

REF. AS ITEM 1.

Shire of Nannup

PO Box 11

Nannup 6275

24th March 2026

Dear Shire of Nannup,

Re: Submission re447 022 Nannup Alpine Resort, Lot 500 Brockman Highway, Nannup

Please find attached a copy of correspondence sent in March 2024 regarding the Local Development Plan (LDP). We wish to emphasise that many of our concerns expressed in the previous communication remain unchanged. In addition to submitting written feedback, we have also attended meetings in person to address the Shire Councilors directly. To date, we have not received a response related to our concerns.

Scale of Development

The Traffic Management Plan projects a substantial increase in local traffic as a result of the proposed development. It is challenging to envision how an additional 200 vehicles per hour will navigate the proposed intersection, particularly when also considering the Dunnet, Brockman, and Grange intersection. We are especially concerned about this in relation to the marked increase in heavy vehicles and large trucks. The traffic impact statement provided appears to lack adequate evidence (note the comparison used to similar developments in the United States for example) and contains contradictions, offering little assurance that such a high number of pedestrians, cyclists, residents, and visitors will realistically be able to navigate the existing residential area safely.

Access Road Concerns

We continue to have serious concerns regarding the proposed resort driveway for entering and exiting Dunnet Road. As outlined in our prior correspondence dated 14th March 2024, issues related to safety, amenity, and privacy in the context of this proposed access driveway remain central to us and our neighbors. These matters have been thoroughly communicated both in writing and in person to the Nannup Shire.

To reiterate, our opposition to the proposed resort access driveway is reasonable and consistent with relevant regulatory government conditions. According to the WA Planning Commission Policy (DC2.6) regarding access roads, of which Dunnet Road is classified: “access roads serve only to provide access to individual dwellings and are the link between these dwellings and the local distributor. It is on roads in this category that the domestic environment should predominate over the needs of the motor vehicle”. We see the proposed resort exit/entrance at Dunnet Rd as unnecessary and ill-conceived in its attempts to minimise traffic entering Brockman highway, in addition, it appears to wrongly prioritise the convenience of visitors over the wellbeing of ratepayers.

We strongly encourage Shire Councilor's to visit and experience firsthand the precarious unsealed section of Dunnet Road, as well as the location of the proposed resort access driveway in proximity to the existing four-way intersection. We believe this will offer

valuable perspective for decision-making about pedestrian and driver safety and the potential consequences from a steep increase in its use.

Drainage and Water Management

We note that the Shire has agreed to fund and redirect runoff away from the proposed development site. Given the concerns previously raised about flooding on Dunnet Road and nearby properties, we request more detailed information on this matter. We specifically note the consideration by the developer and the Shire for additional runoff from a contaminated pipe to be redirected to either Asplin or Dunnet Roads. This proposal will inevitably substantially increase water volume and the risk of frequent and more severe flooding for Dunnet Road, adjacent properties and those along the dry brook creek line. Our property already experiences annual flooding due to inadequate infrastructure, specifically, the swale at the bottom of the sealed portion of Dunnet Road and the failure of the culvert at Dry Brook. Attached photos taken during winter 2023, 2024 and 2025 illustrate these issues.

Thank you for considering our concerns and objections to the development as is currently proposed. We hope the Shire will acknowledge and take meaningful action to address the issues we have raised regarding the scale of the development, the proposed resort access on Dunnet Road, and water management and drainage. We would appreciate the opportunity to discuss these matters further and meet with relevant stakeholders.

Yours Sincerely

Todd and Ellen

43 Grange Rd, Nannup

0452 209 199

todd@blackoodstone.com.au

Shire of Nannup
PO Box 11
Nannup 6275

REF. AS ITEM 2.

10th September 2024

Dear Shire of Nannup,

447 022 NANNUP ALPINE RESORT LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN, LOT 500
BROCKMAN HIGHWAY, NANNUP

Thank you for the correspondence dated 14th July, received by us on 14th August 2024. As direct neighbours, living adjacent to and neighbouring the proposed project site we welcome the opportunity to provide comment in response to the Nannup Alpine Resort Local Development Plan and to have our points of concern formally noted. Given the concerns that we outline here, we are respectfully objecting to the proposal.

While we are not entirely opposed to a tourist development (we appreciate this proposal has perceived benefits and that there is broad support for tourism as a considered transition away from traditional industries), we are strongly opposed to the scale of this particular project and recognise the direct link between the magnitude/scale and the increase in negative impacts on surrounding residents and the natural environment. Risk, disruption, potential decline in property value and a generalised reduction in wellbeing are realities when faced with the prospect of a development of this scale. These impacts would seem equally relevant during both construction and operation of the proposal.

In writing this submission, we have referred to the relevant LDP, Constraints Plan, Master Plan and Bushfire Management Plan (BMP). We have viewed these documents from a variety of perspectives, including our own, the surrounding neighbours, the natural environment and the wider Nannup community.

With regard to the later, we have referred to the Nannup Community Strategic Plan and the key strategic themes highlighted within. In our reference to this document, we do not recognise an alignment with the proposed development and are concerned that at a community level, this project, at this scale, is at odds with the reasons that people live and visit Nannup.

In consideration of the information available to us, please note the following points of concern that inform our objection to the Nannup Alpine Resort Local Development Plan:

2.6 Vehicle Access

Dunnet Road Access/Entry

For reasons of privacy, we object to the positioning of the driveway/access point directly facing our property and being less than roughly 10 metres from our boundary. The proximity of this proposed driveway is troubling and will dramatically impact on our sense of place, our sense of privacy and safety. Specifically, we are concerned about onlookers (pedestrians and cyclists included) looking directly at our everyday life, headlights shining directly into the South East side of our home and a general increase in activity around the intersection.

Given that water regularly inundates our property due to the Dunnet Road drain overflow, the over-run of the culvert further up and generalised flooding of Dry Brook (referred to as the

creek in the LDP), mitigating our privacy concerns by way of a fence/screening is both impractical and at odds with our way of life - this being enjoying the surrounding natural habitat, open space and visual view point. We are also positioned at a lower level than LOT 500 Brockman and are separated by an open culvert so use of a fence to create any sense of privacy would be redundant.

We raise concern for reasons of noise generated by pedestrian and vehicle traffic using that intersection/access point. This is in addition to the noise generated more broadly by the daily activity of the proposed establishment.

This proposed access road will effectively create a fourth intersection that surrounds our property – an unreasonable proposition and additional imposition.

Given that the intersection of Grange Rd, Dunnet Rd (both the sealed section to the South and unsealed to the North East) and Brockman Hwy is an irregular and hazardous intersection, consisting of several blind spots, we are concerned that the addition of another intersection at the proposed Dunnet Rd access point, together with a general increase in everyday traffic, will increase the likelihood of an accident.

If, in an emergency situation, as stated in the BMP, the intention is for traffic to exit from the proposed Dunnet Rd access point, onto Brockman Rd, it is difficult to imagine how such a high number of vehicles might navigate this intersection safely and efficiently in an emergency, under extreme conditions. For example, the unsealed section of Dunnet Road, metres from the proposed driveway/access point, is prone to flooding on an annual basis requiring that the road be either closed, unsafe or unusable for periods of time while water recedes, and repeated maintenance is carried out (most recently evidenced in the Nannup Shire newsletter). Again, this does not appear to be a safe or sensible position for an emergency exit or everyday access road.

We have general concerns about the safety (accident or loss of life) of any potential increase in pedestrian, cyclist or vehicle traffic on Dunnet Rd resulting from the project proposal. The unsealed section of Dunnet Rd is hazardous in its current state due to its narrow width - it is essentially unfit as a two-way road. At the steepest point there is no visibility, meaning that there is no clear sight of pedestrians, cyclists or oncoming traffic using this road. In the case of oncoming cars, this currently requires one car to reverse into a bush/rock lined verge space (or anywhere that substitutes as a pull over), to allow traffic to pass. Again, in the event that the proposed Dunnet Rd access point is used in an emergency, in its current condition, this has the potential to create additional risk and confusion.

The LDP states “realistically the tourist development would typically be at 60% capacity rate, which results in 8 cars typically using this entry point”. This supports our concerns around the scale of the project and its feasibility but equally concerning is the assumption that 8 cars would typically use this access point – the evidence for this is not made clear or supported, and with the overall rationale appearing to be illogical. In reality, we are unable to accept there is a valid way to limit the number of vehicles/pedestrians/cyclists using this proposed Dunnet Rd entrance/exit.

The proximity to the town centre has been cited in the LDP as a feature of the proposal. Safe pedestrian access to the town centre has not been addressed in the LDP. Given the current infrastructure does not cater to safe and logical pedestrian access around Dunnet Rd, Grange Rd and Brockman Hwy intersections, we are opposed to the Dunnet Rd access point on this basis also. This is likely to encourage walkers to navigate around a culvert, across a weedy and rocky verge, along the side of a major main road, across the front of our property and onto a paved pathway that appears to stop and start at random intervals along Grange Rd.

General Vehicle Access Points

This section of the LDP states “a general upgrade of these crossovers (and roads to some extent) shall be completed in accordance with local policies, and as agreed by IDG Resorts PTY LTD and the Shire of Nannup”. We would like it to be noted that the lack of detail and concise explanation here raises serious concerns. We would welcome any information around decision making processes with regard to how the Shire prioritise road upgrades, and to what extent does/can a private business inform such decisions.

We also note that this section of the LDP raises more questions and concerns than it does answers, for example, what and where are road upgrades proposed and necessary; what type (and duration) of disruption are residents likely to expect?

2.7 Landscaping and Open Space

This section defers information to another section 1.3 which does not exist within the current LDP. Again, our point of concern here is the lack of relevant information and detail. We would welcome any information around potential habitat loss/removal, and planned changes to the natural environment and existing habitat in and around the watercourse. This appears especially relevant given the existing bird habitat that feed, roost and breed within this lot, including each of the three species of South West WA Black Cockatoos, all of which are vulnerable.

2.8 Watercourse

Hydrology, Risk & Safety

With the information available to us, we are concerned by the omission of any meaningful or adequate risk management or engineering related to working with the hydrology of the landscape. Given that the proposal sits within a flood zone, this being evidenced this and previous winters (flood events and their impacts on Nannup being well documented) we are both surprised and concerned that there has not been more significance given to this within the LDP.

We are particularly confused and concerned by the proposed construction of a ‘head wall’. It is generally accepted that a headwall is a wall around a culvert that allows the entry and exit of water to the culvert without eroding the substrate, however, the LDP demonstrates an intention to construct a head wall “to provide a larger water course area within the subject site” rather than its regular function of ensuring that a water course is diverted and/or channelled effectively. We are concerned about the rationale and integrity of the LDP here - the intention is clearly to dam the Dry Brook for the purpose of manufacturing a ‘lake’ with no evidence of any rigorous engineering or risk assessment to residents, river system, landscape or wildlife.

Additionally, the LDP states that “any works on the creek-line will not impede the natural flow of the watercourse” at the same time maintaining and contradicting that “the low (unsubstantiated) headwall is designed to assist the increase of water”. In this event such engineering (a larger body of water being held in a constructed ‘lake’) would certainly increase the risk of severe flooding to our property and those downstream. To clarify, when the brook is flowing and the proposed lake is full, any flooding would certainly have greater consequences to our property and lives.

In our observations, over roughly a decade, the Dry Brook is an empty tributary 80-90% of the year. We have no evidence or rationale within the LDP to explain how, if the water course is dammed by way of constructing a head wall, the proposed lake will hold water year-round. This consequently raises concerns around water resource use for the purpose of maintaining a fabricated lake.

Ecology

Fundamentally, this water course is a significant, dynamic and often powerful part of a major river system that does not exist in isolation to the surrounding environment or the natural ebb and flow either up or down stream. It is concerning that the significance of the Dry Brook as a meaningful and substantial tributary for the Blackwood River has been reduced to being represented as a 'creek' within the LDP, providing no consideration to its wider ecological significance. There is also a distinct lack of reference to any existing vulnerabilities and risk of this watercourse, in particular when viewed through the lense of climate change.

The LDP states that the rationale for the head wall is "to create a larger watercourse area within the subject site to create a natural sanctuary and habitat" and to "encourage the reestablishment of natural wildlife that once inhabited this area". These statements are at odds with our experience of this wetland and the water course that sustains it. The inference is that there is no valuable, existing ecological system and that through the construction of a tourists board walk, a head wall, and presumably the company of 469 guests, wildlife and habitat will return - we are led to believe this is a place currently void of any ecological relevance.

We would also welcome a discussion with the Shire in regards to how any planning in and around a watercourse that feeds the Blackwood River is assessed from a wider ecological/ environmental view point, with particular regard to climate change but also in relationship to the key strategic theme of Our Natural Environment within the Nannup Strategic Plan. What tangible action is taken to ensure that the Nannup Community Strategic Plan maintains its integrity as a document designed to guide and inform the preservation and care of our natural environment and the value it holds for residents?

General Comments/Concerns

Adjacent Planning

Regarding the intention for LOT 9005 Brockman Highway, for the purpose of an over 55's development, the Shire of Nannup Council Meeting Minutes dated 25th July 2024 minutes (Agenda Item No. 11.7) state that, in support for the suitability of the site for housing, "There are amenity and land use conflicts which will arise from a tourist attracting development being built in this location, particularly in regards to traffic and noise". While we are supportive of the proposal to provide over 55's housing (at the proposed site or otherwise) and appreciate the time and thought invested by the local community, we feel there is a valid point to be made here in consideration of the Alpine Resort proposal.

For example, if this location (LOT 9005) is not assessed as suitable for tourism (the rationale being a negative impact through increased noise and traffic), what consideration, will be given to a far bigger tourist project, only several metres away and directly across the road from this one? It is apparent that the same neighbours bordering LOT 9005 Brockman are also in close proximity to and likely to be impacted by the much larger tourist project proposed for LOT 500.

We would welcome any information with regards to the mechanisms/process/relevant policies given by the Shire in ensuring that a transparent and rigorous assessment of the suitability of each proposal, and in relationship to one another, is made – this supposing that a high density over 55's development will evidently increase regular traffic and noise, in addition to the noise and traffic generated from the proposed development that, according to the BMP, has the potential to hold 547 people (including staff) on any given day.

General Noise & Traffic

While the issue of noise and traffic to neighbours along Brockman Hwy has been addressed to some extent in the LDP, there is no inclusion of any consideration given to our or

neighbouring properties along Dunnet Rd. Rather, we face the prospect of a completely re-imagined lifestyle – one that would require we adapt to the noise and intensity generated by a motel accommodating literally hundreds of people and their vehicles, only metres from our boundary, and a direct driveway and tourist board walk with full view of our back yard and home.

We thank you in advance for your considered response to our concerns and overall objection to the Alpine Resort LDP. Please feel welcome to contact us in order to clarify or discuss any aspect of our letter in more detail.

Kind regards,

Todd & Ellen

Todd - 0452 209 199 todd@blackwoodstone.com.au

Ellen – 0458598066 ellen.jess@live.com.au











REF. AS ITEM 3.

SHIRE OF NANNUP RECEIVED	
Ref:	No:
24 MAR 2026	
Officer:	

CHRISTINE WATKINS
HEATH PICKETT

21 DUNNET RD
NANNUP

PH. 0484 933 642

To David Taylor (C.E.O)

Christine and I have lived on Dunnet Rd for over 25 years and oppose the development on Lot 500 Brockman Hwy.

We are disappointed there has been no direct contact by the Shire or developer on this matter at any stage!

The resort will make a huge impact on the valley's environment, the traffic on intersection of Dunnet, Brockman Grange and will create more danger and impact on local pedestrians. The light pollution will corrupt the evening sky in the valley forever!

The development and disruption on this site will take many years and may not deliver initial outcomes in proposed plans!

Unfortunately we have seen the long and failed Moonlight Ridge, development not deliver initial outcomes, this area is still not completed and infrastructure, roads, drainage are already deteriorating at great cost to shire.

With the unique aspect of Lot 500 and surrounding area we have huge concerns on the re-shaping of water course, with the amount of water that can impact this catchment.

We feel this hotel does not support the strategic plan of the Shire and its future. It is unnecessary to offer a resort experience when visiting tourist do not want this kind of accommodation in the Southwest.

We see no reason the shire should support this development as the money ^{spent} and ^{future} rate increase should be allocated towards more concerning needs for the people of Nannup

Heath

HEATH PICKETT JDP.

CHRISTINE WATKINS.

REF. AS ITEM 4.

To whom it may concern,

I cannot understand how you can build a car park across the road from my property without notifying me so I can write a letter in response. The car park has an EXIT directly pointing into my driveway and house which shines car lights directly inside my house at night. This is not acceptable and was completely avoidable.

Regarding the new car park directly across road from my property.

I understand the sewage pumping station is situated under the ground there hence making valuable land unavailable for any other purpose, however, a letter advising me of this would have given me an opportunity to oppose the 'EXIT' and make it an 'ENTRANCE' ... or, MOVE the EXIT further along so as to not impact my home excessively with car headlights.

I also believe an application is in place for a development at lot 500 Brockman Highway? Once again, no contact has been received by me regarding this project. This project is located close to my premises.

I believe Nannup water and sewage is already at capacity so what are you doing to upgrade and cope with this situation ?? I already cope with sewage smelling from across the road, it stinks when prevailing wind blows in my direction (which is 99% of the time).

Looking forward to hearing from you.

Regards Deborah Read

25 Grange Rd

Nannup

OFFICIAL

REF. AS ITEM 5.

18 March 2026

Our Reference: REQ-0002860

Your reference: A920

To: Shire of Nannup

From: Department of Water and Environmental Regulation

RE: - Development Application – Lot 500 Brockman Highway, Nannup Proposed Tourism Develop

Thank you for providing the above referenced proposal for the Department of Water and Environmental Regulation (Department) to consider.

The Local Water Management Strategy (LWMS) states that it addresses the requirements of the Shire of Nannup stated in their letter dated 3 February 2025 in response to the Draft Local Development Plan. In the Department's advice of the Local Development Plan (Our Ref PA066194, dated 10/09/24) a future new head wall/low level weir was identified along Dunnet Road, and it is noted that this has been removed from the proposal.

The Department does not object to the proposal and provides the following advice:

1. Issue: LWMS

Advice: The Department has provided comments on the LWMS in the table below, none of these require a response but should be considered in the development of the more detail plans and reports, and the following condition are recommended:

- Prior to any works being undertaken a Stormwater Management Plan is to be prepared to the satisfaction of the Shire, which is to provide detailed design supported by the results of geotechnical and groundwater investigations.
- Prior to any works being undertaken a Construction Management Plan is to be prepared to the satisfaction of the Shire, which is to outline protection of the watercourse and vegetation to be retained, dust management, surface runoff, noise management, and traffic management.
- Prior to any works being undertaken a Landscape Management Plan is to be prepared to the satisfaction of the Shire.

2. Issue: Native Vegetation

Advice: While not explicitly stated, based on the plans and reports provided no clearing of native vegetation is indicated to be proposed.

More detail pertaining to the above issues are provided in the table below.

Item No.	Reviewer comment/advice
1	Issue: Local Water Management Strategy Comments:

Section 4.3:

- CSS_SITE_ID 5529, which relates to this site was classified by the Department as 'Not contaminated - unrestricted use' on 11 Dec 2025.

Section 4.4:

- Further investigation and assessment of groundwater is supported and should be conditioned individually or linked to the proposed Stormwater Management Plan. Aerial imagery indicates there may be expressions of groundwater as hillside seepage, mostly towards the west, east and downslope along the northern edge. The potential interaction, and impact, of these expressions on the capacity, and ability to infiltrate the first 15mm of rainfall, of the proposed basins during winter will need consideration.

Section 4.5:

- Development of a geotechnical report is supported and should be conditioned individually or linked to the proposed Stormwater Management Plan. As detailed, this will assist 'during detailed design stage, to confirm the soils and permeability, and confirm the proposed sizing of the swales and basins'.

Section 5.1:

- It is noted and supported that the development will be serviced with reticulated scheme water and reticulated sewerage. As detailed on this webpage [Water Corporation WA | Warren-Blackwood Regional Water Supply Scheme](#), in early 2026 the Department approved Water Corporations application to increase their groundwater licence from 1.5 GL/year up to 1.9GL/year. It is therefore assumed that the Water Corporation can service the full proposal.

Section 5.2:

- In accordance with the *Decision Process for Stormwater Management in WA (DWER 2017)* the Department's expectation is management of the first 15mm, for water quality, as close to source as possible. In mimicking the pre-development conditions this could require detention or retention.
- The disconnected treatment train prior to stormwater discharge into the watercourse is supported.

Section 5.3:

- The reference to the 'education from the proponent at the point of sale' is assumed to be not relevant to this proposal, as there are no freehold or survey strata lots.

Section 5.4:

- Rainwater harvesting and reuse for garden irrigation, toilet flushing and laundry purposes is supported.
- The final dot point that references Aerobic Treatment Unit is assumed to be not relevant to this proposal, as it will be serviced with reticulated sewerage.

Section 7:

- It is stated 'To preserve the natural hydrological and ecological function of the creek, the habitable buildings have been set back from the bottom of the bank of the creek by a minimum of 30m.' An assessment of the appropriate foreshore, as per *Operational policy - Identifying and establishing waterways foreshore areas (DoW 2012)* has not been undertaken. This is considered acceptable based on the proposed setback, management of stormwater through a disconnected treatment train, connection to reticulated sewerage, and a desktop review of landform and watercourse. However, noting that no rehabilitation of the watercourse is proposed, it is recommended that a Landscape Management Plan be conditioned to ensure appropriate species are being considered to avoid weed encroachments into the watercourse.

Section 8.2:

- Development of a Construction Management Plan is supported and should be conditioned.

Section 9.2:

- Development of a Stormwater Management Plan is supported and should be conditioned.

Appendix B (DWG No: 24208-C-01 Rev D):

- This drawing indicated minor encroachment of four of the chalets into the floodplain at the northwestern edge. This was noted and deemed acceptable during the assessment of the Local Development Plan, as it was considered not to be obstructive to major flows, as long as a minimum habitable floor level of 68.7 m AHD was applied, which is proposed.

In the event there are modifications to the proposal that may have implications on aspects of environment and/or water management, the Department should be notified to enable the implications to be assessed. Should you require any further information on the comments please contact the undersigned.

Yours sincerely,

Krish Seewraj
Planning Advice Program Manager
South West Region
Approvals – Statewide Delivery

Department of Water and Environmental Regulation
71 McCombe Road, BUNBURY, WA 6230
PO Box 261, BUNBURY, WA 6231
T: (08) 9726 4137 | F: (08) 9726 4100 | E: krish.seewraj@dwer.wa.gov.au
www.dwer.wa.gov.au | [Twitter: @DWER_WA](https://twitter.com/DWER_WA)

Hello,

REF. AS ITEM 6.

I understand that submissions close tomorrow re. the proposal for a new tourist development on the Brockman Highway site. As a landowner in Moonlight Ridge I have many concerns about this proposal. Given the creek running through this property I do not feel confident that the plan adequately addresses the issues re. potential environmental issues of this fragile, and changing landscape. I simply can't fathom how this creek that when flowing in the winter, can continue to pass through this area and into the Blackwood River as it should.

I also believe that this type of development is not in keeping with the feel of Nannup. The proposed development is too large for the site. I'm also concerned about how- if the site is to be developed how the surrounding area would be impacted and how the site would be accessed. The added pressure of extra people in the town to house during construction..? Where would they all be housed..? I see many local businesses struggle so in my opinion the extra restaurant would have a detrimental effect on established businesses. Another major concern would have to be the noise not only during construction but after..Noise is already an issue in that part of the valley floor. It bounces around Moonlight Ridge- and Boise from one side of the road to the other is already very noticeable. I don't feel confident that this proposal would be of benefit to the local residents of Nannup. Looking at your plans for the future- we need more housing for residents- not for tourists. I choose to call Nannup home for its natural beauty and quiet, country feeling. I object to this proposal in its current form and would like my objection to be noted by council as you consider whether or not to approve its application.

With Thanks

Kelly Fournier

REF. AS ITEM 7.

Allan Waters
3 McAlpine Mews
Nannup
WA 6275
Mobile 0417994298
27th February, 2026

David Taylor
Chief Executive Officer

And Erin Gower
Acting Development Services Coordinator

Shire of Nannup
15 Adam Street
Nannup 6275

Attention David Taylor
Cc Erin Gower

I wish to comment on the proposed Tourism Development at 500 Brockman Highway, Nannup. Reference A920. My main objection is to the access being created onto Dunnet Road. Even though it says limited access, I cannot see how there is any restriction preventing all guests and staff using the Dunnet Road access. I would prefer to see that there is no access to the development from Dunnet Road. I think traffic entering Brockman Highway from Dunnet Road will be a dangerous. My only other comment is that the development is being built on a flood plain. I have witnessed this area flooding every year and I am not sure how this is going to be mitigated. I have photographs to show that situation, if you wish to have copies.

Kind regards



Allan Waters

The C.E.O. Mr. D. Taylor
Nannup Shire.

24th March 2026

REF. AS ITEM 8.

Dear Sir,

RE. Development Application, Lot 500 Brockman Highway, Nannup

Although I read the Shire Notice Board and receive e-newsletters I cannot recall an entry about the above and only heard, by word of mouth, today that a further detailed application has been submitted for this and that the closing date for submissions is today. I went into the Shire office this morning and was advised this latest application is a more detailed one and different to the earlier one, but that not many submissions had been received. Having since spoken to a councillor to explain this to me I can understand why there is renewed concern being expressed around me about the latest application. Perhaps the legislation regarding this type of thing needs to be explained to the ratepayers as to how the various stages of a development application works?

Having now briefly read the section on transport regarding this development, I could not see any mention of the concerns made at a Council meeting about the state of the access road from Dunnet Road North. Do I presume those issues will still be part of the next round regarding this latest detailed application?

In my earlier submission I did mention that the angle of the intersection of Brockman Highway, Dunnet Road South and Grange Road is not an easy one for the following reasons:

- Limited vision because of the slight rise when exiting Grange Road and the high bank on the right coming out of Dunnet Road South, combined with the curvature of the road between these points and the proposed entry to the development on Brockman Highway.
- This location needs to be considered in view of the inevitable traffic increase between these points, and the proposed entry to the development on Brockman Highway and the potential costs involved to the Shire for any realignments.

Although this may seem like an emotive topic I think it is an important one. Like others that I have talked to I am concerned about the impact of such a large development so close to the centre of town and neighbouring residential areas. Tourism can have a positive and negative effect, but as we can now see the impact this has created in overcrowding in the United Kingdom and European holiday places, resulting in social displacement and demonstrations, this really is a topic that needs to be part of the discussion about such a development in Nannup.

Yours sincerely,
Janet Brenkman
26 Dunnet Road, Nannup
janbrenkman@gmail.com