

Proposal	Transfer of non-conforming land use; Community Purpose (Rehabilitation Facility)
Property Address	Lot 848 & 844 Moorilup Road
Assessing Officer	Clara
Application Reference	P902

Schedule of Submissions

Public Submissions

Submission Number	Comments	Officer Assessment
1	<p>Drug and alcohol rehabilitation</p> <p>We are writing to formally express our strong objection to the proposed drug and alcohol rehabilitation facility in our local area. As standing residents, we value the safety, stability, and close-knit nature of our community. While we acknowledge the importance of rehabilitation services, we have significant concerns about the suitability of this particular location for such a facility.</p> <p>Our primary concerns are as follows:</p> <p>Safety of Children and Families</p> <p>Our area is home to many young families, and children regularly play outdoors and move freely within the neighbourhood. Introducing a facility of this nature raises concerns about potential risks to their safety and wellbeing.</p> <p>Impact on Property Values</p> <p>We are concerned that the presence of a rehabilitation facility may negatively affect property values in the surrounding area. For many residents, their home is their most significant financial investment.</p> <p>Disruption to a Quiet Residential Community</p> <p>Our neighbourhood is currently a peaceful and close community. There is concern that the introduction of a facility of this type may bring increased noise, traffic, and general disruption that is not in keeping with the character of the area.</p> <p>Potential Increase in Crime and Anti-Social Behaviour</p> <p>While we understand that rehabilitation aims to support individuals, there is concern—based on similar developments elsewhere—that such facilities can be associated with increases in anti-social behaviour and localised crime.</p> <p>Governance, Management, and Accountability</p> <p>We would like greater transparency around how the facility will be managed, including security measures, staffing, and accountability structures. At present, there is a lack of clarity that makes it difficult for residents to feel confident in the proposal.</p> <p>We respectfully request that the Shire reconsider the location of this development and undertake further consultation with local residents. At a minimum, we ask that detailed information be provided addressing safety measures, operational plans, and long-term community impact.</p> <p>We understand the need for rehabilitation services; however, we believe that careful consideration must be given to placing such facilities in locations that minimise risk and disruption to established residential communities.</p> <p>Thank you for taking the time to consider our concerns. We look forward to your response.</p>	<p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety, security, children/school bus, resident movement and perceived anti-social behaviour concerns are noted; amenity and operational management have been assessed, including staffing, supervision, visitor, intake and exit/discharge arrangements. • Potential impacts on property values or marketability are not valid planning considerations for a development application assessment. • Consultation and notification concerns are noted; the application was advertised in accordance with the statutory process required under the Regulations, furthermore 28 days was provided in lieu of the minimum requirement of 14 days, and submissions have been considered. • Rural amenity, land-use compatibility and change from tourism/function use are relevant planning considerations and have been assessed against the existing lawful use and locality. • Traffic, access and parking matters are relevant planning considerations and have been assessed, including recommended access and parking management requirements where appropriate.
2	<p>Submission for development</p> <p>I have great concerns regarding the advertisement for development of a rehabilitation centre for Aboriginal peoples drug alcohol and metal health. This is proposed for Kendenup cottages and Lodge location.</p> <p>I disagree with this proposal for the immediate future safety of our residential community including elderly and children.</p> <p>We do not have any local police and only volunteers ambulance service.</p> <p>We have the right to feel safe in our town and do not want the steady rising property market affected by this development.</p> <p>I am totally disappointed with the shire considering this development in our Small community.</p> <p>This needs to be situated somewhere where the community are not surrounded affects this facility in our community.</p> <p>Strong NO.</p> <p>MOVE ELSEWHERE.</p> <p>Public meeting regarding this proposal is demanded by local residents.</p> <p>When and Where Shire questions to be answered because we are not suffering our safety at your hands.</p>	<p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety, security, children/school bus, resident movement and perceived anti-social behaviour concerns are noted; amenity and operational management have been assessed, including staffing, supervision, visitor, intake and exit/discharge arrangements. • Police, ambulance, hospital and emergency response resourcing are State service matters and are not determinative planning considerations; the Shire has considered site suitability, access, bushfire and emergency management within its planning role. • Potential impacts on property values or marketability are not valid planning considerations for a development

Submission Number	Comments	Officer Assessment
		application assessment. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Shire cannot require the proposal to be lodged on an alternative site; the application must be assessed at the proposed location on its individual planning merits. • The Shire is required to consider any and all development applications submitted to it, whether such applications are approved or not is part of the assessment process.
3	<p>I147437 - Objection to Proposed Rehabilitation Centre at 217 Moorilup Road Kendenup WA 6323 Attention Julian Murphy CEO For and on behalf of the Shire of Plantagenet RE: Proposed Rehabilitation Centre at 217 Moorilup Road Kendenup WA 6323 We are writing to strongly oppose the proposed Great Southern Drug and Alcohol Rehabilitation Centre (GSDARC) at 217 Moorilup Road, Kendenup. We feel this location is entirely unsuitable. This is a densely populated rural area, with many family homes nearby, and a school bus route directly passing the proposed GSDARC site. As a local school bus service, we operate both a large bus, seating 57 students, and a smaller bus, seating 21 students, along this route and within close proximity. One of the buses stops directly adjacent to the proposed GSDARC, collecting two young primary aged children. With other additional stops within hundreds of metres to the Southern Aboriginal Corporations (SAC) proposed Drug and Alcohol Rehabilitation Centre. The introduction of a facility of this nature raises serious safety concerns, for not only the children we transport daily, but also the bus driver. Our local police station is limited. From experience, calls made to the small police station in Mount Barker, after hours or during weekends, are redirected to the Albany Police station. Redirected calls to the Albany police station, can often stay on hold for long lengths of time, let alone the time it takes for them to travel from Albany to the Kendenup area. For example, a drug induced vehicle accident which occurred below our property on Moorilup Road, required police assistance before the medics could assist him. Being the weekend, it took the Albany Police 2.5 hours to attend. The proposed GSDARC, we feel, would place unnecessary strain on these already stretched emergency resources. It is mentioned in the SAC proposal, that a single staff member from Cyrenian House in Albany, is available for back-up support. According to the SAC documentation, possibly only 2 staff members are rostered on night shift and weekends, servicing a maximum of 20 residents. As you know, any required help or assistance will be almost an hour from this address, if it were to come from Albany, being 72km away. Kendenup has a small Ambulance centre, with limited volunteers, to offer medical service to those in need. Are these volunteers equipped with the resources, knowledge, and training to deal with the potential emergency circumstances that may arise from such a facility? Many of these situations surrounding this centre could require Police attendance, which as we have mentioned, would possibly need to come from Albany. How do you propose this situation would be managed with assurance for our surrounding community? We feel that introducing a facility of this nature, without appropriate immediate surrounding support services, is irresponsible. Beyond that, we have serious concerns about our personal infrastructure and safety. The small shop in Kendenup may not be adequately equipped to manage potential incidents or risks. It sells alcohol, which directly contradicts the purpose of a rehabilitation environment. It is also understood that residents of GSDARC are not detained, and there is a potential for individuals to leave at any time. This raises legitimate concerns regarding community safety and security, with the potential of GSDARC residents entering surrounding properties and/or accessing vehicles. This is not a risk that local residents should be expected to absorb or live with. Furthermore, the information is not entirely clear regarding staffing arrangements. Will all staff be accommodated onsite? Will they be commuting? Will they require local housing, and required to source accommodation within an already limited rural housing market? Consequently, the practicality of maintaining adequate staffing levels for the proposed GSDARC may be impacted. Additionally, we have concerns that our property value will decline. Also, we may be forced to bear added costs of increased property security. No doubt, other local families will share the same concerns. When we purchased our property, and built our dream lifestyle here, we did not see any risk of a Drug and Alcohol rehabilitation centre being established only 500 metres up the road. Our concern is that if we are to sell and relocate due to the proposal of this facility, we fear that potential demand, and value, of our property will be significantly impacted. Assurances about the GSDARC resident's behaviour, does not eliminate the reality, that unpredictability exists where drug and alcohol dependency is involved. Our community with its current resources, is not the place for this level of risk. It is mentioned in the SAC documentation, that 40% of the drug rehabilitation, would likely be from methamphetamine use. From research, these individuals can be irritable, and sometimes dangerous or unpredictable, when removed from such substance. The SAC documentation also states, that alcohol abuse is likely to be the remainder of substance abuse cases at this centre. How can anyone guarantee, that</p>	Objection <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety, security, children/school bus, resident movement and perceived anti-social behaviour concerns are noted; amenity and operational management have been assessed, including staffing, supervision, visitor, intake and exit/discharge arrangements. • Police, ambulance, hospital and emergency response resourcing are State service matters and are not determinative planning considerations; the Shire has considered site suitability, access, bushfire and emergency management within its planning role. • Potential impacts on property values or marketability are not valid planning considerations for a development application assessment. • The Shire cannot require the proposal to be lodged on an alternative site; the application must be assessed at the proposed location on its individual planning merits. • Consultation and notification concerns are noted; the application was advertised in accordance with the statutory process required under the Regulations, furthermore 28 days was provided in lieu of the minimum requirement of 14 days, and submissions have been considered.

Submission Number	Comments	Officer Assessment
	<p>local homes will not become victim to GSDARC residents seeking alcohol, or as previously mentioned, our friendly local store... only a 5.5km walk away. It is concerning, that schizophrenia is a major possible mental health issue, for the individuals at this proposed centre, as stated in the SAC documentation. Paranoia, and/or hallucinations, which could lead to erratic behaviour, is our understanding of this disorder.</p> <p>We hold great concern, if faced with someone of this nature, that we are not equipped in how to manage the individual or the situation correctly, or safely. This may also be the case for many other local residents and families, who do not know how to deal with such people.</p> <p>We have lived a very peaceful life here on the intersection of Hawker and Moorilup Road, and we oppose this proposal.</p> <p>We urge you to reconsider the location of such a facility, and expect full transparency with this matter.</p> <p>We will oppose any approval that does not properly address these concerns.</p>	
4	<p>Proposal re Kendenup Cottages and Lodge</p> <p>We strongly disagree with the proposal to turn the above into a rehabilitation centre</p> <p>We moved to this town to get away from this sort of establishment</p> <p>How dare the shire not even have the decency to advise residents</p> <p>The establishment has sold already plans in progress already without even consulting the town residents and surrounding farmers</p> <p>We have no police out here to help when needed Medical and ambulance services limit</p> <p>This is a community of mixed ages</p> <p>Retirees young kids middle aged</p> <p>We want to feel safe</p> <p>Not to mention the effect on the real estate prices We do not want this establishment</p> <p>WE STRONGLY OBJECT</p>	<p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety, security, children/school bus, resident movement and perceived anti-social behaviour concerns are noted; amenity and operational management have been assessed, including staffing, supervision, visitor, intake and exit/discharge arrangements. • The Shire has 'advised residents' through the required statutory advertisement process, hence receiving this submission. • Police, ambulance, hospital and emergency response resourcing are State service matters and are not determinative planning considerations; the Shire has considered site suitability, access, bushfire and emergency management within its planning role. • Potential impacts on property values or marketability are not valid planning considerations for a development application assessment.
5	<p>Proposed Non-Conforming Land Use for a Community Purpose (Rehabilitation Facility)</p> <p>I wish to make a submission regarding the Proposal: A Non-Conforming Land Use for a Community Purpose (Rehabilitation Facility) at Lot 843 & 844, 217 Moorilup Road, Kendenup.</p> <p>In order to submit my response, I would like to seek clarification regarding the current zoning and use of the land in question. As per my understanding, currently this land is zoned "Rural". As per the State Administrative Tribunal (SAT) in their 2018 WASAT 36 decision, it is noted that a 'rehab' facility meets the land use definition of 'Community Purpose'. Under the Shire's Local Planning Scheme No. 5, 'Community Purpose' in the 'Rural' zoned is deemed an 'X-Not Permitted use', meaning even if you wanted to approve it, you could not. In turn, it could not operate in the 'Rural' zone. Can you please explain why you are asking for submissions (given the above) and what the Council's process and timeframe is, for these submissions?</p> <p>Could you also please confirm what use the Kendenup Lodge & Cottages is (in its current form), that makes it non-conforming.</p> <p>Also, we live 560 meters from the facility in question. Whilst we do not share a direct boundary with the Kendenup Lodge and Cottages, being that we are less than 1 kilometre from the land in question, why were we not informed about the Proposal?</p> <p>I believe that the timeframe to submit a response to this Proposal is woefully inadequate and lacks proper community consultation for a decision on this nature. Can you please inform me of the steps to formally request an extension to the deadline for submission, so that neighbours, residents and other community members have sufficient time to conduct research, find out more information and undertake the necessary consultation, to make an informed decision.</p> <p>21 May 2026 Hi Clara</p> <p>So essentially what you are saying is that the 2004 approval for a Conference Centre, is non-conforming, as Conference Centre is not a listed use in the land use table, in the new scheme.</p> <p>That may be technically correct, however, the counter argument is that it not being listed in the land use table, does not mean it is non-conforming. If it was</p>	<p>Non-Objection</p> <p>Individual responses have been provided directly to each of these emails from this landowner. The below dot points seek to summarise them as much as possible for the sake of the Council Report.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarification request regarding zoning, non-conforming use status, • Advertising and process has been clarified, advertising was completed in accordance with the regulations. 28 days provided in lieu of 14 day minimum and 200m physical advertising, including on site signage and online advertising all conducted. • Land use classification and the non-conforming use pathway are addressed in the Council report. • Requests for historical documents and additional explanation are administrative/procedural matters, not determinative planning considerations and landowner has been advised to obtain these through the recommended channels • The landowner was also advised that the previous approvals/Council minutes are not able to be advertised as they do not form part of the application, but rather inform the assessment, which is the planning officer's responsibility, not for public comment necessarily. • Furthermore, it would not be deemed a reasonable use of rate payer money to print that much documentation off and provide it to all landowners when it can be accessed through other avenues, if a landowner wishes to view it

Submission Number	Comments	Officer Assessment
	<p>concluded by the Council and officers, when the new scheme was written, that this use could be bundled up with something else in that same table (exhibition centre, art gallery etc), the best way to understand this would be to read the reports from when the new scheme was created.</p> <p>It's also critical to understand that the Council, in Table 5 (and later on) in the same new Scheme, specifically lists those properties that have non-conforming uses as a result of the new scheme coming into effect, and the scheme protects these. The Lodge is not listed in this table - why not ?</p> <p>I would argue that it was never the intent of Council to make the Conference Centre at the Lodge, a non-conforming use, so soon after its approval, otherwise this intent would have been articulated in the scheme. It is not reasonable to state that the use is non-conforming purely because it is not specifically listed in the Land Use Table. Using that argument means that a Conference Centre could not ever be constructed in any zone, as it does not appear as an allowable use for any zoning.</p> <p>The question is, what land use in the new scheme was considered appropriate to encompass Conference Centres? It is perhaps more logical to conclude that Council and planning officers, knew the Conference Centre was there, knew it was approved, had no intent of making it non-conforming, and concluded that the use was adequately encompassed by some other use, in the use class table.</p> <p>This is why I think the Council report/s on the development of the new town planning scheme, and on the 2004 Council approvals of the Lodge are needed, so we can see what the Council and officers were saying. I would like to request those please. These reports should all be printed out or bundled up and made available to anyone, as part of this process of advertising, otherwise it can not be concluded that we (the ratepayers) have been given adequate information to assess this Planning Application.</p> <p>The other thing to consider, if the Conference Centre is the basis for the non-conforming use argument, then surely the uses that are not non-conforming (chalets, units accommodation, etc) are all then be definition lawful, and cannot be used by the applicant for a rehab facility, as a rehab facility using these for that purpose, isn't allowed?</p> <p>Given that the submission deadline is the 26th May, your prompt reply would be appreciated.</p> <p>Kind regards,</p> <p>Cindy North</p> <p>21 May 2026 Hi Clara Why can you not respond to these queries?</p> <p>Please pass them onto someone who can, as I feel that establishing non-conforming use for the Conference Centre is absolutely vital in assessing whether this Planning Application that has been brought to the Shire, is legal.</p> <p>This is of high importance and time has already been wasted with my original email not being responded to in a timely manner. If the public is asked to comment or provide submissions regarding a Planning Application, then I would expect that all the relevant documentation and supporting information, should be made available so that an informed submission can be lodged.</p> <p>Kind regards,</p> <p>Cindy North</p> <p>22 May 2026 Hi Clara Further to my below email, can you please provide me with the Council Minutes and supporting documentation for N206 – 2004 Approval – Tourist Accommodation (Conference Facility and Accommodation). This decision was made on the 9th November 2004.</p> <p>I am not asking for you to provide comment or enter discussion, I would just like access to the information that is referred to in the Planning Application P902. If the Planning Applicant, Planning Solutions, has been privy to this information and has referenced it in the Planning Application, then we, the ratepayers should have access to this information as well. I believe that this information is critical in understanding and determining the "non-conforming use" argument that has</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The substantive later objection from the same submitter is addressed separately in this schedule.

Submission Number	Comments	Officer Assessment
	<p>been put forward in the Planning Application.</p> <p>Therefore, can I respectfully request the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning Application N206 – 2004 Approval – Tourist Accommodation (Conference Facility and Accommodation) • All Council Meeting Minutes and supporting documentation in relation to Planning Application N206 – 2004 Approval – Tourist Accommodation (Conference Facility and Accommodation) <p>Given that the submissions for Planning Application P902 closes this Tuesday 26th May and there has already been lengthy delays in the communication process, I would appreciate you giving this your highest priority.</p> <p>Kind regards,</p> <p>Cindy North</p>	
6	<p>Community Concerns Regarding Proposed Rehabilitation Facility in Kendenup Dear Shire of Plantagenet Councillors,</p> <p>I am writing to express my concerns regarding the proposed drug and alcohol rehabilitation facility planned for Kendenup. While I understand the importance of rehabilitation services and supporting vulnerable members of the community, I believe there are significant concerns that need to be carefully considered before moving forward with a development of this scale in our small rural town.</p> <p>Kendenup is a growing community with limited essential services and infrastructure. One of the most pressing concerns is the strain this facility could place on our already stretched volunteer emergency services, particularly the local volunteer ambulance crews. These volunteers already dedicate significant time and resources to supporting the wider community, and increased demand on emergency responses could negatively impact their ability to provide timely care to residents.</p> <p>In addition, Kendenup has a very limited police presence. The town does not currently have the level of policing or emergency response capacity that would be necessary to adequately support a facility dealing with complex drug and alcohol rehabilitation matters. This raises concerns for both community safety and the wellbeing of those accessing the service.</p> <p>Many residents have chosen to live and invest in Kendenup because of its peaceful rural environment, family-friendly atmosphere, and growing potential as a thriving regional community. There is concern among locals that a development of this nature, without the appropriate supporting infrastructure and services, may negatively impact future growth, property investment, tourism, and community confidence.</p> <p>I respectfully ask the Shire to carefully consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The capacity of current volunteer emergency services; The lack of permanent police resources in Kendenup; The long-term impacts on community growth and development; Whether a larger regional centre with established health, emergency, and policing infrastructure may be more suitable for such a facility; The importance of genuine community consultation before any approvals are granted. <p>Our community deserves to have its concerns heard and properly addressed. I encourage the Shire to ensure that any decisions made prioritise the safety, sustainability, and future growth of Kendenup and its residents.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and consideration.</p> <p>Kind regards,</p>	<p>Non-Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landowner expresses fair and reasonable aspects for the Shire to consider in its assessment (which it would anyway), but does not formally object. Comments appreciated • Safety, security, children/school bus, resident movement and perceived anti-social behaviour concerns are noted; amenity and operational management have been assessed, including staffing, supervision, visitor, intake and exit/discharge arrangements. • Police, ambulance, hospital and emergency response resourcing are State service matters and are not determinative planning considerations; the Shire has considered site suitability, access, bushfire and emergency management within its planning role. • Consultation and notification concerns are noted; the application was advertised in accordance with the statutory process and submissions have been considered. • Rural amenity, land-use compatibility and change from tourism/function use are relevant planning considerations and have been assessed against the existing lawful use and locality. • Bushfire and evacuation concerns are noted; bushfire risk and emergency management have been considered through the Bushfire Management Plan and assessment recommendations.
7	<p>I147492 4/05/2026 RE: Formal Request for Extension – Public Submissions Proposal for Lot 843 & Lot 844, 217 Moorilup Road, Kendenup Dear Julian</p> <p>I write to formally request an extension to the current deadline for public submissions in relation to the above proposal.</p> <p>This request is made on the basis of significant concerns regarding procedural fairness, adequacy of consultation, and the limited timeframe provided for community response to a proposal of this scale and potential impact.</p> <p>Firstly, I note that despite my property being located within 600 metres of the above-mentioned location, I have not received any formal notification of this Proposal. Given the proximity and the likely direct impact on neighbouring landowners, this raises serious concerns regarding whether appropriate consultation requirements and notification expectations under the planning framework have been adequately met.</p> <p>Secondly, the current submission period is, in my view, woefully inadequate given the nature and complexity of the proposal. The establishment of a drug and alcohol rehabilitation facility in a rural locality has far-reaching implications, including planning, social, infrastructure, emergency services, and community safety considerations. It is not reasonable to expect affected residents to properly review documentation, seek advice, and prepare informed submissions within the timeframe provided.</p>	<p>Non-Objection</p> <p>Again, individual responses have been provided directly to each of these emails from this landowner. The below dot points seek to summarise them as much as possible for the sake of the Council Report.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Request for an extension to the advertising period and clarification of the non-conforming use pathway is noted. • Advertising and process has been clarified, advertising was completed in accordance with the regulations. 28 days provided in lieu of 14 day minimum and 200m physical advertising, including on site signage and online advertising all conducted. An extension is therefore not deemed required, and the Shire is required to make a determination within a statutory timeframe stipulated

Submission Number	Comments	Officer Assessment
	<p>This concern is compounded by the realities of our rural community. Many residents in the Kendenup community are not actively connected to social media or online platforms and may be entirely unaware that this proposal is under consideration. Reliance on passive or digital forms of communication in a rural setting materially limits genuine community engagement and risks excluding a significant portion of affected stakeholders.</p> <p>In addition, the proposal raises serious matters that require further investigation and consultation, including but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Capacity and proximity of emergency and medical services in a rural area Potential impacts on neighbouring rural land and family environments Infrastructure and service limitations in and around Kendenup Broader community safety and amenity considerations <p>Given these factors, it is essential that the community is afforded a fair and reasonable opportunity to participate in the planning process with community consultation and engagement given the highest priority. The current timeframe of less than one month, does not achieve this.</p> <p>I formally request that the submission period be extended by a minimum of 6 months, and that consideration be given to improved direct notification of affected landowners within both the immediate and surrounding vicinity and the broader Kendenup community.</p> <p>Failure to provide a reasonable opportunity for community input on a proposal of this significance risks undermining confidence in the integrity and transparency of the Shire's planning process.</p> <p>I respectfully request written confirmation of the Shire's decision regarding this extension at your earliest convenience.</p> <p>Yours sincerely 1147559. 6/05/2026 Hi again Julian</p> <p>Just a further question, can you please tell me how the Kendenup Lodge and Cottages is a "Non-Conforming Land Use"? Presumably if it has already been approved by Council to operate in a "Rural Zone" it is a Conforming Land Use? Therefore how would a transfer of one supposed Non-Conforming Land Use to another, be legal grounds for an application? 6 May 2026 Hi Julian</p> <p>Thank you for your time earlier on the phone in giving me an overview of the process required to assess the Proposal at Lot 843 & 844, 217 Moorilup Road, Kendenup.</p> <p>As discussed, if you are able to find out whether we are able to have a copy of the Planning Application that was submitted to Council, that would be appreciated.</p>	<p>under the Regulations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Shire cannot determine the legal merits of the application during advertising; these matters are addressed through the assessment and Council determination process.
8	<p>Proposal for Drug and Alcohol Rehabilitation Centre</p> <p>We are writing to advise of our horror and indignation at the suggestion that a Drug and Alcohol Rehabilitation Centre is being considered at Lots 843 and 844 Moorilup Road , Kendenup.</p> <p>The fact that we were first advised of the proposal by receipt of a letter on May 1 and are expected to digest all the information and respond by May 26 is ludicrous.</p> <p>There are countless considerations to be addressed and we expect that a Council who is representative of it's ratepayers would not reach a decision of this nature without considerable consultation with said ratepayers.</p> <p>There are countless issues of safety, supervision and accessibility to emergency services to be considered not to mention the immediate devaluing of our property should the proposal go ahead.</p> <p>We therefore implore the Council to reconsider the timeline stipulated in your letter of April 29 inst.</p> <p>Yours faithfully, Responded 083175 Thank you for your email.</p>	<p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Shire is required to receive and assess any and all applications submitted to it, whether or not they receive approval is part of that development assessment process Safety, security, children/school bus, resident movement and perceived anti-social behaviour concerns are noted; amenity and operational management have been assessed, including staffing, supervision, visitor, intake and exit/discharge arrangements. Police, ambulance, hospital and emergency response resourcing are State service matters and are not determinative planning considerations; the Shire has considered site suitability, access, bushfire and emergency management within its planning role. Potential impacts on property values or marketability are not valid planning considerations for a development application assessment. Consultation and notification concerns are noted; the application was advertised in accordance with the statutory process required under the Regulations, furthermore 28 days was provided in lieu of the minimum requirement of 14 days, and submissions have been considered. Traffic, access and parking matters are relevant planning considerations and have been assessed,

Submission Number	Comments	Officer Assessment
9	<p>Nathanael, I am following up on my previous email sent nearly four weeks ago regarding the condition of our road particularly outside my property. The surface has deteriorated significantly and is now extremely uneven, with deep bumps directly in front of my driveway. It is becoming difficult to access my driveway without my car just about falling apart. When will it be addressed???</p> <p>It also may help if they Shire put a layer of gravel on the road to stop the road from deteriorating after it has been fixed. The road is only sand with no gravel meaning it will only be a matter of time before the Shire will need to redo the works.</p> <p>I would also like to get on the band wagon of the proposed drug and alcohol facility in Kendenup. Many residents are increasingly upset and concerned about the lack of consultation with ratepayers and the potential impact on our very small community, including property values.</p> <p>We want the Shire to reconsider the proposed location. If the Shire want it so badly have it Barker closer to our tiny local hospital and police when something goes wrong. From A concerned and annoyed ratepayer for nearly 20years..... (Nathanael, I understand you have nothing to do with the Shire decisions but we as a tiny rate paying town need someone to hear us before it's too late 😞)</p>	<p>including recommended access and parking management requirements where appropriate.</p> <p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Police, ambulance, hospital and emergency response resourcing are State service matters and are not determinative planning considerations; the Shire has considered site suitability, access, bushfire and emergency management within its planning role. • Potential impacts on property values or marketability are not valid planning considerations for a development application assessment. • The Shire does not 'want it so badly', the Shire is not proposing this development, it is assessing the development. • The Shire cannot require the proposal to be lodged on an alternative site; the application must be assessed at the proposed location on its individual planning merits. • Consultation and notification concerns are noted; the application was advertised in accordance with the statutory process and submissions have been considered. • Traffic, access and parking matters are relevant planning considerations and have been assessed, including recommended access and parking management requirements where appropriate.
10	<p>SUBMISSION – OBJECTION TO DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION Great Southern Drug and Alcohol Rehabilitation Centre Lots 843 & 844, 217 Moorilup Road, Kendenup To the Shire of Plantagenet Planning Department, I write as a property owner in Kendenup to lodge my objection to the proposed change of use of Kendenup Cottages and Lodge to a residential drug and alcohol rehabilitation facility and low-medical withdrawal unit. While I acknowledge the importance of providing alcohol and other drug treatment services within regional Western Australia, I have concerns regarding the suitability of this specific site in relation to rural land use compatibility, emergency response capacity, and the potential impacts on surrounding rural amenity.</p> <p>1. Emergency response capacity and service accessibility A key concern is the ability of emergency services to respond in a timely manner to incidents at the site. The proposed facility will operate on a 24-hour basis and include a low-medical withdrawal unit and residential rehabilitation program requiring clinical supervision. In the event of a medical emergency, behavioural incident, or other urgent situation, response times from police, ambulance, and hospital services may be significantly longer than in more centrally located facilities, due to the site's rural location and distance from Mount Barker and Albany. Given the clinical nature of the proposed service, I am concerned that the application does not sufficiently demonstrate how timely emergency response will be reliably achieved in practice.</p> <p>2. Rural amenity and existing residential character The surrounding area includes rural residential properties, including families with children, alongside agricultural land uses. While the proposal includes operational management measures, the introduction of a permanent 24/7 clinical rehabilitation facility changes the established pattern of land use activity in the locality, including continuous staffing, structured resident supervision, and regulated visitor movements. This represents a shift in the character of the area from low-intensity rural and tourism-based use toward an institutional health service environment.</p> <p>3. Perceived amenity and property market impacts While property values are not a primary determining factor in planning decisions, changes in land use intensity and amenity can influence the perceived attractiveness of rural residential areas. The introduction of a permanent institutional-style facility operating 24 hours per day may alter perceptions of amenity and quiet rural enjoyment that typically underpin rural residential lifestyle expectations in the area.</p> <p>4. Comparison with previous approved use The application relies on previous approval for a 260-person function and accommodation facility to argue reduced intensity. However, the proposed use is materially different in nature, being: continuously rather than event-based clinically supervised rather than recreational/tourism-based</p>	<p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety, security, children/school bus, resident movement and perceived anti-social behaviour concerns are noted; amenity and operational management have been assessed, including staffing, supervision, visitor, intake and exit/discharge arrangements. • Police, ambulance, hospital and emergency response resourcing are State service matters and are not determinative planning considerations; the Shire has considered site suitability, access, bushfire and emergency management within its planning role. • Potential impacts on property values or marketability are not valid planning considerations for a development application assessment. • The Shire cannot require the proposal to be lodged on an alternative site; the application must be assessed at the proposed location on its individual planning merits. • Traffic, amenity, land use classification, zoning and non-conforming use arguments are noted and addressed in the statutory assessment against Local Planning Scheme No. 5 and the deemed provisions throughout the Council Report.

Submission Number	Comments	Officer Assessment
	<p>operational 24 hours per day rather than intermittent These differences result in a fundamentally different type of land use impact, regardless of nominal capacity comparisons. 5. Traffic, activity, and ongoing operations The proposal introduces continuous staff shift changes, regulated visitor access, service deliveries, and potential emergency service attendance. While individually managed, these movements occur on a permanent and ongoing basis, which differs from the intermittent nature of the existing approved use. Conclusion For the reasons outlined above, I respectfully submit that the proposed development raises concerns in relation to emergency response capacity, rural land use compatibility, and impacts on the established rural amenity of the area. While I support the provision of alcohol and other drug treatment services in principle, I do not consider this site to be an appropriate location for a 24-hour clinical rehabilitation and withdrawal facility given its rural setting and surrounding residential context. I therefore request that the Shire give careful consideration to these matters in assessing the application. Yours sincerely,</p>	
	<p>Rehab Kendenup To CEO of SOP, I am a resident and rate payer of Kendenup and would like to express my support for a rehabilitation centre in Kendenup. There needs to be places for people with addictions to get help. You have got my yes. Kind regards,</p>	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for the proposal and the regional need for rehabilitation services is noted.
11	<p>Good day. Please find my disapproval for the proposed Rehabilitation Centre for Kendenup. Under the proposed plans have you seriously considered the safety of residents living in Kendenup. As you are aware the individuals who need to be retabulated have been exposed to crimes to gain funds for their habit. At night with only two staff members to look after all of the centre is crazy. This will give free for all to wonder out of the grounds roaming the streets to look for a fix or to commit a crime to get the funds to fund their habit. The premises is not secure; we have no Police station in the area and have to call upon an understaffed police service from Mt Barker. This is not acceptable.</p>	<p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety, security, children/school bus, resident movement and perceived anti-social behaviour concerns are noted; amenity and operational management have been assessed, including staffing, supervision, visitor, intake and exit/discharge arrangements. • Police, ambulance, hospital and emergency response resourcing are State service matters and are not determinative planning considerations; the Shire has considered site suitability, access, bushfire and emergency management within its planning role. • Staffing concerns are noted; day-to-day staffing is primarily operational, but the approved Operational Management Plan and supervision commitments are addressed through relevant conditions.
12	<p>Notice of objection: Lots 843 and 844 (217) Moorilup Road, Kendenup</p> <p>To the Chief Executive Officer and Councillors Shire of Plantagenet</p> <p>Objection to Development Application – Non-Conforming Use Lots 843 and 844 (217 Moorilup Road, Kendenup) Great Southern Drug and Alcohol Rehabilitation Centre (GSDARC)</p> <p>I write to object to the above development application and respectfully request that Council exercise caution in determining this proposal under Clause 23 of Local Planning Scheme No. 5 (LPS5).</p> <p>At the outset, I acknowledge the importance of alcohol and other drug rehabilitation services within Western Australia and recognise the demonstrated need for additional regional support infrastructure. This submission is not directed toward the value of rehabilitation services generally, but rather toward whether this specific proposal represents an appropriate planning outcome for this locality under the Shire’s strategic planning framework and the intent of LPS5.</p>	<p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submission raises valid planning considerations regarding land use permissibility, non-conforming use rights, rural amenity, strategic planning context, bushfire/emergency management, traffic, and the qualitative difference between the existing approved use and the proposed use. • The application has not been assessed as an ordinary discretionary use. “Community Purpose” is an “X” use in the Rural zone and cannot be approved unless the statutory pathway for changing a non-conforming use is available and the relevant tests are satisfied. • The Shire has assessed the application under the non-conforming use provisions of Local Planning Scheme No. 5. Those provisions require consideration of whether a lawful non-conforming use exists, the nature and extent of that use, and whether the proposed use is less detrimental to the amenity of the locality and closer to the intended purpose of the Rural zone. • The submitter’s concerns regarding “theoretical approval capacity” are noted. The assessment does not

Submission Number	Comments	Officer Assessment
	<p>The application seeks approval for a change from one non-conforming use to another prohibited (“X”) use within the Rural zone. While the applicant identifies a technical pathway under Clause 23 of LPS5 and Clause 67 of the Deemed Provisions, it is respectfully submitted that the application significantly overextends the intended purpose of non-conforming use provisions.</p> <p>The planning report argues that because the historic “tourist accommodation” approval under the former Scheme No. 3 included conference and reception functions, and because “reception centre” became a prohibited use under LPS5, the site now benefits from lawful non-conforming use rights. The applicant then seeks to utilise those historic non-conforming rights to justify an entirely different prohibited use classified as “community purpose”.</p> <p>While this may be technically arguable, Council should carefully consider the broader planning implications of allowing grandfathered rights associated with a historic tourism/reception use to evolve into a permanent institutional/community-purpose facility.</p> <p>The purpose of non-conforming use provisions is generally to manage and gradually limit incompatibility created by historical approvals following scheme changes — not necessarily to facilitate the transition from one prohibited institutional use to another fundamentally different prohibited use indefinitely.</p> <p>Importantly, the Rural zone under LPS5 appears intentionally restrictive toward institutional and community-service land uses. The fact that “Reception Centre”, “Community Purpose”, and various health-related land uses are classified as X-uses strongly suggests a deliberate strategic intention to prevent the gradual institutionalisation of rural land.</p> <p>Accordingly, the existence of a discretionary pathway under Clause 23 should not automatically be interpreted as support for broad substitution between prohibited uses where the proposed use materially alters the strategic character and long-term role of the locality.</p> <p>The current and historic use of the site has fundamentally been tourism and hospitality-based in nature. The site has operated for many years as accommodation and function facilities associated with the district’s rural tourism economy and visitor identity. This aligns more closely with the Shire’s strategic direction for tourism diversification, rural amenity, and compatible economic activity within the district.</p> <p>By contrast, the proposed rehabilitation facility introduces:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● long-term therapeutic residency; ● withdrawal management services; ● clinical and counselling services; ● permanent staffing arrangements; ● and institutional/community-purpose operational characteristics fundamentally different from rural tourism accommodation. <p>The application repeatedly attempts to reduce this distinction to a comparison of numerical intensity by relying heavily on the historic approval for up to 260 persons associated with the reception centre component.</p> <p>However, the existence of a historical theoretical approval capacity should not be treated as equivalent to the actual operational character of the site or locality.</p> <p>Having resided locally for several years, it is my observation that the property has not operated as an intensive 260-person function venue in practice. Rather, the site has operated as comparatively low-intensity rural tourist accommodation. Council should therefore carefully distinguish between:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● dormant or theoretical approval capacity; and 	<p>rely solely on a hypothetical maximum-capacity operation of the existing approval. The historic approval and its lawful scope are relevant to identifying the existing non-conforming use, but the application must be assessed on its actual planning merits, including the submitted operational details, likely intensity, built form, traffic generation, amenity impacts, management arrangements and surrounding land use context.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The proposed use is materially different from tourist accommodation / reception centre activity. However, the planning test is not whether the proposed use is identical to the existing non-conforming use, but whether the proposed use satisfies the statutory requirements for a change of non-conforming use. This includes an assessment of the relative amenity impacts of the existing lawful use and the proposed use. ● The submitter’s comments regarding the Rural zone and the broader strategic planning context are noted. Policy No. 19 and the Shire’s strategic planning documents identify the importance of rural amenity, land use compatibility and long-term planning outcomes for Kendenup. These matters have been considered as part of the assessment. However, the application must be determined under the current statutory planning framework and on the merits of the proposal before Council. The Shire cannot determine the application on the basis that the land may be rezoned or used differently at some future time unless that future planning outcome has progressed to a point where it is a relevant planning consideration. ● Approval of a change of non-conforming use would not create an unrestricted or indefinite entitlement to any future use of the land. The approved use would remain subject to the terms of the approval, the approved plans and management documents, any conditions imposed, and the ongoing operation of the non-conforming use provisions. If the approved non-conforming use is discontinued, the relevant scheme provisions relating to discontinuance would apply. ● Concerns regarding bushfire, evacuation, emergency management, access, traffic, operational management and resident supervision are valid planning considerations and have been addressed through the assessment and recommended conditions, including requirements relating to the approved Operational Management Plan, Bushfire Management Plan, Emergency Evacuation and Risk Management procedures, access and parking arrangements, and limitations on the scale and operation of the approved use. ● The submitter’s concerns regarding precedent are noted. Any future application involving a non-conforming use would need to be assessed on its own facts, including the evidence of existing non-conforming use rights, the

Submission Number	Comments	Officer Assessment
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the actual established amenity and operational expectations of the locality. <p>The applicant's argument that the proposal is "less detrimental" appears heavily reliant upon a hypothetical comparison to a maximum-intensity reception centre operation which, in practical terms, does not appear reflective of the site's established contemporary use.</p> <p>Further, while the proposal may be operationally quieter than occasional large-scale functions, planning compatibility is not solely determined by traffic numbers or noise levels. The qualitative nature of the land use is equally important.</p> <p>A permanent institutional/community-purpose facility involving rehabilitation and withdrawal services is materially different in planning character from tourism accommodation and rural hospitality uses.</p> <p>Council should also give careful consideration to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the precedent implications associated with approving one prohibited institutional use in substitution for another prohibited use within the Rural zone; whether the proposal genuinely represents a use "closer to the intended purpose of the zone" as required under Clause 23; the long-term strategic planning implications for Kendenup and surrounding localities; and whether approval would undermine the intended distinction between rural land and institutional/community-purpose land uses under LPS5. <p>Importantly, Town Planning Scheme Policy No. 19 – Kendenup Rural Surrounds identifies the locality as "Future Rural Residential Areas" and emphasises reducing land use conflict and avoiding inappropriate land uses. The broader strategic direction for the locality appears focused on rural amenity, compatible development, tourism, and future rural residential outcomes.</p> <p>Similarly, the recently adopted Shire of Plantagenet Housing Strategy 2025–2035 reinforces the importance of liveability, local character, workforce attraction, economic resilience, and carefully managed long-term growth throughout the Shire.</p> <p>In this context, Council should carefully consider whether approving a permanent institutional/community-purpose X-use is genuinely consistent with the Shire's own recently adopted strategic planning vision.</p> <p>The application also places considerable reliance upon positive assertions regarding the Nannup Therapeutic Community. However, limited objective evidence has been provided regarding measurable operational impacts, emergency service demand, incident data, policing impacts, or long-term compatibility outcomes associated with comparable facilities.</p> <p>In addition, further consideration should be given to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> bushfire and evacuation suitability for vulnerable residents in a bushfire-prone locality; emergency response capability; long-term impacts upon the district's tourism identity and visitor economy; and the appropriateness of introducing a permanent institutional/community-purpose use into a locality identified for future rural residential and amenity-based outcomes. <p>While the proposal may provide a valuable social service, the issue before Council is not whether rehabilitation services are important. The issue is whether this</p>	<p>proposed use, the locality, zone objectives, amenity impacts and relevant statutory tests. Approval of this application would not automatically support other prohibited uses in the Rural zone.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> On balance, the matters raised in the submission have been considered. While the objection raises substantive planning issues, the proposal is considered capable of support subject to conditions, as the assessment concludes that the proposed use satisfies the relevant statutory tests for a change of non-conforming use and can be appropriately managed in the locality.

Submission Number	Comments	Officer Assessment
	<p>particular land use outcome is appropriate within this specific locality and consistent with the intent of the Shire's planning framework.</p> <p>For the reasons outlined above, I respectfully request that Council refuse the application or, at minimum, defer determination pending further independent strategic planning assessment regarding the long-term implications of the proposal and the intended scope of non-conforming use provisions under LPS5.</p> <p>Yours faithfully,</p> <p>Kylee Bennett</p> <p>836 Newdegate Rd Kendenup</p>	
13	<p>Re: Rehabilitation Facility at 217 Moorilup Rd, Kendenup Rehabilitation Facility at 217 Moorilup Road Kendenup.</p> <p>I'd like to oppose the current proposal for a Rehabilitation Facility to be approved for the site of Kendenup Lodge & Cottages as there are planning issues that should be rejected by the shire!</p> <p>Kind regards Lana & Tony Spiccia Concerned Kendenup ratepayers</p>	<p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objection noted, though not deemed a valid planning object as the objection does not highlight specific planning related concerns in which to object against
14	<p>I request all documents mentioned within the proposal above. As these will no doubt come before the council and be attached Agenda Items that will be publically available - I am requesting that all supporting documents that are referred to in this application be provided. Thank you.</p> <p>I am also writing to inform you that to date I have not received any notification of this proposal and our residence is directly across the road on 214 Moorilup. This is very disappointing.</p> <p>Due to this I also request an extension - given we have little time to fully grasp whether we will object or simply ask more questions.</p> <p>I understand that you are following regulations for the Public Notice but given many have not personally received notification - particularly those within 1km - it would be seen as a reasonable act to do so.</p> <p>Kind regards Deanna Shand</p>	<p>Non-Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Request for additional documents, notification information and an extension of time is noted. • Consultation and notification concerns are noted; the application was advertised in accordance with the statutory process required under the Regulations, furthermore 28 days was provided in lieu of the minimum requirement of 14 days, and submissions have been considered. • No substantive planning objection to the merits of the proposed use is raised in this submission.
15	<p>Kendenup GSDARC proposal feedback</p> <p>Dear Member's of Parliament, Councillor's and the Shire of Plantagenet,</p> <p>I am putting forth my objections to the above proposed centre, for the following reasons:-</p> <p>Kendenup is a very small town (1082 population), with minimal infrastructure- lacking the services such as public transport, police station, medical facilities, shopping centre and a petrol station to support the above centre.</p> <p>The local store also sells alcohol, and has had a non- break in record for 11 yrs now. Concerns for the potential risk to the store owner were expressed by himself at the meeting. Also concerns in his business insurance policy.</p> <p>There are children's school bus stops near the proposed centre which have not been taken into consideration.</p> <p>There has been no risk assessment undertaken for the safety of the community.</p> <p>The sale of the property and proposed plans have not involved the community and we have been notified after the fact.</p> <p>I attended the local meeting at the hall last night as did alot of the community, who also felt their concerns they expressed, were downplayed, dismissed and ignored.</p> <p>The issue of 'rascism' was brought up by one of the speakers deflecting the community's concern by him discussing the 'stolen generation' which has absolutely nothing to do with this proposal.</p> <p>The woman speaker kept referring to the 'Nannup model' and a city rehabilitation centre which is irrelevant to Kendenup.</p> <p>The program is 'voluntary' and we were informed the people in the program can leave anytime. There is no bus service to Mt. Barker, the next town 22 kms away. So where will these people go?</p> <p>We were informed the people in the program are free to go shopping. The town only has one small general store- and this store sells alcohol!</p> <p>There is no accommodation for visitors in the town.</p> <p>Rate paying residents are concerned about property values decreasing, due to a rehabilitation centre which isn't a great selling point for potential buyers either!</p> <p>Why weren't SAC and Cyreian House transparent in the proposal and purchase of the property?</p> <p>The general consensus from those I have spoken with at the meeting, and in the community is that we do not want this centre in our tiny community.</p> <p>We understand the importance of rehabilitation, but not in our community.</p> <p>It was suggested that somewhere near Pardalup Prison would make more sense, as there is infrastructure to support the centre.</p>	<p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety, security, children/school bus, resident movement and perceived anti-social behaviour concerns are noted; amenity and operational management have been assessed, including staffing, supervision, visitor, intake and exit/discharge arrangements. • Police, ambulance, hospital and emergency response resourcing are State service matters and are not determinative planning considerations; the Shire has considered site suitability, access, bushfire and emergency management within its planning role. • Potential impacts on property values or marketability are not valid planning considerations for a development application assessment. • The Shire cannot require the proposal to be lodged on an alternative site; the application must be assessed at the proposed location on its individual planning merits. • Concerns regarding risk management and operational accountability are noted; the approved Operational Management Plan is recommended to define how the use is to operate.

Submission Number	Comments	Officer Assessment
	<p>I am a rate paying Kendenup resident, and have worked in the field as a professional practitioner helping patient's with drug and alcohol dependence. I understand the implications concerning mental health and addiction. I have witnessed people in drug- induced psychosis, and other mental health issues, and there is a high risk of violence/crime in alot of these instances. This is extremely concerning for residents, as we don't have police/medical facilities in an emergency.</p> <p>I am asking for this proposal to be rejected on the concerns for our small community as abovementioned.</p> <p>Your heartfelt considerations are appreciated!</p> <p>Yours faithfully, Veronica Hansen</p>	
16	<p>Kendenup GSDARC proposal feedback To Whom It May Concern,</p> <p>I write to you regarding the proposal for the Great Southern Drug and Alcohol Rehabilitation Centre put forward for Kendenup, WA.</p> <p>I have been a resident of Kendenup for the last 3 years after my husband and 2 young children purchased a property within the town. As we were not from WA, many people warned us about buying out here due to Kendenup being perceived as a town with a poor reputation for drugs, alcohol and violence. Since moving to Kendenup, we have had no issues and have found the opposite and that there to be no more problems with violence or drug and alcohol consumption than any other town, in fact, far less I am sure than residents of Albany and even mount Barker, are subject to.</p> <p>Within the last 3 years the community has grown significantly with new houses popping up almost monthly. More families have moved to the area and retirees looking for a slower, country life. The general store has expanded and now has a proper post office attached.</p> <p>I recently attended the community information night held on 14/05/26 at the Kendenup Town Hall, something that I only received knowledge of through word of mouth at work, something that we as a household received no formal information about, or invitation to, and the same can be said for the proposed facility itself. A gross lack of communication between planners and the general community.</p> <p>At the information night many a reference was made to the facility operating in Nannup and the hosts spent much of their time comparing the similarities of the towns, something which I and many others fail to see. Nannup is closer to major towns including Busselton (40mins) and Bunbury (60mins). Nannup is a well-established town itself more similar to that of Mount Barker with a police station, many cafes, a brewery, a small hospital, a medical centre, a general store, among other things.</p> <p>Kendenup has one general store, a post office, a small children's park, a skate park, a school, a town hall, a golf course, tennis courts and a small country club at the local football oval. Our population is comprised of mostly elderly residents and young families. There is no local bus service, no local taxi service, no local health service. We have 2 community volunteers for SJA and a number of volunteer firefighters. Our closest small hospital is 20mins away in the town of Mount Barker.</p> <p>At the information night the hosts also made many a reference to the positive feedback from the community of Nannup, yet despite also briefly raising that there had been some incidents of concern and negative feedback, no further expansion on this was provided with their focus solely on the positives, even voicing an estimated 2.1million dollars in anticipated economical return for the Kendenup community.</p> <p>The community information night was poorly put together with not even ¼ of the town in attendance likely due to the complete lack of knowledge and communication surrounding this proposal.</p> <p>As a Registered Nurse that has worked both in Emergency and Adult Inpatient Mental Health within the Great Southern I understand the need for such a facility within the region, however due to the significant lack of resources within our community, do not believe that Kendenup is an appropriate setting.</p> <p>The hosts stated that they have been unable to secure any residential property that would be large enough for such a facility, and yet there is farming properties for sale right across the region. If the need for the Great Southern to have such a facility is so high, there should be no issue in securing funding for land closer to that of bigger towns such as Katanning and Albany and building a designated facility where there are greater resources available to the benefit of the participants of these programs.</p> <p>Regards, Chantelle</p>	<p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety, security, children/school bus, resident movement and perceived anti-social behaviour concerns are noted; amenity and operational management have been assessed, including staffing, supervision, visitor, intake and exit/discharge arrangements. • Police, ambulance, hospital and emergency response resourcing are State service matters and are not determinative planning considerations; the Shire has considered site suitability, access, bushfire and emergency management within its planning role. • The Shire cannot require the proposal to be lodged on an alternative site; the application must be assessed at the proposed location on its individual planning merits. • Consultation and notification concerns are noted; the application was advertised in accordance with the statutory process and submissions have been considered. Furthermore and more specifically, the Shire did not conduct these community information nights, this was organized by local community groups and the applicant themselves. • Land use classification, zoning and non-conforming use arguments are noted and addressed in the statutory assessment against Local Planning Scheme No. 5 and the deemed provisions within the Council Report.
17	<p>NOTICE OF DEVELOPMENT APPROVAL - P902 GREAT SOUTHERN DRUG AND REHABILITATION CENTRE Shire of Plantagenet,</p> <p>The residents of Kendenup have recently been made aware of the proposal to open a rehabilitation centre at 217 Moorilup Road Kendenup.</p> <p>After attending a meeting with SAC and Cyrenian House, several points were raised regarding the suitability of the premises.</p> <p>This appears to be a medical facility, but with no security attached. Residents are free to leave at any time. This poses a serious risk to nearby citizens.</p> <p>There is no water connected to the facility, only tank water. This was not sufficient in the past, and water had to be bought in on several occasions. The proposed number of residents at the new facility is far higher than the previous numbers, so water will become a major issue.</p> <p>There is also a problem with the septic system. In previous years it has overflowed, and the run off has flowed into the dam. This problem will increase substantially with the increase of personnel on the site.</p> <p>These, and many other points, were raised at the meeting, but answers were far from satisfactory.</p> <p>By changing the property from accommodation to Rehabilitation, it reduces the tourist income for Kendenup. This is a small rural town, so every dollar counts.</p>	<p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety, security, children/school bus, resident movement and perceived anti-social behaviour concerns are noted; amenity and operational management have been assessed, including staffing, supervision, visitor, intake and exit/discharge arrangements. • Police, ambulance, hospital and emergency response resourcing are State service matters and are not determinative planning considerations; the Shire has considered site suitability, access, bushfire and emergency management within its planning role. • The Shire cannot require the proposal to be lodged on

Submission Number	Comments	Officer Assessment
	<p>Rehabilitation centres are necessary, but they need to be in an area with suitable infrastructure. There are no Doctors or police in Kendenup. Everything needs to come from Albany, which, if there's a crisis situation, could cost someone their life. This type of facility should be situated near a large town, which has the appropriate facilities. Thanking you, Rob and Sue Appelbee</p>	<p>an alternative site; the application must be assessed at the proposed location on its individual planning merits.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rural amenity, land-use compatibility and change from tourism/function use are relevant planning considerations and have been assessed against the existing lawful use and locality. • Servicing, wastewater and water supply concerns are noted; wastewater and bushfire water matters have been considered through the relevant referral material and bushfire management documentation.
18	<p>Richard Avery 60 Wandoo Road, Kendenup WA 6323 ra@farmgateadvisory.com.au 0429423976 17 May 2026 Shire of Plantagenet PO Box 48 Mount Barker WA 6324, By email: info@sop.wa.gov.au</p> <p>Dear Councillors,</p> <p>Submission — Proposed Development Application, Lot 843 & 844 (217) Moorilup Road, Kendenup — Great Southern Drug & Alcohol Rehabilitation Centre (GSDARC)</p> <p>I am writing as an adjoining landowner and in response to your letter to me dated 29th April 2026 [Ref: I146000; 082927], in response to the proposal by the Southern Aboriginal Corporation (SAC) and Cyrenian House to re-purpose the Kendenup Cottages and Lodge property at 217 Moorilup Road as a 20-bed residential alcohol and other drug treatment facility with an integrated 4-bed low-medical withdrawal unit. I have read the Operational Management Plan (January 2026) and the associated Site Plan (Planning Solutions, Rev. 4, 11 February 2026).</p> <p>I want to begin by acknowledging the merit of an AOD residential service for the Great Southern region. The need is real, and Cyrenian House bring genuine experience and a clear social-purpose framing to the project. My submission is not opposed to the <i>concept</i> of such a facility being established somewhere in the region.</p> <p>My submission is that the documentation currently before the Shire is not yet a complete planning application capable of being determined on its merits, and I respectfully ask the Shire to require the applicant to address the matters set out below before the application proceeds to determination. Several of these matters bear directly on neighbour amenity and rural-area land-use conflict — which Policy 19 (Kendenup Rural Surrounds) was specifically adopted to manage.</p> <p>1. The use is not contemplated by Policy 19 and the use-class pathway is unresolved</p> <p>Policy 19, at clauses 13 and 14, sets out the uses that are permitted or discretionary in the Future Rural Smallholding context. The list is deliberately narrow — single house, home occupation, bed and breakfast, cottage industry, craft shop and gallery, home business, horse stables, horticulture, rural use, tourist accommodation, winery, and a small number of others.</p> <p>A 24/7 residential treatment facility with a clinical withdrawal unit is not on either list and bears little resemblance to any use that is.</p> <p>The applicant's own materials describe the proposal as a "non-conforming land use for a community purpose." That is candid, but it raises the threshold question the Shire must answer first: what is the use class under Local Planning Scheme No. 5, what is its permissibility in the Rural zone, and is the correct pathway a "use not listed" determination, a discretionary approval, or a Scheme amendment? The applicant's documentation does not address any of this.</p> <p>Requested action: Before the application is determined, ask the applicant to (a) identify the use class under LPS 5, (b) state its permissibility in the relevant zone, and (c) set out which procedural pathway is proposed. If the use is "X" (not permitted) in the Rural zone, the application cannot be granted under ordinary discretion and the proper pathway needs to be made transparent to affected landowners.</p> <p>2. Bushfire — vulnerable land-use status not acknowledged</p>	<p>Non-Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter acknowledges the merit and regional need for an AOD residential service but seeks further information before determination. • Town Planning Policy 19 does not dictate the approval pathway, furthermore, policies are due regard documents and open to variation. • The proposal must be determined on the submitted application and the relevant statutory tests, rather than through a separate scheme amendment process unless Council forms that view. The approval pathway through transfer of non-conforming land uses is outlined in the Council Report • The applicant has provided a BAL and BMP as part of the application, which formed part of the assessment. Discretion around whether a land use is deemed 'vulnerable' or not is up to the decision maker, SPP3.7 and its guidelines only provide guidance to this • The use of TPP19's requirements for water is not applicable here as that applies to residential development, not commercial development. Furthermore, it is not possible to impose that here without the relevant statutory authority to do so. The applicant can cart water in if they wish, organise a WaterCorp connection should they wish (though likely very cost prohibitive) but an option nonetheless. This including wastewater provisions has been covered in the Council Report. • A Traffic Impact Statement or Assessment is not deemed required, the roads in question are more than capable of catering for this level of traffic (plus much more), the crossovers on site can and will be managed accordingly, there is insufficient justification to suggest this be required • TPP19 is a due regard document. Furthermore, it has not been reviewed since 2011 at its original inception and was adopted by Council as DPLH did not adopt the Local Planning Strategy they wanted, so to circumvent this the Shire adopted these planning policies. At this stage, these planning policies do not align with modern planning frameworks and will be rescinded once the Shire completes its Local Planning Strategy review to ensure compliance with State Planning Frameworks. These policies are not deemed to currently hold up if challenged

Submission Number	Comments	Officer Assessment
	<p>The site is in a designated bushfire-prone area. The 4-bed Low-Medical Withdrawal Unit will, by the applicant's own description, house residents in acute withdrawal — typically managed by a Clinical Nurse and support staff — for up to 14 days. These residents will plainly be impaired in their capacity to self-evacuate, particularly at night.</p> <p>Under State Planning Policy 3.7 — <i>Planning in Bushfire Prone Areas</i> (operational 18 November 2024), such a use is a "vulnerable land use." That classification has substantive consequences: a maximum acceptable Bushfire Attack Level of BAL-29; a Bushfire Management Plan that must be jointly endorsed by the Shire and the Department of Fire and Emergency Services; enhanced separation distances; and two trafficable emergency-access routes capable of serving emergency vehicles.</p> <p>The application as advertised does not:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • include any BAL assessment or BAL contour map for the site; • acknowledge that the use is a vulnerable land use under SPP 3.7; • include the Bushfire Management Plan that the OMP says has been "commissioned"; • demonstrate the second emergency-access route required for vulnerable uses; • provide a vulnerable-cohort evacuation plan; • state the capacity of the "Strategic Bushfire Tank" labelled on the site plan, against the minimum 50,000 L required under Policy 19 cl. 29. <p>I raise this not in the abstract — a bushfire that begins on or spreads to this property would directly affect every adjoining landowner, and an inadequately planned response by a facility housing 20 residents (a portion of them in active withdrawal) is a real risk to the broader neighbourhood, not only to the residents themselves. At the time of writing, there is heavy fuel load on this property near our boundary, posing significant risk for future summers.</p> <p>Requested action: Require lodgement of a Level 2 BAL Assessment and a vulnerable-use Bushfire Management Plan jointly endorsed by the Shire and DFES, together with confirmation of a second egress route and firefighting water capacity, before the application is advertised or determined.</p> <p>3. Water supply and on-site effluent — capacity and impact on the local groundwater</p> <p>Policy 19 cl. 27–29 requires a minimum 92,000 L of potable water per dwelling plus an additional 50,000 L of firefighting / secondary water where lots are not connected to a reticulated supply. The application proposes to support 20 residents, a peak staff complement of up to seven, daily visitors, a commercial kitchen, and a bulk laundry on a property that the OMP says is supplied solely by "rainwater tanks for each building and two dams."</p> <p>No demand-and-supply balance has been provided. Without it, the Shire cannot be satisfied that the property has the water capacity to operate.</p> <p>The effluent question is even more significant. A 20-resident facility with the additional commercial kitchen and laundry load will produce hydraulic loading well above the 540 L/day threshold at which the Government Sewerage Policy 2019 requires Department of Health (rather than local-government) approval. Depending on volume and discharge characteristics, the use may also be a prescribed premises under Category 85 of Schedule 1 to the <i>Environmental Protection Regulations 1987</i>, requiring DWER licensing.</p> <p>Yet the application:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • does not describe the existing on-site effluent system, its type, age, capacity, or current approvals; • does not assess whether that system can handle the proposed load; • does not propose new or upgraded infrastructure; • does not address the Policy 19 cl. 20 setbacks; and • does not identify the DoH (and, where applicable, DWER) approval pathway. 	<p>in SAT and therefore have been used in a due regard nature, but by no means can entirely dictate this proposal</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building Classification is not something that can be assessed, approved or refused through a development application • The Operational Management Plan has been requested to be updated in accordance with the recommended conditions and advice notes in the Council Report. These need to be correctly written to be held up if challenged through SAT, the Shire cannot simply condition whatever it wants such as "Residents with a history of serious violence or sexual offending shall be excluded from admission.", the Shire does not have the statutory authority to do so. • Whilst the Shire acknowledges pre-lodgement community engagement from an applicant is good practice, it is not a statutory requirement, nor something the Shire has the statutory ability to require the applicant to do

Submission Number	Comments	Officer Assessment
	<p>In an area where landowners rely on bores and surface water, the wastewater profile of a 27-plus-person, 24/7 institutional use is materially different from the existing operation and deserves direct, evidenced scrutiny.</p> <p>Requested action: Require lodgement of a Water Balance Statement and a Wastewater Management Strategy, prepared by appropriate consultants, before determination. Both should specifically address impact on neighbouring groundwater and downstream creekline.</p> <p>4. Traffic — Moorilup and Wandoo Roads</p> <p>The applicant compares parking and traffic to the existing tourist-event use, which (the OMP notes) is licensed for events of up to 250 persons. That comparison understates the change. The current use is intermittent — peaks on weekends with quiet weekdays. The proposed use is continuous: three rostered shifts a day, every day, plus weekday clinical, allied-health and delivery visits, and structured Sunday family-visiting hours from 9 am to 4 pm.</p> <p>The application does not provide a traffic engineering assessment. It does not identify the bay-count required under the LPS 5 parking schedule for the chosen use class; it does not assess the Moorilup Road / Wandoo Road intersection for sight distance; and it does not address how emergency vehicles will negotiate the property (which is also a bushfire issue under SPP 3.7).</p> <p>Requested action: Require a Transport Impact Statement proportionate to the use, before determination.</p> <p>5. Land-use compatibility — buffers and neighbour amenity</p> <p>Policy 19 was adopted, in the Shire's own words, "to provide guidance to assist in land use control to avoid/reduce land use conflict from the inappropriate location of particular land uses" (Objective 1). The aerial photograph supplied by the applicant shows neighbouring agricultural land to the south and pastoral activity on adjoining lots. Several of these are within distances ordinarily considered insufficient under EPA <i>Guidance Statement No. 3 — Separation Distances Between Industrial and Sensitive Land Uses</i> between a sensitive use (which a facility for vulnerable persons clearly is) and lawful rural activities such as spray application, frost-fan operation, livestock and harvest noise.</p> <p>The application does not assess these separation distances, does not propose mitigations, and does not acknowledge the reciprocal risk — that lawful rural activity carried on by neighbours, including practices protected by Policy 19 cl. 32, may in future be the subject of complaint by the operator or by residents' families.</p> <p>Requested action: Require a Land Use Compatibility Statement that identifies surrounding activities, separation distances, mitigation measures, and a formal acknowledgement by the operator of the rural-amenity context (consistent with Policy 19 cl. 32).</p> <p>6. Building Code classification</p> <p>The property currently operates as a Class 3 (motel/tourist accommodation) and Class 1b/3 hybrid. A residential drug-and-alcohol facility with 24/7 care is more accurately a Class 9c "residential care building" under the National Construction Code. Class 9c imposes substantially more stringent fire-safety, accessibility, and egress requirements than Class 3 — sprinklers and detection, protected exits, ramp gradients, accessible-bedroom ratios, circulation widths. The applicant describes the necessary works as "minor capital works," which is unlikely to survive a building-surveyor assessment.</p> <p>This matters to adjoining landowners because untimely or unbudgeted Class 9c retrofits typically translate into either (a) a facility commencing operation before it is properly fitted out, or (b) extended construction-period disturbance.</p> <p>Requested action: Require a building-surveyor classification report and a list of Class 9c works to be identified as conditions of approval, with operational commencement contingent on completion.</p> <p>7. Operational commitments need to be enforceable</p> <p>The OMP contains a number of commitments that materially affect neighbour amenity: lights-out at 10 pm; visitor hours limited to 9 am to 4 pm on Sundays; no resident-owned vehicles on site; tobacco-free property; exclusion of any resident with a history of serious violence or sexual offending; senior on-call support after hours. These are valuable assurances. As currently drafted, however, they sit in a third-party operational document with no enforceability under planning law.</p> <p>Requested action: Require the applicant to reformat the operational commitments as a Schedule of Proposed Conditions attached to the planning application, so that any approval binds the operator to those commitments and breach can be enforced under the <i>Planning and Development Act 2005</i>. Examples of language suitable for conditions include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Residents shall not be permitted to keep private vehicles on the premises." 	

Submission Number	Comments	Officer Assessment
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Visiting hours shall be limited to 9:00 am to 4:00 pm on Sundays only, unless otherwise approved in writing by the Shire." • "Residents with a history of serious violence or sexual offending shall be excluded from admission." • "The use shall at all times be operated in accordance with the Operational Management Plan dated January 2026 (or any later version approved in writing by the Shire)." • "Minimum staffing shall comprise no fewer than two awake staff on site at all times, with a Registered Nurse on site or on call within 30 minutes at any time the Low-Medical Withdrawal Unit is occupied." <p>8. Community engagement before lodgement</p> <p>The OMP describes an admirable <i>post-approval</i> community engagement plan but contains no evidence that the applicant has, before lodgement, made direct contact with adjoining landowners. The first occasion on which neighbours have been able to consider the proposal is via the formal advertising under cl. 64 of the deemed provisions to the <i>Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015</i>. For a use as sensitive as this — both for the operator's clients and for the rural community — pre-lodgement engagement is good practice, and its absence is itself a matter the Shire is entitled to weigh.</p> <p>Requested action: Extend the advertising period to the maximum available under cl. 64, and require the applicant to station a community liaison officer at site for a minimum period of two weeks (9am to 4pm Monday to Friday), before the matter is reported for determination. With such an impactful landuse, and scale of community members impacted, a close, more personal approach is needed rather than town hall style gatherings.</p> <p>9. Other matters</p> <p>For completeness, the application as advertised also does not appear to address:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the boundary setbacks under Policy 19 cl. 30 (15 m from a road; 5 m from other boundaries) — none are annotated on the site plan; • the fact that the use straddles two separate lots (Lot 843 and Lot 844), which will require either amalgamation or a unity-of-title arrangement under s. 150 of the <i>Planning and Development Act 2005</i>; • a stormwater management plan under Policy 19 cl. 26; • remnant-vegetation mapping under Policy 19 cl. 16 and 17, including any clearing required for bushfire asset-protection zones; • the <i>Aboriginal Heritage Act 1972</i> due-diligence position for the lots; and • alignment with State Planning Policy 2.5 (Rural Planning), which presumes against non-rural uses in rural zones unless community benefit is demonstrated and adverse impacts are mitigated. <p>Conclusion</p> <p>I want to repeat that this submission is not opposed to a regional AOD service. It is opposed to the determination of this application on the documentation currently before the Shire. If the applicant addresses the matters above — particularly bushfire (item 2), water and wastewater (item 3), building classification (item 6), and enforceable operational conditions (item 7) — and if pre-lodgement consultation is undertaken with neighbours (item 8), there is a coherent path to an application that the Shire can fairly determine on its merits.</p> <p>I respectfully ask the Shire to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. issue a request for further information under cl. 63(3) of the deemed provisions covering the matters above; 2. extend the advertising period to its maximum; 3. require a community liaison officer to be based in Kendenup; and 	

Submission Number	Comments	Officer Assessment
	<p>4. once the matters are addressed, re-advertise the application before any determination.</p> <p>I would be grateful to be advised when the request for further information is issued, when the application is re-advertised, and when the matter is to be considered by Council or by a Development Assessment Panel.</p> <p>I am available for comment or questions, at the above listed email and phone number, if you require.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to make this submission.</p> <p>Yours faithfully, Richard Avery</p> <p>Adjoining landowner, Kendenup Rural Surrounds</p>	
19	<p>Fwd: Objection to Proposed Great Southern Drug and Alcohol Rehabilitation Centre at Kendenup Attention Shire President & Councillors, I am writing to formally express my objection to the proposal to repurpose Kendenup Cottages and Lodge (Lot 843 & 844, 217 Moorilup Road, Kendenup) into the Great Southern Drug and Alcohol Rehabilitation Centre (GSDARC). My concerns are based on both personal safety and the broader impact on the local community. I reside approximately 2.5 km from the proposed site and, for the majority of the time, I live alone. The area has limited emergency response capacity, particularly after hours. There are no on-duty police stationed locally overnight, and both ambulance and fire services rely heavily on volunteers. This significantly limits the ability to respond quickly and effectively to emergencies that may arise. Given the nature of the proposed facility—including residential rehabilitation and a withdrawal unit for individuals dealing with alcohol and other drug dependency—I am concerned that the risks associated with this type of service are not compatible with the current level of local infrastructure and emergency support. Furthermore, I do not believe that this proposal will provide a net benefit to local ratepayers. Instead, it may place additional strain on already limited community resources while increasing safety concerns for nearby residents. While I acknowledge the importance of providing support services for individuals experiencing substance dependency, I strongly believe that such facilities should be located in areas with appropriate emergency services, infrastructure, and support systems already in place. For these reasons, I respectfully request that this proposal not proceed at the Kendenup location. Thank you for considering my submission.</p>	<p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety, security, children/school bus, resident movement and perceived anti-social behaviour concerns are noted; amenity and operational management have been assessed, including staffing, supervision, visitor, intake and exit/discharge arrangements. • Police, ambulance, hospital and emergency response resourcing are State service matters and are not determinative planning considerations; the Shire has considered site suitability, access, bushfire and emergency management within its planning role. • Rural amenity, land-use compatibility and change from tourism/function use are relevant planning considerations and have been assessed against the existing lawful use and locality. • Bushfire and evacuation concerns are noted; bushfire risk and emergency management have been considered through the Bushfire Management Plan and assessment recommendations. • Traffic, access and parking matters are relevant planning considerations and have been assessed, including recommended access and parking management requirements where appropriate.
20	<p>Regarding proposed, drug and alcohol rehabilitation centre, at 217 Moorilup Rd, Kendenup. Families and friends' visits, are only permitted on Sundays. Local police, are not always rostered on over weekends and not always available for re-calls. Station phones, are redirected to District office in Albany, 70 kilometres away, when local police aren't available. Only 2 people and CCTV, are supervising, the 20 clients, in 2 separate buildings at night. Families, on properties next door, to 217 Moorilup Rd, have legitimate concerns, with their children riding bikes and waiting at the school bus shelters, right alongside the drug and alcohol centre. Land values have risen substantially, in the Kendenup area, over the last 5 years. Property values, will be severely impacted, when buyers realise, that a Rehab Centre is, within the local area. We hope that the shire of Plantagenet, will give due consideration to our concerns. Regards, Local Rate Payers.</p>	<p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety, security, children/school bus, resident movement and perceived anti-social behaviour concerns are noted; amenity and operational management have been assessed, including staffing, supervision, visitor, intake and exit/discharge arrangements. • Police, ambulance, hospital and emergency response resourcing are State service matters and are not determinative planning considerations; the Shire has considered site suitability, access, bushfire and emergency management within its planning role. • Potential impacts on property values or marketability are not valid planning considerations for a development application assessment. • The Shire cannot require the proposal to be lodged on an alternative site; the application must be assessed at

Submission Number	Comments	Officer Assessment
		<p>the proposed location on its individual planning merits.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic, access and parking matters are relevant planning considerations and have been assessed, including recommended access and parking management requirements where appropriate.
21	<p>Im writing this letter in Regard to the Planning Proposal Drug and Alcohol Rehabilitation centre on Moorilup Rd Kendenup. I moved to the country because I wanted a peacefull life and a caring community for my family to be a part of. I have lived in Mt Barker for a long time and watched my children grow up in a community that looked out for each other and didn't look away when situations arose. It troubles me to hear that Rehabilitation centre is even consideredf in such a remote area. I have experienced first hand a drug addict.</p> <p>My brother at the age of 17 became addicted to hard drugs, I have watched him change into an unrecognizable person. The only thing that mattered to him is when and where he's going to get his next high, he's mood swings, aggression frequently triggered by withdrawal. The addiction didn't only effect his family it affected the community.</p> <p>My experience more than one occasion was terrifying and sad how a drug addicted person can devastate families and communities. I am all-inclusiv to help people with addition, but putting a centre where emegency help will not be available immediately is very concerning for the safety and well-being for people that live there and work on the premises.</p> <p>Im in that area once a week and I shouldn't be worried about my safety, because the council has chosen a remote area to put a centre for unpredictable people. With my experience of being all a part of drug addiction I advice against this Rehabilitation Centre to open in Kendenup. Please don't change the Cultural Harmony of our beautiful community.</p>	<p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety, security, children/school bus, resident movement and perceived anti-social behaviour concerns are noted; amenity and operational management have been assessed, including staffing, supervision, visitor, intake and exit/discharge arrangements. • Rural amenity, land-use compatibility and change from tourism/function use are relevant planning considerations and have been assessed against the existing lawful use and locality. • Traffic, access and parking matters are relevant planning considerations and have been assessed, including recommended access and parking management requirements where appropriate.
21	<p>OBJECTION - PROPOSED REHABILITATION CENTRE - 217 MOORILUP ROAD KENDENUP - L LISIC</p>	<p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Duplicate/summary objection associated with the same submitter reference as the preceding submission. • The substantive planning matters are addressed in the preceding entry and in the Council report.
22	<p>Re: Proposed - Great Southern REHAB Kendenup To : Chief Executive Officer - Shire of Plantagenet All Councillors currently representing the Shire of Plantagenet Re: Development Application – Proposed Repurposing of Kendenup Cottages & Lodge into a Residential Drug & Alcohol Rehabilitation Centre (Southern Aboriginal Corporation)</p> <p>We, the undersigned residents, landowners of area situated in the Eastern Smuts Rd/Harding precinct, submit this formal list of concerns to the proposed repurposing of Kendenup Cottages & Lodge into a residential drug and alcohol rehabilitation centre operated by the Southern Aboriginal Corporation (SAC). Our concerns are based on planning non-compliance, insufficient service capacity, loss of local tourist facility and associated tourist related promotion and revenue streams, inadequate local staffing availability, and lack of community consultation relating to the proponent. Local residents were not informed early, not invited to public meetings, and not given an opportunity to ask questions or provide input before the application was lodged. A development of this scale and sensitivity should involve transparent, open engagement with the community from the outset.</p> <p>Reasons for Objection</p> <p>The Proposed Use Is Fundamentally Incompatible with Rural Zoning of area</p> <p>The Rural zone exists to support:</p> <p>Agriculture Low-intensity lifestyle rural living Land-based industries Low-impact tourism</p> <p>A 24/7 residential rehabilitation facility is an urban institutional land use, not a rural one. It introduces:</p> <p>Intensive staffing Continuous service delivery and monitoring Emergency response requirements Community Safety & Policing Risks Are Understated Kendenup has no police station. Mount Barker Police are already resource-limited. Rehabilitation facilities typically generate:</p> <p>Welfare checks Absconding incidents(cont.over) Relapse-related disturbances Mental health issues</p>	<p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Group objection noted. Concerns relate to rural land-use compatibility, community safety, policing/emergency services, consultation, tourism impacts and the non-conforming use pathway. • The Shire advertised as early as possible to residents through the Statutory process, the Shire cannot advertise until it has received an application. Public meetings were not organised by the Shire but rather local residents and the applicant, therefore the Shire could not invite or not invite anyone • No one is able to provide comment before an application is lodged, that is the entire purpose of an assessment process and the resultant advertising. Anyone can lodge any application at any point in time, no prior discussion is required if the applicant wishes so • The Shire cannot require the proposal to be lodged on another site; the application must be assessed at the proposed location. • Emergency service resourcing is a State service matter; planning assessment is limited to land use, amenity, access, bushfire, servicing and operational management impacts. • Property value impacts are not a valid planning consideration. • Further comments are covered in the Council Report

Submission Number	Comments	Officer Assessment
	<p>Drug-related behavioural issues Health & Emergency Services Cannot Support the Facility Kendenup has no medical services. Mount Barker Medical Centre is at capacity. St John Ambulance relies heavily on volunteers. Plantagenet Hospital has ongoing staffing limitations. The proposal requires external services for: Emergency medical response Additional medical requirements as a result of substance and lifestyle abuse Strategic Implications for the Shire Loss of a Key Tourism Asset The Shire's Strategic Community Plan identifies tourism as a growth sector. Removing a rare, high-capacity accommodation venue undermines regional tourism development. Reduced Local Spending Loss of visitor expenditure impacts local businesses: Mount Barker IGA Kendenup General Store Wineries Cafés Fuel stations Trades and contractors Reduced Rates Revenue Potential charitable exemption reduces Shire income. No Offsetting Economic Benefit The proposed facility does not generate tourism, events, or significant employment. It introduces service burdens (policing, health, emergency response) without economic return. Summary While we strongly oppose the repurposing of Kendenup Cottages & Lodge, we acknowledge the need for appropriate alcohol and drug rehabilitation services in the Great Southern. However, the current proposal is poorly located, poorly designed, and incompatible with the Rural zoning and surrounding land uses. Why a Purpose-Built Facility Is Better Designed from the ground up to meet clinical, cultural, safety, and disability standards. Allows for secure medication rooms, withdrawal spaces, crisis-safe rooms, and proper staff supervision. Avoids retrofitting tourist buildings that were never intended for high-risk residential care. More Suitable Locations A purpose-built facility should be located: Near essential services (police, ambulance, GP, mental health, hospital). On land zoned for community, special-use, or institutional purposes, not Rural. With sealed road access for emergency response and staff travel. Locations near Albany, or Katanning are far more appropriate and safer for clients. Benefits to the Shire Retains the existing tourism asset, preserving over \$1M per year in economic activity. Avoids increased demand on emergency services in an isolated rural area. Ensures any new facility is properly staffed, clinically supported, and safely located. Aligns with the Shire's Strategic Community Plan, which prioritises tourism growth and appropriate land use. Conclusion: For these reasons, we respectfully request that the Shire of Plantagenet refuse the application in full. We encourage the proponent to pursue a purpose-built, properly located rehabilitation facility near essential services—one that supports client safety and recovery without sacrificing a key tourism asset or imposing unacceptable risks on the community.</p>	
23	<p>OBJECTION - PROPOSED REHABILITATION CENTRE - 217 MOORILUP ROAD KENDENUP - R ANDERSON I am writing to outline my objections to the proposed rezoning of Lots 843 and 844, 217 Moorilup Road, Kendenup for the purpose of operating a Drug and Alcohol rehabilitation centre. I consider that there is a safety risk in that there doesn't appear to be a management plan addressing the security of surrounding neighbours in the event that a client of the facility makes the decision to leave mid treatment. Our property is immediately opposite the abovementioned property with our entrances being 30 metres apart. I would like to be assured that there is no threat to our safety but the current information does not give me that comfort. There are no police in Kendenup and volunteers provide ambulance and fire response. They would likely experience an increase in demand for their assistance,</p>	<p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety, security, children/school bus, resident movement and perceived anti-social behaviour concerns are noted; amenity and operational management have been assessed, including staffing, supervision, visitor, intake and exit/discharge arrangements. • Police, ambulance, hospital and emergency response resourcing are State service matters and are not

Submission Number	Comments	Officer Assessment
	<p>thereby impacting locals and clients of the proposed centre. A rehabilitation centre does not fit the current land use in the area and I am asking that the council reject the proposal to rezone the property. Yours faithfully</p>	<p>determinative planning considerations; the Shire has considered site suitability, access, bushfire and emergency management within its planning role.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land use classification, zoning and non-conforming use arguments are noted and addressed in the statutory assessment against Local Planning Scheme No. 5 and the deemed provisions. • Bushfire and evacuation concerns are noted; bushfire risk and emergency management have been considered through the Bushfire Management Plan and assessment recommendations. • Traffic, access and parking matters are relevant planning considerations and have been assessed, including recommended access and parking management requirements where appropriate. • Further comments are covered in the Council Report
24	<p>OBJECTION - PROPOSED REHABILITATION CENTRE - 217 MOORILUP ROAD KENDENUP - J ANDERSON Proposed rezoning Kendenup I am writing to ask that the Shire of Plantagenet reject Proposal P902 to rezone Lots 843 and 844, 217 Moorilup Rd, Kendenup. Having attended an information session where representatives from Southern Aboriginal Corporation and Cyrenian House presented their respective rationale for establishing a drug and alcohol rehabilitation centre on the abovementioned property I am not convinced that the safety of community members has been adequately addressed. There needs to be an acceptable plan for all possible eventualities. The local emergency response is a concern as is the distance to essential services in Albany. We need to be provided with much more detailed documentation in order to convince us that all facets have been adequately considered and planned for. Yours faithfully Jill Anderson</p>	<p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety, security, children/school bus, resident movement and perceived anti-social behaviour concerns are noted; amenity and operational management have been assessed, including staffing, supervision, visitor, intake and exit/discharge arrangements. • Police, ambulance, hospital and emergency response resourcing are State service matters and are not determinative planning considerations; the Shire has considered site suitability, access, bushfire and emergency management within its planning role. • The Shire cannot require the proposal to be lodged on an alternative site; the application must be assessed at the proposed location on its individual planning merits. • Land use classification, zoning and non-conforming use arguments are noted and addressed in the statutory assessment against Local Planning Scheme No. 5 and the deemed provisions. • Traffic, access and parking matters are relevant planning considerations and have been assessed, including recommended access and parking management requirements where appropriate.
25	<p>SUBMISSION - PROPOSED REHABILITATION CENTRE - 217 MOORILUP ROAD KENDENUP Great Southern Drug and Alcohol Rehabilitation Centre To Whom it May Concern The following is my submission in relation to the Planning Proposal for the Great Southern Drug and Alcohol Rehabilitation Centre (GSDARC). The issues that I personally feel have not been addressed, answered and resolved are the following - 1) Water - At the meeting held in Kendenup with the representatives of the GSDARC in attendance, when the issue of maintaining the supply of water to the site their reply was they were not sure of the duration that the onsite water would last and that if it did they would access trucks to transport more to the site. The following information is known from the meeting in relation to the number of people who would be on site and the average consumption is an Australian Standard. Assuming there is 100kl on site rain water storage, then they should have been able work out how long the onsite water would last. - People - 20 people being treated, 2 overnight staff and 8 day time staff, giving an average daily head count of 26 full time people on site. This does not include any other workers or visitors allowed on site. - Water Consumption- Average daily water consumption is 150 - 200 litres per day. - Assumed Water Capacity - 100 000 litres. This gives an on site water use duration of between 19 and 25 days. Obviously they would not let the supply run down to this degree with proper planning and maintenance.</p>	<p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Servicing, wastewater and water supply concerns are noted; wastewater and bushfire water matters have been considered through the relevant referral material and bushfire management documentation. • Traffic, access and parking matters are relevant planning considerations and have been assessed, including recommended access and parking management requirements where appropriate. • Staffing concerns are noted; day-to-day staffing is primarily operational, but the approved Operational Management Plan and supervision commitments inform the amenity assessment. • The applicant is well within their rights to have water trucked to their site, just like anyone in Rocky Gully,

Submission Number	Comments	Officer Assessment
	<p>Although water is a state control issue - how and where are they going to access water to resupply their tanks? How will this affect the water supply to the town of Kendenup? 2) Infrastructure - Assuming the water deliveries are in 15kl trucks, that would require between 90 and 115 truck movements to replenish the water supply for each year. What damage to Councils infrastructure will happen and who will be made responsible for rectifying any damage? How will this extra maintenance impact on the works already being carried out and how will this impact on the Councils maintenance backlog? 3) Environment - With this I particularly refer to the amount of effluent that will be produced by the number of people on the site. This will include toilet, showering and washing - cloths, linen and meal prep and cleaning. Does the current system have the capacity to handle the volume of waste water that will be used by the facility? Is the overflow from the existing facility being tested before it is released? Is the current system compliant to the planned facility usage? Has the downstream catchment been tested to confirm that there is no contamination? The above are issues the GSDARC have not addressed and presented to the people of Kendenup. Thanks Colin and Val Gorman</p>	<p>Porongurup and so forth. If they wanted, although likely cost prohibitive, could obtain a water mains connection from WaterCorp. Potable water supply is the responsibility of the landowner for commercial land at this scale, the Shire does not have the statutory authority to dictate this</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental and biosecurity concerns are noted; no new external buildings are proposed and any separate clearing, environmental or biosecurity obligations remain the responsibility of the operator. • Concerns regarding risk management and operational accountability are noted; the approved Operational Management Plan is recommended to define how the use is to operate. • Further comments are covered in the Council Report
26	<p>ATTN: Mr Julian Murphy - Submission regarding planning proposal for the GSDARC Kendenup Dear Mr Murphy Attached is our submission against the proposed Great Southern Drug & Alcohol Rehabilitation Centre in Kendenup. Kind Regards Carole & Stephen Anderson Re: Planning Proposal for the Great Southern Drug & Alcohol Rehabilitation Centre (GSDARC) to be located at Lot 843 & Lot 844, 217 Moorilup Road, Kendenup WA 6323 ATTENTION: Mr Julian Murphy Dear Mr Murphy We are strongly opposed to the Great Southern Drug & Alcohol Rehabilitation Centre being located in Kendenup. We have attended two local meetings regarding this proposal and feel we have justification for opposing this proposal. Our objections in order of priority to us are as follows: Section 6 Facility and Location; paragraph 2 of the proposal states: SAC has made an offer to purchase the property which has been formally accepted by the current owners. The sale of the property will be completed subject to conditions including approval of funding from the Mental Health Commission and Development Approval from the Shire of Plantagenet. This seems to be false and misleading information as we have been advised by Southern Aboriginal Corporation that the sale of the property has already been completed and that they have taken possession. This is prior to development approval from the Shire of Plantagenet. We brought up this question at the public meeting hosted by SAC & Cyrenian House and the only response we received was "oh hasn't the proposal been updated?" Section 4.3 Staffing; paragraph 4 Weekend Shifts states: Weekend Shifts o Same shift structure as for weekdays above, which are covered by two Residential Supervisors at all times. o Visitor hours: 9am – 4pm Sundays (for approved residents only). At the meeting hosted by SAC & Cyrenian House we were advised both verbally and via their digital presentation that there would be a minimum of two residential supervisors after hours. This seems to conflict with the statement in their proposal where the word minimum isn't included. What are we supposed to believe? This again seems to be misleading. Section 5.3 Risk Management; paragraph 3 states: The residents of the GSDARC will be carefully screened and selected as part of SAC and Cyrenian House's normal residential assessment process. This assessment identifies any issues such as previous sexual offending or serious violence amongst potential residents. Anyone with significant violence or any sexual offending history will be excluded from being admitted to the service. Again at the meeting with SAC & Cyrenian House this statement was brought up in question time and they were asked if that meant the residents didn't have any criminal record. They said no, some may still have a criminal record. This makes us concerned that we could still be at risk of violence, be it significant or not. Section 5.3 Risk Management; paragraph 5 states: People who complete their treatment stay will be supported to return to their homes, which in the case of the GSDARC will mostly be other towns and communities in the Great Southern region. People who need to exit the service because they have broken key rules of the program (such as using alcohol or drugs on-site) will be transported back to their home communities; either by the service; or by their family and/or friends. SAC will not approve someone to exit the service without a clear plan as to how the person will return home. Cyrenian House representatives at the meeting couldn't guarantee that, should a resident be collected by their family and/or friends, that they wouldn't loiter in</p>	<p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety, security, children/school bus, resident movement and perceived anti-social behaviour concerns are noted; amenity and operational management have been assessed, including staffing, supervision, visitor, intake and exit/discharge arrangements. • Police, ambulance, hospital and emergency response resourcing are State service matters and are not determinative planning considerations; the Shire has considered site suitability, access, bushfire and emergency management within its planning role. • The Shire cannot require the proposal to be lodged on an alternative site; the application must be assessed at the proposed location on its individual planning merits. • Consultation and notification concerns are noted; the application was advertised in accordance with the statutory process and submissions have been considered. • Rural amenity, land-use compatibility and change from tourism/function use are relevant planning considerations and have been assessed against the existing lawful use and locality. • Further comments are covered in the Council Report

Submission Number	Comments	Officer Assessment
	<p>the Kendenup area, posing a risk to us as residents.</p> <p>Section 6.1 Planning consideration; paragraph 8 of the proposal states: Environmental and safety considerations – given the rural location, SAC has commissioned a bushfire management plan. Further, SAC and Cyrenian House: will ensure the development of a comprehensive evacuation procedure for the GSDARC, as they have done so for all the existing facilities they operate; will have access to existing Rangers program employed by SAC to monitor and maintain existing environment conditions; and will ensure compliance with relevant building, health and safety standards.</p> <p>Their response to questions about their bushfire management plan seemed sadly lacking. We have concerns that the property doesn't have the necessary water supply to not only cover the residents on a day to day basis, but in the event of a fire, their water supply could be severely depleted. They said they could have water delivered, but as residents of Kendenup we are all aware that there are only two suppliers and that they are often unavailable due to demand.</p> <p>Section 10.2 Impact on Local Services; paragraph 1 Policing of the proposal states: SAC is aware that there may be concern that the proposed GSDARC will impact on local Police. SAC and Cyrenian House are confident that the service will have an insignificant or nil impact on the workload of local Police.</p> <p>Kendenup doesn't have a Police Station, nor do we have any police officers living in the town. The Mount Barker Police Station is only open Monday - Friday 8am - 4pm, with after hours calls being sent through to Albany.</p> <p>We have had to call the Mount Barker Police to a nearby domestic violence incident and it took 40 minutes for them to respond. We have also had to call the police after hours due to disturbances and these calls have NEVER been responded to. Should an issue arise at the proposed GSDARC, Cyrenian House told us at the meeting that they would call the police if necessary. Given that the Mount Barker Police Station is badly under staffed and that after hours calls are directed to Albany, what hope do we have that police will arrive rapidly?</p> <p>Section 10.2 Impact on Local Services; paragraph 5 General Practitioners, Hospitals and Ambulance Services of the proposal states: SAC is aware that access to GP services in Kendenup and surrounding districts is limited. Given the partners experience at other AOD residential services, it is anticipated that approximately a total of 4-5 appointments on average per fortnight will be required by the service. This is not expected to be substantially higher than any member of the public accessing a GP for general health issues.</p> <p>It already takes two months to get an appointment with our GP at Plantagenet Medical. Having the rehab centre here will no doubt increase that wait time.</p> <p>Section 10.2 Impact on Local Services; paragraph 12 Mental Health of the proposal states: SAC also has established working relationships with key mental health service providers including the following which can provide support for residents in some situations: Amity Health Great Southern Aboriginal Health Association WA Country Health Service (Albany Health Campus, Plantagenet Cranbrook Health Service) Headspace Albany.</p> <p>We have both experienced extended wait times to see a mental health professional through Amity Health. Currently the wait has been 3 months and still waiting to get an appointment. The rehab centre will no doubt increase that wait time even further.</p> <p>Kendenup is a small, peaceful community of mostly senior/aged residents, with the median age being 54 at the 2021 Census. There are a significant number of elderly residents in the town, who have chosen to live here for the peace and quiet. Allowing the GSDARC to be located in Kendenup will put an extreme amount of stress on those of us who came here for that peace and quiet. Since hearing of this proposal, we have started looking into security cameras for our property, something that we didn't ever dream of needing here.</p> <p>Please do not allow this rehab centre to go ahead in Kendenup.</p> <p>Yours faithfully Carole & Stephen Anderson</p>	
27	<p>As the landowner of lots 838 & 839, 197 Moorilup Road, Kendenup I am opposed to the proposed establishment of the Great Southern Drug & Alcohol Rehabilitation Centre at Lots 853 ^& 844, 217 Moorilup Road, Kendenup.</p> <p>Concerns are: It's not a suitable location for such a facility Does the proposal fit within the rural zoning? The impact health services; there are not mental health services available locally Are security levels for the proposed facility adequate? Staffing levels may be insufficient particularly at night/after hours The impact on local emergency services; in particular after-hours police response times Potential attraction for criminal behaviour; how will visitors be controlled? Community safety o noting residents can leave the facility at aby time.</p>	<p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety, security, children/school bus, resident movement and perceived anti-social behaviour concerns are noted; amenity and operational management have been assessed, including staffing, supervision, visitor, intake and exit/discharge arrangements. • Police, ambulance, hospital and emergency response resourcing are State service matters and are not determinative planning considerations; the Shire has considered site suitability, access, bushfire and emergency management within its planning role. • Land use classification, zoning and non-conforming use

Submission Number	Comments	Officer Assessment
		<p>arguments are noted and addressed in the statutory assessment against Local Planning Scheme No. 5 and the deemed provisions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic, access and parking matters are relevant planning considerations and have been assessed, including recommended access and parking management requirements where appropriate. • Staffing concerns are noted; day-to-day staffing is primarily operational, but the approved Operational Management Plan and supervision commitments inform the amenity assessment. • Further comments are covered in the Council Report
28	<p>Dear Sir/Madam, Please find attached a Letter of Objection on behalf of Mrs Susan Thomas of today's date. Please confirm receipt of this email. A hard copy will be delivered on Monday. Kind regards, JA Houlton Re: Objection to Proposed Great Southern Drug & Alcohol Rehabilitation Centre for Voluntary Patients (GSDARC) Property: Lots 843-844, 217 Moorilup Road, Kendenup, Western Australia Applicant: Southern Aboriginal Corporation (Lead Agency) in partnership with Cyrenian House Dear Sir/Madam,</p> <p>I write to formally object to the proposed planning application for the use of the above property as a drug and alcohol treatment facility. My objection is not directed toward people seeking treatment or support. Drug and alcohol rehabilitation services are important and necessary within the community. However, I do not believe this particular location is suitable for this type of operation due to significant concerns regarding community safety, emergency response capability, and the existing local environment. Kendenup is a small rural community with limited public services and infrastructure. Importantly, there is no permanent local police presence in the town, with police resources based in Albany approximately one hour away. This creates a serious concern regarding response times should incidents occur requiring urgent intervention.</p> <p>In addition, the town does not have full-time medical or hospital services available locally. Residents rely heavily on hospital and emergency medical services located in Albany. This lack of immediate medical infrastructure raises further concerns regarding the suitability of locating a drug and alcohol treatment-related operation within the community, particularly where vulnerable individuals may require urgent health, mental health, or crisis intervention support. There are already ongoing concerns within the local area regarding drug-related activity and alleged drug dealing. Introducing a facility associated with substance dependency and rehabilitation into a community already experiencing these issues risks placing additional pressure on residents and limited local resources. I also understand that the proposed facility would operate on a voluntary basis, meaning individuals are free to come and go rather than being accommodated within a secure or medically supervised environment. This raises additional concerns regarding community safety, supervision, and the management of individuals who may be experiencing substance dependency, relapse, behavioural issues, or mental health crises without immediate local support services available.</p> <p>My concerns include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased demand on emergency and policing services that are already geographically stretched. • Potential impacts on community safety and public amenity. • The suitability of locating such a facility in a small rural residential environment lacking immediate support infrastructure. • Potential impacts on nearby residents, families, and vulnerable community members. • Lack of local medical, security, and crisis-response capability. <p>Concerns regarding supervision, transport, and management arrangements for clients attending or residing at the property. I respectfully submit that facilities of this nature are more appropriately located in areas with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Immediate access to police and emergency services; • Established medical and mental health infrastructure; • Public transport and support services; • Appropriate commercial or institutional zoning; • Adequate staffing and security capability. <p>I request that the Council carefully consider whether the proposal is compatible with the existing character, safety requirements, and infrastructure limitations of Kendenup. Should Council nonetheless consider approval, I strongly request that extensive independent community consultation, operational management plans, security</p>	<p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety, security, children/school bus, resident movement and perceived anti-social behaviour concerns are noted; amenity and operational management have been assessed, including staffing, supervision, visitor, intake and exit/discharge arrangements. • Police, ambulance, hospital and emergency response resourcing are State service matters and are not determinative planning considerations; the Shire has considered site suitability, access, bushfire and emergency management within its planning role. • Potential impacts on property values or marketability are not valid planning considerations for a development application assessment. • The Shire cannot require the proposal to be lodged on an alternative site; the application must be assessed at the proposed location on its individual planning merits. • Consultation and notification concerns are noted; the application was advertised in accordance with the statutory process and submissions have been considered. • Further comments are covered in the Council Report

Submission Number	Comments	Officer Assessment
	<p>plans, staffing details, and emergency response arrangements be fully disclosed and independently assessed before any decision is made. I respectfully ask that this objection be formally recorded and fully considered as part of the planning assessment process.</p> <p>Yours faithfully, Susan Valerie Thomas</p>	
29	<p>Notice of objection: P_902 To the Chief Executive Officer and Councilors' Shire of Plantagenet RE: Objection to Development Application P 902– Non-Conforming Use Lots 843 and 844 (217 Moorilup Road, Kendenup) Great Southern Drug and Alcohol Rehabilitation Centre (GSDARC)</p> <p>I write to object to the above development application and respectfully request that Council exercise caution in determining this proposal under Clause 23 of Local Planning Scheme No. 5 (LPS5).</p> <p>A non-conforming use can be changed to another non-permitted use with development approval, pursuant to clause 23 of LPS5: 23.</p> <p>Changes to non-conforming use</p> <p>(1) A person must not, without development approval — (</p> <p>a) alter or extend a non-conforming use of land; or</p> <p>(b) erect, alter or extend a building used for, or in conjunction with, a non-conforming use; or</p> <p>(c) repair, rebuild, alter or extend a building used for a non-conforming use that is destroyed to the extent of 75% or more of its value; or</p> <p>(d) change the use of land from a non-conforming use to another use that is not permitted by the Scheme.</p> <p>Environmental and safety considerations – —given the rural location, SAC has commissioned a bushfire management plan. The proposal is supported by the attached Bushfire Management Plan that provides recommendations to ensure the development is able to mitigate any risk of bushfire. (Where is the bushfire management plan and what procedures to evacuate if needed).Because they will need it when summer comes, we were told they have one but where is it? For any facility there is a Risk Assessment Plan, there is none for here. We as residents here cannot contact the ranger in emergency, so what chance will the individuals have at the facility. Police takes an hour if they are around Mount Barker. Our services so far out stretched. Apparently —theyl will have their own SAC ranger.</p> <p>Residents will be fully supervised by professional and trained staff on a 24/7 basis. In addition to having properly trained after-hours staff, there will also be senior staff on call to support the night staff if required. More clarity is needed.</p> <p>Security and fencing – sheep fence which is rusting away. A sheep can easily jump that fence.</p> <p>Visitors – will they be screened and monitored as well. As we are all how secure a Prison is with screening as well and yet —things —get into there.</p> <p>The experience of neighbours' elsewhere – Nannup is not Kendenup. They always mentioned Nannup at the meeting. In Nannup, Cyrenian house took over an already established rehab. Blackwood river clinic) Therefore no planning approval or rezoning etc was needed. They just changed hands and the local didn't object to that.</p> <p>Nannup facility is very isolated and far from town and I stress it was already an existing facility therefore no approval was needed. Kendenup is surrounded by lots of properties close by and is not isolated as Nannup facility.</p> <p>Impact on Local Services Policing – this is already so far stretched they call back in 1 hour and say is he still there? From past experience.</p> <p>General Practitioners, Hospitals and Ambulance Services – these services are far stretched that you need 2 weeks in advance booking. 1 ambulance service which is far stretched as it doesn't only cater for Kendenup. Who will have the priority if an individual is having a heart attack, a car crash with severely injured or someone with psychotic episode at the facility or be it having severe withdrawal symptoms.</p> <p>Mental health People with alcohol and other drug problems may also present with mental health conditions. What happens when they go walk about, will we the residents be notified. As at the meeting we were told —yes but after they are foundl, what sense is that??</p> <p>—In 2019, SAC in partnership with Cyrenian House opened the Nannup Therapeutic Community facility. Since commencement of operations, they have been regarded as considerate stakeholders that contributed positively to the local amenity, community life and local businesses. Importantly, the standard which residents and service workers maintain the Nannup Therapeutic Community facility has enhanced the amenity of the locality.l</p> <p>The above is a section of the 3.1.1 Southern Aboriginal Corporation, mentioning that in 2019 they opened a facility in Nannup. Now at the meeting on the 14th of May in Kendenup we were told by the representatives' that the two organizations have never worked together and this is the first time. And after 3years of being together the Cyrenian House will leave the care to the SAC. So what is the meaning of the above (in Green) that someone is misleading the community of ours.</p> <p>Development Application – Non-Conforming Use Lots 843 and 844 (217) Moorilup Road, Kendenup Community purpose is a use that is not permitted in the Rural zone under LPS5. Clause 67(1) of the deemed provisions provides: Development approval cannot be granted on an application for approval of — (a) development that is a class X use in relation to the zone in which the development is located, unless — (b) the development relates to land that is being used for a non-conforming use; and the local government considers that the proposed use of the land would be less detrimental than the non-conforming use. 3</p> <p>4.4 Town Planning Scheme Policy No. 19 Kendenup Rural Surrounds Town Planning Scheme Policy No. 19. (TPSP19) seeks to provide guidance to assist in land use control to avoid/reduce land use conflict from the inappropriate location of particular land uses. TPSP19 outlines criteria in assessing land use proposal in the Kendenup rural surrounds. This policy identifies the site to be within 'Future Rural Residential Areas'. Dear councilors at the meeting on Thursday the 14th the reps mentioned something as a Women's Refuge in Albany and a updated proposal does this mean that if they don't receive the funding from the Mental Health Department: the lodge will then be used a refuge. The reps also many times mentioned that the current proposal is not the updated proposal.</p>	<p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety, security, children/school bus, resident movement and perceived anti-social behaviour concerns are noted; amenity and operational management have been assessed, including staffing, supervision, visitor, intake and exit/discharge arrangements. • Police, ambulance, hospital and emergency response resourcing are State service matters and are not determinative planning considerations; the Shire has considered site suitability, access, bushfire and emergency management within its planning role. • The Shire cannot require the proposal to be lodged on an alternative site; the application must be assessed at the proposed location on its individual planning merits. • Consultation and notification concerns are noted; the application was advertised in accordance with the statutory process and submissions have been considered. • Land use classification, zoning and non-conforming use arguments are noted and addressed in the statutory assessment against Local Planning Scheme No. 5 and the deemed provisions. • The land use approval pathway has been outline in depth in the Council Report • The Shire cannot comment on the use of drugs, this is not an aspect that can be considered through a development application and is covered under separate legislation. The Shire does not have the statutory authority to dictate what sedatives etc. may or may not be used on site • Further comments are covered in the Council Report

Submission Number	Comments	Officer Assessment
	<p>Community Safety Does the above means in time to come there will little houses built to accommodate the homeless. Who guarantees that these individuals will not take drugs/alcohol? Who guarantees our community safety? Council should also give careful consideration to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the precedent implications associated with approving one prohibited institutional use in substitution for another prohibited use within the Rural zone; and whether the proposal genuinely represents a use —closer to the intended purpose of the zone as required under Clause 23; and the long-term strategic planning implications for Kendenup and surrounding localities; and whether approval would undermine the intended distinction between rural land and institutional/community-purpose land uses under LPS5. <p>By the way there is a school bus stop just opposite the —lodgeI now who will guarantee the children’s safety. Every parent is not available to pick up their kids. The reps told us at the meeting that they were not aware of this and had not even physically knew where this facility existed? They purchased a place not knowing it was red/brindle or blue. Again at the meeting one of the rep said that they are not prisoners and they will not be monitored meaning they will be free to wonder around.</p> <p>We need a lot of clarity as when these questions were asked at the meeting with the representatives they —were put aside or ignoredI. So many questions remain unanswered as the reps did not know themselves what was in the proposal. Where did you get that information from was their attitude. The reps told us at the meeting —Oh that’s not the updated proposalI. Dear councilors so where is the updated proposal, will it come out after the 26th of May?</p> <p>On the ABC radio it the reps mentioned only 1 neighbour was consulted. By chance it wasn’t us who live 1 driveway away. There are many close neighbors right next to the —lodgeI. It was only 4 made public via Facebook. The rep said on the Radio that they had engaged a lot earlier in Nannup to the community so why leave it to the last minute here in Kendenup; the proposals came on Shire of Plantagenet days later. The original proposal is dated January 2026 so where was it floating till then Apparently it was put in council on the 30th April, 2026. To bring to your attention that there are a lot of people in KENDENUP, who are only finding about this proposal now or don’t even know to this date. By the way there was no prior advertising as the original advertising had been taken away.</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no deep sewerage at the intended facility and when it rains water travels to all the properties around and as we all have livestock who would take responsibility if ever there was a bio-security issue/breach. At meeting this was also mentioned that the individuals are not inmates therefore —Freedom to leave —and also “go for walksI so who would be responsible for the security of the community if things did go wrong. As at the meeting we were told —we can’t guarantee everythingI Oh yes, in one proposal it mentions 16 residential adults and in the other 20. There is absolutely no competency in these proposals as the reps themselves. The documents are as clear as mud. CCTV was mention for the individuals inside as well general public on the outside. I don’t want to be on CCTV doing my walking and jogging and my grandkids riding their bikes. Is this not —invasion of our privacy?”</p> <p>Diazepam drug/medication was mentioned by the reps however it has so many side effects. Once my GP told me individuals can act out on it. (see attached) —“Specific to the Great Southern Region, the Plan identified that there are no alcohol and other drug residential rehabilitation beds and low medical withdrawal beds, and by the end of 2025 there needs to be a total of 17 beds and two beds, respectively, to meet demand. The proposal has at its core a purpose of improving the general welfare of the Shire’s inhabitants by filling a gap in the provision of adequate facilities for people with alcohol and/or other drug issues.”</p> <p>This clause from the proposal however at the meeting we were told that this is not for the local community but for all over Western Australia. So what chances will someone we know around here will get a placement. We as locals need to know what really the true outcome of the proposed facility is!?</p> <p>Having resided locally for nine years, the site has operated as comparatively low-intensity rural tourist accommodation. Council should therefore carefully distinguish between:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dormant or theoretical approval capacity; The actual established amenity and operational expectations of the locality. <p>There been several wedding receptions and we as locals frequented the —lodgeI for breakfast and dinners on many occasions. A point to be noted, since when had the Kendenup Lodge Cottages become a facility. —</p> <p>2. Service Partners.</p> <p>The Southern Aboriginal Corporation, as the lead agency, has formed a partnership with Cyrenian House to implement and operate the GSDARC, subject to being awarded the tender by the MHC, and subject to planning approval to utilise the current Kendenup Lodge and Cottages facility for this purpose”. (Page 5 of the proposal).</p> <p>Many a times Tourist used to stay there prior to the continuation of their journeys to the Stirling and Porongurup ranges. Residing so close to the then —LodgeI I can mention that it was not dormant.</p> <p>While the proposal may provide a valuable social service, the issue before Council is not whether rehabilitation services are important. The issue is whether this particular land use outcome is appropriate within this specific locality and consistent with the intent of the Shire’s planning framework.</p> <p>For the reasons outlined above, I respectfully request that Council to refuse the above application or, at minimum, defer determination pending further independent strategic planning assessment regarding the long-term implications of the proposal and the intended scope of non-conforming use provisions under LPS5.</p> <p>Yours faithfully, Anita Furber 275 Moorilup Road, KENDENUP Side effects of Diazepam Most commonly, you can absolutely act out on diazepam (Valium). While it is a sedative meant to calm the nervous system, it can also lower inhibitions, impair</p>	

Submission Number	Comments	Officer Assessment
	<p>judgment, and because what are known as "paradoxical reactions"—the exact opposite of the calming affects you would expect.</p> <p>Behavioral Side Effects When a person "acts out" on diazepam, it often manifests as: Disinhibiting: Acting impulsive, reckless, or saying things you normally wouldn't. Aggression and Rage: Unusual outbursts, irritability, hostility, or even violent behavior. Confusion and Delirium: Not knowing where you are, behaving inappropriately, or having hallucinations and delusions. Anterograde Amnesia: Doing or saying things while heavily sedated and having zero memory of the event afterward. Factors that Make "Acting Out" Worse Mixing with Alcohol: Combining diazepam with alcohol is highly dangerous. It multiplies the sedative and disinhibiting effects, severely increasing the risk of blackouts, extreme aggression, and life-threatening breathing suppression. Underlying Conditions: These erratic behaviors are more common in individuals with pre-existing mental health conditions or in the elderly or children. Abruptly Stopping: "Acting out" can also occur during withdrawal if you abruptly stop taking the medication after a period of dependence. Individuals can experience aggressive, dangerous, or suicidal impulses while taking diazepam. This is just to inform the councilors that the reps said the individuals are/will be given this medication. Why waste our money (tax payer) money to serve at the GSDARC. Any GP will confirm it can severely have the opposite outcome.</p>	
30	<p>PROPOSED NON-CONFORMING LAND USE FOR A COMMUNITY PURPOSE (REHABILITATION FACILITY) LOT 843 & LOT 844, MOORILUP ROAD, KENDENUP This is my objection to P902. RE: Objection to Development Application P902 – Proposed Change of Use, Lots 843 & 844, 217 Moorilup Road, Kendenup To whom it may concern.</p> <p>I am writing to formally object to Development Application P902. I am a young woman who worked hard and saved for years to buy my home in Kendenup. It was not easy, and it matters to me enormously. I chose this town because it is quiet, safe, and feels like a real community. This proposal threatens all of that, and I want Council to understand what it means to someone in my position.</p> <p>I attended the public consultation meeting on 14 May 2026, hoping to get answers. I left feeling more alarmed than when I arrived, and deeply let down by the process.</p> <p>1. The Consultation Meeting Raised More Questions Than It Answered At the meeting on 14 May, SAC and Cyrenian House representatives were unable to answer basic questions from concerned residents. What struck me most was that they appeared to have no knowledge of Kendenup at all. They did not know that we have no police station. They did not know that our services are extremely limited. They showed no awareness of, or concern about, the very real anxieties the community was expressing in that room. For organisations proposing to plant a 24/7 facility in our town, this lack of basic preparation was alarming. If they do not know we have no police station before the application is lodged, how can we trust that they have genuinely thought through the impact on this community?</p> <p>2. They Could Not Guarantee the Behaviour of Visitors or Discharged Residents At the meeting, Cyrenian House acknowledged that they cannot guarantee the behaviour of visitors to the facility, or of residents who leave early or are evicted for breaking the rules of the program. This is not a minor point. This is the crux of the safety concern for people like me. I live alone. Kendenup has no police station. The nearest police are in Mount Barker, 22 kilometres away. If a visitor becomes difficult, or a former resident is evicted and has nowhere to go and no way to leave, who responds? The answer given at the meeting was not reassuring. They state that discharged residents will be transported home – but it also acknowledges that this depends on families, friends, or the service having the capacity to arrange it. In a town with no services and no police presence, "we will do our best" is not good enough.</p> <p>3. My Property Value and My Sense of Security I saved for a long time to buy my home. I am proud of what I have achieved. The prospect of a drug and alcohol rehabilitation facility operating close to town has me genuinely worried about what that does to the value of my property and to the feel of this street and this town. I have not been able to find anyone who can tell me clearly whether my concerns about property values are valid or not. I do not have lawyers or planners advising me. I am a resident trying to understand a complex planning process that feels like it has been designed by and for organisations with resources that ordinary people in this town simply do not have. I feel like my concerns are being dismissed rather than genuinely heard.</p> <p>4. Health Services Are Already Not Coping I already wait weeks to see a GP. Adding the ongoing medical needs of 20 rehabilitation residents to this system is not a small thing. It is more competition for appointments that local people are already struggling to access.</p> <p>5. I Feel Unsupported by This Process I want to be honest with Council about how this process has felt. The application runs to dozens of pages of planning and legal language. The organisations behind it have professional planners, lawyers, and communications staff. I have none of that. I am doing my best to put my concerns in writing, but I am not a planner and I should not need to be one to have my voice heard on something that directly affects where I live. The Shire has a responsibility to its residents, not just to applicants with resources. I ask that Council take seriously the voices of the people who actually live here, who pay rates here, and who chose this town as their home.</p> <p>Conclusion</p>	<p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety, security, children/school bus, resident movement and perceived anti-social behaviour concerns are noted; amenity and operational management have been assessed, including staffing, supervision, visitor, intake and exit/discharge arrangements. • Police, ambulance, hospital and emergency response resourcing are State service matters and are not determinative planning considerations; the Shire has considered site suitability, access, bushfire and emergency management within its planning role. • Potential impacts on property values or marketability are not valid planning considerations for a development application assessment. • Consultation and notification concerns are noted; the application was advertised in accordance with the statutory process and submissions have been considered. • Land use classification, zoning and non-conforming use arguments are noted and addressed in the statutory assessment against Local Planning Scheme No. 5 and the deemed provisions. • Further comments are covered in the Council Report

Submission Number	Comments	Officer Assessment
	<p>I object to this application. I am asking Council not to approve it. The organisations involved could not answer basic questions about our town at a public meeting. They cannot guarantee the safety and behaviour of people leaving their facility. There is no police presence here. There are no services for people in crisis. And there is a community of real people who are frightened, confused, and feel like no one is listening to them.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Greta Evans Kendenup resident</p>	
31	<p>RE: Objection to Development Application P902 – Proposed Change of Use, Lots 843 & 844, 217 Moorilup Road, Kendenup</p> <p>Dear Manager,</p> <p>I write as a resident of Kendenup to formally object to Development Application P902, which seeks approval to repurpose the Kendenup Cottages and Lodge as the Great Southern Drug and Alcohol Rehabilitation Centre (GSDARC).</p> <p>My objection is to this location and to the misleading way this application has been presented to the community and to Council. The supporting documents contain claims about local employment, economic benefit, and planning impact that are, at best, overstated and, at worst, simply not true when applied to Kendenup. I ask Council to look past the regional-level justifications and consider what this proposal actually means for the people who live here.</p> <p>1. Staffing</p> <p>The applicant states that SAC will “seek to employ local people” and suggests staff and their families will settle in Kendenup and the surrounding area. This is not a realistic picture of how this organisation operates.</p> <p>1.1 Kendenup is a small, predominantly retired community. Across the Shire there is no local pool of clinical coordinators, registered nurses, specialist AOD counsellors, or psychologists. The Shire’s own Corporate Business Plan acknowledges that attracting health professionals is one of the region’s most pressing challenges – and that is across the entire Shire, not just our small town. SAC recruits and develops its own workforce. The staff for this facility will come from within SAC’s and Cyrenian existing networks and would likely be brought in from elsewhere. The promise of local employment is unfounded.</p> <p>1.2 Worse, if SAC purchases local properties to house incoming staff – something organisations of this kind routinely do – it will directly compete with people from this area, who have family ties to Plantagenet, for housing in a market that is already unaffordable for many people in this community. An organisation with institutional purchasing capacity entering our small housing market would price local people out of an already competitive market.</p> <p>2. Financial benefit.</p> <p>The applicant projects \$2.5–3 million annually flowing to the “local economy” and commits to purchasing goods and services locally. This figure is presented as a benefit to Kendenup. It is not.</p> <p>2.1 Kendenup has a small general store that sells liquor but no fresh produce. There is no supermarket, no hardware business, no commercial food wholesaler or fuel sales.</p> <p>I regularly have people knocking on my door on a Saturday or Sunday afternoon looking for fuel, as there is nothing open after midday, or fuel sales at all. I live on the main street next to the general store. With Sunday being “visiting day” there are no services available in Kendenup for food, fuel, accommodation or mechanical breakdown. Any assistance will fall on the local community.</p> <p>2.2 Any serious purchasing for a 20-resident, 24/7 facility would likely go to Albany or Katanning – which is where SAC’s regional office is located anyway, and where competitive pricing is available. When the applicant says “purchase local”, local means the Great Southern region, not this town.</p> <p>2.3 The economic benefit to Kendenup is further undermined by the fact that the facility is deliberately designed to be self-contained. The applicant describes a commercial-grade kitchen, a fully equipped laundry, a workshop, and a vegetable garden and orchard growing produce for residents on site.</p> <p>2.4 Specialist trades, like those needed to up grade or maintain a medical facility for mild withdrawal, who routinely stayed at Kendenup lodge, would not be sourced in Kendenup, or even Mt Barker.</p> <p>3. Costs to Kendenup</p> <p>The applicant cites a Benefit Cost Ratio of 1.29 for Aboriginal residential rehabilitation services. What it does not say is that none of that benefit flows to Kendenup.</p> <p>3.1 The applicant is explicit: residents will come from other towns and communities across the Great Southern region, and when treatment ends they will return to those same communities. The improved health outcomes, reduced crime, and increased workforce participation quoted accrue to Albany, Katanning, Denmark and elsewhere. Kendenup gets the facility, the operational disruption, and the ongoing presence of a 24/7 institutional service in what is currently a quiet rural setting.</p> <p>3.2 That presence has a cost that does not appear in any ratio. This community is already experiencing real anxiety, uncertainty and distress about this proposal. Residents feel that a decision affecting the fundamental character of our town is being made over our heads, justified by regional statistics that have nothing to do with life in Kendenup. That cost is real and it deserves to be weighed.</p> <p>4. Local Health Services.</p> <p>The applicant acknowledges that GP access in Kendenup and the surrounding district is limited, then estimates the facility will require four to five GP appointments per fortnight and characterises this as unremarkable. It is not unremarkable.</p> <p>The Shire’s own Corporate Business Plan lists expanding GP and health services as one of the top five community priorities, precisely because demand already exceeds what is available. Adding a steady stream of specialist health needs – mental health management, medication oversight, clinical referrals – for 20 residents to a system that is already stretched is not a neutral impact. It directly competes with the health needs of the people who already live here.</p>	<p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local employment etc. whilst beneficial, is not an aspect that can be considered through a development application, the Shire cannot dictate where the facility may hire people from nor dictate where they may or may not purchase property The same commentary applies to ‘financial benefit’, this is not something the Shire can consider through a development application, whether beneficial or not Safety, security, children/school bus, resident movement and perceived anti-social behaviour concerns are noted; amenity and operational management have been assessed, including staffing, supervision, visitor, intake and exit/discharge arrangements. Police, ambulance, hospital and emergency response resourcing are State service matters and are not determinative planning considerations; the Shire has considered site suitability, access, bushfire and emergency management within its planning role. Potential impacts on property values or marketability are not valid planning considerations for a development application assessment. The Shire cannot require the proposal to be lodged on an alternative site; the application must be assessed at the proposed location on its individual planning merits. Land use classification, zoning and non-conforming use arguments are noted and addressed in the statutory assessment against Local Planning Scheme No. 5 and the deemed provisions within the Council Report The comments claim the reception centre land use ceased under LPS5 in Feb 2021 is factually incorrect Further comments are covered in the Council Report

Submission Number	Comments	Officer Assessment
	<p>5. Planning</p> <p>The planning report argues that the GSDARC is less intensive than the existing approved use because a 260-person reception centre would be more disruptive. This comparison is deliberately misleading.</p> <p>The reception centre classification ceased to exist under LPS5 in February 2021. It has not operated as such. The honest comparison is between a 20-resident, 24/7 supervised rehabilitation facility running three staff shifts every day of the year, and a quiet rural holiday property. Any fair reading of that comparison shows the proposed use is a significant intensification of activity and impact, not a reduction. Council should reject the 260-person baseline for what it is: a figure chosen to make the application look better than it is.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>Besides the facility not being for “Community Service “ as stated by the applicant for planning purposes, but in fact a 24/7 medical withdrawal facility, and should not be approved, I ask Council to answer a straightforward question: what does this proposal actually deliver for the residents of Kendenup, and what does it cost them?</p> <p>The answer is that it delivers very little to this community specifically, while imposing real and lasting consequences – on our housing, our health services, our community character, and our peace of mind. This application should not be approved.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Deris Ford</p>	
32	<p>FORMAL OBJECTION – DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION P902 – LOTS 843 & 844 (217) MOORILUP ROAD, KENDENUP</p> <p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>Please find attached my formal objection letter to Development Application P902 for the proposed change of use of Lots 843 and 844 Moorilup Road, Kendenup to the Great Southern Drug & Alcohol Rehabilitation Centre (GSDARC).</p> <p>I strongly urge the Shire to refuse the application outright for the serious statutory, procedural and amenity reasons set out in the attached letter. I request written confirmation of receipt and that my objection will be placed before the decision-maker and included in the full report to Council.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>Jerome Poiron</p> <p>Re: FORMAL OBJECTION – Development Application P902 Lots 843 & 844 (217) Moorilup Road, Kendenup Proposed Change of Use to Great Southern Drug & Alcohol Rehabilitation Centre (GSDARC) – Non-Conforming Use</p> <p>Dear Sir/Madam</p> <p>I am the owner of land that shares a common boundary fence with the subject site. I write to lodge this strong and comprehensive objection to Development Application P902.</p> <p>The application is fundamentally defective and cannot lawfully be approved. It fails multiple mandatory statutory tests under the *Planning and Development Act 2005* (WA), the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015* (Deemed Provisions), and Shire of Plantagenet Local Planning Scheme No. 5 (LPS5). Council is obliged to refuse the application outright. Any approval would constitute an error of law, expose the Shire to a successful appeal in the State Administrative Tribunal, potential judicial review, and significant adverse community reaction.</p> <p>1. The Application is Premature, Incomplete and Non-Compliant with Clause 64 of the Deemed Provisions</p> <p>All architectural and site plans are explicitly marked “First Draft” (Revision 1/CD/First Draft/09.12.2025 and 2/CD/13.01.2026). The Operational Management Plan is dated January 2026 and states it is “to be reviewed 3-yearly”. The Bushfire Management Plan is repeatedly referenced but has not been provided. No traffic impact assessment, acoustic report, wastewater/effluent report, social impact assessment or disability access report has been lodged.</p> <p>This breaches clause 64(2) of the Deemed Provisions, which requires sufficient information to enable proper assessment. Council cannot lawfully determine an application based on draft or incomplete material. The application must be refused.</p> <p>2. Incorrect Land-Use Classification – The Proposal is a Hospital / Medical Centre, Not “Community Purpose”</p> <p>The Low Medical Withdrawal Unit (4 beds, staffed by a Clinical Nurse with 24-hour supervised medical withdrawal for up to 14 days) and associated clinical services meet the definitions of Hospital or Medical Centre under LPS5 clause 38 and the *Health Services Act 2016* s 8(4). Both are X (prohibited) uses in the Rural zone (LPS5 Table 3). The applicant’s attempt to classify the entire facility as “Community Purpose” is legally untenable and fatal to the Clause 23 pathway.</p> <p>3. Failure to Satisfy the Mandatory Two-Limb Test in Clause 23(3) of LPS5</p> <p>LPS5 clause 23(3) (mirroring Deemed Provisions cl 67(1)) permits a change from one non-conforming use to another prohibited use only if both limbs are satisfied: the proposed use must be less detrimental to the amenity of the locality than the existing non-conforming use, and it must be closer to the intended purpose of the Rural zone.</p> <p>The proposal fails both limbs. A 24/7 institutional facility is materially more detrimental to rural amenity than the previous intermittent tourist accommodation and reception centre (approved capacity 260 persons). It is also further removed from the Rural zone objectives in LPS5 clause 16 and Table 2, which require protection of broadacre agriculture and the limiting of inappropriate sensitive land uses (objective 4).</p> <p>Furthermore, approval would result in the permanent loss of an established tourist accommodation and reception facility that serves the Stirling Ranges region — a clear negative impact on the local economy and visitor services, contrary to clause 67(2)(v) of the Deemed Provisions.</p> <p>4. Failure to Address Mandatory Clause 67(2) Matters – Amenity and Social Impacts</p>	<p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety, security, children/school bus, resident movement and perceived anti-social behaviour concerns are noted; amenity and operational management have been assessed, including staffing, supervision, visitor, intake and exit/discharge arrangements. • Police, ambulance, hospital and emergency response resourcing are State service matters and are not determinative planning considerations; the Shire has considered site suitability, access, bushfire and emergency management within its planning role. • Consultation and notification concerns are noted; the application was advertised in accordance with the statutory process and submissions have been considered. • Land use classification, zoning and non-conforming use arguments are noted and addressed in the statutory assessment against Local Planning Scheme No. 5 and the deemed provisions. • Rural amenity, land-use compatibility and change from tourism/function use are relevant planning considerations and have been assessed against the existing lawful use and locality. • Further comments are covered in the Council Report

Submission Number	Comments	Officer Assessment
	<p>Council must have regard to all matters in clause 67(2), including amenity of the locality (including social impacts), access and parking, traffic generation and road safety, and the impact of the development on the community as a whole.</p> <p>I share a fence with the site and the school bus stop is located directly in front of the neighboring gate. Despite the Operational Management Plan's claims of "local community engagement" in Section 8, I have never been contacted by the new owners (Southern Aboriginal Corporation) or their consultants. This is not engagement — it is disregard.</p> <p>The proposal introduces a permanent 24/7 institutional use immediately adjacent to existing dwellings with young children. Nothing in the documents prevents residents in withdrawal or rehabilitation from leaving the site (authorized or unauthorized) at night and entering neighboring properties. The risk of trespass, theft, damage or assault is real and foreseeable. The constant need to "look over my shoulder" has already caused material detriment to my mental health and the peaceful rural character of the locality. These impacts are valid planning considerations that the applicant has wholly ignored.</p> <p>I invite the Shire's planning officers and elected Councilors who will determine this application to reflect seriously on how they would feel — and what actions they would demand to protect their own families — if this 24/7 institutional facility with a low-medical withdrawal unit were located directly adjacent to their own homes and the school bus stop used by their children.</p> <p>5. Additional Irreconcilable Defects</p> <p>The proponent purchased the property and completed settlement knowing (or having failed to undertake proper due diligence on) the strict planning constraints of the Rural zone and the non-conforming use status. Settlement does not cure the statutory defects in the application.</p> <p>The proposal also directly conflicts with Town Planning Scheme Policy No. 19 – Kendenup Rural Surrounds (Future Rural Residential Areas) and State Planning Policies 2.5 and 3.7.</p> <p>Council's Statutory Obligations</p> <p>Council is not entitled to approve this application merely because it is State-funded. The *Planning and Development Act 2005* and the Deemed Provisions impose strict, non-discretionary obligations. Approving a defective application would be an error of law and expose the Shire to costs and reputational damage in the SAT and Supreme Court.</p> <p>The local community is already deeply concerned about the loss of tourist accommodation and the introduction of a sensitive institutional use in a quiet rural setting. Approval will generate significant public backlash, adverse media attention, and organised opposition from residents who expect the Shire to protect existing amenity and safety.</p> <p>I therefore formally demand that the Shire of Plantagenet refuse this application outright.</p> <p>In the alternative, the application must be rejected as incomplete and any re-lodged version must be re-advertised with full supporting studies and proper neighbour consultation.</p> <p>I reserve all rights to appeal to the State Administrative Tribunal, seek judicial review, and recover costs if this application is approved.</p> <p>Yours faithfully Jerome Poiron Adjacent Landowner</p>	
33	<p>P902 Submission in Response to Public Notice Submission on P902 A Non-Conforming Land Use for a Community Purpose Proposed Great Southern Drug & Alcohol Rehabilitation Centre Property Lot No: 843 & 844 Street: 217 Moorilup Road Suburb: Kendenup Submitted by: Christina Farrington</p> <p>1. Introduction</p> <p>I am a resident and ratepayer of Kendenup and am writing to provide a formal submission on the proposed change of use to Lots 843 and 844, Moorilup Road, to establish the Great Southern Drug and Alcohol Rehabilitation Centre (GSDARC).</p> <p>After reviewing the Operational Management Plan and Planning Report issued for public comment by the Shire of Plantagenet, I submit that the proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » Fails to meet the appropriate justification required by the Shire of Plantagenet to accept the application as a change of use from one non-conforming use to another » Is contrary to the requirements of the Local Planning Scheme No. 5 (LPS5), particularly Clause 23(3)(a) in relation to the "less detrimental to the amenity of the locality than the existing non-conforming use: » Conflicts with the Town Planning Scheme Policy 19 (TPP19) Kendenup Rural Surrounds as the rehabilitation centre is not compatible with future rural residential. » There are flaws with the Advertising Proposal P902 and Planning and Development documents which are detailed in the sections below. The predominant theme being the lack of community engagement, consultation and overall knowledge of the availability and capacity of services. <p>I respectfully request that the Shire refuse the proposal.</p> <p>2. General Comments</p> <p>I note generally that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » The Operational Management Plan (OMP) presented for public comment is a weak document that shows a lack of community engagement and consultation, and the absence of a desktop assessment processes to understand any pertinent factors in the operation of the proposed GSDARC. » The OMP states other documents that either do not exist or have not been made available for public comment. These include the Risk Management Plan 	<p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety, security, children/school bus, resident movement and perceived anti-social behaviour concerns are noted; amenity and operational management have been assessed, including staffing, supervision, visitor, intake and exit/discharge arrangements. • Police, ambulance, hospital and emergency response resourcing are State service matters and are not determinative planning considerations; the Shire has considered site suitability, access, bushfire and emergency management within its planning role. • The Shire cannot require the proposal to be lodged on an alternative site; the application must be assessed at the proposed location on its individual planning merits. • Consultation and notification concerns are noted; the application was advertised in accordance with the statutory process and submissions have been considered. • Land use classification, zoning and non-conforming use arguments are noted and addressed in the statutory assessment against Local Planning Scheme No. 5 and the deemed provisions. • Further comments are covered in the Council Report

Submission Number	Comments	Officer Assessment
	<p>(confirmed as not existing by Cyrenian House Chief Executive Officer at information meeting on 14 May 2026), and Bushfire Management Plan. This makes review of the proposal difficult as key matters are either not planned or are not transparent.</p> <p>» It is disappointing that the Shire of Plantagenet released this document for public comment in its weak form and without adequate notice of the public notice which has led to division within the community. This has contributed to a perception within the community that the process has lacked transparency and adequate notice.</p> <p>The information meeting held by the Southern Aboriginal Corporation and Cyrenian House on 14 May 2026 at the Kendenup Town Hall demonstrated limited understanding of Kendenup and its community context. Their inability to respond to queries, the contradictory information in the presentation against the Operational Management Plan, and constant comparison of Kendenup to Nannup further eroded confidence in them as a competent operator and good neighbour.</p> <p>3. Key Planning Grounds for the Objection Based on the Planning Report The Planning Report in Section 2.2 discusses the meeting between the Proponent's consultant, Planning Solutions, and the Shire of Plantagenet. It is stated that, "During these discussions, it was accepted an application could be made for a change of use from one nonconforming use to another, subject to appropriate justification." Additionally, it refers to the Operational Management Plan as attached.</p> <p>However, the OMP is an operational document, not a planning assessment tool, and it does not address the core planning considerations relevant to a non-conforming use test, including land-use compatibility, emergency service capacity, rural-residential interface, or the objectives of the Rural zone under LPS5. Therefore, it cannot be relied on as the required evidence of support or the appropriate justification.</p> <p>4. Key Planning Grounds for the Objection Based on the Operational Management Plan The following table provides commentary as to my issues and concerns with the Operational Management Plan (OMP) issued for public comment</p> <p>5. Rebuttal to the Planning Report Conclusion on the Development The Planning Report written by Alexia Yacoubian, Senior Planning of Planning Solutions states in the conclusion of this report that, "It is considered the proposal should be favourably determined, on individual merit, recognising the proposal provides an invaluable service to the community, and the use will be managed in such a way so as not to interfere with the amenity of the surrounding rural landholdings."</p> <p>This conclusion is not supported by the OMP provided by the Southern Aboriginal Corporation and Cyrenian House for comment.</p> <p>When assessed against the proposal documents and the realities of Kendenup, the use cannot be considered "non-interfering" or "favourable."</p> <p>// 5 Key impacts include:</p> <p>» 24/7 operations with permanent residents, clinical withdrawal services, drug testing, and continuous staff movements are all incompatible with the Rural zone and far more intensive than the existing non-conforming use.</p> <p>» No police presence in Kendenup, with after-hours and weekend policing provided from Albany will result in significant delays for behavioural incidents, absconding, welfare checks, or emergency attendance. This is incompatible with a facility that operates 24/7, houses vulnerable residents, and requires rapid response capability.</p> <p>» Volunteer ambulance and fire services are the only local emergency responders and are not equipped or staffed to manage the increased behavioural, medical, and emergency risks associated with a 20-bed rehabilitation and withdrawal facility.</p> <p>» 70km distance to Albany Hospital, resulting in delayed emergency response times for withdrawal complications, mental health crises, or medical events which cannot be treated at the Plantagenet Hospital in Mt Barker.</p> <p>» Introduction of a high-risk institutional land use into a rural-residential and agricultural setting, affecting the safety, amenity, and cohesion of the wider Kendenup community.</p> <p>» Vulnerable groups (elderly residents, children, isolated households) face increased safety concerns, with many residents anticipating the need for surveillance, fortification, or behavioural precautions that would alter Kendenup's rural character.</p> <p>» No public consultation and no community-facing risk management plan addressing safety, emergency response, or local service capacity.</p> <p>» The proposal does not meet any identified local need in Kendenup and is driven by a future procurement process by the Mental Health Commission, not local community demand.</p> <p>» The existing tourism buildings are not suitable for conversion into a 20-bed withdrawal and residential treatment facility, and the Operational Management Plan does not resolve these planning and amenity issues.</p> <p>For these reasons, the proposal cannot be considered "favourably" and should not be approved.</p>	
34	<p>SUBMISSION APPLICATION - PROPOSED NON-CONFORMING LAND USE FOR A COMMUNITY PURPOSE (REHABILITATION FACILITY) LOT 843 & LOT 844, MOORILUP ROAD, KENDENUP</p> <p>The Drug and Alcohol Rehab Centres are very necessary in this day and age, just not in this area.</p> <p>The reasons I appose it in this particluar location are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Our Ambulance service is run by volunteers and to get a paid Paramedic to come to Kendenup has taken up to 2 hours in past incidences. 2. The lack of a 24 hour manned Police Station within half an hour of the centre for community security I believe is critical. 	<p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety, security, children/school bus, resident movement and perceived anti-social behaviour concerns are noted; amenity and operational management have been assessed, including staffing, supervision, visitor, intake and exit/discharge arrangements. • Police, ambulance, hospital and emergency response resourcing are State service matters and are not

Submission Number	Comments	Officer Assessment
	<p>3. The Doctors in our community who are 30 minutes away from Kendenup are not equipped to handle an incident that may arise in this centre.</p> <p>4. There are young families in very close proximity to the proposed centre. All of these young vulnerable children catch morning and afternoon buses to school. How will this effect thier lives?</p>	<p>determinative planning considerations; the Shire has considered site suitability, access, bushfire and emergency management within its planning role.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land use classification, zoning and non-conforming use arguments are noted and addressed in the statutory assessment against Local Planning Scheme No. 5 and the deemed provisions. • Bushfire and evacuation concerns are noted; bushfire risk and emergency management have been considered through the Bushfire Management Plan and assessment recommendations. • Traffic, access and parking matters are relevant planning considerations and have been assessed, including recommended access and parking management requirements where appropriate.
35	<p>In reference to application P902 - located at Lots 843 and 844,217 Moorilup rd, Kendenup I Deanna Shand of 214 Moorilup Rd, Kendenup (Now 220 Hawker Rd, Kendenup) object to said proposal on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I did not receive adequate notification - neither through Shire channels nor via community engagement. 2. We are within 1km of the property from building to building and no buffers other than scattered trees . Subsequently - noise has not been addressed adequately. To make mention in a document that we will potentially hear less is not the method by which sensitive receptors are monitored. 3. More traffic - currently we rarely hear cars come and go and now potentially with up to 20 people - every week will be twenty plus cars for individual families. Nowhere has it mentioned how this will be managed with low staffing. 4. One non conforming use to another - as this is a planning issue I have not been privy to the first lot of documents that allowed for the establishment of this lodge nor what conditions had been placed on it. My understanding is Therapeutic facilities are not permitted in this area - with good reason. 5. To move it through as a "community" purpose to fit the Strategic Plan is negating "fit for purpose" structures that require adherence to building codes for Therapeutic use and move around Planning for restricted uses. 5. No psychosocial assessments have been performed for those surrounding this proposal and can be said to be excluded and discriminated against as such the mental and physical well being is as important to ratepayers as to non ratepayers - yet we have no reporting for this ? 6.No supporting documents have been provided other than planning and Operational overview - totally inadequate documentation to make an informed decision 7. Resources , water, sewerage, bush fire mitigation for people under low impact withdrawal - usually cannot be moved quickly - these are inadequate for a Therapeutic Facility and would question that it even meets the criteria for tender 8. Police, Ambulance, Hospital and Local Government staffing for compliance all understaffed. 9. Risks are not being mitigated - to make a statement - "don't worry these are not criminals " by Cyrenian House representatives is very foolish - I would question Insurances that would cover the Local Government ,Elected Members, Cyrenian House and SAC, if they approve this facility and there are any civil incidences that arise from this facility, that are able to be litigated. Particularly given that the lack of policing, and supervision when withdrawing from drugs, has been mentioned numerous times within our community and well documented. <p>I object to this facility and any other that detracts from tourism for our area - the Gateway to the Stirlings surrounded by homes is not Nannup.. no matter what the CEO has said. Nannup facility is about 18km away from the main town, on a large farm without sensitive receptors within 500m. It is an area of vegetation and tree farms - not homes with children.</p> <p>When I came here I researched this area according to your documents - this is a rural , agricultural and lifestyle pursuits, with a bent towards tourism - nowhere in your documentation is there provisions for Therapeutic Facilities.</p> <p>Signed Deanna Shand</p>	<p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety, security, children/school bus, resident movement and perceived anti-social behaviour concerns are noted; amenity and operational management have been assessed, including staffing, supervision, visitor, intake and exit/discharge arrangements. • Police, ambulance, hospital and emergency response resourcing are State service matters and are not determinative planning considerations; the Shire has considered site suitability, access, bushfire and emergency management within its planning role. • Consultation and notification concerns are noted; the application was advertised in accordance with the statutory process and submissions have been considered. • Land use classification, zoning and non-conforming use arguments are noted and addressed in the statutory assessment against Local Planning Scheme No. 5 and the deemed provisions. • Rural amenity, land-use compatibility and change from tourism/function use are relevant planning considerations and have been assessed against the existing lawful use and locality. • Further comments are covered in the Council Report
36	<p>Concerned Kendenup residents of 30 years ! Terry & Ruth Barnsley Lot 967 or 845 Carbarup Road Kendenup 6323</p> <p>We are opposed to the planning proposal for the Great Southern Drug and Alcohol Rehabilitation Centre(GSDARC)to be located at Lot 843 & Lot 844 , Moorilup Road , Kendenup W.A 6323</p> <p>We came to Kendenup 30 years ago to find our dream property ,as we love the small town hospitality , friendliness and safety this community has always given us .</p> <p>The town has grown over the years with a new shop and post office in town ,skate board parks for the kids ,tennis's court , country club and golf course and</p>	<p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety, security, children/school bus, resident movement and perceived anti-social behaviour concerns are noted; amenity and operational management have been assessed, including staffing, supervision, visitor, intake and exit/discharge arrangements. • Police, ambulance, hospital and emergency response resourcing are State service matters and are not determinative planning considerations; the Shire has

Submission Number	Comments	Officer Assessment
	<p>now the town also has taken over the town hall. Th community have markets every month The kendenup community is made up with many old residents and lots of new young families have taken up residence over the last few years too. The proposal to build the GSDARC in kendenup with no residents even knowing about it was disgusting and the meeting that SAC and Crimea house put at the town hall on was very unorganised ,information incorrect, couldn't hear or even understand the Indian lady speaking and the blond haired lady from crimea house was very rude and combative with every question the residents put forward and kept saying about how well the Nannup, Rockingham is doing which all have a police station,hospital,emergency services on hand . We have no police station,no hospital only volunteers SES ,Ambulance and fire services which would be stretched even further with 20 drug or alcohol affected residents in the town . The fact that all the patients can come and go as they please just makes our life here now more about security and safety for our own lives , where as before our town here was about attracting tourists to come see our beautiful Stirling Ranges and stroll around town and stop for a coffee and chat at the local two black sheep store Instead Sundays will be visiting day at the rehabilitation centre so all sorts of people be coming into our town to visit which will always brings trouble Why as residents do we have to change our lifestyle to accommodate a few that can't look after themselves or say no to drugs or alcohol and turn KENDENUP Into THE GATEWAY TO THE REHABILITATION CENTRE 🚗 INSTEAD OF KENDENUP THE GATEWAY TO THE STIRLING RANGES Living only 1.7 kilometres away from the facility has already sent my husband and myself in to anxiety overload as we already get people / aboriginals coming in our driveway late at night saying they are wanting fuel as they have run out and after saying no to them threatening to come back and burn our house down which I have on video as evidence. My husband and are both in our sixties but will now have to fight to live a peaceful lifestyle and we now have to start putting cameras and electric fencing to feel safe on our own property which is more expenses for us to fork out to feel safe in our retirement We are a definite NO on a rehabilitation Centre Yours Sincerely Terry and Ruth Barnsley 24/5/2026</p>	<p>considered site suitability, access, bushfire and emergency management within its planning role.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential impacts on property values or marketability are not valid planning considerations for a development application assessment. • Rural amenity, land-use compatibility and change from tourism/function use are relevant planning considerations and have been assessed against the existing lawful use and locality. • Bushfire and evacuation concerns are noted; bushfire risk and emergency management have been considered through the Bushfire Management Plan and assessment recommendations. • Further comments are covered in the Council Report
37	<p>Planning Proposal for the Great Southern Drug & Alcohol Rehabilitation Centre to be located at Lot 843 & Lot 844 217 Moorilup Road KENDENUP 6323 I submit that the proposal is inappropriate for the site on many planning grounds. A facility of the kind proposed is NOT less detrimental to the amenity of the locality than the existing use. Nor is it closer to the intended purpose of the zone in which the land is situated. The original Tourist Development and Reception Centre aimed to boost visitor numbers to the shire. As a non- conforming land use this is beneficial economically in an accumulative way and sustainable. By showcasing this area in collaboration with wineries and galleries, for example, visitors were attracted to stay and spend on other items like dining out benefiting, not just Kendenup but, the whole shire community. The Reception Centre offered a facility to attract convention style meetings, again highlighting what the area has to offer, and host social gatherings in a secluded country setting. This is closer to the intended purpose of the rural zoning than a Drug and Alcohol Rehabilitation Centre. The proponents suggest a Rehabilitation Centre would bring less traffic, less noise, less disturbance to the neighbours. This claim is predicated on the assumption that the short term accommodation which exists now is full every day of the week, with tourists coming and going all day and night. It also pretends the Reception Centre is operational all the time and full of large noisy crowds. The figures used to make this point are maximum potential figures – bearing no resemblance to reality. Opposition demonstrates that the local population do not consider such a facility less detrimental than the existing use. A 'Community Purpose' is a use that is not permitted in the Rural Zone. The proposal makes much of the benefit to the broader community. That means the urban community where people sleeping on the streets is much more prevalent than here. It brings nothing for Kendenup. Worse, the model does not allow those in the local community who need the service to access it. The local community is asked to accept an unpopular development for the benefit of other people and communities but will see no direct benefit itself. 4.1.3 of the planning proposal states that 'no works are proposed as part of this application...' However, there is not sufficient water to service such a facility. The only water on the site is collected in tanks and dams. Significant work would be needed to address this. Meanwhile, and probably permanently, water would need to be carted- massive quantities of water to accommodate ablutions for long term residents plus other general water uses. That represents a significant drag on resources and an addition to local road traffic not accounted for in the proposal. 4.1.4.v (of the planning proposal) states: "This proposal will not result in the loss of any existing community service or benefit." As demonstrated above the community would be robbed of a tourism business generating visitors to the region, employment opportunities currently available to other than trained health professionals, and a facility for holding private or business functions. The existing land use i.e. short term accommodation and reception proves the local process has provided flexibility within the rural zone. Changing the non-conforming land use to such an extreme degree is not necessary. The proposed use introduces an inappropriate land use and presents a potential risk of land use conflict. This proposal should be rejected as approving such a land use would be conditional on approving the management plan. This one shows signs of cut and paste and is deeply flawed. It fails to provide a risk assessment. It states that one will underpin the project but where is it? Where it touches on this subject briefly the emphasis is on risk to the proponents. It does not take into consideration risk to the rest of the community particularly the owners of neighbouring properties. The proposal does not meet planning requirements and is not suited to this rural zone. The costs far outweigh the benefits; town planning initiatives are beginning in Kendenup to address the problems of the past and tourism potential is being explored and expanded. This proposal would eliminate one such operation and add a facility the locals clearly don't want offering no service to the addicted in its own community or this shire.</p>	<p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land use classification, zoning and non-conforming use arguments are noted and addressed in the statutory assessment against Local Planning Scheme No. 5 and the deemed provisions. • Rural amenity, land-use compatibility and change from tourism/function use are relevant planning considerations and have been assessed against the existing lawful use and locality. • Servicing, wastewater and water supply concerns are noted; wastewater and bushfire water matters have been considered through the relevant referral material and bushfire management documentation. • Traffic, access and parking matters are relevant planning considerations and have been assessed, including recommended access and parking management requirements where appropriate. • Environmental and biosecurity concerns are noted; no new external buildings are proposed and any separate clearing, environmental or biosecurity obligations remain the responsibility of the operator. • Further comments are covered in the Council Report

Submission Number	Comments	Officer Assessment
38	<p>Point 1: No Community Consultation Beforehand.</p> <p>The 2 applications submitted to the shire are dated January and February:- 1. Operational Management Plan is dated January 2026 and 2. Development Application - non conforming use is dated 27 February 2026. I only happened to find out about it from a post on the Kendenup's Local Facebook Page on 2 May which was posted by a community member and then saw another post on 6 May about the meeting at the Kendenup Hall for 14 May to be held by SAC and Cyrenian House.. This meeting was After the settlement of the property went through of Lot No 843 and 844, 217 Moorilup road, Kendenup.</p> <p>In the operational management plan on page 10, point 6 paragraph 2 it states "SAC has made an offer to purchase the property which has been formally accepted by the current owners.The sale of the property will be completed subject to conditions including approval of funding from the Mental Health Commission and Development Approval from the Shire of Plantagenet."</p> <p>So how could the sale and settlement go through without approval from the shire?</p> <p>On page 16 point 8 of the above-mentioned document, it mentions that we as the community will have the opportunity to obtain information, once again we had to find out for ourselves as we were not informed.</p> <p>The only engagement between the community, Cyrenian house and SAC was the meeting held on 14 May which The Community also happened to find out about it from the local Kendenup page on Facebook Once again after the settlement of the property had gone through and with only 14 days to respond to the proposal with limited information.</p> <p>SAC and Cyrenian house we unable to give the community sufficient and satisfactory answers bringing about more confusion and anger towards the proposed facility.</p> <p>Point 2: Security.</p> <p>Kendenup does not have a Police Station. The closest is in Mount Barker which is 22km away and is not operational 24 hours a day. So, in an emergency after hours, the police would have to come from Albany which is a proximately an hour away. And seeing that we live 500m from the proposed facility, how is our safety guaranteed? My son with special needs and I are alone during the week . We moved here to get away from things like this. I am dealing with my own PTSD and this is not helping my recovery nor is it helping my son with needs. Both of us are not sleeping and continuously feeling anxious about this whole ordeal</p> <p>In the proposal it states that 2 staff will be on duty after hours during weekdays and on weekends, how will they be able to make sure that the patients are at the facility at all times? This is large rural land; how will this be done? If patients want to go wandering at night, what would stop them?</p> <p>As secure fencing is not a priority as stated on page 18, point 10.1 Security and Fencing, Patients are able to leave if they desire.</p> <p>Also, what is to stop someone from breaking into the facility and stealing medications.</p> <p>Page 2 Comments (Continued)</p> <p>Point 3: Emergency and Medical Care.</p> <p>There is a lack of medical services in Kendenup as there is only one volunteer ambulance, If any further assistance is required for a serious mental health related issue this would need to be in or from Albany as Mount Barker Hospital does not accept these patients</p> <p>Point 4: Bush Fire.</p> <p>WE only have volunteer fire fighters, if a fire should occur in Kendenup, they would already be engaged which would leave limited capacity to assist residents at the facility. Also, who is responsible to help evacuate the residence and would they get preference over locals? We do not have access to their bush fire management plan.</p> <p>Point 5: Tourism.</p> <p>The Kendenup Cottages and Lodge has brought in tourism to our small community for over two decades. We moved here with plans on opening a Farm Stay Accommodation on our property as part of our retirement strategy but now we are unsure of the feasibility of this project.</p>	<p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety, security, children/school bus, resident movement and perceived anti-social behaviour concerns are noted; amenity and operational management have been assessed, including staffing, supervision, visitor, intake and exit/discharge arrangements. • Police, ambulance, hospital and emergency response resourcing are State service matters and are not determinative planning considerations; the Shire has considered site suitability, access, bushfire and emergency management within its planning role. • The Shire cannot require the proposal to be lodged on an alternative site; the application must be assessed at the proposed location on its individual planning merits. • Consultation and notification concerns are noted; the application was advertised in accordance with the statutory process and submissions have been considered. • Rural amenity, land-use compatibility and change from tourism/function use are relevant planning considerations and have been assessed against the existing lawful use and locality. • Further comments are covered in the Council Report
39	<p>Point 1: No Community Consultation Beforehand.</p> <p>The 2 applications submitted to the shire are dated January and February this year: - 1. Operational Management Plan is dated January 2026 and 2. Development Application - non conforming use is dated 27 February 2026. I only found out about it from my wife as I am rarely on social media. She saw a post on the Kendenup's Local Facebook Page on 2 May which was posted by a community member and she saw another post on 6 May about the meeting at the Kendenup Hall for 14 May to be held by SAC and Cyrenian House. This meeting was held After the settlement of the property went through of Lot No 843 and 844, 217 Moorilup road, Kendenup.</p> <p>In the operational management plan on page 10, point 6 paragraph 2 it states "SAC has made an offer to purchase the property which has been formally accepted by the current owners. The sale of the property will be completed subject to conditions including approval of funding from the Mental Health Commission and Development Approval from the Shire of Plantagenet."</p> <p>So how could the sale and settlement go through without approval from the shire?</p> <p>On page 16, point 8 of the above-mentioned document, it says that we as the community will have the opportunity to obtain information, once again we had to find out for ourselves as we were not informed.</p> <p>The only engagement between the community, Cyrenian house and SAC was the meeting held on 14 May which The Community also happened to find out about it from the local Kendenup Facebook page. Once again after the settlement of the property had gone through and with only 14 days to respond to the proposal with Limited information.</p> <p>SAC and Cyrenian house we unable to give the community sufficient and satisfactory answers bringing about more confusion and anger towards the proposed</p>	<p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety, security, children/school bus, resident movement and perceived anti-social behaviour concerns are noted; amenity and operational management have been assessed, including staffing, supervision, visitor, intake and exit/discharge arrangements. • Police, ambulance, hospital and emergency response resourcing are State service matters and are not determinative planning considerations; the Shire has considered site suitability, access, bushfire and emergency management within its planning role. • The Shire cannot require the proposal to be lodged on an alternative site; the application must be assessed at the proposed location on its individual planning merits. • Consultation and notification concerns are noted; the application was advertised in accordance with the

Submission Number	Comments	Officer Assessment
	<p>facility. Point 2: Security. Kendenup does not have a Police Station. The closest is in Mount Barker which is 22km away and is not operational 24 hours a day. So, in an emergency after hours, the police would have to come from Albany which is a proximately an hour away. And seeing that we live 500m from the proposed facility, how is our safety guaranteed? My wife and son with special needs are alone during the week and I am concerned for their safety and wellbeing.</p> <p>Page 2 Comments (Continued) In the proposal it states that 2 staff will be on duty after hours during weekdays and on weekends, how will they be able to make sure that the patients are at the facility at all times. This is large rural land; how will this be done. As secure fencing is not a priority as stated on page 18, point 10.1 Security and Fencing, Patients are able to leave if they desire. Also, what is to stop someone from breaking into the facility and stealing medications. Point 3: Emergency and Medical Care. There is a lack of medical services in Kendenup as there is only one volunteer ambulance. If any further assistance is required for a serious mental health related issue this would need to be in or from Albany as Mount Barker Hospital does not accept these patients. Point 4: Bush Fire. WE only have volunteer fire fighters, if a fire should occur in Kendenup, they would already be engaged which would leave limited capacity to assist residents at the facility. Also, who is responsible to help evacuate the residence and would they get preference over locals)? We do not have access to their bush fire management plan. Point 5: Tourism. The Kendenup Cottages and Lodge has brought in tourism to our small community for over two decades. We moved here with plans on opening a Farm Stay Accommodation on our property as part of our retirement strategy but now we are unsure of the feasibility of this project.</p>	<p>statutory process and submissions have been considered.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rural amenity, land-use compatibility and change from tourism/function use are relevant planning considerations and have been assessed against the existing lawful use and locality. • Further comments are covered in the Council Report
40	<p>Dear Sir/Madam First of all I would like to make it known that although I still own property at 214 Moorilup Rd I do not reside there at the moment. I have been a residents for 25 years until recently and have seen the development of the local area thru initiatives such as the Kendenup Lodge & Cottages, which have further enhanced the tourist industry within the Kendenup area and the Plantagenet Shire. There has also been a large increase in the number of people moving to the area to establish lifestyle blocks to live and in many cases raise families. Therefor also acknowledging the fact that unfortunately there is a need for facilities such as the one proposed and after having read the Operational Management Plan in which I feel there are some questionable parts ie 2 staff Members overnight etc. I feel that the remoteness from services that would potentially be needed, along with the promotion of the Kendenup area as a tourist (ie wineries etc) destination and lifestyle area within the Shire of Plantagenet lead me to believe even though it may be a good idea it may not be in the right location. Regards Adam Heath</p>	<p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety, security, children/school bus, resident movement and perceived anti-social behaviour concerns are noted; amenity and operational management have been assessed, including staffing, supervision, visitor, intake and exit/discharge arrangements. • Rural amenity, land-use compatibility and change from tourism/function use are relevant planning considerations and have been assessed against the existing lawful use and locality. • Traffic, access and parking matters are relevant planning considerations and have been assessed, including recommended access and parking management requirements where appropriate. • Staffing concerns are noted; day-to-day staffing is primarily operational, but the approved Operational Management Plan and supervision commitments inform the amenity assessment. • Environmental and biosecurity concerns are noted; no new external buildings are proposed and any separate clearing, environmental or biosecurity obligations remain the responsibility of the operator. • Further comments are covered in the Council Report
41	<p>To the Chief Executive Officer and Councillors, Re: Support for the Proposed Drug and Alcohol Rehabilitation Facility at 217 Moorilup Road, Kendenup I am writing to express my support for the proposed drug and alcohol rehabilitation facility at 217 Moorilup Road, Kendenup. Substance dependency continues to have a significant impact on individuals, families and communities across regional Western Australia, and there is a clear need for rehabilitation and recovery services in our region. I understand there is no perfect location for a facility of this nature, however, a farm-style property with no immediate neighbourhood street frontage represents a sensible and balanced outcome that minimises impact on surrounding residents while still providing the privacy, space and calm environment needed for recovery. Neighbouring properties are minimal, and a significant distance between houses and the proposed buildings on the site, which will have far less impact than a facility located in town or in a larger CBD in the region. The proposed site with multiple existing cottages, larger spaces and ample parking and amenities appears well suited due to its rural setting, separation from the main residential areas, and capacity to provide a supportive therapeutic environment. The site is currently approved for accommodation with multiple people</p>	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for the proposal and the regional need for rehabilitation services is noted. • Comments that the rural setting may assist recovery and minimise neighbourhood impacts are noted. • The proposal remains subject to the non-conforming use tests, amenity assessment and recommended conditions.

Submission Number	Comments	Officer Assessment
	<p>coming and going to the site, along with a huge volume of people for a function, which sets a precedence of this being an accommodation facility, which will have little change of impact if approved for a change of use to community purpose. If approved for this use, the site will have less activity and impact than that of a short stay accommodation facility and function centre.</p> <p>There are a number of successful drug and alcohol rehabilitation facilities operating in regional Western Australia that demonstrate these services can work well in rural settings. Programs located in regional communities have shown positive outcomes because they provide stable environments, separation from harmful influences, strong community connections, and access to nature-based therapeutic settings that support long-term recovery. These facilities operate responsibly with minimal impact on surrounding residents and adhere to the operational management plan.</p> <p>I encourage the Shire of Plantagenet to support this proposal and continue to work collaboratively with the community and service providers to ensure the facility operates responsibly and successfully for both the operator, the clientele, and the surrounding community.</p>	
42	<p>I write to object to the above development application. Firstly I respect the need and importance for a drug and Alcohol facility in the Great Southern region however the proposed location at lots 843 and 844 - 217 Moorilup rd , Kendenup , is not suitable.</p> <p>The applicant proposes for a change from one non confirming use to another (x). The accommodation at 217 Moorilup rd was historically purpose built for tourism purposes not what the applicant seeks approval for -medical uses. If the applicant is successful a historic tourism venue would be lost forever in Kendenup. The location at 217 is not suitable for a Alcohol and Drug rehab Facility due to many reasons ;the lack of resources and services available in the area, Kendenup does not have a Police Station - nearest Police station is located in Mt Barker which closes at midnight, on average a local ha to wait approximately 6 weeks to get a GP appointment locally in Mt barker, the local hospital is not equipped , Extremely limited volunteer ambulance staffing, 5 Alcohol premises within 5 kilometres of the proposed facility - the town itself having major drug issues - not suitable for clients that are trying to redeem themselves and get away from drugs.</p> <p>As Noticed at the SAC/CYRENIAN house meeting held on Thursday 14th May , at the Kendenup Town Hall , there has been no community consultation prior to seeking approval for the proposed facility, C.E.O of CYRENIAN HOUSE -CAROL mentioning multiple times their proposal was not up to date with the shire as advertised on the shires website , Many questions remain unanswered and with SAC/CYRENIAN HOUSE holding no responsibility of their clients when the exit/quit the program or that of their visitors , we have major trust and security issues for our families.</p> <p>Location 217 Moorilup Rd is surrounded by dozens of lifestyle properties which comprises a lot of kids , elderly population and families. We as a community , our number one priority always should be Community safety. What about the mental wellbeing of our kids? Residents having to completely change their lifestyle.</p> <p>For reasons above I request the Council to refuse the application or seek further assessment of the implications of the proposal by the applicant.</p> <p>Yours Faithfully Ben Furber 275 Moorilup Rd</p>	<p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety, security, children/school bus, resident movement and perceived anti-social behaviour concerns are noted; amenity and operational management have been assessed, including staffing, supervision, visitor, intake and exit/discharge arrangements. • Police, ambulance, hospital and emergency response resourcing are State service matters and are not determinative planning considerations; the Shire has considered site suitability, access, bushfire and emergency management within its planning role. • Consultation and notification concerns are noted; the application was advertised in accordance with the statutory process and submissions have been considered. • Rural amenity, land-use compatibility and change from tourism/function use are relevant planning considerations and have been assessed against the existing lawful use and locality. • Traffic, access and parking matters are relevant planning considerations and have been assessed, including recommended access and parking management requirements where appropriate. • Further comments are covered in the Council Report
43	<p>Dear Shire of Plantagenet Councillors</p> <p>Opposition to planning proposal for Great Southern Drug and Alcohol Rehabilitation Centre, proposed location 217 Moorilup Road, Kendenup</p> <p>We refer to the planning proposal sought to re-purpose Kendenup Cottages and Lodge at Lot 843 and Lot 844, 217 Moorilup Road, Kendenup, Western Australia for use as the Great Southern Drug and Alcohol Rehabilitation Centre (the Proposal).</p> <p>We write to lodge our objection to the Proposal. We reside at 72 Wandoo Road, Kendenup, less than one kilometre from the proposed facility.</p> <p>We acknowledge and support the important role that rehabilitation and withdrawal services play within the community, and we recognise the need for appropriate facilities to assist people in the Great Southern region experiencing substance dependence. Our objection is not to the concept of rehabilitation services themselves, but rather to the suitability of this particular rural location for such a facility.</p> <p>Our concerns are as follows:</p> <p>4.1 Security and supervision concerns. The proposed facility will be located on a property that is approximately 16 hectares in size with extensive fencing boundaries that would be difficult to effectively secure and monitor. The site currently contains multiple stand-alone buildings spread across the property. From both a practical and clinical perspective, this raises concerns regarding adequate supervision, patient safety, and security management, particularly for individuals undergoing acute substance withdrawal. We understand that the Proposal currently includes a low-medical withdrawal service for up to four individuals requiring short-term support and supervision for the safe continuation or reduction in the use of a substance of dependence. As a former registered nurse with experience and understanding of patient care, I am aware that individuals in the withdrawal phase of substance dependence can experience impaired judgement, compromised decision-making capacity, agitation, confusion, and unpredictable behaviour. These clinical realities require environments that can provide close supervision, rapid intervention, and secure management.</p> <p>We do not believe a large rural property with dispersed buildings is an appropriate setting to safely manage patients in this phase of treatment. Further, we understand that only two staff members are intended to be rostered on-site during the evening and weekends and that the low medical withdrawal patients will reside in both the former homestead building and motel wing, with staff offices and treatment rooms for the low medical withdrawal unit to be located in another standalone cottage. It therefore follows that staff will be unable to directly supervise all low medical withdrawal patients simultaneously whilst also</p>	<p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety, security, children/school bus, resident movement and perceived anti-social behaviour concerns are noted; amenity and operational management have been assessed, including staffing, supervision, visitor, intake and exit/discharge arrangements. • Police, ambulance, hospital and emergency response resourcing are State service matters and are not determinative planning considerations; the Shire has considered site suitability, access, bushfire and emergency management within its planning role. • Rural amenity, land-use compatibility and change from tourism/function use are relevant planning considerations and have been assessed against the existing lawful use and locality. • Traffic, access and parking matters are relevant planning considerations and have been assessed, including recommended access and parking management requirements where appropriate. • Staffing concerns are noted; day-to-day staffing is primarily operational, but the approved Operational

Submission Number	Comments	Officer Assessment
	<p>providing care in the treatment room and/or attending to up to 16 residential rehabilitation clients. We consider that this is prima facie insufficient and poses both a safety</p> <p>4.2 Limited access to emergency and support services. The proposed site is located approximately 17 kilometres from Mount Barker, creating potential delays in access to police, ambulance, and emergency mental health support services. In situations involving acute withdrawal complications, behavioural emergencies, absconding residents, or other critical incidents, timely emergency response is essential. The distance and rural setting may compromise the ability to provide rapid intervention when required.</p> <p>4.3 Concerns regarding court-ordered rehabilitation. The Proposal provides that residents of the service will be voluntary, highly motivated and committed to recovery and to an alcohol and drug free life and future. However, if court-ordered rehabilitation placements are accepted, there is a possibility that some residents may have limited personal motivation or readiness to engage in treatment. This may further increase the challenges associated with supervision, compliance, and community safety within a large rural property that is difficult to secure. The very nature of substance dependence means that even highly motivated voluntary patients are likely to struggle with the adjustment to sobriety, and this remains particularly true of the patients in the low-medical withdrawal unit experiencing acute withdrawal.</p> <p>4.4 Impact on local tourism and existing businesses. Our property, located less than one kilometre from the proposed facility, operates a tourist-based Airbnb accommodation business. Tourism is an important contributor to the local economy and to the character of our community. Visitors choose this area because of its peaceful rural environment, sense of safety, and recreational appeal. The establishment of a withdrawal and rehabilitation facility in close proximity has the potential to negatively affect visitor perceptions and may adversely impact tourism-based businesses in the immediate area.</p> <p>4.5 Proximity to school bus routes. The property is bordered on two sides by school bus routes used daily by local children and families. Given the nature of the proposed facility, this raises understandable community concerns regarding public safety and suitability of location. Even if attendance at the facility is intended to be voluntary, there remains the possibility that some residents may leave the premises unexpectedly during periods of impaired judgement or emotional distress.</p> <p>In summary, notwithstanding our recognition of the need for drug and alcohol rehabilitation services within the wider Great Southern region, we do not believe this particular site is appropriate for such a facility due to concerns relating to security, emergency access, patient management, neighbouring tourism operations, and the proximity to school transport routes. Given that many of these concerns are intrinsic to the Proposal's rural location, we are not satisfied that these can be mitigated by the Proposal applicants or otherwise addressed by the complaints management process outlined in the Proposal.</p> <p>We respectfully request that the Shire of Plantagenet carefully consider the suitability of this location and the potential impacts on neighbouring residents, local businesses, tourism, and community safety before making any decision regarding approval.</p> <p>We would be happy to discuss this letter further with any of the Shire of Plantagenet Councillors as required.</p> <p>Yours sincerely</p>	<p>Management Plan and supervision commitments inform the amenity assessment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further comments are covered in the Council Report
44	<p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>I am a Kendenup property owner and soon to be resident that is located within 1km as the crow flies of the Kendenup Cottages and Lodge. I write in relation to the proposed drug and alcohol rehabilitation centre, which is not suited to the current 'rural' zoning. The Shire of Plantagenet Town Planning Scheme Policy No. 18.1 – Planning Vision makes it clear in section 2.3 (Rural Vision) that tourist nodes are to be encouraged and yet this opportunistic purchase and proposed change of use of one of the main accommodation venues in our Shire will be a backwards step for tourism in our area. When considering the purchase of my own Kendenup property, I researched the planning scheme's rural limitations and understood what was and wasn't permitted in the area, which led to my decision to purchase the property.</p> <p>I surely would not have purchased the property if I had a proposed development in mind that was contrary to the permitted uses, which I feel the Southern Aboriginal Corporation has done here as a 'power play', to force the hand of the Shire into granting regulatory approval. I implore the Shire to assess this development fairly, allowing the current planning schemes and the voices of concerned stakeholders to be heard as this proposal is assessed and considered. Please do not allow any kickbacks from those with more financial clout to sway your decision making.</p> <p>Proverbs 11:1 (NIV) - The LORD detests dishonest scales, but accurate weights find favour with him.</p> <p>Proverbs 28:21 (NIV) - To show partiality is not good, yet a person will do wrong for a piece of bread. (BR comment: please resist the piece of bread)</p> <p>Regards, Ben Rattray 883 Carbarup Rd Kendenup</p> <p>e: m:</p>	<p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land use classification, zoning and non-conforming use arguments are noted and addressed in the statutory assessment against Local Planning Scheme No. 5 and the deemed provisions. • Rural amenity, land-use compatibility and change from tourism/function use are relevant planning considerations and have been assessed against the existing lawful use and locality. • Further comments are covered in the Council Report
45	<p>David Williams 55 Hassell Avenue, Kendenup WA 6323 23 May 2026 Manager Planning & Development Services Shire of Plantagenet PO Box 48, Mount Barker WA 6324</p>	<p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety, security, children/school bus, resident movement and perceived anti-social behaviour concerns are noted; amenity and operational management have been assessed, including staffing, supervision, visitor, intake and exit/discharge arrangements.

Submission Number	Comments	Officer Assessment
	<p>RE: Objection to Development Application P902 – Proposed Change of Use, Lots 843 & 844, 217 Moorilup Road, I am writing to formally object to Development Application P902. I want to begin with some personal context, because I think it matters. I am a reformed heroin addict. I used hard drugs for twelve years until 1993. My brother died from the combined toxicity of alcohol and heroin at age 42. I have lost many friends and associates to drugs and alcohol and I know the devastation it causes to families, including my own. You might assume that means I would support this proposal. I do not.</p> <p>I came to Kendenup to renovate a house I had bought as an investment. I found an open, close-knit and friendly community. We liked it so much that we sold our other home and moved here permanently. We invested heavily knowing that a chicken abattoir and a rail line run past our front door. We did not invest knowing there would be a residential AOD facility within walking distance of our home. I have served as chairman of the Kendenup Town Hall and secretary of the Kendenup Progress Association because I believe in this town and want it to be better. This facility, based on my direct experience of rehabilitation, will not make it better.</p> <p>I attended the public meeting on Thursday 21 May with an open mind. What I found confirmed what I had feared: two organisations that had done no meaningful research into the community they are proposing to move into, and which showed no genuine concern about the community's very real anxieties. I am aware that Council has received many objections dealing with planning law, from people better qualified than me to address those matters. My objections come from a different place – from lived experience of drug use, rehabilitation, and the realities of how these facilities actually operate.</p> <p>1. This Is an Untested Partnership.</p> <p>The application presents SAC and Cyrenian House as an experienced and proven partnership. It is not. Every positive statistic cited about community relations, neighbour impact, and safety record in the supporting documents relates to Cyrenian House operating its own facilities, or contracted directly by government departments. There is no mention anywhere of SAC's own record with neighbours, because SAC has no track record operating a residential AOD facility of this type.</p> <p>The application's own documents reveal this internal contradiction clearly. The planning report submitted by Planning Solutions (the DA letter) states, under section 3.1.1 describing SAC's credentials: "In 2019, SAC in partnership with Cyrenian House, opened the Nannup Therapeutic Community facility." This claim is used to support the argument that the two organisations have a demonstrated working relationship.</p> <p>However, the Operational Management Plan (OMP) – the companion document lodged with the same application – tells a different story. In section 2, where Cyrenian House lists the facilities it currently operates, the Nannup Therapeutic Community appears as a Cyrenian House facility with no mention of SAC involvement whatsoever. The OMP describes it simply as "Nannup Therapeutic Community (20 bed residential treatment in Nannup)", listed alongside Cyrenian House's other wholly-owned and operated services.</p> <p>These two documents cannot both be correct. How many other inconsistencies are these documents especially as we cannot access attachments quoted? Cyrenian House typically runs its own facilities or operates under direct government contract. This arrangement is fundamentally different: SAC will be the owner, the contract holder with the Mental Health Commission, and the operational lead. Cyrenian House will be a subcontractor providing clinical services. This is a new and untested structure. Approving a facility in an isolated rural community on the basis of a partnership whose own supporting documents cannot agree on its history is not a sound planning decision.</p> <p>It is also relevant to note that SAC's Albany offices were the subject of a deliberate arson attack in August last year. A 36-year-old woman, Jessica Louise Brown, was sentenced in the Albany District Court earlier this month to three years imprisonment after pleading guilty to willfully and unlawfully damaging property by fire, having used petrol as an accelerant. ABC Regional News reported the sentencing on 8 May 2026. I raise this not to suggest SAC was responsible for the attack, but because it demonstrates that the organisation operates in an environment where it attracts serious community conflict. Council should be asking what that means for a small town like Kendenup if this facility proceeds.</p> <p>2. The Real Exit Rates.</p> <p>At the meeting on 21 May, James Hunter from Cyrenian House quoted figures of 70–80% completion for the medical withdrawal unit and 50% for the residential rehabilitation program. These figures require careful scrutiny.</p> <p>The national AIHW data for 2023–24 shows that approximately 58% of AOD treatment episodes ended in a planned or expected completion, and around 19% ended in an unplanned completion. However, "planned completion" in these statistics does not mean a person finished their full program. It means the exit was agreed and documented – including cases where a resident had simply had enough and signed a form on the way out. A peer-reviewed study of Australian Therapeutic Communities found actual full program completion rates ranging from just 9% to 56%, with one study finding a rate of 30.6%. The honest figure and the reported figure are very different things.</p> <p>(See attached documents, Completion of drug and alcohol services in Australia and Alcohol and other drug treatment services in Australia)</p> <p>In practical terms, the 16 residential beds turning over residents every six months sounds manageable – perhaps 30 to 40 people per year. But if actual full-program completion rates are in the range suggested by the research literature, the true number of people exiting – planned, unplanned, or evicted – could be well in excess of 100 per year from the residential program alone. The 4-bed withdrawal unit with stays of up to 14 days adds a further substantial number of movements. Council should require independently verified exit rate projections before making any planning decision.</p> <p>My experience is that the first attempt at rehabilitation is rarely successful. The people who come to collect an unplanned discharge are rarely the same people who dropped the resident off. They are not pre-screened, they are not approved visitors, and their first act on collecting that person will often be to use drugs or alcohol together. Crime is a necessity to supporting a drug habit or serious alcohol use. Opportunistic crime in a town with no police station and no services, there is no capacity to manage that.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Police, ambulance, hospital and emergency response resourcing are State service matters and are not determinative planning considerations; the Shire has considered site suitability, access, bushfire and emergency management within its planning role. • Potential impacts on property values or marketability are not valid planning considerations for a development application assessment. • The Shire cannot require the proposal to be lodged on an alternative site; the application must be assessed at the proposed location on its individual planning merits. • Consultation and notification concerns are noted; the application was advertised in accordance with the statutory process and submissions have been considered. • Further comments are covered in the Council Report

Submission Number	Comments	Officer Assessment
	<p>I ask Council to require, as a condition of any further consideration of this application, a clear and independently verified exit management plan: one that guarantees every departure – planned or otherwise – is transported directly to the resident's home community by SAC in a SAC vehicle, at SAC's cost, with no exceptions.</p> <p>3. Rehabilitation Environments Are Volatile and Dangerous to Manage I have been an outpatient of Cyrenian House in Perth and I have been an inpatient of a residential rehabilitation facility in Victoria that is no longer operating. The reason I raise the Victorian facility is not to criticise Cyrenian House, but to make the point that even experienced and reputable organisations cannot always control what happens inside a residential AOD environment. At that Victorian facility, drugs were being used openly. It was badly managed, and it closed. Distance, isolation, an untested partnership, and an under-resourced community create exactly the conditions for that kind of failure. At the 21 May meeting, Ms Daws from Cyrenian House confirmed that they cannot offer any guarantee as to what their previous clients will do when they leave the facility. That statement was made in a public forum and it is the honest answer. But it is also the answer that tells Kendenup residents everything they need to know about the real limits of oversight that even the most experienced AOD organisation can provide in a community like ours.</p> <p>4. Staffing an Isolated facility Running a 24/7 residential AOD facility in an isolated rural location requires qualified, stable, and closely supervised staff. I want Council to consider how realistic that picture is for a facility in Kendenup. There are no suitably qualified local candidates. Staff will need to be brought in and housed, either from within Kendenup's already tight housing market or provided with accommodation by SAC, which raises its own community impacts. Senior management oversight from SAC's Albany office and Cyrenian House's Perth base means that the people running this facility day to day will be doing so with very limited direct supervision from experienced leadership. That is a particular problem in an environment where staff are working with people who are in crisis, in withdrawal, or facing significant mental health challenges. Regional staff shortages do not just mean vacancies. They also mean that when misconduct occurs, the consequences can be softened by the simple fact that there is no one available to replace the person involved. ABC Regional News reported in May 2026 that a psychiatrist in regional Western Australia, Dr Padaranga Malakajan Rapuri, received a suspension of only three and a half months after admitting to professional misconduct – repeatedly pursuing a relationship with a nurse over two months despite her repeated rejections. The Medical Board of Australia stated openly that it would have imposed a longer suspension but for the fact that he is the sole psychiatrist responsible for inpatient mental health care in his region and that there is a shortage of psychiatrists there. That is what regional staff shortage looks like in practice: it does not just create vacancies, it reduces accountability. The AOD sector is not immune to the same human failings that affect any workplace. To illustrate, I draw Council's attention to the Fair Work Commission decision [2023] FWC 1681, David Paul Lonnie v WA Council on Addictions Incorporated (Cyrenian House), handed down on 17 July 2023. In that case, Cyrenian House was required to dismiss its General Manager of Residential Services – a senior employee of over ten years – following findings of serious domestic violence perpetrated against a co-worker, as well as an earlier incident involving the improper handling of drugs seized from a resident. CEO Carol Daws gave detailed evidence about multiple incidents of physical violence, coercive control, and sexual assault. A prior Family Violence Restraining Order relating to another woman was also discovered on the employee's work laptop. (See attached document 2023fwc1681) I raise this case not to attack Cyrenian House for how it ultimately handled the matter. I raise it because it demonstrates, plainly, what can happen inside a specialist AOD organisation even at senior management level, even with an experienced CEO, even in a Perth metropolitan office with direct oversight. If that level of misconduct – drug handling incidents, domestic violence, coercive control – can occur undetected for an extended period in that environment, what is the realistic capacity to detect and manage similar issues in a small facility in an isolated rural town, operated by a brand-new partnership, with management oversight provided from hundreds of kilometres away, and with the added pressure of a regional labour market that, as the psychiatrist case shows, reduces the consequences of misconduct? Conclusion I know more than most people about what drug and alcohol addiction does to a person and to the people around them. I support the idea of rehabilitation. I do not support this facility, in this location, delivered by this untested partnership, without honest answers to the questions I have raised. I ask Council to require independently verified exit rate projections, a guaranteed exit transport plan, and a detailed staffing and supervision plan that honestly addresses how an isolated rural facility will be overseen – before any approval is considered. On the information currently before Council, including planning considerations raised in other submissions, this application should not be approved. Yours sincerely, David Williams Kendenup resident Chairman, Kendenup Town Hall Inc. Secretary, Kendenup Progress Association</p>	
46	<p>After careful consideration, I do not support the application for the Kendenup Lodge to be used as a Drug and Alcohol Rehabilitation Centre, for the following reasons: I appreciate the need for rehabilitation services of this kind but I don't believe Kendenup is the right place for them. With our very small population (largest cohorts being children under 10 and residents over 65), Kendenup is too small to provide the "community support" necessary, and we don't have shopping or recreational activities in which GSDARC clients can take part.</p>	<p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety, security, children/school bus, resident movement and perceived anti-social behaviour concerns are noted; amenity and operational management have been assessed, including staffing, supervision, visitor, intake

Submission Number	Comments	Officer Assessment
	<p>I believe the Lodge facilities should be used to their most effective and efficient capacity, for the benefit of a larger number of people. I would prefer to see an Aboriginal Arts and Cultural Centre and/or a Story Telling Centre with accommodation, providing an holistic range of educational and historical experiences for locals and visitors alike.</p> <p>My other concerns refer to the lack of benefits for Kendenup. It would appear from the meeting on 14 May, that representatives from SAC and Cyrenian House feel Kendenup should be grateful to have the facility in its' midst. They seemed unaware that Kendenup has just one deli/liquor store and a Post Office. Perhaps with the exception of purchasing chicken products directly from Mt Barker Chickens, there will be no money directly spent by the GSDARC in the town of Kendenup.</p> <p>It was also not practical for Cyrenian House and SAC to make success comparisons with other facilities operating in places such as Rockingham, Nannup, or Perth metropolitan area, none of which have similar lifestyle demographics to Kendenup.</p> <p>Diane Graham 25 May 2026</p> <p>I appreciate the need for rehabilitation services of this kind but I don't believe Kendenup is the right place for them.</p> <p>I have no issue with the two organisations proposing this new service however, I do have concerns about the Council being asked to formalise the reclassification of the property on Lot 843 & 844 Moorilup Rd, Kendenup before other requirements have been confirmed, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * SAC's ownership of the property * SAC winning the MHC tender as Lead Agency for the GSDARC * Cyrenian House winning the tender to implement and operate the GSDARC <p>As stated in the SAC Operational Management Plan, the Southern Aboriginal Corporation, as the lead agency, has formed a partnership with Cyrenian House to implement and operate the GSDARC, subject to being awarded the tender by the MHC, and subject to planning approval to utilise the current Kendenup Lodge and Cottages facility for this purpose.</p> <p>This project could look vastly different if the Tender was ultimately won by a US-owned Prison provider guaranteeing WA's Mental Health Commission a better return on investment. Perhaps the SOP can wait until all these contingencies have been formalised.</p> <p>Diane Graham 25 May 2026</p>	<p>and exit/discharge arrangements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rural amenity, land-use compatibility and change from tourism/function use are relevant planning considerations and have been assessed against the existing lawful use and locality. • Traffic, access and parking matters are relevant planning considerations and have been assessed, including recommended access and parking management requirements where appropriate. • Concerns regarding risk management and operational accountability are noted; the approved Operational Management Plan is recommended to define how the use is to operate. • Further comments are covered in the Council Report
47	<p>Please find attached a list of my concerns regarding the use of the said property for the intended use.</p> <p>I will also add that, the lack of any public consultation is wholly inadequate, especially since the Plantagenet Shire Council has known about this since January. This stinks of a cover up. I am looking forward to a good explanation of such behaviour.</p> <p>Our residence is 2km away from the proposed rehab facility.</p> <p>I am against having G.S.D.A.R.C. in KENDENUP.</p> <p>We were NEVER NOTIFIED found out through Facebook.</p> <p>I Live on the Next Block, ABOUT 2KMS away.</p> <p>SAFETY FOR myself + my Family + the residents of KENDENUP.</p> <p>School Bus goes + Drops off CHILDREN NEXT to cottages.</p> <p>Affect iT will have ON OUR TOURISM. There's A shortages of Rentals + Homes To Buy as iT is.</p> <p>NO APPROVAL FROM council.</p> <p>Lack of LOCAL INVOLVEMENT / NOT CONSULTED.</p> <p>SAFTEY IS A BIG ISSUE. OUR AMBULANCE are volunteers NOT Qualified. NO Police Presence - have to come from Albany.</p> <p>NOT LOCK - Free to Roam - Leave Property - VISOTER come + go.</p> <p>SAFETY + SECURITY. Lack of STAFF - 5 STAFF FOR 20 ADULTS (week)</p> <p>2 STAFF FOR 20 ADULTS weekend. if 1 person has A RE DRAW OR MENTAL PROBLEM. 2 people are not going to handle THE Problem.</p> <p>Safety.</p> <p>STAFF NEED TRAINING + help. physical + Mentally.</p> <p>Bush Fire Risk.</p> <p>NOT A GOOD LOCATION:</p> <p>MAYBE ALBANY OR Katanning.</p>	<p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety, security, children/school bus, resident movement and perceived anti-social behaviour concerns are noted; amenity and operational management have been assessed, including staffing, supervision, visitor, intake and exit/discharge arrangements. • Police, ambulance, hospital and emergency response resourcing are State service matters and are not determinative planning considerations; the Shire has considered site suitability, access, bushfire and emergency management within its planning role. • The Shire cannot require the proposal to be lodged on an alternative site; the application must be assessed at the proposed location on its individual planning merits. • Consultation and notification concerns are noted; the application was advertised in accordance with the statutory process and submissions have been considered. • Rural amenity, land-use compatibility and change from tourism/function use are relevant planning considerations and have been assessed against the existing lawful use and locality. • Further comments are covered in the Council Report
48	<p>Dear sir.</p> <p>I write in reference to application P902 - located at Lots 843 and 844,217 Moorilup rd, Kendenup</p> <p>I Craig James Shand of 214 Moorilup Rd, Kendenup (Now 220 Hawker Rd, Kendenup) object to the proposal on the following grounds:</p> <p>Although I reside directly across the road from the proposed development & within 1 kilometre, I did not receive any written notice of a pending application for</p>	<p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety, security, children/school bus, resident movement and perceived anti-social behaviour concerns are noted; amenity and operational management have been

Submission Number	Comments	Officer Assessment
	<p>approval from the Shire or from any community engagement.</p> <p>The only barrier between said development & our property is a buffer of bushland. As a result noise emanating from the development will be of concern & mitigation has not been addressed adequately if at all.</p> <p>Traffic noise - with an increase in vehicle traffic with visitors on weekends, how will this be managed & kept under control</p> <p>Security is a major concern for me. There is no mention of Risk Management systems to be integrated within the operation & how the operators will keep residents within the bounds of the property at all times</p> <p>Infra-red night vision records of coming & going of residents would be essential</p> <p>Inadequate staffing to control residents</p> <p>Having (2) staff at night is not risk mitigation</p> <p>Our community does not have the benefit of a large regional city. We have no local police. No Medical facilities. We have a volunteer Fire Brigade, an Ambulance all run by an understaffed group of volunteers.</p> <p>What Bush Fire Management protocols will be implemented to prevent the escape of Fire</p> <p>Our nearest hospital is in Mt Barker some 19klm away, which invariably is unable to cope with medical emergencies & patients are on forwarded to Albany another 50klm away</p> <p>The Mt Barker police are understaffed & the call out time to Kendenup would be a minimum 15 minutes away & more likely to be a lot longer due to the nature of their work</p> <p>Water supply. There is no ground water at the address so it would rely on the catchment of water to supply the needs of the facility.</p> <p>Waste management. What Risk Management procedures will be put in place to adequately manage & contain this.</p> <p>As an insurance broker of some 40 years with an abundance of experience in Public & Professional Liability I certainly hope the Shire is adequately insured for legal liability arising out of the operation of a facility with a number of seemingly inadequate systems & protocols in place to manage this facility. Condoning the placement of this facility within a tourism, Lifestyle hobby farm region with all the potential risks that might arise is putting the Shire at grave risk & being joined in any legal claim against the facility.</p> <p>Having a facility within the middle of a local community with zero communication with the local residents is not acceptable.</p> <p>Having the facility somewhere else is a good thing potentially but not in its present location.</p> <p>I object to this facility and any other that detracts from tourism for our area - the Gateway to the Stirlings.</p> <p>I certainly hope that the Shire uses wisdom in its decision making process.</p> <p>Yous faithfully Craig J Shand 214 Moorilup Road, Kendenup WA 6323 E -</p>	<p>assessed, including staffing, supervision, visitor, intake and exit/discharge arrangements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Police, ambulance, hospital and emergency response resourcing are State service matters and are not determinative planning considerations; the Shire has considered site suitability, access, bushfire and emergency management within its planning role. • The Shire cannot require the proposal to be lodged on an alternative site; the application must be assessed at the proposed location on its individual planning merits. • Rural amenity, land-use compatibility and change from tourism/function use are relevant planning considerations and have been assessed against the existing lawful use and locality. • Servicing, wastewater and water supply concerns are noted; wastewater and bushfire water matters have been considered through the relevant referral material and bushfire management documentation. • Further comments are covered in the Council Report
49	<p>"I am against having G.S.D.A.R.C. in Kendenup. We were never notified found out through Facebook. I live on the next block, about 2kms away.</p> <p>Safety for myself, my family + the residents of Kendenup.</p> <p>School bus goes + drops of children next to cottages. Affect it will have on our tourism. There's a shortages of rentals + homes to buy as it is. No approval from Council.</p> <p>Lack of local involvement/not consulted. Safety is a big issue. Our ambulance are volunteers not qualified. No police presence - have to come from Albany. Not lock-free to roam - leave property - visitor come + go. Safety & security. Lack of staff - staff for 20 adults (week) 2 staff for 20 adults weekend. If 1 person has a redraw or mental problems, 2 people are not going to handle the problem. Safety. Staff need training + help physical + mentally.</p> <p>Bush fire risk. NOT A GOOD LOCATION. Maybe Albany or Katanning."</p>	<p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety, security, children/school bus, resident movement and perceived anti-social behaviour concerns are noted; amenity and operational management have been assessed, including staffing, supervision, visitor, intake and exit/discharge arrangements. • Police, ambulance, hospital and emergency response resourcing are State service matters and are not determinative planning considerations; the Shire has considered site suitability, access, bushfire and emergency management within its planning role. • The Shire cannot require the proposal to be lodged on an alternative site; the application must be assessed at the proposed location on its individual planning merits. • Consultation and notification concerns are noted; the application was advertised in accordance with the statutory process and submissions have been considered. • Rural amenity, land-use compatibility and change from tourism/function use are relevant planning considerations and have been assessed against the existing lawful use and locality. • Further comments are covered in the Council Report
50	I am opposed to the proposed establishment of a drug and alcohol rehabilitation centre at the former Kendenup Cottages and Lodge at Lot No: 843 & 844 Street	Objection

Submission Number	Comments	Officer Assessment
	<p>217 Moorilup Road Suburb in Kendenup.</p> <p>The proposal has proceeded without public consultation and transparency, leaving the community excluded from a decision that will significantly affect local safety, security and amenity. Disappointingly, the planning documents, in particular the Operational Management Plan, was released to the public with insufficient detail relevant to the location and the wider Kendenup community. The lack of information and generic nature of the document has led to divisive opinions in the community and people feeling undervalued and unsafe.</p> <p>Kendenup has no police presence, and all emergency response is provided by volunteer ambulance and fire services. These volunteer based services are not resourced or staffed to manage the increased demand and risk associated with such a facility. This creates unacceptable safety risks for both Kendenup residents and prospective clients.</p> <p>Additionally, there has been thought or planning within the proposal in relation to those close neighbours and the direct impact the facility will have on their amenity and safety. At the community meeting held by the Proponent – Southern Aboriginal Corporation and Cyrenian House – they seemed to be oblivious to these issues (e.g. school bus stops and neighbour proximity) and were dismissive as to the concerns.</p> <p>While I recognise the importance of rehabilitation services, this proposal is incompatible with the land use purpose and the resource, emergency capability, and safety needs of our community.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objection noted. No detailed planning reasons were provided in the submission text. • The application has been assessed against the relevant planning framework, submissions and amenity considerations. • Further comments are covered in the Council Report
51	<p>Kendenup is a quiet and safe rural town thanks to its residents who value these two qualities well above others. Young families, retirees in the majority from the city, farmers, FIFO , choose to live there despite some noticeable shortfalls such as :Kendenup’s limited services and shopping, its isolation, its lack of medical facilities , its reliance on a few ambulance volunteers in case of an emergency, its fewer employment opportunities and its absence of a police station or High School The residents are prepared to accept all these downsides in exchange for being away from the issues of alcoholism and drug addiction that exist in larger towns in the Great Southern such as Albany, Mount Barker, Gnowangerup, Katanning and Kojoonup. Residents of Kendenup have escaped from a larger city with its associated problems of alcohol abuse, domestic disputes, drugs and youth related problems. So why should the citizens of Kendenup have to accept that a Rehabilitation Centre for Drugs and Alcohol be placed in the middle of their community, in lieu of what was for decades a Lodge and Cottages for tourists. Is this the reward they deserve for maintaining a safe community ?</p> <p>Each town should take care of its own concerns, especially residents who suffer from drug and alcohol abuse, by building their own facility rather than the one proposed in Kendenup. This is definitely not the place to have one such facility due to its isolated position and its large aging population. Australia being a democracy, would it not be the right of Kendenup citizens to decide, via a vote, whether they accept to take on board the risk of such a place in their small community?</p> <p>I do hope that it will be the case.</p> <p>Regards,</p>	<p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety, security, children/school bus, resident movement and perceived anti-social behaviour concerns are noted; amenity and operational management have been assessed, including staffing, supervision, visitor, intake and exit/discharge arrangements. • Police, ambulance, hospital and emergency response resourcing are State service matters and are not determinative planning considerations; the Shire has considered site suitability, access, bushfire and emergency management within its planning role. • The Shire cannot require the proposal to be lodged on an alternative site; the application must be assessed at the proposed location on its individual planning merits. • Consultation and notification concerns are noted; the application was advertised in accordance with the statutory process and submissions have been considered. • Rural amenity, land-use compatibility and change from tourism/function use are relevant planning considerations and have been assessed against the existing lawful use and locality. • Further comments are covered in the Council Report
52	<p>I am the owner of two black sheep general store & Kendenup LOP located 7km from 214 Moorilup Rd, the proposed site.</p> <p>I am writing to formally bring to your attention security & safety concerns I have being the only commercial business in town</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. lack of street lighting on Hassell Ave close to the store 2. lack of police presence & response time in case of incident 3. some concerns on the safety of my employees 4. security concerns regarding the nature of our business we sell: <p>Alcohol Cigarettes & tobacco Kendenup LPO – Banking (cash handling)</p> <p>We understand the need for this type of facility but this current proposal. We feel, is not the correct location in Kendenup</p>	<p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety, security, children/school bus, resident movement and perceived anti-social behaviour concerns are noted; amenity and operational management have been assessed, including staffing, supervision, visitor, intake and exit/discharge arrangements. • Police, ambulance, hospital and emergency response resourcing are State service matters and are not determinative planning considerations; the Shire has considered site suitability, access, bushfire and emergency management within its planning role. • The Shire cannot require the proposal to be lodged on an alternative site; the application must be assessed at the proposed location on its individual planning merits. • Further comments are covered in the Council Report
53	<p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>We wholeheartedly agree with the need for a rehab centre in this region. Substance issues continue to grow, and having a facility with space to recover in a peaceful farm environment is a great opportunity. It is far enough from Kendenup town to avoid major impacts on the local community, while still being close</p>	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for the proposal, including the need for rehabilitation services and the suitability of a rural setting,

Submission Number	Comments	Officer Assessment
	<p>enough to Albany and emergency services for people to access medical and support services if needed. The distance from neighbouring homes would mean the change from short stay accommodation to short stay residential rehabilitation would have minimal impact. The location is set up well as-is, and the everyday use of the site wouldn't change much to what it is currently approved for. 20 people plus staff is significantly less than the 200+ function centre currently on the site.</p> <p>This centre will bring jobs to town, and other centres like this in WA have a good track record of low impact in the surrounding community in a farm like setting. People want to be there, and want to recover. Not everyone gets the opportunity to change their life, and they know what's at stake if they don't. A place like this is a great way to support those recovering from substance abuse, whilst not significantly impacting on an established community or neighbourhood. The block is secluded and a good balance of being close to town, but far enough out of town to operate discretely.</p> <p>If not an existing accommodation site like this on the outskirts of a small town, then where else would a centre like this be appropriate? Not many people would want this in their backyard, but a farm property with significant distance to a small amount of other houses is far better than in the centre of a townsite or in a neighbourhood pedestrian street.</p>	<p>is noted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments regarding lower intensity compared with the approved function/reception use are noted and considered in the less-detrimental assessment. • Any approval remains subject to recommended conditions and approved operational management arrangements.
54	<p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>In regards to the proposed Residential Alcohol & Drug Rehabilitation Centre Kendenup I have a few concerns into this proposal as follows:</p> <p>As per Section 6. Facility and Location of the SAC Operational Management Plan - Great Southern Drug and Alcohol Rehabilitation Centre paragraph 2 states " SAC has made an offer to purchase the property which has been formally accepted by the current owners. The sale of the property will be completed subject to conditions including approval of funding from the Mental Health Commission and Development Approval from the Shire of Plantagenet."</p> <p>I believe that the sale has gone through already and the SAC own it now. So if the Development Approval from the Shire of Plantagenet fails to get approval, what happens to the facility? Does it turn into another Aboriginal Town Camp like all the others around Western Australia which resemble abandoned camps scattered with car bodies and litter with buildings going to rack and ruin? If this is the case I could see the Police Service and Ambulance Service (if they could get here timely) having to visit them regularly for domestic violence incidents, drug and alcohol problems and community safety issues. Would the SAC and the Shire of Plantagenet ensure the site is kept in a clean state?</p> <p>We bought our property (101 Hudson Rd, Kendenup) in 2021 knowing there is no facilities like the proposed centre in our area. If this proposal goes ahead I can see all our property valuations going down hill. We live out here for the serenity and great views of the Stirling Ranges.</p> <p>I'm not against Alcohol and Drug Rehabilitation but would prefer to see it somewhere else. If the proposal is denied then I would prefer to see the formally Kendenup Cottages and Lodge be resold to someone else.</p> <p>Thank you. Doug Lennox Email Mob</p>	<p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety, security, children/school bus, resident movement and perceived anti-social behaviour concerns are noted; amenity and operational management have been assessed, including staffing, supervision, visitor, intake and exit/discharge arrangements. • Police, ambulance, hospital and emergency response resourcing are State service matters and are not determinative planning considerations; the Shire has considered site suitability, access, bushfire and emergency management within its planning role. • Potential impacts on property values or marketability are not valid planning considerations for a development application assessment. • The Shire cannot require the proposal to be lodged on an alternative site; the application must be assessed at the proposed location on its individual planning merits. • Concerns regarding risk management and operational accountability are noted; the approved Operational Management Plan is recommended to define how the use is to operate. • Further comments are covered in the Council Report
55	<p>Hi Clara</p> <p>Further to my below email, can you please provide me with the Council Minutes and supporting documentation for N206 – 2004 Approval – Tourist Accommodation (Conference Facility and Accommodation). This decision was made on the 9th November 2004.</p> <p>I am not asking for you to provide comment or enter discussion, I would just like access to the information that is referred to in the Planning Application P902. If the Planning Applicant, Planning Solutions, has been privy to this information and has referenced it in the Planning Application, then we, the ratepayers should have access to this information as well. I believe that this information is critical in understanding and determining the "non-conforming use" argument that has been put forward in the Planning Application.</p> <p>Therefore, can I respectfully request the following: Planning Application N206 – 2004 Approval – Tourist Accommodation (Conference Facility and Accommodation) All Council Meeting Minutes and supporting documentation in relation to Planning Application N206 – 2004 Approval – Tourist Accommodation (Conference Facility and Accommodation)</p> <p>Given that the submissions for Planning Application P902 closes this Tuesday 26th May and there has already been lengthy delays in the communication process, I would appreciate you giving this your highest priority.</p> <p>Kind regards, Cindy North</p>	<p>Non-Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Individual response provided to this comment • Request for historical approval material and supporting documentation is noted. • The non-conforming use history and the relevance of the 2004 approval are addressed in the Council report. • This submission does not raise a separate objection to the planning merits of the proposed use.
56	<p>To Plantagenet Shire Council</p> <p>Why I don't want a Rehabilitation in our area as its not suitable.</p> <p>I have lived & Payed Rates for 23 Years in Kendenup area so I have a right to speak on this subject. We have a nice town, a good school & kindy were our grandchildren went, they walked to school & played with friends all around so safe it was for them. Lots wait at the rd side for the school bus and there wasn't a safety worry. But if there is a Drug & Rehabilitation here! that will change.</p>	<p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety, security, children/school bus, resident movement and perceived anti-social behaviour concerns are noted; amenity and operational management have been assessed, including staffing, supervision, visitor, intake

Submission Number	Comments	Officer Assessment
	<p>Now the Plantagenet Shire is trying to pass plans to let that happen. With no real Advertising about this, a little on the Web Site. Well I wouldn't know how to find a website, Why didn't it get in the Plantagenet News?</p> <p>I am very Cross with the way the council has handled it. My understanding is that something as important as this has to be Advertised, so all in "KND" can look into this peroneal, which is not a good idea as there's no transport for a person who wants to leave, and with young children waiting on the rd sides for school Busses all alone. (p. 1) Who knows what a poor person will do when they need a "fix"? This is very import-ant to us, we are not a big town with lots of people around to see what's going on.</p> <p>Please don't do this to Kendenup.</p> <p>Carroll Ahern. P.O. Box 111 Kendenup</p>	<p>and exit/discharge arrangements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultation and notification concerns are noted; the application was advertised in accordance with the statutory process and submissions have been considered. • Further comments are covered in the Council Report
57	<p>Re: Objection to Proposed Great Southern Drug & Alcohol Rehabilitation Centre for Voluntary Patients (GSDARC) Property: Lots 843–844, 217 Moorilup Road, Kendenup, Western Australia Applicant: Southern Aboriginal Corporation (Lead Agency) in partnership with Cyrenian House Dear Sir/Madam, I write to formally object to the proposed planning application for the use of the above property as a drug and alcohol treatment facility. My objection is not directed toward people seeking treatment or support. Drug and alcohol rehabilitation services are important and necessary within the community. However, I do not believe this particular location is suitable for this type of operation due to significant concerns regarding community safety, emergency response capability, and the existing local environment. Kendenup is a small rural community with limited public services and infrastructure. Importantly, there is no permanent local police presence in the town, with police resources based in Albany approximately one hour away. This creates a serious concern regarding response times should incidents occur requiring urgent intervention. In addition, the town does not have full-time medical or hospital services available locally. Residents rely heavily on hospital and emergency medical services located in Albany. This lack of immediate medical infrastructure raises further concerns regarding the suitability of locating a drug and alcohol treatment-related operation within the community, particularly where vulnerable individuals may require urgent health, mental health, or crisis intervention support.</p> <p>There are already ongoing concerns within the local area regarding drug-related activity and alleged drug dealing. Introducing a facility associated with substance dependency and rehabilitation into a community already experiencing these risks placing additional pressures on residents and limited local resources.</p> <p>I also understand that the proposed facility would operate on a voluntary basis, meaning individuals are free to come and go rater than being accommodated within a secure or medically supervised environment. This raises additional concern regarding community safety, supervision, and the management of individuals who may be experiencing substance dependency, relapse, behavioural issues, or mental health crises without immediate local support services available.</p> <p>My concerns include: Increased demand on emergency and policing services that are already geographically stretched. Potential impacts on community safety and public amenity. The suitability of locating such a facility in a small rural residential environment lacking immediate support infrastructure. Potential impacts on nearby residents, families, and vulnerable community members. Lack of local medical, security, and crisis-response capability. Concerns regarding supervision, transport, and management arrangements for clients attending or residing at the property.</p> <p>I respectfully submit that facilities of this nature are more appropriately located in areas with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Immediate access to police and emergency services; • Established medical and mental health infrastructure; • Public transport and support services; • Appropriate commercial or institutional zoning; • Adequate staffing and security capability. <p>I request that the Council carefully consider whether the proposal is compatible with the existing character, safety requirements, and infrastructure limitations of Kendenup.</p> <p>Should Council nonetheless consider approval, I strongly request that extensive independent community consultation, operational management plans, security plans, staffing details, and emergency response arrangements be fully disclosed and independently assessed before any decision is made.</p> <p>I respectfully ask that this objection be formally recorded and fully considered as part of the planning assessment process.</p> <p>Yours faithfully, Susan Valerie Thomas</p>	<p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety, security, children/school bus, resident movement and perceived anti-social behaviour concerns are noted; amenity and operational management have been assessed, including staffing, supervision, visitor, intake and exit/discharge arrangements. • Police, ambulance, hospital and emergency response resourcing are State service matters and are not determinative planning considerations; the Shire has considered site suitability, access, bushfire and emergency management within its planning role. • Potential impacts on property values or marketability are not valid planning considerations for a development application assessment. • The Shire cannot require the proposal to be lodged on an alternative site; the application must be assessed at the proposed location on its individual planning merits. • Consultation and notification concerns are noted; the application was advertised in accordance with the statutory process and submissions have been considered. • Further comments are covered in the Council Report
58	<p>Badly needed</p>	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for the proposal is noted. • The regional need for rehabilitation services has been considered as part of the social and community benefit assessment.

Submission Number	Comments	Officer Assessment
59	There is a definite need for the rehabilitation providers as substance abuses is prevalent in this area and throughout the great southern	Support <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for rehabilitation services in the locality and the Great Southern region is noted. • Social and community benefit is a relevant planning consideration and has been considered in the assessment.
60	<p>I object to the proposal and submit the following documents that supports the rejection of the change of use application:</p> <p>Submission Response to P902 Community Meeting Minutes – Kendenup Town Hall – No Case – 10 May 2026 I purchased Kendenup around 18 months ago and I am still renovating my property. I chose Kendenup because of its location, amenities such as the shop/post office, town hall and country club and it's small town vibe after a long search around the Great Southern region. Through the renovation process I have met many great people who are can-do and helpful to "newbies". Many people here run their own businesses and also volunteer their time for the fire brigade, ambulance, landscape care etc. When I lived in the city I was dismissive of the term "community". I have been inspired by the people I've met in Kendenup and now volunteer my own services with starting a community music group which is still going strong, also playing for free at Town Hall events such as the markets and supplying a p.a. system. I don't believe the Proponents claims about their Rehab stats and being a "Rehab Town" will inevitably bring the drug trade and those who prey on vulnerable people. Kendenup deserves a future without this kind of trouble. Losing the accommodation/venue use will be a set back to the future many of us would like to see and are working towards as a "small events" town.</p> <p>Summary The Shire of Plantagenet has received an application for a change of use at the property under Application Number 902 and has advertised the proposed change of use with public comment to be received by 26 May 2026. Advertised documents on the Shire's website include:</p> <p>Document 1: The Change of Use proposal from proponents Southern Aboriginal Corporation & Cyrenian House to change the Non-Conforming Use to a Rehabilitation Centre from Tourist Development & Reception Centre. I content this does not meet the land use requirements under current Rural zoning requirements.</p> <p>Document 2: Supporting planning Development Application – Non-Conforming Use Lots 843 and 844 (217) Moorilup Road, Kendenup prepared by Planning Solutions (Perth) sets out the planning case for the change. I contend the case for change has not been met.</p> <p>Rural Zoning (Extract from Planning Solutions Document 2) The objective of the Rural zone under LPS5 is: To provide for the maintenance or enhancement of specific local rural character. To protect broad acre agricultural activities such as cropping and grazing and intensive activities such as horticulture as primary uses, with other rural pursuits and rural industries as secondary uses in circumstances where they demonstrate suitability and compatibility with the primary use. To maintain and enhance the environmental qualities of the landscape, vegetation, soils and water bodies, to protect sensitive areas especially the natural valley and watercourse systems from damage. To provide for the operation and development of existing, future and potential rural land uses by limiting the introduction of inappropriate sensitive land uses in the Rural zone. To provide for a range of non rural land uses where they have demonstrated benefit and are compatible with surrounding rural uses.</p> <p>COMMENT The current use under the Rural zoning since circa 2005 has provided local families and their guests and visitors to Mount Country with a venue that supports and shares rural life. Weddings, birthdays and other significant events and visitors to Mount Country it has provided a quintessential Great Southern country experience. The current use of the land supports: Enhancement of specific local rural characteristics: o the ability to roam and enjoy a break on 40 rural acres o the ability to explore and discover or reconnect to the beauty and facilities at Stirlings, Porongurup, Mount Barker and Kendenup Town. Kendenup Cottages & Lodge use has proven itself to be compatible over 20 years with the surrounding Rural use in that there were no complaints from neighbouring land owners in relation to noise, vehicles or that it was a licensed venue. In fact many local people and their friends and family including those not living in the area have supported and loved this business. Where the business on the land continued and supported large events at 20% of potential occupancy for visitor accommodation</p>	Objection <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety, security, children/school bus, resident movement and perceived anti-social behaviour concerns are noted; amenity and operational management have been assessed, including staffing, supervision, visitor, intake and exit/discharge arrangements. • Police, ambulance, hospital and emergency response resourcing are State service matters and are not determinative planning considerations; the Shire has considered site suitability, access, bushfire and emergency management within its planning role. • Potential impacts on property values or marketability are not valid planning considerations for a development application assessment. • The Shire cannot require the proposal to be lodged on an alternative site; the application must be assessed at the proposed location on its individual planning merits. • Consultation and notification concerns are noted; the application was advertised in accordance with the statutory process and submissions have been considered. • Further comments are covered in the Council Report

Submission Number	Comments	Officer Assessment
	<p>It is expected the Kendenup area and surrounding areas would economically benefit from: N.B. This estimation does not include people seeking short term accommodation for work purposes or whilst moving to the area. So, with its current use the operations on the land are not inappropriate sensitive land uses in a Rural Zone, and meets the other highlighted in blue planning requirements. Its current use services, (at a conservative estimation) approximately 1,368 people making memories, adding to the economy Kendenup and its surrounding attractions and supporting local jobs.</p> <p>I contend that the proposed use as a Medical (Rehab) facility is an inappropriate sensitive use in a Rural zone and will provide no material or social benefit to the Kendenup and local areas or its residents.</p> <p>This would service approximately 80 people based on the Proponents information in Document 1</p> <p>It is noted that the B&B business located on a neighbouring property (which is allowable under the Zoning Table) may also be effected by a neighbouring "Rehab" facility further reducing visitor numbers. It is understood that this business often supported overflow from the Cottages or Lodge bookings.</p> <p>Current Zoning & Use from Tourist Development and Non-Conforming Use (under the previous Town Planning Scheme Reception Centre) – (Extract from Planning Solutions Document 2)</p> <p>On 17 February 2021, former Town Planning Scheme No.3 was repealed and replaced by LPS5. The incoming LPS5 did not carry over the 'Tourist Accommodation' land use. Instead, the activities of 'temporary accommodation' and 'convention areas' fall under two distinct (and separate) land use categories under LPS5: 'Tourist Development' and 'Reception Centre', respectively defined as:</p> <p>Tourist Development: A building, or a group of buildings forming a complex, other than a bed and breakfast, a caravan park or holiday accommodation, used to provide —</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) short-term accommodation for guests; and (b) onsite facilities for the use of guests; and (c) facilities for the management of the development. <p>Reception Centre: Premises used for hosted functions on formal or ceremonial occasions.</p> <p>A 'reception centre' is a use that is prohibited in the Rural zone pursuant to LPS5. Accordingly, the use of the subject site for a reception centre is, and has been since 17 February 2021, a 'non-conforming use', meaning a use of land which, though lawful immediately before the coming into operation of a planning scheme or amendment to a planning scheme, is not in conformity with a provision of that scheme:</p> <p>A non-conforming use can be changed to another non-permitted use with development approval.</p> <p>COMMENT</p> <p>Good to Know. The residents of Kendenup are already very aware of the value of the current use of the property as Holiday Accommodation (Conforming) and Function Centre (Non-Conforming)</p> <p>Where this proposed change of use is approved by the Shire of Plantagenet it is inevitable that the planning laws that are perceived impediments to land owners from replacing the loss of to our community the Kendenup Cottages & Lodge accommodation type easily - which is often commented upon - will come into focus.</p> <p>Allowance of Non-Conforming Use Change Under LPS5 – Extract from Planning Document 2</p> <p>a non-conforming use may be changed to another non-permitted use only with development approval, pursuant to clause 23 of LPS5:</p> <p>(1) a person must not, without development approval —</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) alter or extend a non-conforming use of land; or (b) erect, alter or extend a building used for, or in conjunction with, a non-conforming use; or (c) repair, rebuild, alter or extend a building used for a non-conforming use that is destroyed to the extent of 75% or more of its value; or (d) change the use of land from a non-conforming use to another use that is not permitted by the Scheme <p>(2) An application for development approval for the purposes of this clause must be advertised in accordance with clause 64 of the deemed provisions.</p> <p>(3) A local government may only grant development approval for a change of use of land referred to in subclause (1)(d) if, in the opinion of the local government, the proposed use</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) is less detrimental to the amenity of the locality than the existing non-conforming use; and (b) is closer to the intended purpose of the zone in which the land is situated. <p>Based on outcomes of case law and other planning decisions in Western Australia, a premises used for rehabilitation of persons seeking recovery from alcohol and other drugs is classified as a 'community purpose' land use under LPS5. 'Community purpose' is defined by LPS5 as:</p> <p>Community Purpose Premises designed or adapted primarily for the provision of educational, social or recreational facilities or services by organisations involved in activities for community benefit .</p> <p>Community purpose is a use that is not permitted in the Rural zone under LPS5. Clause 67(1) of the deemed provisions provides:</p> <p>Development approval cannot be granted on an application for approval of —</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) development that is a class X use in relation to the zone in which the development is located, unless <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) the development relates to land that is being used for a non-conforming use; and (ii) the local government considers that the proposed use of the land would be less detrimental than the non-conforming use; <p>The proposal is considered appropriate, as follows:</p> <p>The proposed use will not adversely impact the amenity of the locality. The facility will operate within the existing buildings, and an Operational Management</p>	

Submission Number	Comments	Officer Assessment
	<p>Plan has been prepared to ensure the use is managed effectively and sensitively. The proposed use aligns with the objectives of the zone by delivering a demonstrated benefit and is compatible with surrounding rural uses. The facility provides essential support and services for individuals affected by alcohol and other drugs, improving individual well-being and, in turn, contributing positively to the broader community.</p> <p>COMMENT</p> <p>The Proponents could have made a proposal to change the use to either Medical Facility and/or Consulting Rooms under the X Category for Rural according to the Zoning Table in LPS5. Surely this better describes the use of the proposed facility? It is understood, if approved, this facility will provide consultations and withdrawal appropriate drugs to patients/participants in the programme including but not limited to; mental health, medical conditions associated with withdrawal, medical transfers in the case of crises cases etc. So why choose "Community Purpose"? Attached in Appendix 1 of this document is a record from a meeting of the valid concerns by residents (including ratepayers) in Kendenup (p. 6). Our Community concerns are elevated by near neighbours and other rural and special rural properties closer to town and residential properties in town . A meeting held by the proponents SAC and Cyrenian House on 14th of May 2026 failed to address our community concerns for the Proposal Document (Document 1) for the more than 100 attendees. This facility is not Fit for Purpose</p> <p>COMMENT</p> <p>What "broader community"? Mount Barker? Narrikup? Albany, Perth, Port Hedland? Is there a definition somewhere I have missed reading in this Planning Document that defines the term "broader community" for the purpose of reading this document? Perhaps what is meant by this term is that no-one suffering the afflictions that the proposed facility from this local area will be able to access treatment? This facility does not meet the definition as a common person would perceive it of "Community Purpose" as it will not involve education, social or recreational activities for community benefit for the people who reside or who will reside in the Shire of Plantagenet. This facility is not Fit for Purpose.</p> <p>Comparison of the Current Use to Proposed Use - Extract from Planning Documents 2 The proposed use is considerably less intensive than the current approved reception centre (p. 6). The reception centre is approved for a capacity of 260 persons, whereas the proposed drug & alcohol rehabilitation centre will cater for up to 20 clients, thereby proposing to accommodate only one thirteenth of the capacity of the existing facility. Additionally, where a reception centre may frequently have amplified music, the proposed drug & alcohol rehabilitation centre would have strict controls of noise and other nuisances (p. 6). It is therefore more in keeping with the Rural zone objectives which limit the introduction of inappropriate land uses and more compatible with rural activities.</p> <p>COMMENT</p> <p>This has already been addressed this on Pages 1 & 2 under Comment to zoning change. Please re-read. In essence, the current use for the property for Holiday Accommodation and Function Centre is proven over 20 years and attracts far more business, employment and goodwill and experiences to the Town and general area than a "Rehab" facility will.</p> <p>QUESTIONS FROM PROPONENTS SAC & CYRENIAN HOUSE DOCUMENT (DOCUMENT 1) Question One - Cover Page of Proposal from SAC & Cyrenian House The proposal states this application currently before Council will be reviewed in three years. Do the Proponents (SAC or Cyrenian House or the government agencies supporting the proposed new endeavour) intend any extension to the 20 beds during or after the 3-year review? Also page 11 of the Proposal document states: "In addition to Section 6.2 which describes the suitability of the site for GSDARC use, SAC and Cyrenian House have also given due consideration to the following planning and amenity related matters: Traffic and parking - the proposed site for GSDARC is currently used as a holiday stay. In its current form, the site accommodates the following: o 35 people in the motel style suites; o an additional 16 people at the Lodge and 3 chalets (assuming 4 people staying in each); o staff required to operate the business; and o the property also has event capacity of 250 persons. The property is located on 40 acres and provides ample parking for visitors and staff to meet this requirement." Does this mean it is the Proponents intention within 3 years to build 35 additional motel style units making the proposed facility, by the figures supplied in the proposal a 47 bed facility? Can the residents of Kendenup expect that after 3 years when you have changed the zoning (not just a change of use) to "Medical" that you will extend the facility?</p>	

Submission Number	Comments	Officer Assessment
	<p>Part of your current operations listed in the document show that the Proponents operate: Wandoo Therapeutic Community – 77 bed woman's prison therapeutic community in Murdock Rick Hammersley Centre Therapeutic Community Gngangara Program (50-bed residential treatment in Cullacabardee Rick Hammersley Centre Therapeutic Community Saranna Program (14-cottage residential treatment in Cullacabardee – so a total of 64 beds It is hard to understand how a proposed 20 bed facility will stack up financially or how it will meet the "described needs" of the Great Southern as per the proposal document So what are we signing up for in Kendenup, Mount Barker and the Shire of Plantagenet, really? Question Two - Page 10 Facility and Location (Page 10) "SAC and Cyrenian House have identified the Kendenup Cottages and Lodge (the property) as the preferred site for the establishment of the GSDARC. The property is located at Lot 843 & 844, 217 Moorilup Road in Kendenup, within the Shire of Plantagenet. The property currently operates as a four-star holiday accommodation venue set on 40 acres of land, situated 7 km from the town of Kendenup, 17 km from Mount Barker, 67 km from Albany, and 70 km from Denmark. SAC has made an offer to purchase the property which has been formally accepted by the current owners. The sale of the property will be completed subject to conditions including approval of funding from the Mental Health Commission and Development Approval from the Shire of Plantagenet." How did the Proponent organisations identify the Kendenup Cottages & Lodge as a preferred site for the establishment of Great Southern Drug & Alcohol Rehabilitation Centre (GSDARC). Rather than say the greater Albany area which is the Regional Centre or Katanning which is another regional centre with the necessary support networks (police, hospitals,) (airports at Kojunup or Albany for flying doctor services). It has been difficult to establish any "for sale" internet listings for the Kendenup Cottages & Lodge since the sale to the previous owners in 2021. Was the property put to the open market as an accommodation business with its current use? ** Further Kendenup has long standing issues with very bad mobile reception, a police station in Mount Barker that is only open until 12 midnight with long wait times, and a regional hospital in Mount Barker where emergencies presenting often having to be onforwarded to Albany. It is noted that the Southern Aboriginal Corporation did not wait for Development Approval from the Shire of Plantagenet but settled the property on the 5th of May 2026 prior to the closing of notification term for public comment on the proposal which closes on 26 of May 2026. The Council will then make a decision on the proposed change of use from there which may take up to 2 months so perhaps by July 2026. ** THIS SUBMISSION ALSO CONTAINS AN ANNEXURE 1 FROM THE "NO" CASE MEETING AT THE KENDENUP TOWN HALL ON SUNDAY 10TH MAY (See following pages) Which sets out Other community concerns in detail surrounding the Proposal Document The effect on the Community relating to the proposed Rehab Facility AGAINST THE GREAT SOUTHERN DRUG & ALCOHOL REHABILITATION CENTRE COMMUNITY MEETING MINUTES SUNDAY, 10 MAY 2026 AT 6PM KENDENUP TOWN HALL Welcome and Statement of Intent Meeting Address by Len Handasyde, President of the Shire of Plantagenet » Council will assess Southern Aboriginal Centre (SAC)/ Cyrenian House proposal impartially. » Available decisions include adjourning it (not preferred), approve without conditions, approve with conditions, rejected it outright, or request further information. » If rejected, SAC/Cyrenian can appeal to the State Administrative Tribunal. » The Council weighs the impact on the community and the appropriateness of the development. General Concerns » Loss of accommodation used by workers (e.g. Main Roads) » Most neighbouring landowners have had no formal notification, only informal or verbal advice. » Impact to property values. Key Issues Raised by Community 1 Safety and Security Concerns about the ability to manage residents safely and prevent impacts on surrounding properties. Examples: » Residents may leave the facility at any time, as it is not a secure facility under the Mental Health Act. » Nearby residents raised concerns about people arriving at night seeking help, transport, or money. » Concern about lack of police presence, with response times potentially up to an hour. » Reports that fencing or security measures may be insufficient to prevent entry/exit. 2 Access to Alcohol and Other Drugs</p>	

Submission Number	Comments	Officer Assessment
	<p>Concerns that the location and operational model may allow ongoing access to substances, undermining rehabilitation outcomes and impacting the community.</p> <p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » A winery located within approximately 2 km raises concerns about ease of access to alcohol. » Questions about how residents will be supervised when leaving the site and/or shopping for supplies in Kendenup or Mt Barker. » A cited example from another facility (Nannup) where a resident was dropped near a pub and subsequently accessed methamphetamine. » Concerns that the facility could attract drug dealing or increase availability of substances locally. » Potential flow-on impacts to local liquor licensing and responsible service obligations (e.g. Kendenup Country Club). <p>3 Emergency and Health Services</p> <p>Concerns about limited capacity to respond to medical or psychiatric emergencies.</p> <p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » Community members noted that after-hours policing is provided from Albany, and expressed concern that this may lead to extended response times, particularly at night or during emergencies. » Residents reported that mental health patients requiring acute care would need transport to Albany. Mt Barker Hospital does not take these patients. » Only two volunteer ambulance workers at Kendenup and they cannot transport mental health patients. Paramedics would need to be deployed from Albany. » Local fire and emergency services are volunteer-based and already stretched. <p>4 Suitability of Location</p> <p>Strong view that Kendenup lacks the infrastructure required for this type of facility.</p> <p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » Kendenup described as isolated and lightly serviced, with limited healthcare infrastructure. » Alternative locations (e.g. Katanning) were suggested due to better access to hospital and police services. » Concerns that similar facilities are normally located closer to major health resources. <p>5 Impact on Community and Lifestyle</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » A school bus stop is located directly opposite the facility, raising concerns for children's safety. Additionally, residents will learn the timing of the bus schedule and use it to leave the facility. » Parents indicated children may no longer be able to ride bikes or move around independently. » Residents stated they may need to remain at home during visiting periods (i.e. Sundays) to monitor activity. » Concerns about increased psychological stress and vigilance within the community. <p>6 Operational and Staffing Concerns</p> <p>Questions about whether the facility can be safely and effectively staffed.</p> <p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » Concerns that staffing levels may be insufficient, particularly at night or after hours. » Questions raised about whether staff may include trainees or lower qualified personnel. » Concerns about managing aggressive or unstable residents and situations requiring physical restraint (which may need multiple staff). » Lack of clarity on how incidents or rule breaches would be handled. <p>7 Emergency Planning (Bushfire Risk)</p> <p>Concerns about evacuation and emergency preparedness.</p> <p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » If bushfires occur, our volunteers may already be engaged which leaves limited capacity to assist facility residents. » Questions about who is responsible for evacuating residents and whether residents would be prioritised over locals. <p>8 Planning, Process, and Transparency</p> <p>Concerns about lack of consultation and information.</p> <p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » Community members reported no direct engagement prior to the proposal reaching an advanced stage. » Questions about how the proposal progressed given limited local awareness. » Lack of detailed information regarding operations, complaint processes, and oversight mechanisms. <p>9 Infrastructure and Services</p> <p>Concerns about whether local infrastructure can support the facility.</p> <p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » Questions about waste management capacity at the Kendenup Transfer Station and disposal of specialist medical waste (sharps). » Concerns about conversion of a residential/tourism building into a medical-style facility (e.g. alarms, soundproofing). » Uncertainty about transport arrangements for residents (arrival, discharge, absconding). <p>10 Community Sentiment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » Strong opposition was expressed. 	

Submission Number	Comments	Officer Assessment
	<p>» Some attendees felt the process had already negatively impacted the community.</p> <p>» Perception that the proposal places disproportionate risk on local residents.</p> <p>11 Some Questions for Proponent</p> <p>Key questions identified for the upcoming meeting:</p> <p>» Why was Kendenup selected over better-resourced locations?</p> <p>» How will access to alcohol and drugs be controlled?</p> <p>» What staffing levels and qualifications will be in place?</p> <p>» What are the emergency and evacuation procedures?</p> <p>» How will residents be transported and supervised off-site?</p> <p>» What complaints and oversight mechanisms will exist?</p> <p>» What types of clients will be admitted (e.g. voluntary, court-mandated, co-occurring mental health conditions)?</p> <p>» How will the facility manage clients experiencing psychosis and severe withdrawal?</p> <p>» How will staff know where residents are at all times?</p> <p>» What controls are in place if residents eave the property (abscond), break rules, or are discharged early?</p> <p>» Who is responsible for transporting residents if they leave unexpectedly?</p> <p>» How long would it take for external support to arrive if staff cannot manage a situation?</p> <p>» What arrangements are in place for emergency medical response and mental health crises?</p> <p>» The document mentions a Bushfire Management Plan. Can you please provide this?</p> <p>» What is stored in treatment areas (e.g. medications, equipment)?</p> <p>» What are the visiting day arrangements, and how will community impacts be managed?</p> <p>» Are there plans to expand (e.g. up to 70 residents)?</p>	
61	<p>I have lived in Kendenup for 22 years. I previously owned a property with my ex-husband on Wandoo Road and I now work in Albany during the week and live at the above address on weekends and days off.</p> <p>The townspeople have been advised that the residents of the proposed facility are voluntary and under certain circumstances can leave. The fencing is inadequate and it appears to me that anyone could easily leave to do whatever at any time. Lots of older people who live alone live in the area close to the proposed facility. And kids waiting in the school bus stop across the road are a few of my concerns.</p> <p>I just don't think that this is good for Kendenup for the people who live here, tourism and the limited services available.</p> <p>I object to the proposal and submit the following documents that supports the rejection of the change of use application</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submission Response to P902 • Community Meeting Minutes – Kendenup Town Hall – No Case – 10 May 2026 <p>Summary</p> <p>The Shire of Plantagenet has received an application for a change of use at the property under Application Number 902 and has advertised the proposed change of use with public comment to be received by 26 May 2026. Advertised documents on the Shire's website include:</p> <p>Document 1:</p> <p>The Change of Use proposal from proponents Southern Aboriginal Corporation & Cyrenian House to change the Non-Conforming Use to a Rehabilitation Centre from Tourist Development & Reception Centre.</p> <p>I contend this does not meet the land use requirements under current Rural zoning requirements.</p> <p>Document 2:</p> <p>Supporting planning Development Application – Non-Conforming Use Lots 843 and 844 (217) Moorilup Road, Kendenup prepared by Planning Solutions (Perth) sets out the planning case for the change.</p> <p>I contend the case for change has not been met.</p> <p>Rural Zoning (Extract from Planning Solutions Document 2)</p> <p>The objective of the Rural zone under LPS5 is:</p> <p>To provide for the maintenance or enhancement of specific local rural character.</p> <p>To protect broad acre agricultural activities such as cropping and grazing and intensive activities such as horticulture as primary uses, with other rural pursuits and rural industries as secondary uses in circumstances where they demonstrate suitability and compatibility with the primary use.</p> <p>To maintain and enhance the environmental qualities of the landscape, vegetation, soils and water bodies, to protect sensitive areas especially the natural valley and watercourse systems from damage.</p> <p>To provide for the operation and development of existing, future and potential rural land uses by limiting the introduction of inappropriate sensitive land uses in the Rural zone.</p> <p>To provide for a range of non rural land uses where they have demonstrated benefit and are compatible with surrounding rural uses.</p> <p>COMMENT</p> <p>The current use under the Rural zoning since circa 2005 has provided local families and their guests and visitors to Mount Country with a venue that supports</p>	<p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety, security, children/school bus, resident movement and perceived anti-social behaviour concerns are noted; amenity and operational management have been assessed, including staffing, supervision, visitor, intake and exit/discharge arrangements. • Police, ambulance, hospital and emergency response resourcing are State service matters and are not determinative planning considerations; the Shire has considered site suitability, access, bushfire and emergency management within its planning role. • Potential impacts on property values or marketability are not valid planning considerations for a development application assessment. • The Shire cannot require the proposal to be lodged on an alternative site; the application must be assessed at the proposed location on its individual planning merits. • Consultation and notification concerns are noted; the application was advertised in accordance with the statutory process and submissions have been considered. • Further comments are covered in the Council Report

Submission Number	Comments	Officer Assessment
	<p>and shares rural life. Weddings, birthdays and other significant events and visitors to Mount Country it has provided a quintessential Great Southern country experience.</p> <p>The current use of the land supports:</p> <p>Enhancement of specific local rural characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o the ability to roam and enjoy a break on 40 rural acres o the ability to explore and discover or reconnect to the beauty and facilities at Stirlings, Porongurup, Mount Barker and Kendenup Town. <p>Kendenup Cottages & Lodge use has proven itself to be compatible over 20 years with the surrounding Rural use in that there were no complaints from neighbouring land owners in relation to noise, vehicles or that it was a licensed venue. In fact many local people and their friends and family including those not living in the area have supported and loved this business.</p> <p>Where the business on the land continued and supported large events at 20% of potential occupancy for visitor accommodation</p> <p>It is expected the Kendenup area and surrounding areas would economically benefit from:</p> <p>N.B. This estimation does not include people seeking short term accommodation for work purposes or whilst moving to the area.</p> <p>So, with its current use the operations on the land are not inappropriate sensitive land uses in a Rural Zone, and meets the other highlighted in blue planning requirements. Its current use services, (at a conservative estimation) approximately 1,368 people making memories, adding to the economy Kendenup and its surrounding attractions and supporting local jobs.</p> <p>I contend that the proposed use as a Medical (Rehab) facility is an inappropriate sensitive use in a Rural zone and will provide no material or social benefit to the Kendenup and local areas or its residents.</p> <p>This would service approximately 80 people based on the Proponents information in Document 1</p> <p>It is noted that the B&B business located on a neighbouring property (which is allowable under the Zoning Table) may also be effected by a neighbouring "Rehab" facility further reducing visitor numbers. It is understood that this business often supported overflow from the Cottages or Lodge bookings.</p> <p>Current Zoning & Use from Tourist Development and Non-Conforming Use (under the previous Town Planning Scheme Reception Centre) – (Extract from Planning Solutions Document 2)</p> <p>On 17 February 2021, former Town Planning Scheme No.3 was repealed and replaced by LPS5. The incoming LPS5 did not carry over the 'Tourist Accommodation' land use. Instead, the activities of 'temporary accommodation' and 'convention areas' fall under two distinct (and separate) land use categories under LPS5: 'Tourist Development' and 'Reception Centre', respectively defined as:</p> <p>Tourist Development: A building, or a group of buildings forming a complex, other than a bed and breakfast, a caravan park or holiday accommodation, used to provide —</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) short-term accommodation for guests; and (b) onsite facilities for the use of guests; and (c) facilities for the management of the development. <p>Reception Centre: Premises used for hosted functions on formal or ceremonial occasions.</p> <p>A 'reception centre' is a use that is prohibited in the Rural zone pursuant to LPS5. Accordingly, the use of the subject site for a reception centre is, and has been since 17 February 2021, a 'non-conforming use', meaning a use of land which, though lawful immediately before the coming into operation of a planning scheme or amendment to a planning scheme, is not in conformity with a provision of that scheme:</p> <p>A non-conforming use can be changed to another non-permitted use with development approval.</p> <p>COMMENT</p> <p>Good to Know. The residents of Kendenup are already very aware of the value of the current use of the property as Holiday Accommodation (Conforming) and Function Centre (Non-Conforming)</p> <p>Where this proposed change of use is approved by the Shire of Plantagenet it is inevitable that the planning laws that are perceived impediments to land owners from replacing the loss of to our community the Kendenup Cottages & Lodge accommodation type easily - which is often commented upon - will come into focus.</p> <p>Allowance of Non-Conforming Use Change Under LPS5 – Extract from Planning Document 2</p> <p>a non-conforming use may be changed to another non-permitted use only with development approval, pursuant to clause 23 of LPS5:</p> <p>(1) a person must not, without development approval —</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) alter or extend a non-conforming use of land; or (b) erect, alter or extend a building used for, or in conjunction with, a non-conforming use; or (c) repair, rebuild, alter or extend a building used for a non-conforming use that is destroyed to the extent of 75% or more of its value; or (d) change the use of land from a non-conforming use to another use that is not permitted by the Scheme <p>(2) An application for development approval for the purposes of this clause must be advertised in accordance with clause 64 of the deemed provisions.</p> <p>(3) A local government may only grant development approval for a change of use of land referred to in subclause (1)(d) if, in the opinion of the local government, the proposed use</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) is less detrimental to the amenity of the locality than the existing non-conforming use; and 	

Submission Number	Comments	Officer Assessment
	<p>(b) is closer to the intended purpose of the zone in which the land is situated.</p> <p>Based on outcomes of case law and other planning decisions in Western Australia, a premises used for rehabilitation of persons seeking recovery from alcohol and other drugs is classified as a 'community purpose' land use under LPS5. 'Community purpose' is defined by LPS5 as:</p> <p>Community Purpose Premises designed or adapted primarily for the provision of educational, social or recreational facilities or services by organisations involved in activities for community benefit .</p> <p>Community purpose is a use that is not permitted in the Rural zone under LPS5. Clause 67(1) of the deemed provisions provides:</p> <p>Development approval cannot be granted on an application for approval of —</p> <p>(a) development that is a class X use in relation to the zone in which the development is located, unless</p> <p>(i) the development relates to land that is being used for a non-conforming use; and</p> <p>(ii) the local government considers that the proposed use of the land would be less detrimental than the non-conforming use;</p> <p>The proposal is considered appropriate, as follows:</p> <p>The proposed use will not adversely impact the amenity of the locality. The facility will operate within the existing buildings, and an Operational Management Plan has been prepared to ensure the use is managed effectively and sensitively.</p> <p>The proposed use aligns with the objectives of the zone by delivering a demonstrated benefit and is compatible with surrounding rural uses. The facility provides essential support and services for individuals affected by alcohol and other drugs, improving individual well-being and, in turn, contributing positively to the broader community.</p> <p>COMMENT</p> <p>The Proponents could have made a proposal to change the use to either Medical Facility and/or Consulting Rooms under the X Category for Rural according to the Zoning Table in LPS5.</p> <p>Surely this better describes the use of the proposed facility?</p> <p>It is understood, if approved, this facility will provide consultations and withdrawal appropriate drugs to patients/participants in the programme including but not limited to; mental health, medical conditions associated with withdrawal, medical transfers in the case of crises cases etc.</p> <p>So why choose "Community Purpose"?</p> <p>Attached in Appendix 1 of this document is a record from a meeting of the valid concerns by residents (including ratepayers) in Kendenup (p. 6). Our Community concerns are elevated by near neighbours and other rural and special rural properties closer to town and residential properties in town .</p> <p>A meeting held by the proponents SAC and Cyrenian House on 14th of May 2026 failed to address our community concerns for the Proposal Document (Document 1) for the more than 100 attendees.</p> <p>This facility is not Fit for Purpose</p> <p>COMMENT</p> <p>What "broader community"? Mount Barker? Narrikup? Albany, Perth, Port Hedland?</p> <p>Is there a definition somewhere I have missed reading in this Planning Document that defines the term "broader community" for the purpose of reading this document?</p> <p>Perhaps what is meant by this term is that no-one suffering the afflictions that the proposed facility from this local area will be able to access treatment?</p> <p>This facility does not meet the definition as a common person would perceive it of "Community Purpose" as it will not involve education, social or recreational activities for community benefit for the people who reside or who will reside in the Shire of Plantagenet.</p> <p>This facility is not Fit for Purpose.</p> <p>Comparison of the Current Use to Proposed Use - Extract from Planning Documents 2</p> <p>The proposed use is considerably less intensive than the current approved reception centre (p. 6). The reception centre is approved for a capacity of 260 persons, whereas the proposed drug & alcohol rehabilitation centre will cater for up to 20 clients, thereby proposing to accommodate only one thirteenth of the capacity of the existing facility.</p> <p>Additionally, where a reception centre may frequently have amplified music, the proposed drug & alcohol rehabilitation centre would have strict controls of noise and other nuisances (p. 6). It is therefore more in keeping with the Rural zone objectives which limit the introduction of inappropriate land uses and more compatible with rural activities.</p> <p>COMMENT</p> <p>This has already been addressed this on Pages 1 & 2 under Comment to zoning change. Please re-read.</p> <p>In essence, the current use for the property for Holiday Accommodation and Function Centre is proven over 20 years and attracts far more business, employment and goodwill and experiences to the Town and general area than a "Rehab" facility will.</p> <p>QUESTIONS FROM PROPOSERS SAC & CYRENIAN HOUSE DOCUMENT (DOCUMENT 1)</p> <p>Question One - Cover Page of Proposal from SAC & Cyrenian House</p> <p>The proposal states this application currently before Council will be reviewed in three years.</p> <p>Do the Proponents (SAC or Cyrenian House or the government agencies supporting the proposed new endeavour) intend any extension to the 20 beds during or after the 3-year review?</p> <p>Also page 11 of the Proposal document states:</p>	

Submission Number	Comments	Officer Assessment
	<p>"In addition to Section 6.2 which describes the suitability of the site for GSDARC use, SAC and Cyrenian House have also given due consideration to the following planning and amenity related matters: Traffic and parking - the proposed site for GSDARC is currently used as a holiday stay. In its current form, the site accommodates the following: o 35 people in the motel style suites; o an additional 16 people at the Lodge and 3 chalets (assuming 4 people staying in each); o staff required to operate the business; and o the property also has event capacity of 250 persons. The property is located on 40 acres and provides ample parking for visitors and staff to meet this requirement." Does this mean it is the Proponents intention within 3 years to build 35 additional motel style units making the proposed facility, by the figures supplied in the proposal a 47 bed facility? Can the residents of Kendenup expect that after 3 years when you have changed the zoning (not just a change of use) to "Medical" that you will extend the facility? Part of your current operations listed in the document show that the Proponents operate: Wandoo Therapeutic Community – 77 bed woman's prison therapeutic community in Murdock Rick Hammersley Centre Therapeutic Community Ngarara Program (50-bed residential treatment in Cullacabardee Rick Hammersley Centre Therapeutic Community Saranna Program (14-cottage residential treatment in Cullacabardee – so a total of 64 beds It is hard to understand how a proposed 20 bed facility will stack up financially or how it will meet the "described needs" of the Great Southern as per the proposal document So what are we signing up for in Kendenup, Mount Barker and the Shire of Plantagenet, really? Question Two - Page 10 Facility and Location (Page 10) "SAC and Cyrenian House have identified the Kendenup Cottages and Lodge (the property) as the preferred site for the establishment of the GSDARC. The property is located at Lot 843 & 844, 217 Moorilup Road in Kendenup, within the Shire of Plantagenet. The property currently operates as a four-star holiday accommodation venue set on 40 acres of land, situated 7 km from the town of Kendenup, 17 km from Mount Barker, 67 km from Albany, and 70 km from Denmark. SAC has made an offer to purchase the property which has been formally accepted by the current owners. The sale of the property will be completed subject to conditions including approval of funding from the Mental Health Commission and Development Approval from the Shire of Plantagenet." How did the Proponent organisations identify the Kendenup Cottages & Lodge as a preferred site for the establishment of Great Southern Drug & Alcohol Rehabilitation Centre (GSDARC). Rather than say the greater Albany area which is the Regional Centre or Katanning which is another regional centre with the necessary support networks (police, hospitals,) (airports at Kojunup or Albany for flying doctor services). It has been difficult to establish any "for sale" internet listings for the Kendenup Cottages & Lodge since the sale to the previous owners in 2021. Was the property put to the open market as an accommodation business with its current use? ** Further Kendenup has long standing issues with very bad mobile reception, a police station in Mount Barker that is only open until 12 midnight with long wait times, and a regional hospital in Mount Barker where emergencies presenting often having to be onforwarded to Albany. It is noted that the Southern Aboriginal Corporation did not wait for Development Approval from the Shire of Plantagenet but settled the property on the 5th of May 2026 prior to the closing of notification term for public comment on the proposal which closes on 26 of May 2026. The Council will then make a decision on the proposed change of use from there which may take up to 2 months so perhaps by July 2026. ** THIS SUBMISSION ALSO CONTAINS AN ANNEXURE 1 FROM THE "NO" CASE MEETING AT THE KENDENUP TOWN HALL ON SUNDAY 10TH MAY (See following pages) Which sets out Other community concerns in detail surrounding the Proposal Document The effect on the Community relating to the proposed Rehab Facility AGAINST THE GREAT SOUTHERN DRUG & ALCOHOL REHABILITATION CENTRE COMMUNITY MEETING MINUTES SUNDAY, 10 MAY 2026 AT 6PM KENDENUP TOWN HALL Welcome and Statement of Intent Meeting Address by Len Handasyde, President of the Shire of Plantagenet » Council will assess Southern Aboriginal Centre (SAC)/ Cyrenian House proposal impartially. » Available decisions include adjourning it (not preferred), approve without conditions, approve with conditions, rejected it outright, or request further information. » If rejected, SAC/Cyrenian can appeal to the State Administrative Tribunal. » The Council weighs the impact on the community and the appropriateness of the development. General Concerns</p>	

Submission Number	Comments	Officer Assessment
	<p>» Loss of accommodation used by workers (e.g. Main Roads) » Most neighbouring landowners have had no formal notification, only informal or verbal advice. » Impact to property values.</p> <p>Key Issues Raised by Community</p> <p>1 Safety and Security Concerns about the ability to manage residents safely and prevent impacts on surrounding properties. Examples: » Residents may leave the facility at any time, as it is not a secure facility under the Mental Health Act. » Nearby residents raised concerns about people arriving at night seeking help, transport, or money. » Concern about lack of police presence, with response times potentially up to an hour. » Reports that fencing or security measures may be insufficient to prevent entry/exit.</p> <p>2 Access to Alcohol and Other Drugs Concerns that the location and operational model may allow ongoing access to substances, undermining rehabilitation outcomes and impacting the community. Examples: » A winery located within approximately 2 km raises concerns about ease of access to alcohol. » Questions about how residents will be supervised when leaving the site and/or shopping for supplies in Kendenup or Mt Barker. » A cited example from another facility (Nannup) where a resident was dropped near a pub and subsequently accessed methamphetamine. » Concerns that the facility could attract drug dealing or increase availability of substances locally. » Potential flow-on impacts to local liquor licensing and responsible service obligations (e.g. Kendenup Country Club).</p> <p>3 Emergency and Health Services Concerns about limited capacity to respond to medical or psychiatric emergencies. Examples: » Community members noted that after-hours policing is provided from Albany, and expressed concern that this may lead to extended response times, particularly at night or during emergencies. » Residents reported that mental health patients requiring acute care would need transport to Albany. Mt Barker Hospital does not take these patients. » Only two volunteer ambulance workers at Kendenup and they cannot transport mental health patients. Paramedics would need to be deployed from Albany. » Local fire and emergency services are volunteer-based and already stretched.</p> <p>4 Suitability of Location Strong view that Kendenup lacks the infrastructure required for this type of facility. Examples: » Kendenup described as isolated and lightly serviced, with limited healthcare infrastructure. » Alternative locations (e.g. Katanning) were suggested due to better access to hospital and police services. » Concerns that similar facilities are normally located closer to major health resources.</p> <p>5 Impact on Community and Lifestyle » A school bus stop is located directly opposite the facility, raising concerns for children's safety. Additionally, residents will learn the timing of the bus schedule and use it to leave the facility. » Parents indicated children may no longer be able to ride bikes or move around independently. » Residents stated they may need to remain at home during visiting periods (i.e. Sundays) to monitor activity. » Concerns about increased psychological stress and vigilance within the community.</p> <p>6 Operational and Staffing Concerns Questions about whether the facility can be safely and effectively staffed. Examples: » Concerns that staffing levels may be insufficient, particularly at night or after hours. » Questions raised about whether staff may include trainees or lower qualified personnel. » Concerns about managing aggressive or unstable residents and situations requiring physical restraint (which may need multiple staff). » Lack of clarity on how incidents or rule breaches would be handled.</p> <p>7 Emergency Planning (Bushfire Risk) Concerns about evacuation and emergency preparedness. Examples: » If bushfires occur, our volunteers may already be engaged which leaves limited capacity to assist facility residents. » Questions about who is responsible for evacuating residents and whether residents would be prioritised over locals.</p> <p>8 Planning, Process, and Transparency Concerns about lack of consultation and information.</p>	

Submission Number	Comments	Officer Assessment
	<p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » Community members reported no direct engagement prior to the proposal reaching an advanced stage. » Questions about how the proposal progressed given limited local awareness. » Lack of detailed information regarding operations, complaint processes, and oversight mechanisms. <p>9 Infrastructure and Services Concerns about whether local infrastructure can support the facility.</p> <p>Examples;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » Questions about waste management capacity at the Kendenup Transfer Station and disposal of specialist medical waste (sharps). » Concerns about conversion of a residential/tourism building into a medical-style facility (e.g. alarms, soundproofing). » Uncertainty about transport arrangements for residents (arrival, discharge, absconding). <p>10 Community Sentiment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » Strong opposition was expressed. » Some attendees felt the process had already negatively impacted the community. » Perception that the proposal places disproportionate risk on local residents. <p>11 Some Questions for Proponent Key questions identified for the upcoming meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » Why was Kendenup selected over better-resourced locations? » How will access to alcohol and drugs be controlled? » What staffing levels and qualifications will be in place? » What are the emergency and evacuation procedures? » How will residents be transported and supervised off-site? » What complaints and oversight mechanisms will exist? » What types of clients will be admitted (e.g. voluntary, court-mandated, co-occurring mental health conditions)? » How will the facility manage clients experiencing psychosis and severe withdrawal? » How will staff know where residents are at all times? » What controls are in place if residents leave the property (abscond), break rules, or are discharged early? » Who is responsible for transporting residents if they leave unexpectedly? » How long would it take for external support to arrive if staff cannot manage a situation? » What arrangements are in place for emergency medical response and mental health crises? » The document mentions a Bushfire Management Plan. Can you please provide this? » What is stored in treatment areas (e.g. medications, equipment)? » What are the visiting day arrangements, and how will community impacts be managed? » Are there plans to expand (e.g. up to 70 residents)? 	
62	<p>I object to the proposal and submit the following documents that supports the rejection of the change of use application:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submission Response to P902 • Community Meeting Minutes – Kendenup Town Hall – No Case – 10 May 2026 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➢ The Proponets documentation reads like a cut and paste job and a bad one at that. ➢ It lacks substantive detail due to the lack of public consultation prior to obtaining public funding and settling at this site on 5th May 2026. ➢ The Proponets were unable to successfully assure the Kendenup community at the public meeting they organised at the Town Hall on the 14 May that they were capable of running this type of facility if approved. They admitted at this meeting not even having a risk management plan available along with many other defections of issues raised. ➢ There is no clarity around their impact on a rural area such as any of their patients and/or those not in rehab coming to Kendenup in their support groups not understanding issues such as entering onto biosecurity properties. There is a biosecurity notice on the adjoining property to the west. <p>In my opinion this has been a failed planning process by the Proponets which has lead to deep concerns in Kendenup and Mount Barker which will not abate with time. I would respectfully suggest that the Council reject the proposed change of use and require rezoning application, as in my view it would be more prudent for such a momentous change of use as this proposal contemplates.</p> <p>Summary The Shire of Plantagenet has received an application for a change of use at the property under Application Number 902 and has advertised the proposed change of use with public comment to be received by 26 May 2026. Advertised documents on the Shire's website include: Document 1: The Change of Use proposal from proponents Southern Aboriginal Corporation & Cyrenian House to change the Non-Conforming Use to a Rehabilitation Centre from Tourist Development & Reception Centre. I content this does not meet the land use requirements under current Rural zoning requirements.</p>	<p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety, security, children/school bus, resident movement and perceived anti-social behaviour concerns are noted; amenity and operational management have been assessed, including staffing, supervision, visitor, intake and exit/discharge arrangements. • Police, ambulance, hospital and emergency response resourcing are State service matters and are not determinative planning considerations; the Shire has considered site suitability, access, bushfire and emergency management within its planning role. • Potential impacts on property values or marketability are not valid planning considerations for a development application assessment. • The Shire cannot require the proposal to be lodged on an alternative site; the application must be assessed at the proposed location on its individual planning merits. • Consultation and notification concerns are noted; the application was advertised in accordance with the statutory process and submissions have been considered.

Submission Number	Comments	Officer Assessment
	<p>Document 2: Supporting planning Development Application – Non-Conforming Use Lots 843 and 844 (217) Moorilup Road, Kendenup prepared by Planning Solutions (Perth) sets out the planning case for the change. I contend the case for change has not been met. Rural Zoning (Extract from Planning Solutions Document 2) The objective of the Rural zone under LPS5 is: To provide for the maintenance or enhancement of specific local rural character. To protect broad acre agricultural activities such as cropping and grazing and intensive activities such as horticulture as primary uses, with other rural pursuits and rural industries as secondary uses in circumstances where they demonstrate suitability and compatibility with the primary use. To maintain and enhance the environmental qualities of the landscape, vegetation, soils and water bodies, to protect sensitive areas especially the natural valley and watercourse systems from damage. To provide for the operation and development of existing, future and potential rural land uses by limiting the introduction of inappropriate sensitive land uses in the Rural zone. To provide for a range of non rural land uses where they have demonstrated benefit and are compatible with surrounding rural uses. COMMENT The current use under the Rural zoning since circa 2005 has provided local families and their guests and visitors to Mount Country with a venue that supports and shares rural life. Weddings, birthdays and other significant events and visitors to Mount Country it has provided a quintessential Great Southern country experience. The current use of the land supports: Enhancement of specific local rural characteristics: o the ability to roam and enjoy a break on 40 rural acres o the ability to explore and discover or reconnect to the beauty and facilities at Stirlings, Porongurup, Mount Barker and Kendenup Town. Kendenup Cottages & Lodge use has proven itself to be compatible over 20 years with the surrounding Rural use in that there were no complaints from neighbouring land owners in relation to noise, vehicles or that it was a licensed venue. In fact many local people and their friends and family including those not living in the area have supported and loved this business. Where the business on the land continued and supported large events at 20% of potential occupancy for visitor accommodation It is expected the Kendenup area and surrounding areas would economically benefit from: N.B. This estimation does not include people seeking short term accommodation for work purposes or whilst moving to the area. So, with its current use the operations on the land are not inappropriate sensitive land uses in a Rural Zone, and meets the other highlighted in blue planning requirements. Its current use services, (at a conservative estimation) approximately 1,368 people making memories, adding to the economy Kendenup and its surrounding attractions and supporting local jobs. I contend that the proposed use as a Medical (Rehab) facility is an inappropriate sensitive use in a Rural zone and will provide no material or social benefit to the Kendenup and local areas or its residents. This would service approximately 80 people based on the Proponents information in Document 1 It is noted that the B&B business located on a neighbouring property (which is allowable under the Zoning Table) may also be effected by a neighbouring "Rehab" facility further reducing visitor numbers. It is understood that this business often supported overflow from the Cottages or Lodge bookings. Current Zoning & Use from Tourist Development and Non-Conforming Use (under the previous Town Planning Scheme Reception Centre) – (Extract from Planning Solutions Document 2) On 17 February 2021, former Town Planning Scheme No.3 was repealed and replaced by LPS5. The incoming LPS5 did not carry over the 'Tourist Accommodation' land use. Instead, the activities of 'temporary accommodation' and 'convention areas' fall under two distinct (and separate) land use categories under LPS5: 'Tourist Development' and 'Reception Centre', respectively defined as: Tourist Development: A building, or a group of buildings forming a complex, other than a bed and breakfast, a caravan park or holiday accommodation, used to provide — (a) short-term accommodation for guests; and (b) onsite facilities for the use of guests; and (c) facilities for the management of the development. Reception Centre: Premises used for hosted functions on formal or ceremonial occasions. A 'reception centre' is a use that is prohibited in the Rural zone pursuant to LPS5. Accordingly, the use of the subject site for a reception centre is, and has been since 17 February 2021, a 'non-conforming use', meaning a use of land which, though lawful immediately before the coming into operation of a planning scheme or amendment to a planning scheme, is not in conformity with a provision of that scheme: A non-conforming use can be changed to another non-permitted use with development approval.</p>	<p>• Further comments are covered in the Council Report</p>

Submission Number	Comments	Officer Assessment
	<p>COMMENT</p> <p>Good to Know. The residents of Kendenup are already very aware of the value of the current use of the property as Holiday Accommodation (Conforming) and Function Centre (Non-Conforming)</p> <p>Where this proposed change of use is approved by the Shire of Plantagenet it is inevitable that the planning laws that are perceived impediments to land owners from replacing the loss of to our community the Kendenup Cottages & Lodge accommodation type easily - which is often commented upon - will come into focus.</p> <p>Allowance of Non-Confirming Use Change Under LPS5 – Extract from Planning Document 2</p> <p>a non-conforming use may be changed to another non-permitted use only with development approval, pursuant to clause 23 of LPS5:</p> <p>(1) a person must not, without development approval —</p> <p>(a) alter or extend a non-conforming use of land; or</p> <p>(b) erect, alter or extend a building used for, or in conjunction with, a non-conforming use; or</p> <p>(c) repair, rebuild, alter or extend a building used for a non-conforming use that is destroyed to the extent of 75% or more of its value; or</p> <p>(d) change the use of land from a non-conforming use to another use that is not permitted by the Scheme</p> <p>(2) An application for development approval for the purposes of this clause must be advertised in accordance with clause 64 of the deemed provisions.</p> <p>(3) A local government may only grant development approval for a change of use of land referred to in subclause (1)(d) if, in the opinion of the local government, the proposed use</p> <p>(a) is less detrimental to the amenity of the locality than the existing non-conforming use; and</p> <p>(b) is closer to the intended purpose of the zone in which the land is situated.</p> <p>Based on outcomes of case law and other planning decisions in Western Australia, a premises used for rehabilitation of persons seeking recovery from alcohol and other drugs is classified as a 'community purpose' land use under LPS5. 'Community purpose' is defined by LPS5 as:</p> <p>Community Purpose Premises designed or adapted primarily for the provision of educational, social or recreational facilities or services by organisations involved in activities for community benefit .</p> <p>Community purpose is a use that is not permitted in the Rural zone under LPS5. Clause 67(1) of the deemed provisions provides:</p> <p>Development approval cannot be granted on an application for approval of —</p> <p>(a) development that is a class X use in relation to the zone in which the development is located, unless</p> <p>(i) the development relates to land that is being used for a non-conforming use; and</p> <p>(ii) the local government considers that the proposed use of the land would be less detrimental than the non-conforming use;</p> <p>The proposal is considered appropriate, as follows:</p> <p>The proposed use will not adversely impact the amenity of the locality. The facility will operate within the existing buildings, and an Operational Management Plan has been prepared to ensure the use is managed effectively and sensitively.</p> <p>The proposed use aligns with the objectives of the zone by delivering a demonstrated benefit and is compatible with surrounding rural uses. The facility provides essential support and services for individuals affected by alcohol and other drugs, improving individual well-being and, in turn, contributing positively to the broader community.</p> <p>COMMENT</p> <p>The Proponents could have made a proposal to change the use to either Medical Facility and/or Consulting Rooms under the X Category for Rural according to the Zoning Table in LPS5.</p> <p>Surely this better describes the use of the proposed facility?</p> <p>It is understood, if approved, this facility will provide consultations and withdrawal appropriate drugs to patients/participants in the programme including but not limited to; mental health, medical conditions associated with withdrawal, medical transfers in the case of crises cases etc.</p> <p>So why choose "Community Purpose"?</p> <p>Attached in Appendix 1 of this document is a record from a meeting of the valid concerns by residents (including ratepayers) in Kendenup (p. 6). Our Community concerns are elevated by near neighbours and other rural and special rural properties closer to town and residential properties in town .</p> <p>A meeting held by the proponents SAC and Cyrenian House on 14th of May 2026 failed to address our community concerns for the Proposal Document (Document 1) for the more than 100 attendees.</p> <p>This facility is not Fit for Purpose</p> <p>COMMENT</p> <p>What "broader community"? Mount Barker? Narrikup? Albany, Perth, Port Hedland?</p> <p>Is there a definition somewhere I have missed reading in this Planning Document that defines the term "broader community" for the purpose of reading this document?</p> <p>Perhaps what is meant by this term is that no-one suffering the afflictions that the proposed facility from this local area will be able to access treatment?</p> <p>This facility does not meet the definition as a common person would perceive it of "Community Purpose" as it will not involve education, social or recreational activities for community benefit for the people who reside or who will reside in the Shire of Plantagenet.</p> <p>This facility is not Fit for Purpose.</p> <p>Comparison of the Current Use to Proposed Use - Extract from Planning Documents 2</p>	

Submission Number	Comments	Officer Assessment
	<p>The proposed use is considerably less intensive than the current approved reception centre (p. 6). The reception centre is approved for a capacity of 260 persons, whereas the proposed drug & alcohol rehabilitation centre will cater for up to 20 clients, thereby proposing to accommodate only one thirteenth of the capacity of the existing facility.</p> <p>Additionally, where a reception centre may frequently have amplified music, the proposed drug & alcohol rehabilitation centre would have strict controls of noise and other nuisances (p. 6). It is therefore more in keeping with the Rural zone objectives which limit the introduction of inappropriate land uses and more compatible with rural activities.</p> <p>COMMENT</p> <p>This has already been addressed this on Pages 1 & 2 under Comment to zoning change. Please re-read.</p> <p>In essence, the current use for the property for Holiday Accommodation and Function Centre is proven over 20 years and attracts far more business, employment and goodwill and experiences to the Town and general area than a "Rehab" facility will.</p> <p>QUESTIONS FROM PROPONENTS SAC & CYRENIAN HOUSE DOCUMENT (DOCUMENT 1)</p> <p>Question One - Cover Page of Proposal from SAC & Cyrenian House</p> <p>The proposal states this application currently before Council will be reviewed in three years.</p> <p>Do the Proponents (SAC or Cyrenian House or the government agencies supporting the proposed new endeavour) intend any extension to the 20 beds during or after the 3-year review?</p> <p>Also page 11 of the Proposal document states:</p> <p>"In addition to Section 6.2 which describes the suitability of the site for GSDARC use, SAC and Cyrenian House have also given due consideration to the following planning and amenity related matters:</p> <p>Traffic and parking - the proposed site for GSDARC is currently used as a holiday stay. In its current form, the site accommodates the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 35 people in the motel style suites; o an additional 16 people at the Lodge and 3 chalets (assuming 4 people staying in each); o staff required to operate the business; and o the property also has event capacity of 250 persons. <p>The property is located on 40 acres and provides ample parking for visitors and staff to meet this requirement."</p> <p>Does this mean it is the Proponents intention within 3 years to build 35 additional motel style units making the proposed facility, by the figures supplied in the proposal a 47 bed facility?</p> <p>Can the residents of Kendenup expect that after 3 years when you have changed the zoning (not just a change of use) to "Medical" that you will extend the facility?</p> <p>Part of your current operations listed in the document show that the Proponents operate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wandoo Therapeutic Community – 77 bed woman's prison therapeutic community in Murdock Rick Hammersley Centre Therapeutic Community Gngangara Program (50-bed residential treatment in Cullacabardee Rick Hammersley Centre Therapeutic Community Saranna Program (14-cottage residential treatment in Cullacabardee – so a total of 64 beds <p>It is hard to understand how a proposed 20 bed facility will stack up financially or how it will meet the "described needs" of the Great Southern as per the proposal document</p> <p>So what are we signing up for in Kendenup, Mount Barker and the Shire of Plantagenet, really?</p> <p>Question Two - Page 10</p> <p>Facility and Location (Page 10)</p> <p>"SAC and Cyrenian House have identified the Kendenup Cottages and Lodge (the property) as the preferred site for the establishment of the GSDARC. The property is located at Lot 843 & 844, 217 Moorilup Road in Kendenup, within the Shire of Plantagenet.</p> <p>The property currently operates as a four-star holiday accommodation venue set on 40 acres of land, situated 7 km from the town of Kendenup, 17 km from Mount Barker, 67 km from Albany, and 70 km from Denmark.</p> <p>SAC has made an offer to purchase the property which has been formally accepted by the current owners. The sale of the property will be completed subject to conditions including approval of funding from the Mental Health Commission and Development Approval from the Shire of Plantagenet."</p> <p>How did the Proponent organisations identify the Kendenup Cottages & Lodge as a preferred site for the establishment of Great Southern Drug & Alcohol Rehabilitation Centre (GSDARC).</p> <p>Rather than say the greater Albany area which is the Regional Centre or Katanning which is another regional centre with the necessary support networks (police, hospitals,) (airports at Kojunup or Albany for flying doctor services).</p> <p>It has been difficult to establish any "for sale" internet listings for the Kendenup Cottages & Lodge since the sale to the previous owners in 2021. Was the property put to the open market as an accommodation business with its current use?</p> <p>** Further Kendenup has long standing issues with very bad mobile reception, a police station in Mount Barker that is only open until 12 midnight with long wait times, and a regional hospital in Mount Barker where emergencies presenting often having to be onforwarded to Albany.</p> <p>It is noted that the Southern Aboriginal Corporation did not wait for Development Approval from the Shire of Plantagenet but settled the property on the 5th of May 2026 prior to the closing of notification term for public comment on the proposal which closes on 26 of May 2026. The Council will then make a decision on</p>	

Submission Number	Comments	Officer Assessment
	<p>the proposed change of use from there which may take up to 2 months so perhaps by July 2026. ** THIS SUBMISSION ALSO CONTAINS AN ANNEXURE 1 FROM THE "NO" CASE MEETING AT THE KENDENUP TOWN HALL ON SUNDAY 10TH MAY (See following pages) Which sets out Other community concerns in detail surrounding the Proposal Document The effect on the Community relating to the proposed Rehab Facility AGAINST THE GREAT SOUTHERN DRUG & ALCOHOL REHABILITATION CENTRE COMMUNITY MEETING MINUTES SUNDAY, 10 MAY 2026 AT 6PM KENDENUP TOWN HALL Welcome and Statement of Intent Meeting Address by Len Handasyde, President of the Shire of Plantagenet » Council will assess Southern Aboriginal Centre (SAC)/ Cyrenian House proposal impartially. » Available decisions include adjourning it (not preferred), approve without conditions, approve with conditions, rejected it outright, or request further information. » If rejected, SAC/Cyrenian can appeal to the State Administrative Tribunal. » The Council weighs the impact on the community and the appropriateness of the development. General Concerns » Loss of accommodation used by workers (e.g. Main Roads) » Most neighbouring landowners have had no formal notification, only informal or verbal advice. » Impact to property values. Key Issues Raised by Community 1 Safety and Security Concerns about the ability to manage residents safely and prevent impacts on surrounding properties. Examples: » Residents may leave the facility at any time, as it is not a secure facility under the Mental Health Act. » Nearby residents raised concerns about people arriving at night seeking help, transport, or money. » Concern about lack of police presence, with response times potentially up to an hour. » Reports that fencing or security measures may be insufficient to prevent entry/exit. 2 Access to Alcohol and Other Drugs Concerns that the location and operational model may allow ongoing access to substances, undermining rehabilitation outcomes and impacting the community. Examples: » A winery located within approximately 2 km raises concerns about ease of access to alcohol. » Questions about how residents will be supervised when leaving the site and/or shopping for supplies in Kendenup or Mt Barker. » A cited example from another facility (Nannup) where a resident was dropped near a pub and subsequently accessed methamphetamine. » Concerns that the facility could attract drug dealing or increase availability of substances locally. » Potential flow-on impacts to local liquor licensing and responsible service obligations (e.g. Kendenup Country Club). 3 Emergency and Health Services Concerns about limited capacity to respond to medical or psychiatric emergencies. Examples: » Community members noted that after-hours policing is provided from Albany, and expressed concern that this may lead to extended response times, particularly at night or during emergencies. » Residents reported that mental health patients requiring acute care would need transport to Albany. Mt Barker Hospital does not take these patients. » Only two volunteer ambulance workers at Kendenup and they cannot transport mental health patients. Paramedics would need to be deployed from Albany. » Local fire and emergency services are volunteer-based and already stretched. 4 Suitability of Location Strong view that Kendenup lacks the infrastructure required for this type of facility. Examples: » Kendenup described as isolated and lightly serviced, with limited healthcare infrastructure. » Alternative locations (e.g. Katanning) were suggested due to better access to hospital and police services. » Concerns that similar facilities are normally located closer to major health resources. 5 Impact on Community and Lifestyle » A school bus stop is located directly opposite the facility, raising concerns for children's safety. Additionally, residents will learn the timing of the bus schedule and use it to leave the facility. » Parents indicated children may no longer be able to ride bikes or move around independently.</p>	

Submission Number	Comments	Officer Assessment
	<p>» Residents stated they may need to remain at home during visiting periods (i.e. Sundays) to monitor activity.</p> <p>» Concerns about increased psychological stress and vigilance within the community.</p> <p>6 Operational and Staffing Concerns Questions about whether the facility can be safely and effectively staffed. Examples: » Concerns that staffing levels may be insufficient, particularly at night or after hours. » Questions raised about whether staff may include trainees or lower qualified personnel. » Concerns about managing aggressive or unstable residents and situations requiring physical restraint (which may need multiple staff). » Lack of clarity on how incidents or rule breaches would be handled.</p> <p>7 Emergency Planning (Bushfire Risk) Concerns about evacuation and emergency preparedness. Examples: » If bushfires occur, our volunteers may already be engaged which leaves limited capacity to assist facility residents. » Questions about who is responsible for evacuating residents and whether residents would be prioritised over locals.</p> <p>8 Planning, Process, and Transparency Concerns about lack of consultation and information. Examples: » Community members reported no direct engagement prior to the proposal reaching an advanced stage. » Questions about how the proposal progressed given limited local awareness. » Lack of detailed information regarding operations, complaint processes, and oversight mechanisms.</p> <p>9 Infrastructure and Services Concerns about whether local infrastructure can support the facility. Examples; » Questions about waste management capacity at the Kendenup Transfer Station and disposal of specialist medical waste (sharps). » Concerns about conversion of a residential/tourism building into a medical-style facility (e.g. alarms, soundproofing). » Uncertainty about transport arrangements for residents (arrival, discharge, absconding).</p> <p>10 Community Sentiment » Strong opposition was expressed. » Some attendees felt the process had already negatively impacted the community. » Perception that the proposal places disproportionate risk on local residents.</p> <p>11 Some Questions for Proponent Key questions identified for the upcoming meeting: » Why was Kendenup selected over better-resourced locations? » How will access to alcohol and drugs be controlled? » What staffing levels and qualifications will be in place? » What are the emergency and evacuation procedures? » How will residents be transported and supervised off-site? » What complaints and oversight mechanisms will exist? » What types of clients will be admitted (e.g. voluntary, court-mandated, co-occurring mental health conditions)? » How will the facility manage clients experiencing psychosis and severe withdrawal? » How will staff know where residents are at all times? » What controls are in place if residents eave the property (abscond), break rules, or are discharged early? » Who is responsible for transporting residents if they leave unexpectedly? » How long would it take for external support to arrive if staff cannot manage a situation? » What arrangements are in place for emergency medical response and mental health crises? » The document mentions a Bushfire Management Plan. Can you please provide this? » What is stored in treatment areas (e.g. medications, equipment)? » What are the visiting day arrangements, and how will community impacts be managed? » Are there plans to expand (e.g. up to 70 residents)?</p>	
63	<p>I object to the proposal and submit the following documents that supports the rejection of the change of use application</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submission Response to P902 • Community Meeting Minutes – Kendenup Town Hall – No Case – 10 May 2026 <p>I have been a property owner in Kendenup for the last 20 years. I am in my mid 60's and live alone at the property during the week.</p>	<p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety, security, children/school bus, resident movement and perceived anti-social behaviour concerns are noted; amenity and operational management have been

Submission Number	Comments	Officer Assessment
	<p>I am, quite frankly, frightened if this goes ahead. I left the city more than 20 years ago to stay away from this type of trouble. During my time in the city I experienced attempted break ins through my bedroom window and the neighbourhood was suffering from drug related crime.</p> <p>Given that I live so close to the proposed facility I am aware that many people on Moorilup Road and surrounds are seniors (female and male) and live alone. There are also FIFO families and small children in the immediate area like me and that makes me fearful.</p> <p>Kendenup does not have the services to support a Rehab facility. Our current tourism and future tourism will be hurt.</p>	<p>assessed, including staffing, supervision, visitor, intake and exit/discharge arrangements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rural amenity, land-use compatibility and change from tourism/function use are relevant planning considerations and have been assessed against the existing lawful use and locality. • Traffic, access and parking matters are relevant planning considerations and have been assessed, including recommended access and parking management requirements where appropriate. • Further comments are covered in the Council Report
64	<p>Dear shire & associated interests</p> <p>My husband and I moved to 125 Moorilup road, Kendenup 6323 – eleven years ago. the main reasons for choosing this area were the welcoming community, quiet environment and safe location. it has been a pleasure living here where we can relax and enjoy our own little bit of paradise.</p> <p>Kendenup is proving to be a hub for many others seeking the tranquillity and nurturing environment after the hustle and bustle of the big cities – a place to slow down, enjoy the company of others and feel safe knowing we all look out for each other. tourists are increasing their visits to the area for the wineries, Stirling range walks and country hospitality.</p> <p>imagine our dismay when we heard of the proposal to have a drug & alcohol rehabilitation centre, not just on our doorstep but in our backyards!</p> <p>we strongly urge the shire and other powers that be to halt this insensitive proposition. it is strongly our belief that the researchers for the project have no concept of the distance involved for police and other services to travel to this area.</p> <p>where will staff live? there are no rental vacancies in Kendenup or mount barker – surely it is part of their staff care to not have them travelling to and from Albany (if they can attain a rental there) for shift work. this is also means where will visitors stay? there is already enough traffic on the roads and accidents without contributing more vehicles.</p> <p>How can a facility that is rated for tourism use be suddenly able to operate as a secure environment for recovery from drugs and alcoholism? not only do those staying there need to be in a safe and secure facility they also need to be protected from the possibility of family/friends/associates trying to access them. this then causes a possibility of danger to the local community as police services during after hours are more than an hour away.</p> <p>Surely there are building requirements for a facility that was designed to only have short-term stays being changed to full-time accommodation? the Kendenup lodge and cottages cannot possibly meet these standards. as medical processes including drug dispatch will occur, rooms and buildings need to meet medical standards.</p> <p>There is also, and I believe more importantly, the psychosocial mental health of the surrounding community. we will no longer feel comfortable allowing our grandchildren access to our acreage unsupervised as we are being told that 'residents' can leave whenever they want, what could happen if they encounter our children? how am I to feel safe when my husband is working away and I am hanging out the washing, attending to my garden, feeding and caring for our animals?</p> <p>A facility of this type with the needs it requires would be much better suited to the immediate Albany area where services are more accessible. even for the residents to have excursions to the theatre, sports and other groups they could engage with, the availability in Albany is far far greater than Kendenup and mount barker. we do not need more pressure on our police, ambulance and fire services with their limited resources. for example, during a fire threat when the facility operated as a tourism venture, the visitors have their own transport and would be sent away from the area under their own control. the drug and alcohol facility would need more than 2 (minimum staff) persons to organise safe transport out of the area and during this time our own homes and buildings would be left to the fire threat.</p> <p>Please do not consider this decision lightly there are many peoples livelihoods and health to be accounted for in a change that is detrimental to our current Kendenup lifestyles that we have chosen and pay for.</p> <p>I am available to discuss this further at any time and welcome your feedback.</p> <p>Sincerely Wendy dobson 125 Moorilup road Kendenup wa 6323 mobile:</p>	<p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety, security, children/school bus, resident movement and perceived anti-social behaviour concerns are noted; amenity and operational management have been assessed, including staffing, supervision, visitor, intake and exit/discharge arrangements. • Police, ambulance, hospital and emergency response resourcing are State service matters and are not determinative planning considerations; the Shire has considered site suitability, access, bushfire and emergency management within its planning role. • The Shire cannot require the proposal to be lodged on an alternative site; the application must be assessed at the proposed location on its individual planning merits. • Rural amenity, land-use compatibility and change from tourism/function use are relevant planning considerations and have been assessed against the existing lawful use and locality. • Bushfire and evacuation concerns are noted; bushfire risk and emergency management have been considered through the Bushfire Management Plan and assessment recommendations. • Further comments are covered in the Council Report
65	<p>We want to let you know our strong objection to the proposed Great Southern Drug & Rehabilitation Centre in our suburb. There are young families & Retired Resident living here, the safety our the Children living here isn't conducive to having a Centre like that here We all moved here for the lifestyle.</p>	<p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety, security, children/school bus, resident movement and perceived anti-social behaviour concerns are noted; amenity and operational management have been assessed, including staffing, supervision, visitor, intake and exit/discharge arrangements.

Submission Number	Comments	Officer Assessment
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rural amenity, land-use compatibility and change from tourism/function use are relevant planning considerations and have been assessed against the existing lawful use and locality. • Traffic, access and parking matters are relevant planning considerations and have been assessed, including recommended access and parking management requirements where appropriate. • Further comments are covered in the Council Report
66	<p>I write to object to the above development application. Firstly I respect the need and importance for a drug and Alcohol facility in the Great Southern region however the proposed location at lots 843 and 844 - 217 Moorilup rd , Kendenup , is not suitable.</p> <p>The applicant proposes for a change from one non confirming use to another (x). The accommodation at 217 Moorilup rd was historically purpose built for tourism purposes not what the applicant seeks approval for -medical uses. If the applicant is successful a historic tourism venue would be lost forever in Kendenup. The location at 217 is not suitable for a Alcohol and Drug rehab Facility due to many reasons ;the lack of resources and services available in the area, Kendenup does not have a Police Station - nearest Police station is located in Mt Barker which closes at midnight, on average a local ha to wait approximately 6 weeks to get a GP appointment locally in Mt barker, the local hospital is not equipped , Extremely limited volunteer ambulance staffing, 5 Alcohol premises within 5 kilometres of the proposed facility - the town itself having major drug issues - not suitable for clients that are trying to redeem themselves and get away from drugs.</p> <p>As Noticed at the SAC/CYRENIAN house meeting held on Thursday 14th May , at the Kendenup Town Hall , there has been no community consultation prior to seeking approval for the proposed facility, C.E.O of CYRENIAN HOUSE -CAROL mentioning multiple times their proposal was not up to date with the shire as advertised on the shires website , Many questions remain unanswered and with SAC/CYRENIAN HOUSE holding no responsibility of their clients when the exit/quit the program or that of their visitors , we have major trust and security issues for our families.</p> <p>Location 217 Moorilup Rd is surrounded by dozens of lifestyle properties which comprises a lot of kids , elderly population and families. We as a community , our number one priority always should be Community safety. What about the mental wellbeing of our kids? Residents having to completely change their lifestyle.</p> <p>For reasons above I request the Council to refuse the application or seek further assessment of the implications of the proposal by the applicant.</p> <p>Yours Faithfully Sanjilin Furber 275 Moorilup Rd</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rural amenity, land-use compatibility and change from tourism/function use are relevant planning considerations and have been assessed against the existing lawful use and locality. • Traffic, access and parking matters are relevant planning considerations and have been assessed, including recommended access and parking management requirements where appropriate. • Further comments are covered in the Council Report <p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety, security, children/school bus, resident movement and perceived anti-social behaviour concerns are noted; amenity and operational management have been assessed, including staffing, supervision, visitor, intake and exit/discharge arrangements. • Police, ambulance, hospital and emergency response resourcing are State service matters and are not determinative planning considerations; the Shire has considered site suitability, access, bushfire and emergency management within its planning role. • Consultation and notification concerns are noted; the application was advertised in accordance with the statutory process and submissions have been considered. • Rural amenity, land-use compatibility and change from tourism/function use are relevant planning considerations and have been assessed against the existing lawful use and locality. • Traffic, access and parking matters are relevant planning considerations and have been assessed, including recommended access and parking management requirements where appropriate. • Further comments are covered in the Council Report
67	<p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>I am writing to express my objection to the proposed Developmental Application for 217 Moorilup Rd, Kendenup.</p> <p>Firstly, from the documents that have been provided on the Shire website, the applicant has described the proposed planning use as 'Community Purpose'. Under the Local Planning Scheme (LPS) 5, 'Community Purpose' is described as as:</p> <p>"premises designed or adapted primarily for the provision of educational, social or recreational facilities or services by organisations involved in activities for community benefit"</p> <p>(Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015 - 00-d-00)</p> <p>As described in documents provided by applicant, it includes the provisions of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a registered nurse onsite full time, clinical governance framework a low medical withdrawal unit medical urine screening, random drug screening, breath testing and tobacco screening <p>These medical facility style provisions do not fall under 'educational, social or recreational' usages, in fact indicate that the proposed facility falls under a 'medical centre', as defined by LPS5:</p> <p>"premises other than a hospital used by three or more health practitioners at the same time for the investigation or treatment of human injuries or ailments and for general outpatient care"</p> <p>Arguably, within the application, it is stated that there will be 'at least 2 staff' at any given time; are these staff not considered health practitioners? Based on the descriptions above, the proposed rehabilitation facility arguably falls under a 'medical centre' (land use), rather than 'community purpose'.</p> <p>A 'medical centre' is prohibited in a rural zone (Class X). The only way in which either a 'medical centre' or as the applicant has proposed, a 'community purpose' land use facility, can be approved is if the non-conforming land use is less detrimental than the current non-conforming land use.</p> <p>As a resident of the Kendenup community and residing only 600m from the proposed facility, I can confirm that currently, and over the last many years I have</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rural amenity, land-use compatibility and change from tourism/function use are relevant planning considerations and have been assessed against the existing lawful use and locality. • Traffic, access and parking matters are relevant planning considerations and have been assessed, including recommended access and parking management requirements where appropriate. • Further comments are covered in the Council Report <p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety, security, children/school bus, resident movement and perceived anti-social behaviour concerns are noted; amenity and operational management have been assessed, including staffing, supervision, visitor, intake and exit/discharge arrangements. • Police, ambulance, hospital and emergency response resourcing are State service matters and are not determinative planning considerations; the Shire has considered site suitability, access, bushfire and emergency management within its planning role. • Consultation and notification concerns are noted; the application was advertised in accordance with the statutory process and submissions have been considered. • Land use classification, zoning and non-conforming use arguments are noted and addressed in the statutory assessment against Local Planning Scheme No. 5 and the deemed provisions within the Council Report, including reference to the SAT case law that dictates 'Community Purpose' is the correct land use classification. • Rural amenity, land-use compatibility and change from

Submission Number	Comments	Officer Assessment
	<p>lived at this address, we have low traffic, low noise and the current tourism facility brings in people who visit the area, including wineries, nature (e.g. Stirling Range National Park), our local general store/post office, and other nearby areas. These people are generally of good nature and visit the area to benefit the local tourism.</p> <p>As a functioning rehabilitation centre, there will be increased traffic to and from the centre. This will increase noise in the area as well. People attending the area would include staff, residents of the facility and visitors (limited). Although they may attend some of the tourist locations of the town, one can argue that they would contribute to the tourism aspect of the community less than members to a tourism/holiday accommodation facility. For these points, I believe the proposed land use would be more detrimental than the current, non-conforming land use.</p> <p>Furthermore, the property is assessed as a Bushfire Prone Area 2. There are no bushfire action plans attached to the application, nor any assurance from the applicant that they are aware of this.</p> <p>Residents of the facility may:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> have mobility issues require supervision or assistance have cognitive impairment be unable to evacuate themselves fast if necessary <p>This raises concern for both surrounding residents as well as the safety of patients of the facility. We also have not received a risk management plan that details how these risks will be mitigated/managed. The proposed facility will inevitably bring in residents from other, potentially non-rural areas. How will they know the dangers surrounding fires in bushfire prone areas? How will this be communicated to them, if at all? The lack of communication of important safety concepts raises massive questions for the safety of staff, patients and visitors of the area.</p> <p>To conclude, I want to iterate that I am not opposed to a rehabilitation facility, and I understand the strong need for these facilities. I rather am raising my concerns and oppose the usage of the current land and area in which the proposed application is wanting to utilize. I believe it would not be a suitable fit for our community, citing the safety of both surrounding residents as well as staff and patients of the proposed facility.</p> <p>I hope this will be taken into consideration, and the outcome will reflect the views of the people of Kendenup firstly and foremostly.</p> <p>Kind regards, Olivia North 23 Newdegate Rd Kendenup</p>	<p>tourism/function use are relevant planning considerations and have been assessed against the existing lawful use and locality.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further comments are covered in the Council Report including relevant conditions that will ameliorate many of the concerns raised that the Shire has statutory power over
68	<p>Hi</p> <p>we both have concerns:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1/ no immediate medical centre in kendenup. 2/ no 24 hour police station except in albany. 3/ only 1 ambulance in kendenup. 4/ only 2 staff on duty of a night for 22 patience. 5/the facility will not put anything into the community of any kind. 6/ there is not enough accommodation in the kendenup area now, so by loosing the kendenup lodge as it was approved to used & has been used for the last years, we are even worse off than before the sale. <p>please consider all the above before approving this development.</p>	<p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Police, ambulance, hospital and emergency response resourcing are State service matters and are not determinative planning considerations; the Shire has considered site suitability, access, bushfire and emergency management within its planning role. • The Shire cannot require the proposal to be lodged on an alternative site; the application must be assessed at the proposed location on its individual planning merits. • Land use classification, zoning and non-conforming use arguments are noted and addressed in the statutory assessment against Local Planning Scheme No. 5 and the deemed provisions. • Traffic, access and parking matters are relevant planning considerations and have been assessed, including recommended access and parking management requirements where appropriate. • Staffing concerns are noted; day-to-day staffing is primarily operational, but the approved Operational Management Plan and supervision commitments inform the amenity assessment. • The Shire cannot require anyone to take over the current tourism development and operate it, if someone wishes to do so they can, but the Shire must assess this proposal on its own merits • Further comments are covered in the Council Report
69	To the Plantagenet Shire CEO and Councillors	Objection

Submission Number	Comments	Officer Assessment
	<p>Regarding proposed change of use 217 Moorilup Rd Kendenup, Kendenup Lodge and Southern Aboriginal Corporation proposed Rehabilitation Centre. Supplementary Submission – Clinical Classification Inconsistency</p> <p>I wish to raise a specific concern regarding an apparent inconsistency between the described operation of the proposed rehabilitation facility and its classification for planning and building purposes.</p> <p>1. Inconsistency Between Operational Model and Classification</p> <p>At community engagement, the applicant has asserted that the facility is “not a medical facility.” However, documentation and staffing structures indicate the presence of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> clinical oversight, structured treatment programs, and at least one full-time Registered Nurse (RN). <p>The inclusion of qualified medical personnel in a permanent on-site capacity is not typical of standard residential or tourism-based accommodation. It suggests that elements of care, monitoring, or intervention may be integral to the operation.</p> <p>This raises a fundamental question: Is the classification of the facility being determined by its label, or by its actual function?</p> <p>2. Relevance to NCC/BCA Classification</p> <p>Under the National Construction Code, building classification is based on use and occupant characteristics, not branding.</p> <p>Where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> occupants may be undergoing treatment or rehabilitation, supervision is required, and clinical staff are present, <p>the facility may reasonably fall within:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Class 9a (health care building), or a higher-risk form of Class 3 residential care. <p>The presence of a Registered Nurse strongly indicates that the facility may involve:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> health monitoring, medication management, or clinical response capability. <p>If this is the case, it is not sufficient to assert that the facility is “non-medical” without clearly demonstrating how its operations fall outside these definitions.</p> <p>3. Implications of Misclassification</p> <p>If a facility is functionally operating with clinical characteristics but assessed under a lower classification, this has implications for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> fire safety and evacuation standards, staffing and supervision assumptions, accessibility requirements, and overall occupant safety. <p>The distinction is not semantic—it directly affects the level of protection required under the NCC.</p> <p>4. Lack of Clarity in the Current Proposal</p> <p>It is currently unclear:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> whether an independent building classification assessment has been undertaken, how the presence of clinical staff has been factored into that assessment, and whether the operational model has been tested against NCC definitions for health care or residential care buildings. <p>5. Request for Clarification</p> <p>I request that Council require the applicant to clearly state:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> whether any clinical services (including monitoring, medication administration, or intervention) will occur on-site, the specific role and scope of the Registered Nurse within the facility, the proposed NCC classification of the buildings, and whether this classification has been independently verified. <p>Conclusion</p> <p>The issue is not whether the applicant describes the facility as “medical,” but whether its functional characteristics trigger a higher level of regulatory obligation. Clarity on this point is essential to ensure that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the correct building standards are applied, risks are appropriately assessed, and the integrity of the planning process is maintained. <p>Please ensure these elements have been carefully considered and thoroughly investigated prior to approving the planning application.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety, security, children/school bus, resident movement and perceived anti-social behaviour concerns are noted; amenity and operational management have been assessed, including staffing, supervision, visitor, intake and exit/discharge arrangements. • Police, ambulance, hospital and emergency response resourcing are State service matters and are not determinative planning considerations; the Shire has considered site suitability, access, bushfire and emergency management within its planning role. • Rural amenity, land-use compatibility and change from tourism/function use are relevant planning considerations and have been assessed against the existing lawful use and locality. • Bushfire and evacuation concerns are noted; bushfire risk and emergency management have been considered through the Bushfire Management Plan and assessment recommendations. • Traffic, access and parking matters are relevant planning considerations and have been assessed, including recommended access and parking management requirements where appropriate. • Further comments are covered in the Council Report

Submission Number	Comments	Officer Assessment
	<p>Regards Kieron Seymour 836 Newdegate Rd Kendenup</p>	
70	<p>There are a lot of loopholes in this application - none of neighbouring properties had any contact written or verbal about this prior to the sale of this property. It is a rural block developed as tourism - Kendenup relies on this property for tourists & workers. there is no other property in Kendenup that is suitable for this tourism property, which our small town relies on. this sale has not followed the advertising proposal p902. - sac has made an offer to purchase the property which has been excepted by current owner's. the sale of property will be completed - subject to condition including approval of funding from the mental commission & development + approval from the shire of plant yet settlement has already happened. i am not against a rehab, just its position. Kendenup is a sleepy little town. positioned 17kms north of mount barker & 67kms north of Albany. we are not equipped for a rehab centre. property is rural. closest hospital is in Albany that can deal with a rehab. our services are already stretched. we do not have a police station in Kendenup. closest is mount barker + only open 9 am - 4 pm week days. if we call barker we are put thro to Albany. police attendance is around 1 hr away. even longer at times. our drs in mount barker can take weeks to get an appointment. hospital in barker doesn't have a dr on site it can be 2 hours to be attended to. our Kendenup bush fire brigade is all volunteers. they have enough to do with town site & surrounding areas. they already miss out on family time attending to the brigade. mount barker is also volunteers. this proposal is outrageous. it should be close to Albany or Katanning hospitals as they are equipped for mental health.</p> <p>There will be a clinical nurse at the rehab. is this legal on a rural block. they will be there to deal with 4 bed low withdrawal unit & 16 bed rehab. Staff only 2 from 6pm - 7am. how are they going to police residents. they could go walk about & no one would know. then if they go thro neighbouring properties & get lost our ses - vol would have to find them. there are children in neighbouring properties. it is frightening for rate payors & residents. we will have to take more precautions. we didn't pick that life. our properties will devalue. Sunday is visiting 9am - 4pm.</p> <p>We already have cars driving around wandoo ross & Collins road. they are gravel roads, which we have to put maintenance. reports in, then its still weeks before minimum work is done. there are bus shelters for school kids 1 opposite proposed driveway & 1 next to the property. also more stops in Wandoo, Ross, Collins & Moorilup. at sac meeting we asked about screening visitors. we were told they can't screen visitors. Only verbally ask about drugs & alcohol. if someone goes walk about & gets a lift to Kendenup, they can easily go to the local shop or Kendenup country club & get alcohol. they can also get drugs around town. country club is organising more security at its expense, which we don't have the funds.</p> <p>Telephone & internet access is bad at the lodge. internet always drops out & land lines also droop out. if a resident of rehab had contraband & where smoking. They could start a fire. if there was a fire in summer. it could get out of hand easily. when a resident breaks a rule they will be taken home by the facility or relative or friend. that is a joke. they could go straight to licensed premises.</p> <p>They say this property & its location are well suited for long term residential AOD service & low medical withdrawal unit. the property is not suited for perm stay. what about water, also waste. w.i. visitors how can they quote 'are extremely well behaved'. our mental health as a town & surrounding area have to be considered.</p>	<p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety, security, children/school bus, resident movement and perceived anti-social behaviour concerns are noted; amenity and operational management have been assessed, including staffing, supervision, visitor, intake and exit/discharge arrangements. • Police, ambulance, hospital and emergency response resourcing are State service matters and are not determinative planning considerations; the Shire has considered site suitability, access, bushfire and emergency management within its planning role. • Potential impacts on property values or marketability are not valid planning considerations for a development application assessment. • The Shire cannot require the proposal to be lodged on an alternative site; the application must be assessed at the proposed location on its individual planning merits. • Consultation and notification concerns are noted; the application was advertised in accordance with the statutory process and submissions have been considered. Furthermore, the Shire cannot require anyone to contact neighbours regarding a potential sale, that is a civil matter • Further comments are covered in the Council Report
71	<p>Dear Julian</p> <p>RE: Planning Application P902 - Proposal for Lot 843 & Lot 844, 217 Moorilup Road, Kendenup</p> <p>In respect to the Planning Application (P902) for the Great Southern Drug and Alcohol Rehabilitation Centre (GSDARC) proposed for Lot 843 & Lot 844, 217 Moorilup Road, Kendenup, I would like you to consider my below objections and arguments as to why this Planning Application should be rejected by the Shire of Plantagenet Council.</p> <p>Planning Considerations</p> <p>After reading the document (P902), it is evident that the Planning Application for the GSDARC is based on the use of a very obscure provision of the Local Planning Scheme. This provision allows the Council to approve a non-conforming use (a use that is not allowed on that property) if in doing so, it is replacing another existing non-conforming use, and Council feels that the new use is better than the old use.</p> <p>This raises two issues:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How is the current use (Kendenup Lodge and Cottages) and more specifically the "Conference Centre" (used as the basis for the non-conforming argument) non-conforming? 2. If the current use and the proposed use are both classed as non-conforming, then is the new use better than the old use? 	<p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submission raises detailed planning concerns regarding the non-conforming use pathway, land use classification, the "less detrimental" test, Rural zone objectives, consultation, emergency services, community safety, bushfire risk, tourism impacts and strategic planning outcomes. • The proposal has not been assessed as an ordinary discretionary use. "Community Purpose" is an "X" use in the Rural zone and can only be considered if the statutory pathway for changing a non-conforming use is available and the relevant tests are satisfied. • The submitter's concerns regarding whether a lawful non-conforming use exists are noted. The Council Report addresses the approval history of the site, the previous Conference Facility / Reception Centre and Accommodation approval, the current Local Planning Scheme No. 5 land use framework, and the basis on which the application is being

Submission Number	Comments	Officer Assessment
	<p>Current Non-Conforming Use</p> <p>It is well established that a Rehabilitation Facility is classified as “Community Purpose” and under the SOP Local Planning Scheme No. 5, “Community Purpose” in a 'Rural' zone is deemed an 'X-Not Permitted use'. Essentially the Planning application P902 argues that the 2004 approval for a Conference Centre at the Kendenup Lodge and Cottages, is non-conforming, as Conference Centre is not a listed use in the land use table, in the new scheme. That may be technically correct, however, the counter argument is that it not being listed in the land use table, does not mean it is non-conforming. It could be concluded by the Council and Officers, that when the new scheme was written, the Conference Centre use was bundled up with something else in that same table (exhibition centre, art gallery etc). The best way to understand this would be to read the reports from when the new scheme was created.</p> <p>It is also critical to understand that the Council, in Table 5 (and later on) in the same new Scheme, specifically lists those properties that have non-conforming uses as a result of the new scheme coming into effect, and the scheme protects these. The Kendenup Lodge and Cottages is not listed in this table - why not?</p> <p>I would argue that it was never the intent of Council to make the Conference Centre at the Lodge, a non-conforming use, so soon after its approval, otherwise this intent would have been articulated in the scheme. It is not reasonable to state that the use is non-conforming purely because it is not specifically listed in the Land Use Table. Using that argument means that a Conference Centre could not ever be constructed in any zone, as it does not appear as an allowable use for any zoning.</p> <p>The question is, what land use in the new scheme was considered appropriate to encompass a Conference Centre? It is perhaps more logical to conclude that Council and Planning Officers, knew the Conference Centre was there, knew it was approved, had no intent of making it non-conforming, and concluded that the use was adequately encompassed by some other use, in the use class table.</p> <p>I think the Council report/s on the development of the new town planning scheme, and on the 2004 Council approval of the Conference Centre are needed, so that it can be clearly determined what the Council and officers were saying. I would like to note here, that I have requested these documents, however SOP staff and officers have been unable to provide these. These reports should have been made available, as part of this process of advertising, otherwise it cannot be concluded that we (the ratepayers) have been given adequate information to assess this Planning Application.</p> <p>So what happened? Why did Council approve the Conference Centre in 2004 and in the development of new scheme in 2008 onwards, suddenly decide that this use should no longer be allowed? New schemes generally result in use class tables being tidied up, old out of date uses removed, new uses inserted and so on, using the Model Scheme text to guide the process.</p> <p>Is it plausible that the Conference Facility fell out of the use class tables by accident, and no one thought to check to see if the Lodge was impacted? The Scheme provides the opportunity to list properties impacted by a scheme change, but again, the property wasn't listed. Why?</p> <p>The other thing to consider, if the Conference Centre is the basis for the non-conforming use argument, then surely the uses that are not non-conforming (chalets, units accommodation, etc) are all then by definition lawful, and cannot be used by the applicant for the Rehabilitation facility, as a Rehabilitation facility using these for that purpose, isn't allowed. It is not reasonable to draw the conclusion that only the Conference Centre will be used for the GSDARC, so why “cherry pick” that particular component for the purposes of the application and exclude the other facilities that are already conforming.</p> <p>Another point to note is that the proposal is not automatically allowed simply because one non-conforming use already exists. In fact, planning law generally treats expansion or replacement of non-conforming uses cautiously, because the intention is usually to reduce or phase out non-conforming uses over time, not perpetuate them.</p> <p>Previous correspondence with the Shire</p> <p>In 2024, having heard rumours of this proposal to locate a Drug and Alcohol Rehabilitation Centre at this location, I contacted the Shire. I was informed via email by the Executive Manager of Development and Regulatory Services, Mr Andre Pinto, that (and I quote directly from the email);</p>	<p>assessed under the non-conforming use provisions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The fact that the property is not separately listed in a scheme schedule or table identifying non-conforming uses is noted. However, the existence of non-conforming use rights is not dependent only on being listed in a scheme schedule. It is a matter to be assessed having regard to the lawful approval history, the current scheme provisions, the nature and scope of the approved use, and whether the use has been discontinued. • The submitter’s argument that the Conference Facility may have been omitted from Local Planning Scheme No. 5 accidentally is noted. However, Council must determine the application under the current scheme as it stands. The assessment cannot proceed on an assumption that the scheme table contains an error unless the scheme is formally amended. • The submitter’s comments regarding previous Shire correspondence are noted. Any earlier advice was provided before the current application, supporting material and detailed assessment were before the Shire, with such a lack of detail this could not have been known. The Shire was not aware at the time of the future proposal, nor the planning pathway that would be proposed, hence why it was not mentioned at the time, it is a very rare occurrence that such a planning pathway is utilised. Therefore, this previous commentary is not in any way contradictory to where things currently stand nor is there any confusion. Contrary to these comments, the email does not acknowledge positively or negatively anything in relation to non-conforming uses, but rather that the land use is currently operating as a Tourism Development (noting all other land uses were not even mentioned either), it does not say it is approved as so, but rather operating as so as that is the definition it falls under currently, and that there was an approval in 2004 but no reference is made to the exact land uses under the approval. Earlier preliminary advice does not fetter Council’s statutory obligation to assess and determine the application now before it. • The submitter’s concern about “cherry picking” the Conference Facility component is noted. The Council Report addresses the distinction between the existing approved

Submission Number	Comments	Officer Assessment
	<p><i>The State Administrative Tribunal (SAT) in their 2018 WASAT 36 decision, noted that a 'rehab' facility meets the land use definition of 'Community Purpose'</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>· Under the Shire's Local Planning Scheme No. 5, 'Community Purpose' in the 'Rural' zoned is deemed an 'X-Not Permitted use', meaning even if we wanted to approve it, we could not.</i> <i>o As it is an 'X' use, this ties our hands completely, and the State could not over ride that either.</i> <i>o The only way this can change is if they change the permissibility of the 'Community Purpose' land use from 'X' to 'A' or 'D'</i> <i>· 'A'= Development (Planning) Application is required and the application has to be advertised to the surrounding area</i> <i>· 'D'= Development (Planning) Application is required and advertising can be performed if deemed necessary</i> <i>o To make this change to our Local Planning Scheme they have to apply to Council, Council have to provide support to advertise it, if it receives support, it goes to public advertising, should public advertising go favourably, it then goes up to the State government for consideration of the change in the Scheme. The State are the final determination authority of this change. This process usually takes around 10-12 months, and requires a very lengthy amount of justification, reports etc.</i> <i>· At present the current owners are operating an accommodation/function centre (Kendenup Cottages & Lodge) from that address, so obviously that type of facility can be approved under rural zoning?</i> <i>o That is correct yes, there are many 'commercial' style land uses that are possible in the Rural zone, some require approval, some don't, some aren't possible</i> <i>o Tourism accommodation such as the Kendenup Cottages and Lodge, falls under the land use definition of 'Tourist Development' which is possible in the Rural zone. From our records, it appears to have been approved in approximately 2004ish</i> <p><i>Just to provide clarity, the future owners can apply to have the accommodation/function centre land use changed to anything they wish, this does not mean it will be approved though, nor does it mean its possible to obtain approval using the current planning framework.</i></p> <p>So in 2024, the Shire itself, represented by the most senior Officer in Town Planning, was of the opinion that the Kendenup Lodge and Cottages was both legal and had no non-confirming issues.</p> <p>Two years later, the most recent Council Officer in the very same role (according to the applicant's submission) indicated that the Conference Facility was non-confirming and the applicant could seek approval for their proposal using the "non-confirming" provision in the Local Planning Scheme.</p> <p>If there was such confusion in respect to this matter, within staff, how can the Council reasonably conclude that the Conference facility was ever intended to be non-confirming? The only real way to understand why the use class table was varied and this use was removed, is to review the Council reports from 2008-2011 when the new LPS was being developed. I note here, once again, that I have been trying to obtain these, but SOP staff have been unable to provide these to me.</p> <p>Which is Better?</p> <p>If the Council does allow the use of the non-confirming provision of the Scheme, then it must be assured that both uses are non-confirming and that the proposed new use (Rehabilitation Centre) is a better use of the land than the current use (Conference Facility).</p> <p>The important clauses which are relevant are below in bold:</p> <p>" If a use of land is identified in a zone as being a class X use, the local government must refuse an application for development approval for that use in that zone unless:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) the development approval application relates to land that is being used for a non-confirming use; and (b) the local government considers that the proposed use of the land would be less detrimental than the non-confirming use." <p>And</p>	<p>accommodation / tourism components and the Conference Facility / Reception Centre component, being the relevant non-confirming use relied upon for the current application.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The submitter correctly notes that the existence of a non-confirming use does not automatically allow approval of another prohibited use. The Council Report addresses the statutory tests, including whether the proposed use is less detrimental to the amenity of the locality and closer to the intended purpose of the Rural zone. ● The assessment does not rely solely on a theoretical maximum-capacity operation of the existing approval. The historic approval is relevant to identifying the lawful scope of the existing non-confirming use, but the proposal has also been assessed on its current and actual planning merits, including the submitted operational model, proposed resident numbers, staffing, traffic, visitor arrangements, bushfire risk, servicing, amenity and surrounding land use context. ● The submitter's comments regarding the intermittent nature of the existing use compared with the ongoing nature of the proposed use are valid planning considerations. These matters are addressed in the Council Report through the comparison of land use intensity, operating characteristics, traffic generation, visitor movements, noise, built form, amenity and operational management. ● The proposed Rehabilitation Facility is materially different from the existing tourism / accommodation / reception centre use. However, the statutory test is not whether the two uses are the same. The test is whether the proposed use satisfies the requirements for a change of non-confirming use, including the relative amenity and zone-purpose considerations. ● The submitter's concerns regarding the Rural zone objectives and sensitive land use conflict are valid planning considerations. The Council Report addresses the Rural zone objectives, surrounding rural and rural-residential context, nearby land uses, and whether the proposal would create unacceptable land use conflict. ● The submitter's position that the proposal should instead proceed by way of rezoning or

Submission Number	Comments	Officer Assessment
	<p>Clause 23 (1) d - A person must not, without development approval — change the use of land from a non-conforming use to another use that is not permitted by the Scheme.</p> <p>(3) A local government may only grant development approval for a change of use of land referred to in subclause (1)(d) if, in the opinion of the local government, the proposed use —</p> <p>(a) is less detrimental to the amenity of the locality than the existing non-conforming use; and</p> <p>(b) is closer to the intended purpose of the zone in which the land is situated"</p> <p>The Operational Management Plan submitted by the Lead Agency (Southern Aboriginal Corporation) in partnership with Cyrenian House, appears to provide an argument as to the merit of the facility and how it will be managed. However, if the use is not allowed in the Scheme and it wasn't in 2004 either, then its use is not consistent with the Council's vision for the rural area, and not what the Council wanted to encourage when either Scheme was created.</p> <p>The Conference Facility, by comparison was allowable, and with some confidence, was omitted from the current scheme, perhaps in in error, not by design. How then, can Council decide that the GSDARC is better than a Conference Facility in this location? If this conclusion cannot be drawn, how can this be approved using this provision of the scheme?</p> <p>Furthermore, non-conforming provisions exist to protect established rights rather than create a mechanism for introducing entirely new prohibited land uses into a Rural zone. The proposal appears to introduce a substantially different and potentially more intensive operation than the existing use. Based on the information currently available, it has not been demonstrated that the proposed Rehabilitation facility would be less detrimental to the amenity of the locality as required under the Scheme provisions governing non-conforming uses.</p> <p>The question before Council is whether the proposed Rehabilitation facility would result in a reduction in planning impacts when compared to the existing use. The current lawful use of the site as accommodation and reception/event facilities is inherently intermittent, booking-based and temporary in nature, involving guests arriving for defined purposes and departing after short stays, with activity levels fluctuating according to demand and often including extended periods of little or no activity. By contrast, the proposed rehabilitation facility introduces a fundamentally different operational profile involving ongoing residential occupation, continual year-round use, structured staffing arrangements, supervision and support functions, external service providers and continual management requirements.</p> <p>Unlike the existing use, which naturally experiences periods of inactivity, the proposed use appears to create a pattern of continuous land use intensity. Amenity impacts in rural areas are not measured solely by noise, but by the cumulative effect of traffic movements, staffing shifts, service access, lighting, frequency of activity and the overall character and intensity of land use. Rural residents reasonably expect low-intensity development, predictable land use patterns and periods of quiet. While individual activities associated with the proposed use may appear modest in isolation, their cumulative effect may fundamentally alter the character and amenity of the zone. Importantly, insufficient information has been provided regarding resident numbers, staffing levels, shift arrangements, visitor access, vehicle movements and service demands to allow a proper assessment. In the absence of such evidence and the corresponding Management Plans, Council cannot reasonably conclude that the proposal would be less detrimental to the local amenity than the existing non-conforming use. At best, the application demonstrates a different land use, it has not demonstrated a less detrimental one.</p> <p>Furthermore, the proposal has not demonstrated that it is closer to the intended purpose of the Rural zone as required under the Scheme provisions governing changes to non-conforming uses. Under Local Planning Scheme No. 5, the objectives of the Rural zone include maintaining and enhancing rural character, protecting broadacre agricultural activities as the primary land use, preserving environmental qualities and limiting the introduction of inappropriate sensitive land uses. The Scheme also allows for a range of tourism-based land uses, and the Shire has established planning policies recognising that tourism activities can be appropriately integrated into rural areas where they are compatible with surrounding land uses and contribute to the local economy. This demonstrates that tourism and accommodation uses are anticipated within the planning framework and are regarded as reasonably compatible with the intended function of the Rural zone.</p> <p>By comparison, a residential drug and alcohol Rehabilitation facility represents a fundamentally different land use with therapeutic, institutional and community-service characteristics that do not naturally align with the primary purpose of the Rural zone. A Rehabilitation facility may also constitute a sensitive land use, potentially giving rise to land-use conflicts with surrounding farming operations. Rural landowners should be able to continue ordinary agricultural practices,</p>	<p>scheme amendment is noted. However, the Shire cannot require an applicant to pursue a different planning pathway where an application has been lodged under an available statutory pathway. The application must be assessed and determined on its merits under the current planning framework.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approval of the application would not create an unrestricted or indefinite entitlement to any future prohibited use. Any approval would be limited to the approved use, approved plans, approved management documents and conditions. The non-conforming use provisions would continue to apply, including the provisions relating to discontinuance of a non-conforming use. The submitter's comments regarding the Shire of Manjimup / Yeagarup matter are noted. That matter is not binding on the Shire and involved a different site, scheme context, proposal history and planning pathway. Each application must be assessed on its own facts and merits. The submitter's concerns regarding public advertising are noted. The Council Report outlines the advertising undertaken, including direct landowner notification, onsite signage, Shire website material, social media and newspaper publication. The advertising exceeded the minimum statutory period required for this type of application. Concerns about consultation undertaken by the applicant are noted. Applicant-led consultation is not a statutory precondition to determination. The relevant planning requirement is that the Shire undertake public advertising in accordance with the applicable planning framework, which has been addressed in the Council Report and conducted accordingly. Emergency services, police resourcing, ambulance availability and hospital capacity are acknowledged as community concerns. However, the allocation and operational capacity of police, ambulance and health services are State-level service matters and are not matters the Shire can directly control through a planning approval. The planning assessment has instead considered emergency access, bushfire risk, evacuation procedures, operational management and whether the land is suitable for the proposed

Submission Number	Comments	Officer Assessment
	<p>including early morning/late night machinery operation, movement of heavy vehicles, livestock activities, spraying, seeding, harvesting and other accepted farming practices, without concern that such activities may create conflict or complaints due to the introduction of a nearby sensitive use. Objective 4 of the Rural zone specifically seeks to protect the operation and future development of rural land uses by limiting the introduction of inappropriate sensitive land uses. Rather than moving the site closer to the intended purpose of the Rural zone, the proposal appears to move further away from it. It is therefore impossible to conclude that a residential Rehabilitation facility is more closely aligned with the objectives of the Rural zone than an accommodation and tourism-based use already contemplated within the Scheme framework.</p> <p>Precedent</p> <p>A particularly relevant precedent exists in relation to an earlier Cyrenian House rehabilitation proposal at Yeagarup in the Shire of Manjimup. After the original proposal was refused by Council (using the same non-conforming use pathway), the matter was appealed to the State Administrative Tribunal (SAT), however the applicant ultimately withdrew its application, bringing the proceedings to an end. The proposal was then reconsidered through an alternative planning pathway involving a Scheme Amendment (rezoning), but Council again resolved not to support it, citing concerns including pressure on health services, land use conflict and significant community opposition. This is highly relevant to this application because it demonstrates that rehabilitation facilities cannot simply rely on planning technicalities or alternative approval pathways to overcome fundamental concerns regarding land use compatibility and community impact. Where there are genuine questions around suitability, service capacity and consistency with the planning intent of a zone, those issues remain central and cannot simply be bypassed through procedural technicalities. It highlights that Councils are entitled to take a firm position where a proposal is inconsistent with the long-term interests of the communities they represent. I encourage all Councillors and SOP Planning staff to read and familiarise themselves with this case as it forms a strong precedent and is highly pertinent to Application P902.</p> <p>Advertising period</p> <p>The public consultation process for this application appears to have been inadequate given the scale, complexity and significance of the development being proposed. The full Planning application documentation was not initially made available on the Shire's website and was only uploaded after I contacted the Chief Executive Officer directly, approximately eight days into the public submission period. This meant that for a substantial portion of the submission period, community members were expected to form views on the proposal without access to the detailed planning material necessary to assess the application.</p> <p>In addition, the application was not published in the Plantagenet News until the 20 May 2026, leaving the broader community with only six days remaining before submissions closed on 26 May 2026. For a proposal involving a substantial change in land use with potentially significant impacts on neighbouring landowners and the wider Kendenup community, this timeframe appears unreasonably limited. Reliance primarily on online publication may also have unintentionally digitally excluded members of the community, particularly elderly people and those with limited internet access or digital literacy. Many residents in Kendenup do not regularly access public notices and planning information online and instead rely on the Plantagenet News, word of mouth and direct notification to become aware of important matters affecting their community.</p> <p>Effective community consultation requires not only that information be digitally available, but that affected persons are provided with a fair and practical opportunity to access, understand and respond to the application. In this case, I raise genuine concerns as to whether the community was afforded sufficient time and opportunity to do so.</p> <p>What benefits to the Kendenup community?</p> <p>The proposal fails to demonstrate any tangible benefit to the Kendenup community and instead appears to place the burden of a regional or state-wide service onto a small rural locality with limited infrastructure and resources. Kendenup is a farming community built around agriculture, families, rural living and a quiet country lifestyle. The proposed development does not support or strengthen those existing characteristics and does not appear to contribute to the intended future direction of the area. There is no evidence that the Rehabilitation Centre would provide significant long-term local employment, improve local infrastructure, expand community facilities, or deliver any measurable benefits to local residents.</p> <p>Local community members experience addiction issues are not permitted to use the facility and the primary users of the Centre will be from outside the region. This means the Kendenup community would be expected to absorb the impacts of the development while receiving little or no corresponding local benefit. Those</p>	<p>use.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns regarding community safety, resident supervision, visitors, residents leaving the program and potential impacts on nearby families are noted. These are addressed in the Council Report through consideration of the Operational Management Plan, staffing, intake processes, supervision, visitor controls, exit/discharge procedures and recommended conditions. Personal anxiety, fear and distress experienced by residents are acknowledged. However, perceived fear or generalised concern, without evidence of a likely planning impact, is not by itself a determinative planning consideration. The assessment must focus on land use impacts capable of being assessed under the planning framework, including amenity, traffic, noise, safety, access, bushfire and operational management. The submitter's comments regarding tourism impacts are noted. Loss of a private accommodation business is not, of itself, a determinative planning reason for refusal. The assessment has considered whether the proposed use is acceptable on the subject land under the applicable non-conforming use provisions, rather than whether a tourism use would be preferred by some members of the community. The submitter's comments regarding the Shire of Manjimup / Yeagarup matter are noted. That matter occurred in a different local government area and involved a different site, planning framework, proposal history, community context and decision-making process. The Shire is not in a position to comment on the merits, circumstances or decision-making processes of another local government. The Manjimup matter is not binding on the Shire of Plantagenet and does not determine the outcome of this application. There is no binding precedent created by a planning decision of another local government, as each development application must be assessed on its own facts, site context, applicable planning framework, submissions received and relevant planning merits. While decisions in other jurisdictions may be of general interest, they do not replace the Shire's obligation to determine this application under Local

Submission Number	Comments	Officer Assessment
	<p>impacts may include increased pressure on already stretched emergency and medical services, increased traffic and activity, additional demands on volunteer resources and a substantial change to the established rural character of the locality. Importantly, the proposal seeks approval for a land use that is not ordinarily contemplated within the Rural zone and relies upon exceptional planning provisions to proceed. In such circumstances, a compelling public planning benefit should be clearly demonstrated. No such case has been made. Instead, the proposal appears to transfer the burden and consequences of a regional social service onto a small rural community that has neither sought nor planned for such a development. The broader social value of rehabilitation services is not in dispute; however, the issue before Council is whether Kendenup is an appropriate and strategically justified location. Based on the information provided, that has not been established.</p> <p>Impacts on Local Emergency Services</p> <p>Kendenup does not have the level of emergency service infrastructure and support capacity that larger regional centres can rely upon. As Councillors you are well aware, our community depends heavily on volunteers, particularly volunteer ambulance officers and volunteer bush fire brigade members. These people already give extraordinary amounts of their own time to support and protect our community. They are not an endless resource and are becoming increasingly difficult to recruit and retain.</p> <p>The Mt Barker Hospital provides an important service to the district, however its role and service capacity are extremely limited. It is a small rural hospital that provides valuable frontline care, but it is not equipped with the specialist infrastructure or higher-level support services that facilities of this nature may potentially require. More complex incidents will, no doubt, require transfer to the Albany Health Campus, 70kms away, creating further reliance on already stretched St Johns volunteers and tying up the only local Ambulance in the Kendenup community.</p> <p>The reality of rural service limitations is something that local Kendenup residents experience regularly. Access to GP appointments in Mt Barker can already involve lengthy delays, with it not uncommon to wait for weeks, if not months, to get an appointment. Police resources across the district are stretched across a large area and the fact that we have no Police presence in the town, is also a concern. When Police are needed after hours and on weekends, calls are diverted to Albany and quite often there are lengthy delays in Police response times.</p> <p>Recent incidents close to the Kendenup Lodge and Cottages, illustrate these constraints. Two significant motor vehicle accidents have occurred within 500 metres and 700 metres of the proposed rehabilitation facility location, in the last five years. In one very serious incident, Police took two and a half hours to attend and then responded from Albany. In another, Police did not arrive until approximately one hour after the accident occurred. These examples are not raised to criticise the Police, but rather to demonstrate the practical realities that the Kendenup community deal with when we require Police and other emergency services.</p> <p>With this in mind, it is concerning that a residential Drug and Alcohol Rehabilitation facility, potentially involving vulnerable patients, crisis situations, ongoing support requirements and increased demand on health, Police and emergency services, is being proposed in a location with such limited capacity. The application appears to assume that there will be no instances and that existing systems can simply absorb any increased demand. This, however, reflects a naive and overly optimistic position that demonstrates a concerning lack of understanding of our community and the realities of living in a small rural town where emergency response capability, health services and support systems are already operating under significant pressure.</p> <p>While the broader purpose of rehabilitation services is not questioned, the Kendenup community should not be placed in a position where local families, volunteers and already stretched services are expected to absorb the consequences of a development that offers little direct benefit to the community itself. There is a genuine concern that this proposal places an unfair burden on our town that simply does not have the infrastructure, emergency response capability or support networks necessary to sustain it safely and responsibly.</p> <p>Lack of Community Consultation</p> <p>The Southern Aboriginal Corporation and Cyrenian House failed to undertake consultation with key stakeholders and the Kendenup community before advancing this proposal. I have contacted local critical stakeholders, including the Mt Barker Police, St Johns Ambulance, Plantagenet Medial and the Kendenup Bushfire Brigade and all were not consulted, despite these organisations being the very services likely to experience increased pressure, should the proposal proceed. For a residential rehabilitation facility with potential implications for emergency response, health services and community safety, this represents a serious and concerning omission.</p>	<p>Planning Scheme No. 5 and the applicable planning legislation. Each development application must be assessed on its own facts and planning merits, having regard to the applicable local planning scheme, deemed provisions, relevant planning policies, submissions received and the material before Council.</p> <p>Community concerns are acknowledged and must be considered. However, community opposition, emotional concern or a general request for Councillors to "stand with the community" is not, by itself, a valid planning reason for refusal.</p> <p>Councillors are required to make a planning decision based on valid planning considerations. A refusal based primarily on non-planning grounds, unsupported concerns, or general community opposition may be vulnerable to review by the State Administrative Tribunal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Claims that the proposal provides limited direct benefit to Kendenup are noted. A development application is not required to demonstrate direct local benefit to every nearby resident. The relevant planning question is whether the proposed land use is capable of approval under the planning framework and whether its impacts can be appropriately managed. • Community opposition is acknowledged and has been considered. However, the level of opposition is not, by itself, a determinative planning consideration. Council must make its decision based on the planning merits of the application, the relevant statutory framework, submissions received and the assessment contained in the Council Report. • On balance, the matters raised in the submission have been considered in detail. While the submission raises substantive planning issues, the Council Report concludes that the proposal is capable of support subject to conditions, as the statutory tests for a change of non-conforming use are considered to be satisfied and the likely planning impacts can be appropriately managed.

Submission Number	Comments	Officer Assessment
	<p>Equally concerning is the lack of genuine engagement with local residents. Rather than engaging openly and early with the Kendenup community, consultation appears to have been treated as an afterthought once the proposal had already progressed to Council. This demonstrates a complete lack of regard by the Southern Aboriginal Corporation and Cyrenian House for the Kendenup community, the volunteers who support it, and the local services already operating under significant strain. Communities deserve to be engaged with respectfully and transparently from the outset, not informed after decisions have effectively already been made.</p> <p>Safety and Security of the Community</p> <p>The way this proposal has unfolded and the uncertainty around what it could mean for us personally, has placed an enormous emotional strain on my family and caused ongoing stress and anxiety. Kendenup has been home to my family and our forebears for 120 years, and this is far more than just a place where we live, this is home. When the time came to raise our own children, we chose to stay in Kendenup because we believed it offered a safe, quiet rural lifestyle that families move here for. We wanted our children to grow up with freedom, independence and the sense of security that comes from living in a small rural town.</p> <p>We live just under 600m from the proposed GSDARC. My children regularly ride their bikes and horses around the area and our son gets on and off the school bus on his own, right near the proposed facility. As a parent, this has created genuine fear and anxiety. Until now, there has never been a reason to question our children's safety or independence within our community. Now we find ourselves asking questions we never thought we would have to ask. Will we still feel comfortable allowing our children the same freedom? Will we feel the need to supervise them more closely? Will we feel anxious every time they ride down the road or wait alone for the school bus? Regardless of assurances that may be offered, these concerns are real and they weigh heavily on us as parents. The emotional impact of no longer feeling completely confident in the safety of the place you chose to raise your family is an incredibly difficult pill to swallow.</p> <p>What has made this even more confronting is seeing the impact on others in our community. There is a lovely elderly retired couple living directly opposite the proposed facility. It was heartbreaking to see the retired farmer so visibly upset and distressed by the uncertainty and anxiety this proposal has caused. Vulnerable people who have spent their lives working hard in this community should be enjoying peace and security in retirement, not carrying genuine fear and stress about what the future of their neighbourhood may look like. This proposal is creating real anxiety, real stress and real fear within our community, and people are now questioning how safe we will be in this neighbourhood should the proposed facility eventuate.</p> <p>No matter what rules, policies or assurances are put in place, Southern Aboriginal Corporation and Cyrenian House cannot control everything that happens beyond the boundaries of the facility. While they may be able to manage activities within the site itself, they cannot control outside influences, who visits the facility, or the wider impacts that may flow into the Kendenup community. That is a very real concern for local families because the effects are not necessarily contained within the property boundary.</p> <p>The proposed GSDARC appears to have no functional external security fencing and patients would be free to leave the facility at any time. This raises practical questions that do not appear to have been adequately addressed. If a resident chooses to leave the program early, where are they expected to go? How will they travel into Kendenup or Mt Barker? What transport arrangements are proposed, particularly outside normal hours or in crisis situations?</p> <p>There is a legitimate concern regarding the potential impact on neighbouring properties. In the absence of and public transport, support or immediate supervision, what assurances can be provided that individuals will not seek assistance, shelter or transport from nearby residents or properties? While many people undertaking rehabilitation may be committed to positive change, it must also be acknowledged that facilities of this nature can involve individuals experiencing addiction issues, mental health challenges, emotional distress, personal crises or other complex circumstances. At times, these people may behave unpredictably, make impulsive decisions or act out of desperation. If an incident occurs, are you going to personally vouch for the safety of my family and my property?</p> <p>These are not matters that should simply be dismissed as unlikely scenarios. Neighbouring residents and local families should not be expected to accept uncertainty regarding the safety of their homes, families and properties without clear evidence that these risks have been realistically assessed and addressed.</p> <p>Kendenup is a small rural community where people value the sense of safety, trust and security that comes with rural living. Once a facility of this nature is established, the broader impacts on the immediate neighbours and the wider Kendenup community cannot simply be managed through policies and procedures on paper and if an incident occurs, it will be the local neighbours and residents who will ultimately bear the consequences.</p> <p>Tourism Impacts</p>	

Submission Number	Comments	Officer Assessment
	<p>Kendenup and the surrounding district are increasingly recognised as a tourism destination and this proposal is not consistent with the direction our community has been moving toward for many years. We sit at the doorstep of the Stirling Range National Park and are surrounded by wineries, scenic rural landscapes and easy access to some of Western Australia's beautiful coastal areas. Visitors come to this region for its natural beauty, peaceful rural atmosphere and country hospitality. Tourism is well established in our region and it supports local businesses, attracts investment and creates employment opportunities.</p> <p>The existing use of this site as an accommodation venue aligns with that direction and with the Shire's recognition that tourism-based uses can be appropriate within the Rural zone. This proposal would permanently remove another accommodation option from the district and replace it with a use that does not complement or strengthen the tourism future of the area. In doing so, it risks reducing visitor capacity, undermining future tourism opportunities and potentially costing local jobs and investment. At a time when communities such as Kendenup should be building on their natural strengths and promoting sustainable tourism growth, this proposal represents a step away from the future many local residents see for our community.</p> <p>Shire of Manjimup</p> <p>The experience of the Shire of Manjimup provides an important precedent and a reminder of the role elected Councillors play in representing the communities they serve. When a Planning Application (using the same non-conforming use argument) associated with a rehabilitation facility at Yeagarup was considered, there was strong community response, formal deputations, petitions and significant public engagement. Community members made their concerns known and Council was required to carefully weigh, not only the merits of the proposal, but also the potential impacts on the location and the wishes of the community directly affected. That process recognised an important principle, Councillors are elected not simply to assess planning documents in isolation, but to represent and advocate for their communities.</p> <p>The Kendenup community has made it clear that there are genuine concerns surrounding this proposal, including emergency service capacity, community safety, suitability of the location and long-term impacts on the character of the area. Councillors now face an important decision and are encouraged to stand with and represent the people who elected them, to listen to the concerns being raised and to protect the long-term safety and interests of the community they serve, not the interests of external corporations or businesses that have no vested interest in the long term future of our community.</p> <p>Concluding Remarks – Key Matters for Council Consideration</p> <p>In summary, for the reasons outlined throughout this submission, I respectfully request that Council carefully consider the following key issues before making any determination on Planning Application P902 and ultimately VOTE AGAINST the application on the below points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. The proposal relies upon an obscure and highly questionable interpretation of the non-conforming use provisions within the Local Planning Scheme. It has not been clearly established that the existing Conference Facility was ever intended to become a non-conforming use in the first place. 4. The Kendenup Lodge and Cottages is not identified within the Scheme provisions that specifically protect existing non-conforming uses, raising serious questions as to whether Council ever intended the land use to be non-conforming. 5. The Shire itself previously advised in 2024 that a Rehabilitation facility was an "X – Not Permitted" use in the Rural zone and that approval was effectively impossible without a Scheme Amendment process. It is difficult to reconcile that position with the current interpretation now being advanced. 6. The proposal has failed to demonstrate that the Rehabilitation facility would be "less detrimental to the amenity of the locality" than the existing use, as required under the Scheme. The current use is intermittent, tourism-based and temporary, whereas the proposed use introduces continual occupation, staffing, support services and year-round activity. 7. The proposal has failed to demonstrate that it is "closer to the intended purpose of the Rural zone." Tourism and accommodation uses are already recognised and anticipated within the planning framework. A residential Rehabilitation facility with institutional characteristics appears to move further away from the intended purpose of the zone, not closer to it. 8. A strong planning precedent exists in the Shire of Manjimup, where a similar Cyrenian House proposal was refused, challenged through SAT and ultimately withdrawn by the applicant before later being rejected again through a Scheme Amendment pathway. 	

Submission Number	Comments	Officer Assessment
	<p>9. The proposal places a significant burden on the Kendenup community that lacks the infrastructure and resources to support it. Kendenup does not have a major hospital nearby, local GP services are already under severe pressure and emergency response relies heavily on volunteers.</p> <p>10. Key stakeholders including Police, local St Johns Ambulance, Plantagenet Medical, Kendenup Bushfire Brigade and other volunteer emergency responders were not consulted despite likely being directly impacted by the proposal.</p> <p>11. Community consultation by Southern Aboriginal Corporation and Cyrenian House was inadequate and appears to have been treated as an afterthought, with local residents only becoming aware of the proposal late in the process.</p> <p>12. The public advertising process itself was inadequate, with a critical document only uploaded after direct contact with the CEO and broader newspaper publication occurring with only six days remaining in the submission period.</p> <p>13. The proposal provides little measurable benefit to the Kendenup community, while potentially creating significant social, service and amenity impacts.</p> <p>14. The proposal is causing genuine distress within the community, creating anxiety and uncertainty for families, elderly residents and long-term local landowners who chose Kendenup specifically for its safety, rural character and lifestyle.</p> <p>15. This proposal is inconsistent with the future direction of Kendenup as a tourism destination, potentially removing accommodation capacity, impacting local jobs and undermining already established tourism/accommodation providers.</p> <p>This submission is not an argument against rehabilitation services themselves. Rehabilitation facilities play an important role in supporting people experiencing addiction and helping individuals rebuild their lives. The issue before Council is whether this particular proposal, in this particular location, and through this particular planning pathway, is appropriate.</p> <p>A major concern is the reliance on the non-conforming use pathway, which appears to be little more than an attempt to fast-track this proposal rather than undertake the more appropriate rezoning process. A rezoning application exists specifically to allow broader consultation, strategic planning assessment and proper investigation of long-term impacts. Instead, this proposal has been brought forward under a pathway that limits those opportunities and reduces the level of scrutiny a development of this nature warrants.</p> <p>Based on the planning framework, unresolved land use question, the lack of meaningful consultation, the strain on local infrastructure and emergency services, and the overwhelming community concern, this application SHOULD NOT be supported. Before making your decision, ask yourself one simple question: <i>Would you want this facility located next door to your own home and family?</i> If there is hesitation in answering that question, perhaps that reflects the very concerns being raised by the Kendenup community.</p> <p>I encourage all Councillors to stand with the community they were elected to represent and vote against Planning Application P902.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Cindy North</p>	
72	<p>Hi Shubhra, This information should've been sent out to residents and owners to vote on. I've spoken to some owners but no one has any knowledge of the proposal. All are set against it. Some of the owners are out of town so attending the meeting at such short notice is impossible. I propose a vote be sent out to All owners.</p>	<p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultation and notification concerns are noted; the application was advertised in accordance with the statutory process and submissions have been considered. • The Shire did not organise these community meetings, local residents and the proponent did, therefore the Shire

Submission Number	Comments	Officer Assessment
	<p>Regards Sandra</p>	<p>cannot send out invitations to this, nor notify residents of this.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further comments are covered in the Council Report
73	<p>Dear Shire of Plantagenet Councillors,</p> <p>I am writing as a local General Practitioner working in the Great Southern region to express my support for the proposed Great Southern Drug and Alcohol Rehabilitation Centre at Moorilup Road, Kendenup.</p> <p>From a clinical perspective, there is a clear and ongoing unmet need for accessible, structured alcohol and other drug (AOD) treatment services within our region. Patients frequently require residential rehabilitation and withdrawal support, yet are often required to travel significant distances to access care. This creates barriers to treatment, contributes to delayed presentations, and increases the burden on local health services, including general practice, emergency departments, and mental health services.</p> <p>The proposed model outlined in the Operational Management Plan appears consistent with contemporary, evidence-based care. In particular, the combination of a 16-bed residential rehabilitation program with a 4-bed low medical withdrawal unit provides a clinically appropriate continuum of care.</p> <p>I note several features of the proposal that are reassuring from both a clinical and community safety perspective:</p> <p>The facility will accommodate a relatively small number of residents (maximum 20), significantly less intensive than the currently approved use of the site for large functions and accommodation.</p> <p>The program is highly structured, supervised 24/7, and operates under a Therapeutic Community model, which emphasises accountability, routine, and behavioural change.</p> <p>Residents are screened prior to admission, with exclusion of individuals with significant violent or sexual offending histories.</p> <p>Alcohol and drug use is prohibited on site, with regular testing and monitoring.</p> <p>These factors collectively reduce the risk of adverse impacts on the surrounding community and differentiate this type of service from less structured or unsupervised accommodation.</p> <p>Importantly, effective rehabilitation services provide broader community benefit. When individuals are able to access appropriate treatment, we see reductions in alcohol-related harm, family violence, mental health crises, and presentations to already stretched healthcare services. In this sense, facilities such as this are not only a health service, but a preventative investment in community wellbeing.</p> <p>Rural and regional areas like ours particularly benefit from locally based services that allow individuals to remain connected to their communities, culture, and support networks during recovery. The involvement of very experienced organisations such as Cyrenian House and an Indigenous-led approach also aligns with best practice in culturally appropriate care delivery.</p> <p>While it is appropriate that community concerns are considered, from a medical and public health standpoint, the proposed centre represents a necessary and positive addition to the region's health infrastructure.</p> <p>I therefore support the approval of this development.</p> <p>Kind Regards, Dr Phillip Marmion (Albany based G.P)</p>	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support from a local health practitioner is noted, including comments on regional AOD service need and the proposed clinical model. • The social and health benefits of the proposal are relevant considerations and have been considered. • The proposal remains subject to land-use classification, non-conforming use and amenity assessment requirements.
74	<p>Dear Julian</p> <p>RE: Community Submission Planning Application P902 - Proposal for Lot 843 & Lot 844, 217 Moorilup Road, Kendenup</p> <p>For the past 22 years, Kendenup has been home for our family. This is where we chose to raise our children and build our lives because of the things that make small country communities special. Safety, strong community values, open spaces and freedom are all things that I enjoyed as a child and I wanted my children to be able to experience the same.</p> <p>I want to make it clear from the outset that this is not an argument against rehabilitation services or the people who need them. Helping people overcome addiction is important and rehabilitation services absolutely have a place in society. The issue for me is whether this particular proposal, in this location, and through this particular process, is appropriate for Kendenup and the long-term future of our community.</p> <p>One of my biggest concerns is the planning pathway being used. The proposal appears to use an unusual interpretation of the Local Planning Scheme and an argument around "non-conforming use" provisions. There seems to be some confusion and unanswered questions around whether the existing Conference Facility at the Lodge was ever intended to be considered non-conforming in the first place. If that cannot be clearly established, then it raises legitimate concerns about the basis of the application itself.</p> <p>If this proposal genuinely represents a major change in land use, then I believe it should go through the proper rezoning process where greater consultation, strategic assessment and a detailed investigation can occur. Instead, it feels as though a pathway has been selected that rushes the proposal before Council and limits opportunities for proper scrutiny and community input.</p> <p>There are also real questions around whether the proposed use is actually less impactful than the current use of the site. The Lodge currently operates as accommodation and a function venue where activity naturally comes and goes. There are busy periods and there are quiet periods. A residential rehabilitation facility is very different. It introduces continual occupation, staffing arrangements, support services and year-round activity. That is not a minor change, it represents an entirely different operation and is a very different facility to that of the Lodge and Cottages.</p> <p>Kendenup is a small rural community with limited services and infrastructure. We do not have a major hospital nearby and we rely heavily on volunteers. There is no Police based in Kendenup and often this service is directed through to Albany when the local Mt Barker Police are not able to attend. Ambulance officers,</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submission raises concerns regarding the non-conforming use pathway, consultation, emergency service capacity, community safety, rural amenity, tourism impacts and site suitability. • "Community Purpose" is an "X" use in the Rural zone and has not been assessed as an ordinary discretionary use. The proposal can only be considered through the non-conforming use provisions if the relevant statutory tests are satisfied. • Concerns regarding whether the existing Conference Facility / Reception Centre is a lawful non-conforming use are noted. This matter is addressed in the Council Report, including the site approval history, land use classification and applicable non-conforming use provisions. • The submitter's view that the proposal should proceed by rezoning is noted. However, the Shire must assess the application lodged under the current planning framework and cannot require the applicant to pursue an alternative pathway where a statutory pathway is

Submission Number	Comments	Officer Assessment
	<p>volunteer firefighters and local community members already give an enormous amount of their own time to support the district and I feel that it is an unreasonable burden to place on these already stretch services.</p> <p>People living in rural communities understand the realities that come with country life. We know what it means to wait for medical appointments and emergency responses, and we understand the challenges that come with distance and limited resources. That is why it is concerning that local organisations and services that may ultimately experience increased demand from this proposal, do not appear to have been consulted from the beginning. If a proposal has the potential to impact local emergency services, health providers and volunteers, those discussions should have happened earlier, before the proposal was put to Council. Put quite simply, we do not have the appropriate and timely access to support services that would be essential for the operation of a Rehabilitation Centre in Kendenup. It would be dangerous and irresponsible for the Council to approve this facility knowing full well that it could potentially place the community in a very vulnerable position.</p> <p>Beyond the planning arguments and service impacts, there is also a very personal side to this. My family lives less than 600 metres from the proposed facility. My children ride horses and bikes around the area and catch the school bus nearby. We also farm and run sheep directly opposite the facility. Up until now, we have never had any reason to question the safety and independence that comes with raising children in a small country community. However now I have genuine concerns for the safety of my family, should this proposal eventuate. I spend lengthy periods of time working away from home and I worry that during my absence, my wife and children could be at a substantially increased safety risk with having this facility so close by.</p> <p>No matter what policies or procedures are put in place, Southern Aboriginal Corporation and Cyrenian House cannot control everything outside the boundaries of the facility. They cannot control outside influences, visitors or every situation that may arise beyond the property itself and that is where this is of great concern to me. There appears to be a number of questions that are not answered by the Operational Management Plan provided by the applicant. If someone leaves the program unexpectedly, what happens? How do they travel into town? How are difficult situations managed? There are too many unanswered questions and the Plan provided has done little to address these issues or other community concerns that were raised in the meeting with SAC and Cyrenian House at the Kendenup Town Hall.</p> <p>Unfortunately it only takes one incident and it will be the local families and neighbours that will have to live with the consequences.</p> <p>Kendenup is also a community that has been building a future around tourism. We are fortunate to live in a beautiful part of the Great Southern and we attract many tourists and visitors to the area each year. We will now be losing another accommodation venue in Kendenup which will not help to promote visitors to the region. Replacing an existing accommodation venue with a Rehabilitation facility is a dramatic step away from the direction many people see this community heading.</p> <p>I would like to ask that you please consider the impacts that this will have on not only on the immediate neighbours of the proposed facility, but the whole Kendenup community. Why should the benefits to a small and select group of individuals, outweigh the greater concerns and the potential safety issues of the entire Kendenup community? 3</p> <p>I ask that you give this matter your greatest attention and please keep in mind that your responsibility is to us, the ratepayers. You are elected to represent our views and consider our thoughts and opinions, first and foremost.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration of my submission.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Charlie North 23 Newdegate Road Kendenup WA 6323</p>	<p>available.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed use is materially different from the existing accommodation / function venue use. The Council Report considers this distinction, including operating model, resident numbers, staffing, traffic, visitor arrangements, amenity impacts and management requirements. • Concerns regarding police, ambulance, hospital and emergency service capacity are acknowledged. These are largely State service and resourcing matters, but have been considered where relevant to land use suitability, emergency access, bushfire management, evacuation and operational risk management. • Concerns regarding family safety, residents leaving the facility, visitors, nearby school bus movements and rural lifestyle impacts are acknowledged. These matters are addressed in the Council Report through assessment of the Operational Management Plan, staffing, supervision, intake processes, visitor management, transport, discharge and incident response procedures. • Personal concerns and anxiety experienced by nearby residents are acknowledged. However, perceived fear alone is not a determinative planning consideration unless supported by evidence of likely land use impacts. • Concerns regarding applicant-led consultation are noted. While earlier engagement may have assisted community understanding, it is not a statutory precondition to determination. The Shire's public advertising process is addressed in the Council Report. • Tourism impacts and the loss of an accommodation venue are noted. However, the loss of a private accommodation business is not, of itself, a determinative planning reason for refusal. • Council is required to consider submissions received, but must determine the application on valid planning grounds, including the Scheme, relevant policies, statutory provisions, the Council Report and the planning merits of the proposal. • On balance, the matters raised have been considered. While the submission raises valid planning concerns, those matters are addressed in the Council Report and the proposal is considered capable of support subject to conditions.
75	<p>Re: Letter of Objection – Proposed Development at Lot 843 & 844 Moorilup Road, Kendenup</p> <p>I wish to formally object to the proposed Great Southern Drug and Alcohol Rehabilitation Centre at Lots 843 and 844 Moorilup Road, Kendenup, on the grounds that the development is fundamentally incompatible with the rural-residential character of the area and presents unacceptable risks to community safety, amenity, environmental resilience, and essential service capacity. The proposal seeks to convert a peaceful tourism accommodation site into a 24/7 clinical rehabilitation and</p>	<p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety, security, children/school bus, resident movement and perceived anti-social behaviour concerns are noted; amenity and operational management have been assessed, including staffing, supervision, visitor, intake and exit/discharge arrangements.

Submission Number	Comments	Officer Assessment
	<p>withdrawal facility housing up to 20 adults with alcohol and drug-related issues, including individuals requiring low-medical withdrawal, which represents a substantial and inappropriate change of land use.</p> <p>Although the Operational Management Plan states that residents with significant violence or sexual offending histories will be excluded, this does not eliminate the risks associated with housing a vulnerable and unpredictable cohort in an isolated rural setting, particularly given the facility's own acknowledgement that residents who breach rules—such as using drugs or alcohol on site—will be removed and transported away, creating uncertainty about how safely this will occur in a remote area.</p> <p>The development will also generate continuous staff shift changes, subcontractor visits, deliveries, and scheduled visitor hours, resulting in increased and permanent traffic movements along Moorilup Road, which is not designed for this level of activity. Despite claims of "lights-out by 10pm," the 24-hour staffing model, vehicle movements, and structured daily programs will inevitably impact the quiet enjoyment and amenity of neighbouring properties.</p> <p>In addition, the site is entirely reliant on rainwater tanks and septic systems, which were designed for intermittent short-stay tourist accommodation, not for a permanent 24/7 clinical facility with up to 20 residents and up to 7 staff on duty during peak shifts. The water demand associated with daily showers, laundry, kitchen use, cleaning, medical hygiene requirements, and staff facilities will far exceed the capacity of the existing rainwater supply, while the increased wastewater load poses a significant risk of overburdening the septic systems, potentially leading to environmental contamination or system failure.</p> <p>The site is also located in a bushfire-prone area, and evacuating residents—including those in withdrawal—during an emergency presents significant safety concerns that have not been adequately addressed and will place extra burden on the low staffed Kendenup Voluntary Fire Brigade.</p> <p>Furthermore, the proposal offers little direct benefit to the Kendenup community, as residents will come from across the broader Great Southern region, while local residents bear the full burden of risk and disruption. Finally, the community was not genuinely consulted prior to the site being purchased or the application being lodged, despite claims of earlier consultations that did not involve Kendenup residents regarding this specific location.</p> <p>For these reasons, I strongly oppose the approval of this development and request that the Shire of Plantagenet refuse the application.</p> <p>Regards Lee Blakey 1305 Carbarup Road Kendenup WA 6323</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Police, ambulance, hospital and emergency response resourcing are State service matters and are not determinative planning considerations; the Shire has considered site suitability, access, bushfire and emergency management within its planning role. • Consultation and notification concerns are noted; the application was advertised in accordance with the statutory process and submissions have been considered. • Rural amenity, land-use compatibility and change from tourism/function use are relevant planning considerations and have been assessed against the existing lawful use and locality. • Servicing, wastewater and water supply concerns are noted; wastewater and bushfire water matters have been considered through the relevant referral material and bushfire management documentation. • The Shire does not have the statutory authority to require anyone to engage the community before they purchase a lot or lodge an application, the Shire can only advertise once a formal application has been received • Further comments are covered in the Council Report
76	<p>Dear sir, is the CEO of the Southern Aboriginal Cooperation (Asha Bhat) trying to incite violence in our beautiful community of Kendenup by making racist comments. The reps who were at the meeting on the 14th of May regarding the proposal of REHAB had also made these comments on ABC radio, "The stigma/fallacy and discrimination "they said. Are they trying to divide our community, every individual has a right to say how they feel. What would happen if other residents would read this then certainly it will divide the community as if its not bad enough regarding the proposed rehab. Hope this is seriously taken into consideration.</p> <p>Asha Bhat is suppose to be a leader/CEO but the comments she makes on social media are very lacking the leadership qualities.</p> <p>Many thanks for taking time to read this or you can go her profile to read it if its not clear in the screenshots.</p> <p>Yours faithfully, Anita Furber</p>	<p>Non-Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not a valid planning consideration • The Shire will not and cannot enter into such commentary
77	<p>To whom it May Concern,</p> <p>I am writing to express my support for the proposal of a drug and alcohol withdrawal facility at the Kendenup Cottages and Lodge on Moorilup Road in the shire of Kendenup. As a local resident of the Great Southern region I believe this is a much-needed health service. Whilst I can acknowledge that there is no perfect position for a facility of this purpose and nature, one that is on a large rural block can provide privacy with minimal neighbourhood disruption, low impact of local traffic and provide an excellent setting for the rehabilitation to take place. A quiet setting of this nature would provide opportunity for clientele to immerse themselves in the program without the distractions a town provides.</p> <p>A 40 acre property will provide ample space for activities of recreation and rehabilitation in a comfortable and relaxed setting whilst being within 10-15 minutes drive of local services.</p>	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for the proposal as a needed regional health and rehabilitation service is noted. • Comments that the rural property provides space, privacy and a low-impact setting are noted. • The proposal remains subject to statutory assessment and recommended conditions.

Submission Number	Comments	Officer Assessment
	<p>The Kendenup cottages and lodge have the capacity already to house 35 beds with a function room to hold events, meetings and other important engagements. This property would seem an appropriate site for this type of facility.</p> <p>Sincerely, Dominic Knight</p>	
78	<p>Dear Shire Team,</p> <p>I would like to express my general support for the proposed establishment of the Great Southern Drug and Alcohol Rehabilitation Centre at the former Kendenup Lodge property.</p> <p>Helping people overcome alcohol and drug addiction is an honourable and worthwhile undertaking that provides important benefits not only to the individuals receiving support, but also to families, communities, and society more broadly.</p> <p>The proposed location appears generally well suited to this purpose. A calm rural setting, while still being within reasonable distance of essential services and regional centres, seems appropriate for providing residents with the structure, stability and environment required for effective rehabilitation and recovery. The former Kendenup Lodge property appears to offer many characteristics that could support this kind of therapeutic setting.</p> <p>I also note that in the welcoming remarks contained within the Shire of Plantagenet's job application packages, the Shire describes itself as "an organisation... committed to saying yes as often as possible." I believe this ethos is important and should also be reflected when navigating planning processes and regulations relating to worthwhile projects that may provide meaningful benefit to the wider community.</p> <p>In my view, the major consideration for this proposal should ultimately be whether such a facility contributes more positively than negatively to the broader community - not only within Kendenup itself, but across the entire Great Southern region. This proposal presents an opportunity for Kendenup to contribute in a meaningful way to the wellbeing and recovery of vulnerable members of the Great Southern population.</p> <p>However, while I support the concept of the project in principle, I believe the current application process has been significantly undermined by poor community consultation and engagement by the applicants.</p> <p>Submitting the proposal without prior community engagement created distrust amongst a significant number of local residents. Unfortunately, the subsequent town hall meeting appears to have further increased tensions and dissatisfaction amongst parts of the community, rather than building understanding and trust.</p> <p>Many of the concerns expressed by members of the community appear to have been influenced by limited information, rumours, stigma associated with addiction treatment facilities, uncertainty and stigma regarding the types of residents who may attend the facility, and fears regarding possible impacts on local services and community safety. In emotionally charged situations such as this, effective and carefully managed consultation becomes critically important.</p> <p>In my opinion, the applicants underestimated the level of concern that such a proposal would generate within a small rural community, and the consultation approach adopted was not effective in addressing those concerns constructively. As a result, confidence in the applicants' ability to manage the project has been negatively affected amongst sections of the community.</p> <p>At present, the handling of the proposal has caused division and tension within what is usually a peaceful and friendly community. Before the project proceeds further, I believe the applicants should demonstrate a genuine commitment to rebuilding trust and improving communication with local residents.</p> <p>I therefore believe the Shire should consider either postponing a decision on the application, or imposing conditions requiring substantially improved community engagement prior to final approval or commencement.</p> <p>In particular, I believe the applicants should undertake significantly more detailed and locally focused consultation efforts, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting individually with direct neighbouring landowners within approximately 2 km of the site • Offering small-group consultation sessions within Kendenup for interested residents, in a format more conducive to constructive discussion than a large town hall meeting • Providing the community with a more realistic and tangible understanding of the types of people who would reside at the facility, for example by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> inviting current or former residents of comparable rehabilitation facilities to speak with community members facilitating visits for interested Kendenup residents to comparable facilities such as the Nannup Therapeutic Community, including opportunities to speak with staff, residents, local businesses and nearby residents • Explaining how the organisations intend to contribute positively to Kendenup itself, including any potential support, education or outreach initiatives relating to local alcohol and drug issues • Publishing more detailed information regarding the operational history and track record of comparable facilities operated by the applicants, as well as the assessment process for residence applicants • Clarifying what future plans exist for the property should approval for the rehabilitation facility ultimately not proceed <p>I believe that meaningful additional consultation and trust rebuilding would significantly improve the quality of community discussion around this proposal and help reduce fear, misunderstanding and division within Kendenup.</p> <p>Following such efforts, and after community confidence has had an opportunity to recover, the application could then return to the Shire for final determination on a more informed and constructive basis.</p> <p>Kind regards, Fabian Stein (resident of Kendenup)</p>	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General support for the proposal and its broader community benefit is noted. • Comments regarding the suitability of the former lodge property and a calm rural setting are noted. • The application has nevertheless been assessed against the statutory non-conforming use tests, amenity considerations and recommended conditions.

Submission Tally

Category	Total
Objections	74
Support	8
Non-Objections	6
Total counted submissions	88

Note

- Please note, tally is based on the fact a group submission was also received, which has been split into multiple submissions instead, to more accurately reflect the submission count.