

Hi Erin.

Sorry for the delay.

The comments received from the DA advertising period are mostly a repeat of what was raised during the LDP approval phase.

These items were addressed and consequently the LDP was approved (see attached email chain).

Based on this approval, the DA was prepared and submitted.

There had also been some further correspondence between the shire and our office on some minor matters and these have also been addressed in the DA set submitted.

It would be fair to say that the LDP and Development Application work hand in hand, as such, would hope that the current items raised from the advertising period have already been satisfied within the shire /council based on the signed off LDP.

Never the less, and in sincerity to assist any local concerns, I make the following comments in response.

It should be noted that the majority of the items raised by a small number of the community has been taken seriously and with concern. It is our ethic duty of care (and being a local resident myself) to try and accommodate all concerns with any proposed development and in this case we have done the same.

We understand that change is hard to accept in many cases but we have worked with the shire to address any issues the neighbouring residents may have.

*It should also be noted that as per with any large development, that it is imperative to **design for the full capacity** of the resort so that all infrastructures can be considered and the site can successfully accommodate for that. As with any development, the market will determine the extent of the construction phases and overall completion. If, and that's an if, the market demonstrated that the project should be staged then that would be addressed at that point of construction design/documentation phase with the shire but at least the site has already been planned and approved for the full capacity (Services, roads, parking, landscaping, drainage etc.).*

It should also be noted that although the existing drainage pipe from Moonlight Ridge has been approved by the shire to be removed from lot 500, and diverted elsewhere, The Memorial site has undergone further investigation and testing to have the status removed and become part of lot 500 without any encumbrances. This has been successful (see attached letter (DWER)).

This does not affect the current DA but now means that this area can be utilised for the resort.

I have reattached the comments you sent me and referenced them by number to relate to my response.

Ref. item 1.

- Majority of items already addressed in the shire approved LDP.
- The suggested issue of additional flooding the Dunnet road due to the redirection of the stormwater pipe from Moonlight Ridge is not necessarily valid. There would not necessarily be any additional water from Moonlight ridge entering Dry Brook /Dunnet road. Current water flows either transfer to existing locations on /near Dunnet road or onto and over lot 500 where it then flows its natural course

down Dry Brook, The shire have agreed that the pipe and water flow should not travel across lot 500 and will design an appropriate stormwater drainage system around lot 500. It should also be noted that the current water catchment on lot 500 has been tested and deemed not contaminated. This report is available and has been mentioned in the DWER submission in this DA. The design of the proposed stormwater diversion , around lot 500, is still to be determined and will be inevitably under some further consultation with the property owners in due course. This diversion is not relevant to the current development application. All Lot 500 development water control has been addressed in the LWMS.

Ref . Item 2.

- It has been stated in the ,shire approved ,LDP that the number of vehicles using the Dunnet Road entrance is limited to the (6x) chalet accommodation only. The direction of the crossover has been changed to accommodate the concerns of the neighbour opposite the cross over , by forcing vehicles to turn left onto Brockman highway via Dunnet road. This aims the headlights away from the neighbouring residence. The developer is also sympathetic to the neighbouring property and is open to a mutual discussion of how best to satisfy their concerns. Screening , Boom gates etc. are options to be considered at the time of Building design planning however the intent of the development application should be approved on its merit and the facts stated in the TIS /LDP. Considering that there is substantial design and development pending for the Dunnet road upgrade itself (by the Nannup shire) this aspect can be further investigated and items such as traffic management , island /planting design etc. can be considered. However it must be noted that the TIS and LDP states clearly as to the numbers of vehicle to use Dunnet road exit and this would become conditional at approval. Such conditions would become part of the construction design phase and any final building licence approvals.
- The landscape plan clearly shows that the natural flora that exists in and along the creek line will remain as this area is in the flood zone , ACH and the previous proposal for a headwall has been removed from this application. A Cockatoo study was deemed as not being required with the consideration of NOT creating the headwall or developing the creek line under this application. The remainder of the site is open fields and pastures.
- The “watercourse” is not part of this application.

Ref . Item 3.

- The “watercourse” is not part of this application.

Ref . Item 4.

- Services to lot 500 ,and the proposed development ,have been accepted by the Governing authorities under the application submitted and responses received.

Ref . Item 5. DWER

- The comments have been generally accepted and demonstrate support (with some suggestions of items being made “conditional” as part of the DA approval (as standard)

Ref . Item 6.

- The “watercourse”is not part of this application. No change to the water flow or this zone is proposed at this point.

- Workers during construction ? Although this is not relevant to the application , the proposal identifies staff and workers accommodation on site . Subject to project management analysis at the time of pre-construction, the staff and workers accommodation could very well be prioritised and house construction workers that may need to be sourced from out of town. The buildings would then be converted to staff quarters for the resort use when that time arrives. It should be noted that the aim of the construction phase is to use as much local /regional labour and trades where possible ,and the skills allow. Although this is stated in “good faith” , it does not form part of the Development application as such nor should it contribute to a decision.

Ref Item 7

- As per item 2

Ref Item 8.

- As per item 2

Kind regards,

Paul Meschiati

Managing Director



Your ref: GAM/CDH81104
Our ref: DWERDGCDCG-251100471
Enquiries: Andrew Miller, 6364 7186

Mr Glen McLeod
Principal/Director
McLeod Fisher & Hamdorf

Email: glen@mfhlaw.com.au

Dear Mr McLeod

LOT 500 BROCKMAN HIGHWAY, NANNUP

Thank you for your letter of 12 November 2025 and the preliminary site investigation and detailed site investigation reports prepared by JBS&G on behalf of GPF TTESMSF Pty Ltd, the registered proprietor of Lot 500 Brockman Highway, Nannup.

The Department will review the reports and consider whether the classification of the site should be updated in consultation with the Department of Health. This work will be progressed as a priority in the coming weeks.

Notice of classification letters will be provided within ten days of the any update to the classification being made.

If the site is reclassified as *not contaminated – unrestricted use*, as suggested, the contaminated site memorial on the certificate of title will be removed.

Yours sincerely

Alistair Jones
DIRECTOR GENERAL

01 December 2025