



Karratha Revitalisation Strategy

Schedule of Submissions

No/Ref	Date Received	Name	Address	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response	Officer Recommendation
1	25 March 2015	Annabelle Little	10 Hyde Road, Pegs Creek	<p><i>Issue/Comment No. 1:</i></p> <p><u>Summary of revitalisation community meetings</u></p> <p>To provide improvements in the amenity of the suburbs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Improve aesthetics -Mow and manage walkways and swale drains -Increase useability for walking and riding with improved safety and crime prevention. 	<p><i>Officer Response No. 1:</i></p> <p>Noted. The City is working on doing all of these things via the KRS. The KRS aims to concentrate use of public spaces and the resources to maintain them in a holistic and coordinated way.</p>	<p><i>Officer Recommendation No. 1:</i></p> <p>No modification required.</p>
				<p><i>Issue/Comment No. 1.1:</i></p> <p>Older suburb redeeming qualities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -People are passionate about their suburbs and block sizes. -Zoning changes accepted close to the City Centre. 	<p><i>Officer Response No. 1.1:</i></p> <p>Noted. The City is aiming to retain redeeming qualities and enhance amenity through revitalisation of streetscapes and the housing stock. It is inevitable that some landowners will want the opportunity to redevelop. A lot of attention has been given to making sure any redevelopment is sympathetic to the existing character and pattern of development. Little change to residential density is proposed over the majority of the study area.</p>	<p><i>Officer Recommendation No. 1.1:</i></p> <p>No modification required.</p>
				<p><i>Issue/Comment No. 1.2:</i></p> <p>Not to create further density.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Residents requested retention of suburb density and not to increase. 	<p><i>Officer Response No. 1.2:</i></p> <p>Increasing residential densities across the study area is an integral and necessary component of the KRS. Infill development and redevelopment form part of the KCN vision for Karratha.</p> <p>This is a long term strategy and changes proposed are expected to occur over the next fifteen to twenty years.</p> <p>The KRS recommends residential density increases in a coordinated manner to assist in creating revitalised housing stock and streetscapes.</p> <p>Redevelopment typologies have been included to show preferred site redevelopment outcomes under each density coding scenario and substantial guidance has been provided on matters to be addressed in design guidelines and policy. This will ensure development under the new density codes is done in the most appropriate and sympathetic way.</p> <p>The capacity to deliver the amenity improvements that are desired by the community is tied to the ability to increase the level of service. The City is able to justify a higher level of service in areas where the density of residential development is higher.</p> <p>The submitter's property is recommended for a minor increase in residential density from the current R20 to R25. The higher R40 density coding is only recommended for residential blocks</p>	<p><i>Officer Recommendation No. 1.2:</i></p> <p>No modification required.</p> <p>Further consultation be undertaken with submitters who expressed concerns about the negative effects of density increases to give them a clear understanding of what the proposed density changes would mean for their property and properties around them and to allow them to communicate their concerns so it can be determined whether additional controls and guidelines are necessary.</p>

No/Ref	Date Received	Name	Address	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response	Officer Recommendation
					<p>adjacent to the City Centre and along the proposed Green Link. The implications of a change in density from R20 to R25 are that instead of requiring a minimum lot size of 900sqm to subdivide and build a second dwelling, only 700sqm would be required. This would not change the redevelopment potential of the subject property and would only marginally change the dwelling yield of the Hyde Road residential cell. It is each landowner's decision as to whether they choose to redevelop their property.</p> <p>The KRS cannot change densities by itself. The KRS will only guide consideration of revised densities via the new Local Planning Scheme No.9. Any proposal to change the density coding of land must, under legislation, be publicly advertised. This gives landowners the opportunity to comment on specific proposals affecting their property.</p>	
				<p><i>Issue/Comment No. 1.3:</i></p> <p><u>Cul-de-sacs</u></p> <p>-Residents appreciate the amount of cul-de-sacs and don't want to increase 'through' roads.</p>	<p><i>Officer Response No. 1.3:</i></p> <p>Improving connectivity across the study area is a key objective of the KRS that has been carried down from Karratha City of the North.</p> <p>Improved connectivity between adjacent residential cells, across suburbs and with the City Centre would support an effective public transport system in the future and provide alternative evacuation routes. Background research for the KRS has revealed that a better connected road network will also alleviate pressure on perimeter distributor roads like Bayview and Dampier and would defer the need for major upgrades of those roads.</p> <p>It is recognised that streets need to remain safe but the overall vision cannot be realised if connectivity is not increased. It is contended that good design can both improve connectivity and maintain safety. To achieve this, the KRS recommends prioritising pedestrian and cyclist movements by creating friction in the design and functioning of the streetscape. The KRS proposes to slow traffic along the Green Link by emphasising its segmented nature, narrowing the perceived street corridor with high density tree planting, providing for on-street parking and planting nibs on long sections and prioritising and increasing pedestrian and cyclist use of the corridor. Four-way pedestrian-friendly intersections controlled with stop or give way signs will help slow the speed of traffic along this route.</p> <p>It is no longer recommended to construct a drain crossing between Galbraith and Demetre and it is not recommended to construct a Hyde Road connection at this point in time. There is a very high number and proportion of cul-de-sacs in the study area. Modern controls (State Planning Policy and Liveable Neighbourhoods) attempt to limit the number of cul-de-sacs to less than 15% of new estates as it is recognised that cul-de-sacs transfer an excessive traffic load upon service roads, contribute towards congestion, and result in road networks of low permeability.</p>	<p><i>Officer Recommendation No. 1.3:</i></p> <p>No modification required.</p>

No/Ref	Date Received	Name	Address	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response	Officer Recommendation
					Affected property owners and residents will continue to be consulted regarding any plans to change their streets or construct road connections.	
				<p><i>Issue/Comment No.1.4:</i></p> <p><u>Loss of Bushland and Walking Tracks and Pedestrian and Children Safety Concerns.</u></p> <p>-The amount of walking tracks between the suburbs increases their viability and their accessibility encourages walking and riding through the suburbs without having to cross major roads or walk adjacent to major roads.</p>	<p><i>Officer Response No.1.4:</i></p> <p>Submitter concerns regarding a decrease in pedestrian safety, particularly for children, where bush tracks or cul-de-sacs are proposed to be modified are acknowledged by the City.</p> <p>Significant amounts of public open space, bushland, walking trails and drainage reserves will be retained. In some instances, the KRS seeks to formalise and improve existing routes recognising the attraction to residents. In other instances, the KRS proposes to create shared movement corridors where substantial improvements for pedestrians, cyclists and automobiles would be proposed. These improvements would include streetscape works such as tree planting, footpaths, street and bollard lighting, and level drainage reserve crossings.</p> <p>In contrast to bush tracks, and as part of an improved transportation network, the shared movement corridors would be well lit and have passing pedestrian and automobile traffic. Combined with overlooking residential development and passive surveillance, the footpaths are considered to be safe environments.</p> <p>Safety concerns are being factored into the design responses that are being developed under the KRS. The KRS proposes to formalise the connections between residential cells to provide safe, compliant and convenient access for all users. These connections will be designed to encourage pedestrian and cyclist activity and as low speed, pedestrian-friendly streetscapes. Pedestrian and cyclist movement will be prioritised at intersections, with stop and give way signs helping to slow traffic movement.</p> <p>The KRS proposes to slow traffic along the Green Link by emphasising its segmented nature, narrowing the perceived street corridor with high density tree planting, providing for on-street parking and planting nibs on long sections and prioritising and increasing pedestrian and cyclist use of the corridor.</p> <p>Affected property owners and residents will continue to be consulted regarding any plans to change their streets or construct road connections. A Karratha-wide traffic model has been developed to help understand, plan for and manage street and intersection design and traffic movements to best meet overall traffic management objectives. Traffic management measures can be introduced to reduce the speed and manage the flow of traffic.</p> <p>Alternative informal access arrangements will still be available.</p>	<p><i>Officer Recommendation No.1.4:</i></p> <p>No modification required. Affected property owners and residents will continue to be consulted regarding any plans to change their streets or construct road connections.</p>
				<p><i>Issue/Comment No.1.5:</i></p> <p><u>City Planning Comparison</u></p>	<p><i>Officer Response No.1.5:</i></p>	<p><i>Officer Recommendation No.1.5:</i></p>

No/Ref	Date Received	Name	Address	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response	Officer Recommendation
				-Canberra has expanded dramatically in density close to CBD nodes yet retained an exceptional amount of 'green space'. The submission noted the high standards of amenity and connectivity experienced by Canberra residents.	Noted and agreed. It is considered that the proposed KRS Strategy will retain large amounts of open space and also improve amenity and connectivity for residents and visitors to the study area.	No modification required.
				<p><i>Issue/Comment No.1.6:</i></p> <p><u>Objection to proposed extension of Hyde Road, Pegs Creek</u></p> <p>-The additional north to south extensions were suggested as an alternative to the central spine road at the community meetings, rather than in addition to.</p>	<p><i>Officer Response No.1.6:</i></p> <p><u>Objection to proposed extension of Hyde Road, Pegs Creek</u></p> <p>The submission refers to the potential extension of Hyde Road (currently a cul-de-sac) as a north-south connection to Galbraith Road. This connection was proposed as an opportunity for a number of streets to have an alternative access / egress to the sole access from Balmoral Road that currently exists.</p> <p>Providing alternative access is a key objective of the KRS Strategy to avoid potential segregation of residential cells if sole access points become compromised i.e. flooded. Another reason for providing alternative access/egress is to spread the volume of vehicles entering Distributor Roads like Bayview Road more evenly across a number of intersections rather than causing bottlenecks at only a few intersections.</p> <p>The focus will be on delivering the Green Link as the first priority. The Hyde Road connection is not being proposed at this stage and any plans to further progress any proposed connection will involve consultation with affected property owners.</p>	<p><i>Officer Recommendation No.1.6:</i></p> <p>Prioritise creating the full Green Link and not construct the Hyde Road connection at this stage.</p>
				<p><i>Issue/Comment No.1.7:</i></p> <p>-Prior to purchasing the property at 10 Hyde Road, our due diligence process included discussion with Council and the Planning team was specifically questioned as to whether Hyde Road was to be extended or included in the Karratha Terrace/Galbraith Road extension. The answer provided only a year ago was there was no extension planned for Hyde Road.</p>	<p><i>Officer Response No.1.7:</i></p> <p>As per Officer response No.1.6.</p>	<p><i>Officer Recommendation No.1.7:</i></p> <p>As per Officer Recommendation No.1.6.</p>
				<p><i>Issue/Comment No.1.8:</i></p> <p><u>Safety</u></p> <p>Safety will be reduced dramatically for:</p> <p>-My children walking to school, parks and to neighbours because they will have to cross the road.</p> <p>-For the immediate community walking to school, parks and town</p> <p>-For my property where vehicles may miss the corner turn.</p>	<p><i>Officer Response No.1.8:</i></p> <p>As per Officer Response No.1.4 and Officer Recommendation No.1.6.</p>	<p><i>Officer Recommendation No.1.8:</i></p> <p>-As per Officer Recommendation No.1.6.</p>
				<p><i>Issue/Comment No.1.9:</i></p> <p>-The cul-de-sac provides a closer knit street. The extension and creation of a thoroughfare loses the community aspect.</p>	<p><i>Officer Response No.1.9:</i></p> <p>As per Officer Response No.1.3.</p>	<p><i>Officer Recommendation No.1.9:</i></p> <p>As per Officer Recommendation No.1.3.</p>
				<p><i>Issue/Comment No.1.10:</i></p>	<p><i>Officer Response No.1.10:</i></p>	<p><i>Officer Recommendation No.1.10:</i></p>

No/Ref	Date Received	Name	Address	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response	Officer Recommendation
				-Our property has an unencumbered view of the Karratha Hills. The extension of the road and the required road signs will impede this view.	As per Officer Response No.1.6 there is no intention to construct the Hyde Road connection at this time.	As per Officer recommendation No.1.6.
				<p><i>Issue/Comment No.1.11:</i></p> <p>-No direct correspondence provided to owners regarding the potential change, yet this is a far more dramatic change than for projects such as underground power or an amendment to the storm surge policy where in these cases all owners of affected properties were provided written notification.</p>	<p><i>Officer Response No.1.11:</i></p> <p>-Extensive community consultation has been undertaken to date as detailed within the report. Additionally, these are long term design proposals which will be subject to localised consultation to consider their local application before any work is done on the ground.</p> <p>Affected property owners will be consulted to talk them through practical implications for their property of any plans to implement KRS recommendations.</p>	<p><i>Officer Recommendation No.1.11:</i></p> <p>-No Modification required. Refer schedule of submissions to submitters offering to further discuss their concerns or any further queries they have regarding the KRS.</p>
				<p><i>Issue/Comment No.1.12:</i></p> <p>-Minimal response time has been provided to owners to enable owners to respond to the proposed plan.</p>	<p><i>Officer Response No.1.12:</i></p> <p>-Consultation will be ongoing. The next step is to make submitters aware of Council's consideration of their submissions and to offer to discuss their concerns or any further queries they may have.</p>	<p><i>Officer Recommendation No.1.12:</i></p> <p>No Modification required.</p>
				<p><i>Issue/Comment No.1.13:</i></p> <p>-Support for the swale drain development.</p>	<p><i>Officer Response No.1.13:</i></p> <p>Noted.</p>	<p><i>Officer Recommendation No.1.13:</i></p> <p>No Modification required.</p>
				<p><i>Issue/Comment No.1.14:</i></p> <p>-Support for the street upgrades.</p>	<p><i>Officer Response No.1.14:</i></p> <p>Noted.</p>	<p><i>Officer Recommendation No.1.14:</i></p> <p>No Modification required.</p>
				<p><i>Issue/Comment No.1.15:</i></p> <p><u>Objection to zoning change for Hyde Road</u></p> <p>-With the retention of Hyde Road as a cul-de-sac, there is no need for the provision to increase the density infill and increase the zoning rate for some properties.</p>	<p><i>Officer Response No.1.15:</i></p> <p><u>Objection to zoning change for Hyde Road</u></p> <p>As per Officer Response No.1.2.</p>	<p><i>Officer Recommendation No.1.15:</i></p> <p>No Modification required.</p>
				<p><i>Issue/Comment No.1.16:</i></p> <p><u>Traffic Congestion</u></p> <p>-Increased development will create greater traffic congestion at Hyde Road and Balmoral Road with the increased volume of vehicles.</p>	<p><i>Officer Response No.1.16:</i></p> <p>The road network is being designed to avoid individual intersections becoming congested.</p> <p>The Hyde Road extension is not being proposed at this stage.</p>	<p><i>Officer Recommendation No.1.16:</i></p> <p>No Modification required.</p>
				<p><i>Issue/Comment No.1.17:</i></p> <p>-There are no local services/businesses that greater density would provide advantage to.</p>	<p><i>Officer Response No.1.17:</i></p> <p>As per Officer Response No.1.2.</p>	<p><i>Officer Recommendation No.1.17:</i></p> <p>No Modification required.</p>
				<p><i>Issue/Comment No.1.18:</i></p> <p><u>Objection to removal of Dodd Park</u></p> <p>-We have appreciated the upgrades to the park including the shade structures and garden clearing.</p>	<p><i>Officer Response No.1.18:</i></p> <p><u>Objection to removal of Dodd Park</u></p> <p>It is understandable that property owners and residents living around a local park would raise concern regarding the possible removal of that park. From a park planning perspective, however,</p>	<p><i>Officer Recommendation No.1.18:</i></p> <p>-No modification required.</p>

No/Ref	Date Received	Name	Address	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response	Officer Recommendation
				While the push is to reduce the green spaces and maintenance, the community has expressed the interest in not only retaining them but increasing them.	Dodd Park has been determined as having overlapping walkable catchments with other nearby parks, which from an operational perspective represents over-servicing. It costs the Council and ratepayers extra money to maintain parks that have overlapping catchments. It is intended to use any returns from disposal of parkland to fund the upgrading of open spaces in the immediate locality. It is recommended that the KRS continue to show Dodd Park as a park that may be replaced at some point in the future. Any further plans in this regard would only proceed alongside a targeted consultation process.	
				<i>Issue/Comment No.1.19:</i> <u>Objection to Dodd Park upcoding to R40</u> -increased traffic congestion at Jennifer and Balmoral Road. -The removal of the park would result in property depreciation nearby.	<i>Officer Response No.1.19:</i> <u>Objection to Dodd Park upcoding to R40</u> As per Officer Response No.1.18.	<i>Officer Recommendation No.1.19:</i> No Modification required.
				<i>Issue/Comment No.1.20:</i> <u>Objection to housing infill of land along creek line.</u> -As per the community feedback there is no interest in the increase in the density infill and increasing the zoning rating for this area. -By increasing development in the area, the amenity space is lost and the value of the flora and fauna in the creek line suffer.	<i>Officer Response No.1.20:</i> -As per Officer Response No.1.2. -There is the opportunity for new residential development to better engage with drainage reserves and provide passive surveillance for improved safety of these open spaces.	<i>Officer Recommendation No.1.20:</i> -No Modification required.
				<i>Issue/Comment No.1.21:</i> <u>Property Devaluation</u> -The removal of the park would drop housing prices in the street and adjoining area.	<i>Officer Response No.1.21:</i> Expert opinion and experience indicates that effective delivery of the full combination of design elements comprising the KRS should have a positive effect on property values, bearing in mind that there are many other factors that can also influence property values	<i>Officer Recommendation No.1.21:</i> No modification required.
				<i>Issue/Comment No.1.22:</i> -Are we able to exclude Hyde Street as a through road?	<i>Officer Response No.1.22:</i> As per Officer Response No.1.6.	<i>Officer Recommendation No.1.22:</i> -As per Officer Recommendation No.1.6.
				<i>Issue/Comment No.1.23:</i> -Are we able to retain Dodd Park?	<i>Officer Response No.1.23:</i> As per Officer response No.1.18	<i>Officer Recommendation No.1.23:</i> No modification required.
2.	5 March 2015	Tony Jeffery	3 Hyde Road, Pegs Creek	<i>Issue/Comment No.2:</i> -Unencumbered views of the Karratha hills.	<i>Officer Response No.2:</i> -As per Officer Response No.1.10.	<i>Officer Recommendation No.2:</i> -No Modification required.

No/Ref	Date Received	Name	Address	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response	Officer Recommendation
				<i>Issue/Comment No.2.1:</i> -Seek retention of cul-de-sac for quiet enjoyment.	<i>Officer Response No.2.1:</i> -As per Officer Response No.1.3.	<i>Officer Recommendation No.2.1:</i> -As per Officer Recommendation No.1.3.
				<i>Issue/Comment No.2.2:</i> -Retain cul-de-sac for value in our property.	<i>Officer Response No.2.2:</i> - Increasing the permeability of the transport network in conjunction with streetscape improvements may increase property values, not devalue them as a result of investment into the public realm and direct connection to locations of activity.	<i>Officer Recommendation No.2.2:</i> -No modification required.
				<i>Issue/Comment No.2.3:</i> -Property is currently within direct walking distance of the local school without having to cross any roads.	<i>Officer Response No.2.3:</i> -As per Officer Response No.1.4.	<i>Officer Recommendation No.2.3:</i> -No Modification required.
				<i>Issue/Comment No.2.4:</i> -Property has the choice of two parks.	<i>Officer Response No.2.4:</i> -As per Officer Response No.1.18	<i>Officer Recommendation No.2.4:</i> -As per Officer Recommendation No.1.18.
				<i>Issue/Comment No.2.5:</i> -We can walk to the city centre as far as Balmoral Road without crossing a road.	<i>Officer Response No.2.5:</i> -As per Officer Response No.1.4.	<i>Officer Recommendation No.2.5:</i> -No Modification required.
3.	23 February 2015	Sylvia Bassett	1 Hyde Road, Pegs Creek	<i>Issue/Comment No.3:</i> -Unencumbered views of the Karratha hills.	<i>Officer Response No.3:</i> -As per Officer Response No.1.10.	<i>Officer Recommendation No.3:</i> -No Modification required.
				<i>Issue/Comment No.3.1:</i> -Seek retention of cul-de-sac for quiet enjoyment.	<i>Officer Response No.3.1:</i> -As per Officer Response No.1.3.	<i>Officer Recommendation No.3.1:</i> -As per Officer Recommendation No.1.3.
				<i>Issue/Comment No.3.2.:</i> -Retain cul-de-sac for value in our property.	<i>Officer Response No.3.2:</i> As per Officer Response No.2.2.	<i>Officer Recommendation No.3.2:</i> As per Officer Recommendation No.2.2.
				<i>Issue/Comment No.3.3:</i> -Property is currently within direct walking distance of the local school without having to cross any roads.	<i>Officer Response No.3.3:</i> As per Officer Response No.1.4.	<i>Officer Recommendation No.3.3:</i> -No Modification required.
				<i>Issue/Comment No.3.4:</i> -Property has the choice of two parks.	<i>Officer Response No.3.4:</i> --As per Officer Response No.1.18	<i>Officer Recommendation No.3.4:</i>

No/Ref	Date Received	Name	Address	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response	Officer Recommendation
						-As per Officer Recommendation No.1.18.
				<i>Issue/Comment No.3.5:</i> -We can walk to the city centre as far as Balmoral Road without crossing a road.	<i>Officer Response No.3.5:</i> As per Officer Response No.1.4.	<i>Officer Recommendation No.3.5:</i> -No Modification required.
4.	23 February 2015	Tane Makoare and Tia Foster-Spiers	4 Hyde Road, Pegs Creek	<i>Issue/Comment No.4:</i> -Unencumbered views of the Karratha hills.	<i>Officer Response No.4:</i> As per Officer Response No.1.10.	<i>Officer Recommendation No.4:</i> -No Modification required.
				<i>Issue/Comment No.4.1:</i> -Seek retention of cul-de-sac for quiet enjoyment.	<i>Officer Response No.4.1:</i> As per Officer Response No.1.3.	<i>Officer Recommendation No.4.1:</i> -As per Officer Recommendation No.1.3.
				<i>Issue/Comment No.4.2:</i> -Retain cul-de-sac for value in our property.	<i>Officer Response No.4.2:</i> -As per Officer Response No.2.2.	<i>Officer Recommendation No.4.2:</i> -As per Officer Recommendation No.2.2.
				<i>Issue/Comment No.4.3:</i> -Property is currently within direct walking distance of the local school without having to cross any roads.	<i>Officer Response No.4.3:</i> -As per Officer Response No.1.4.	<i>Officer Recommendation No.4.3:</i> -No Modification required.
				<i>Issue/Comment No.4.4:</i> -Property has the choice of two parks.	<i>Officer Response No.4.4:</i> -As per Officer Response No.1.18.	<i>Officer Recommendation No.4.4:</i> -As per Officer Recommendation No.1.18.
				<i>Issue/Comment No.4.5:</i> -We can walk to the city centre as far as Balmoral Road without crossing a road.	<i>Officer Response No.4.5:</i> As per Officer Response No.1.4.	<i>Officer Recommendation No.4.5:</i> -No Modification required.
5.	5 March 2015	Geoff Harris	3 Hyde Road, Pegs Creek	<i>Issue/Comment No.5:</i> -Unencumbered views of the Karratha hills.	<i>Officer Response No.5:</i> -As per Officer Response No.1.10.	<i>Officer Recommendation No.5:</i> -No Modification required.
				<i>Issue/Comment No.5.1:</i> -Seek retention of cul-de-sac for quiet enjoyment.	<i>Officer Response No.5.1:</i> -As per Officer Response No.1.3.	<i>Officer Recommendation No.5.1:</i> -As per Officer Recommendation No.1.3.
				<i>Issue/Comment No.5.2:</i> -Retain cul-de-sac for value in our property	<i>Officer Response No.5.2:</i> -As per Officer Response No.2.2.	<i>Officer Recommendation No.5.2:</i>

No/Ref	Date Received	Name	Address	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response	Officer Recommendation
						-As per Officer Recommendation No.2.2.
				<i>Issue/Comment No.5.3:</i> -It is in direct walking distance of the local school without having to cross any roads.	<i>Officer Response No.5.3:</i> -As per Officer Response No.1.4.	<i>Officer Recommendation No.5.3:</i> -No Modification required.
				<i>Issue/Comment No.5.4:</i> -It has a choice of two parks.	<i>Officer Response No.5.4:</i> --As per Officer Response No.1.18.	<i>Officer Recommendation No.5.4:</i> -As per Officer Recommendation No.1.18.
				<i>Issue/Comment No.5.5:</i> -We can walk to the city centre as far as Balmoral Road without crossing a road.	<i>Officer Response No.5.5:</i> -As per Officer Response No.1.4.	<i>Officer Recommendation No.5.5:</i> -No Modification required.
6.	16 March 2015	Peter Schmidtchen	Not supplied	<i>Issue/Comment No.6:</i> -Lifestyle, peace and quiet will be impinged by the proposal.	<i>Officer Response No.6:</i> -The Green Link will be designed as a pedestrian-friendly traffic calmed street. Trucks are expected to use the main distributor roads on the periphery of the suburbs.	<i>Officer Recommendation No.6:</i> -No Modification required.
				<i>Issue/Comment No.6.1:</i> -Increased crime possibilities resulting from increased densities.	<i>Officer Response No.6.1:</i> -The overall KRS strategy is designed to encourage more activity in the streets, a recognised strategy for reducing the incidence of crime. A lot of attention has been given to making proposed increased densities based on sound settlement pattern planning and as compatible and sensitive to the character and amenity of the surrounding neighbourhood as possible.	<i>Officer Recommendation No.6.1:</i> -No Modification required.
				<i>Issue/Comment No.6.2:</i> -Object to rezoning of property and devaluation.	<i>Officer Response No.6.2:</i> -As per Officer Response No.1.2.	<i>Officer Recommendation No.6.2:</i> -As per Officer Recommendation No.6.2.
7.	24 March 2015	Graham and Catherine Palmer	1 Viveash Way Bulgarra	<i>Issue/Comment No.7:</i> -Increased traffic and noise will result.	<i>Officer Response No.7:</i> Concerns are noted. Every effort will be made to make the streets as low speed, high amenity and pedestrian-friendly as possible.	<i>Officer Recommendation No.7:</i> -No Modification required.
				<i>Issue/Comment No.7.1:</i> -The proposed movement network will result in increased danger to Children.	<i>Officer Response No.7.1:</i> -As per Officer Response No.1.4.	<i>Officer Recommendation No.7.1:</i> -As per Officer Recommendation No.1.4.
				<i>Issue/Comment No.7.2:</i>	<i>Officer Response No.7.2:</i>	<i>Officer Recommendation No.7.2:</i>

No/Ref	Date Received	Name	Address	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response	Officer Recommendation
				-Property Devaluation.	-As per Officer Response No.2.2.	-No Modification required.
				<i>Issue/Comment No.7.3:</i> -Link roads are unnecessary. There is no need to ruin a safe and quiet suburb to save a couple of minutes travel time.	<i>Officer Response No.7.3:</i> -The Green Link is necessary to avert the future traffic implications associated with local traffic being dependent upon distributor roads for both local and non-local traffic movements. The capacity to have safe quiet suburbs and a permeable transport network between and within residential cells are not mutually exclusive.	<i>Officer Recommendation No.7.3:</i> -No Modification required.
8.	19 March 2015	Julia Rice	20 Frinderstein Way, Pegs Creek	<i>Issue/Comment No.8:</i> I am against the idea of making our pathways and open land into city centre link roads.	<i>Officer Response No.8:</i> As per Officer Response No.1.4.	<i>Officer Recommendation No.8:</i> -As per Officer Recommendation No.1.4.
				<i>Issue/Comment No.8.1:</i> -Unnecessarily duplicates Balmoral Road and Dampier Road.	<i>Officer Response No.8.1:</i> -The Green Link will serve a different function to the distributor roads and function as a low speed, high friction environment, primarily for movement between residential cells. Road users seeking high speed movement will continue to exit the residential cells onto Bay View Road and Dampier Road for longer or faster journeys.	<i>Officer Recommendation No.8.1:</i> -No Modification required.
				<i>Issue/Comment No.8.2:</i> By making residential roads into main city centre link roads, traffic will increase. Quiet and low traffic roads will turn into very noisy, polluting and high traffic roads.	<i>Officer Response No.8.2:</i> -As per Officer Response No.1.8.	<i>Officer Recommendation No.8.2:</i> -As per Officer Recommendation No.1.8.
				<i>Issue/Comment No.8.3:</i> There is a large amount of people currently using the bush pathways including young children riding to schools.	<i>Officer Response No.8.3:</i> -As per Officer Response No.1.4.	<i>Officer Recommendation No.8.3:</i> -As per Officer Recommendation No.1.4.
				<i>Issue/Comment No.8.4:</i> Green Link roads will go past primary schools.	<i>Officer Response No.8.4:</i> -As per Officer Response No.1.4 regarding pedestrian, particularly child safety. Further to Officer Response No.1.4, the route of the Green Link going past schools and the potential for schools to implement 'walking bus' programs, or for parents to teach children road rules in a pedestrian-friendly environment, is considered to be a strength of the design.	<i>Officer Recommendation No.8.4:</i> -No Modification required.
				<i>Issue/Comment No.8.5:</i>	<i>Officer Response No.8.5:</i>	<i>Officer Recommendation No.8.5:</i>

No/Ref	Date Received	Name	Address	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response	Officer Recommendation
				-Would change area around Frinderstein Road from Residential to City Centre.	-There are no plans to extend the City Centre zone within the proposed Strategy or in the future. It is noted that the existing drainage reserve serves as a boundary between the City Centre and Residential zones and that is proposed to remain. The Green Link and improved movement network will not alter the residential focus of existing residential areas.	-No Modification required.
9.	20 March 2015	Danielle Hage President Karratha City Ratepayers Association	5 McCourt Way, Bulgarra	<i>Issue/Comment No.9:</i> I will be affected personally by this from increased traffic in my area and also the scout hall which I am actively involved in.	<i>Officer Response No.9:</i> Concerns are noted. Every effort will be made to make the streets as low speed, high amenity and pedestrian-friendly as possible.	<i>Officer Recommendation No.9:</i> -No Modification required.
				<i>Issue/Comment No.9.1:</i> -I don't see any achievement other than making the bus route easier and will a bus route achieve its quota?	<i>Officer Response No.9.1:</i> There is potential for a bus service to operate within the study area at a future time. The proposed plan maximises potential viability.	<i>Officer Recommendation No.9.1:</i> No Modification required.
				<i>Issue/Comment No.9.2:</i> The proposal will increase traffic and speed limits in our area.	<i>Officer Response No.9.2:</i> -As per Officer Response No.9.	<i>Officer Recommendation No.9.2:</i> -No Modification required.
				<i>Issue/Comment No.9.3:</i> Buses with noisy brakes will impact shift workers	<i>Officer Response No.9.3:</i> -As per Officer Response No.7.	<i>Officer Recommendation No.9.3:</i> -As per Officer Recommendation No.7.
				<i>Issue/Comment No.9.4:</i> -Scout hall will have a main route running past it.	<i>Officer Response No.9.4:</i> As per Officer Response No.9.	<i>Officer Recommendation No.9.4:</i> -No Modification required.
				<i>Issue/Comment No.9.5:</i> -Have to change address again.	<i>Officer Response No.9.5:</i> -Need for change will only be considered when connection is being introduced, which is likely to be some time away.	<i>Officer Recommendation No.9.5:</i> -No Modification required.
10.	30 March 2015	Owen Leece	25 Viveash Way, Bulgarra	<i>Issue/Comment No.10:</i> -Diminished Amenity from traffic	<i>Officer Response No.10:</i> As per Officer Response No.9.	<i>Officer Recommendation No.10:</i> -No Modification required.
				<i>Issue/Comment No.10.1:</i> -Increased crime rate due to decreased amenity.	<i>Officer Response No.10.1:</i> As per Officer Response No.6.1.	<i>Officer Recommendation No.10.1:</i> No Modification required.
				<i>Issue/Comment No.10.2:</i> -It would be better served if the Council establish two or three roads running from Dampier Road to Searipple Road utilising some of the busier streets to join up the town.	<i>Officer Response No.10.2:</i> -This forms part of the KRS recommendations, although the Green link is the recommended first priority.	<i>Officer Recommendation No.10.2:</i> -No Modification required.

No/Ref	Date Received	Name	Address	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response	Officer Recommendation
11.	13 March 2015	Imelda Bilato	3 Hyde Road, Pegs Creek	<i>Issue/Comment No. 11:</i> -Diminished amenity due to increased traffic	<i>Officer Response No. 11:</i> -As per Officer Response No.9.	<i>Officer Recommendation No. 11:</i> -No Modification required.
				<i>Issue/Comment No. 11.1:</i> -Increased crime risk due to increased accessibility.	<i>Officer Response No. 11.1:</i> As per Officer Response No.6.1.	<i>Officer Recommendation No. 11.1:</i> No Modification required.
				<i>Issue/Comment No. 11.2:</i> -The proposed movement network will result in increased danger to children. Traffic management and safety should be the main priority for the Shire.	<i>Officer Response No. 11.2:</i> -As per Officer Response No.1.4.	<i>Officer Recommendation No. 11.2:</i> -As per Officer Response No.1.4.
				<i>Issue/Comment No. 11.3:</i> -The property has increased appeal and marketability as a house on a cul-de-sac. The extension of the cul-de-sac will result in property devaluation.	<i>Officer Response No. 11.3:</i> -As per Officer Response No.1.6.	<i>Officer Recommendation No. 11.3:</i> -As per Officer Recommendation No.1.6.
12.	29 March 2015	Craig Hemmings	21 Emma Street, Bulgarra	<i>Issue/Comment No. 12:</i> -Convert suburban street into a main road.	<i>Officer Response No. 12:</i> -Suburban streets will remain a suburban streets.	<i>Officer Recommendation No. 12:</i> -No Modification required.
				<i>Issue/Comment No. 12.1:</i> -Heavy vehicle traffic and buses and trucks.	<i>Officer Response No. 12.1:</i> -As per Officer Recommendation No.6. -It is acceptable for buses to run through suburban streets.	<i>Officer Recommendation No. 12.1:</i> -No Modification required.
				<i>Issue/Comment No. 12.2:</i> -Only houses in Karratha on a main road.	<i>Officer Response No. 12.2:</i> -Green Link road will not be designed as a main road.	<i>Officer Recommendation No. 12.2:</i> -No Modification required.
				<i>Issue/Comment No. 12.3:</i> -Property devaluation.	<i>Officer Response No. 12.3:</i> -As per Officer Response No.2.2.	<i>Officer Recommendation No. 12.3:</i> -No Modification required.
				<i>Issue/Comment No. 12.4:</i> -Safety risks for children.	<i>Officer Response No. 12.4:</i> -As per Officer Response No.1.8	<i>Officer Recommendation No. 12.4:</i> -As per Officer Recommendation No.1.8.
				<i>Issue/Comment No. 12.5:</i> -Unnecessary due to existing ring roads.	<i>Officer Response No. 12.5:</i> -Not supported.	<i>Officer Recommendation No. 12.5:</i> -No Modification required.

No/Ref	Date Received	Name	Address	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response	Officer Recommendation
				<p><i>Issue/Comment No. 12.6:</i></p> <p>Karratha 'design' is implemented in new areas so that it has minimal impact upon households. Why are we deviating?</p>	<p><i>Officer Response No. 12.6:</i></p> <p>These concerns are being factored into the design response that is being developed under the KRS. While it is recognised that streets need to remain safe, the overall vision cannot be realised if connectivity is not increased. It is contended that good design can both improve connectivity and maintain safety. To achieve this, the KRS recommends prioritising pedestrian and cyclist movements by creating friction in the design and functioning of the streetscape. The KRS proposes to slow traffic along the Green Link by emphasising its segmented nature, narrowing the perceived street corridor with high density tree planting, providing for on-street parking and planting nibs on long sections and prioritising and increasing pedestrian and cyclist use of the corridor. Four-way pedestrian-friendly intersections controlled with stop or give way signs will help slow the speed of traffic along this route.</p>	<p><i>Officer Recommendation No. 12.6:</i></p> <p>-No Modification required.</p>
13.	24 March 2015	Stephen and Rebecca Gunson	3 Viveash Way, Karratha	<p><i>Issue/Comment No. 13:</i></p> <p>-Increased road traffic and noise would be obtrusive as I am a shift worker.</p>	<p><i>Officer Response No. 13:</i></p> <p>-As per Officer Response No.7.</p>	<p><i>Officer Recommendation No. 13:</i></p> <p>-As per Officer Recommendation No.7.</p>
				<p><i>Issue/Comment No. 13.1:</i></p> <p>-Increased traffic is a danger to children.</p>	<p><i>Officer Response No. 13.1:</i></p> <p>-As per Officer Response No.1.4.</p>	<p><i>Officer Recommendation No. 13.1:</i></p> <p>-As per Officer Recommendation No.1.4.</p>
				<p><i>Issue/Comment No. 13.2:</i></p> <p>-Decrease in aesthetic appeal at expense of bushland.</p>	<p><i>Officer Response No. 13.2:</i></p> <p>As per Officer Response No.1.4.</p>	<p><i>Officer Recommendation No. 13.2:</i></p> <p>-No Modification required.</p>
				<p><i>Issue/Comment No. 13.3:</i></p> <p>-Waste of rate payers and government funds.</p>	<p><i>Officer Response No. 13.3:</i></p> <p>-Not supported.</p>	<p><i>Officer Recommendation No. 13.3:</i></p> <p>-No Modification required.</p>
				<p><i>Issue/Comment No. 13.4:</i></p> <p>-High density living is conducive to anti-social behaviour and crime.</p>	<p><i>Officer Response No. 13.4:</i></p> <p>-As per Officer Response 6.1.</p>	<p><i>Officer Recommendation No. 13.4:</i></p> <p>-As per Officer Recommendation No.1.2.</p>
				<p><i>Issue/Comment No. 13.5:</i></p> <p>-Any bus service can go around the suburbs rather than through suburbs.</p>	<p><i>Officer Response No. 13.5:</i></p> <p>-Long distance bus route will use main roads however local bus services use local roads with the greatest catchments.</p>	<p><i>Officer Recommendation No. 13.5:</i></p> <p>-No Modification required.</p>

No/Ref	Date Received	Name	Address	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response	Officer Recommendation
14.	25 March 2015	Melissa Rose	Not provided	<p><i>Issue/Comment No. 14:</i></p> <p>-Road would not have local traffic. It would become a main road along with Balmoral Road and Dampier Road.</p>	<p><i>Officer Response No. 14:</i></p> <p>-As per Officer Response No.12.6.</p>	<p><i>Officer Recommendation No. 14:</i></p> <p>-No Modification required.</p>
				<p><i>Issue/Comment No. 14.1:</i></p> <p>-Pegs Creek is a very narrow suburb. There would be only a few residential streets either side, north and south, of the link road. Therefore a high proportion of residents of Pegs Creek would be directly, negatively affected by a busy road running through the middle of the suburb, effectively cutting Pegs Creek in two.</p>	<p><i>Officer Response No. 14.1:</i></p> <p>As per Officer Response No.12.6.</p>	<p><i>Officer Recommendation No. 14.1:</i></p> <p>-No Modification required.</p>
15.	2 April 2015	Patricia Brown	27 Andover Way, Bulgarra	<p><i>Issue/Comment No. 15:</i></p> <p>-Significant Noise would be created in an otherwise quiet area.</p>	<p><i>Officer Response No. 15:</i></p> <p>-As per Officer Response No.7.</p>	<p><i>Officer Recommendation No. 15:</i></p> <p>-As per Officer Recommendation No.7.</p>
				<p><i>Issue/Comment No. 15.1:</i></p> <p>-Shift worker who requires rest.</p>	<p><i>Officer Response No. 15.1:</i></p> <p>-As per Officer Response No.7.</p>	<p><i>Officer Recommendation No. 15.1:</i></p> <p>-As per Officer Recommendation No.7.</p>
				<p><i>Issue/Comment No. 15.2:</i></p> <p>-Area would be adequately served by transport using Searipple or Millstream and along Maitland.</p>	<p><i>Officer Response No. 15.2:</i></p> <p>-Not supported.</p>	<p><i>Officer Recommendation No. 15.2:</i></p> <p>-No Modification required.</p>
16.	25 March 2015	Jeff King	44 Andover Way, Bulgarra	<p><i>Issue/Comment No. 16:</i></p> <p>-Increased traffic will pose an increased danger to children.</p>	<p><i>Officer Response No. 16:</i></p> <p>-Not supported.</p>	<p><i>Officer Recommendation No. 16:</i></p> <p>-No Modification required.</p>
				<p><i>Issue/Comment No. 16.1:</i></p> <p>-High boat ownership which, when reversing in or out of properties, will make it an unnecessary accident waiting to happen.</p>	<p><i>Officer Response No. 16.1:</i></p> <p>-Reversing boats etc. will serve to slow down traffic on the link road hereby increasing safety.</p>	<p><i>Officer Recommendation No. 16.1:</i></p> <p>-No Modification required.</p>
				<p><i>Issue/Comment No. 16.2:</i></p> <p>-Crime rate will increase.</p>	<p><i>Officer Response No. 16.2:</i></p> <p>-As per Officer Response No.6.1.</p>	<p><i>Officer Recommendation No. 16.2:</i></p> <p>-As per Officer Recommendation No.6.1.</p>
				<p><i>Issue/Comment No. 16.3:</i></p> <p>-Increased access will increase crime.</p>	<p><i>Officer Response No. 16.3:</i></p> <p>-As per Officer Response No.6.1.</p>	<p><i>Officer Recommendation No. 16.3:</i></p> <p>-As per Officer Recommendation No.6.1.</p>

No/Ref	Date Received	Name	Address	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response	Officer Recommendation
				<i>Issue/Comment No. 16.4:</i> -More traffic will create more accidents.	<i>Officer Response No. 16.4:</i> -Not supported.	<i>Officer Recommendation No. 16.4:</i> -No Modification required.
				<i>Issue/Comment No. 16.5:</i> -Proposal will physically divide community.	<i>Officer Response No. 16.5:</i> -Not supported.	<i>Officer Recommendation No. 16.5:</i> -No Modification required.
				<i>Issue/Comment No. 16.6:</i> -Unnecessary duplication of roads.	<i>Officer Response No. 16.6:</i> -As per Officer Response No.1.3. -As per Officer Response No.6.	<i>Officer Recommendation No. 16.6:</i> -No Modification required.
17.	24 March 2015	Robert Hinckfuss	6 Edney Way, Pegs Creek	<i>Issue/Comment No. 17:</i> -Upgrade of swales supported. Specific recommendations provided.	<i>Officer Response No. 17:</i> -Noted.	<i>Officer Recommendation No. 17:</i> -No Modification required.
				<i>Issue/Comment No. 17.1:</i> -Provide recreational and exercise equipment and facilities for teenagers and adults.	<i>Officer Response No. 17.1:</i> -Noted.	<i>Officer Recommendation No. 17.1:</i> -No Modification required.
18.	21 March 2015	Kellie and Harley Coventry	21 Lewington Way, Bulgarra	<i>Issue/Comment No. 18:</i> -Loss of bushland and movement network.	<i>Officer Response No. 18:</i> As per Officer Response No.1.4.	<i>Officer Recommendation No. 18:</i> -No Modification required.