

[Help](#)

Townsite Survey








It is important to get as many responses from the community as possible, so we would really appreciate you taking the time to complete this questionnaire. Your responses will form the basis of our submissions to Local and State Government. It is important for the community to express their opinion on this significant issue that will affect us all. If you wish to make further comments or respond to a question in more detail, please feel free to email us: gpa@gidgenet.com.au

Townsite

1. The Townsite land is some 240 ha of which we are told 23% is environmentally unacceptable to develop. We are talking of a developed area of 185 ha including amenities and infrastructure. Have you seen the plan of the proposed townsite?

Yes		85.0%	(136)
No		13.8%	(22)
TOTAL		98.8%	158 (160)

2. How many people do you feel should be accommodated in the townsite given a population per household of 2.6?

<1000		45.0%	(72)
1000-2000		22.5%	(36)
2000-3000		15.6%	(25)
3000-4000		1.2%	(2)
4000-5000		1.9%	(3)
>5000		2.5%	(4)
TOTAL		88.8%	142 (160)

3. The present proposal is for 1900 blocks to accommodate over 5000 people. Do you support this?

Yes		3.8%	(6)
No		93.8%	(150)
TOTAL		97.5%	156 (160)

4. What size blocks do you think should be predominant in the townsite?

300m2 - 600m2		1.9%	(3)
---------------	---	------	-----
















600m2 - 1000m2	8.8%	(14)
1000m2 - 5000m2	25.0%	(40)
5000m2 - 10000m2 (1ha / 2.47 acres)	27.5%	(44)
10000m2 - 20000m2	13.1%	(21)
Other: a variety	0.6%	(1)
Other: 10 acre blocks would allow sufficient clearing for the building zone to be cleared for fire protection while retaining habitat for wildlife.	0.6%	(1)
Other: 1000m2 to 10000m2 Toodyay is a nice blend of large and larger blocks	0.6%	(1)
Other: 100m2 in townsite increasing as they move outwards	0.6%	(1)
Other: 2,000m2 minimum	0.6%	(1)
Other: 20000m2 or larger	0.6%	(1)
Other: 2000m2	0.6%	(1)
Other: 2500m2 - 5000m2	0.6%	(1)
Other: 5 acre blocks only!	0.6%	(1)
Other: 5 acres (2 ha) +	0.6%	(1)
Other: 5 acres or more size blocks	0.6%	(1)
Other: 600m2-5000m2	0.6%	(1)
Other: Above 10 acres	0.6%	(1)
Other: approx quarter acre	0.6%	(1)
Other: half acre to one acre	0.6%	(1)
Other: Mainly 2000-4000 m2	0.6%	(1)
Other: Minimum 1000m2	0.6%	(1)
Other: Mix of all	0.6%	(1)
Other: N/A re-read answer 8	0.6%	(1)
Other: No small size blocks, just farms	0.6%	(1)
Other: None	0.6%	(1)
Other: NOT ANY	0.6%	(1)
Other: nothing below 5 acres	0.6%	(1)

Other: The current law of 5 acres minimum	0.6%	(1)
TOTAL	91.2%	146 (160)
5. Do you support the strata residential subdivision proposed for the land east of the townsite?		
Yes	9.4%	(15)
No	83.1%	(133)
TOTAL	92.5%	148 (160)
6. Do you feel the "Orange Route" (bypass) should be expedited?		
Yes	33.8%	(54)
No	53.8%	(86)
TOTAL	87.5%	140 (160)
7. Do you think that converting Bunning Road to a cul de sac and diverting traffic to Little Bunning Road will assist traffic flow and safety?		
Yes	11.2%	(18)
No	64.4%	(103)
TOTAL	75.6%	121 (160)
8. The Proposed townsite population will probably yield an extra 20000 vehicle movements per day on Toodyay Road and local roads. What concerns do you have on the impact of this?		
No concerns	1.2%	(2)
Increased congestion	88.8%	(142)
Increase in accidents	82.5%	(132)
Other: Access from other roads (ef Country Road) will be dangerous in peak time *7.00-8.00am) as more cars travelling at 11 kph	0.6%	(1)
Other: An this is supposed to be a lifestyle village!	0.6%	(1)
Other: At that time the 'Orange' bypass should happen	0.6%	(1)
Other: But infrastructure would eventually follow	0.6%	(1)
Other: Deaths	0.6%	(1)
Other: delays	0.6%	(1)
Other: Further deterioration of existing road surface	0.6%	(1)
Other: Further truck impact	0.6%	(1)

Other: Get a life	0.6%	(1)
Other: higher crime rate	0.6%	(1)
Other: inadequate roads	0.6%	(1)
Other: increase in pollution	0.6%	(1)
Other: increase risk of bush fire	0.6%	(1)
Other: Increased damage to Toodyay Road	0.6%	(1)
Other: Increased noise pollution	0.6%	(1)
Other: Increased pollution	0.6%	(1)
Other: Increased pollution from run-off and air pollution	0.6%	(1)
Other: Increased travelling time	0.6%	(1)
Other: Long delays on Red Hill and other sections with no overtaking lanes. Difficult to exist surrounding streets on to Toodyay Road	0.6%	(1)
Other: Loss of ability to enjoy the drive	0.6%	(1)
Other: Lunatics on road now why make this worse	0.6%	(1)
Other: MASSIVE DELAYS	0.6%	(1)
Other: Massive increase in traffic	0.6%	(1)
Other: Might be a good thing to force changes to Toodyay Road for safety.	0.6%	(1)
Other: More deaths on Toodyay Road	0.6%	(1)
Other: more fire risk	0.6%	(1)
Other: More idiots on the road!	0.6%	(1)
Other: More Infrastructure - road and traffic management construction and maintenance costs.	0.6%	(1)
Other: more litter	0.6%	(1)
Other: more theft	0.6%	(1)
Other: Need to stop school access from Toodyay Road	0.6%	(1)
Other: Noise	0.6%	(1)
Other: noise	1.9%	(3)
Other: Noise pollution from Tooday Rd to all properties within 1km of the road between the townsite and Midland.	0.6%	(1)
Other: Noise polution	0.6%	(1)

Other: noise, pollution	0.6%	(1)
Other: Noise/Safety	0.6%	(1)
Other: not appropriate	0.6%	(1)
Other: pollution	2.5%	(4)
Other: Pollution	0.6%	(1)
Other: Pollution and road kill	0.6%	(1)
Other: poor road surface already	0.6%	(1)
Other: Pulling out of driveways onto Toodyay Road	0.6%	(1)
Other: Red Hill would in no way cope with that amount of traffic.	0.6%	(1)
Other: reduction of speed limits all the way to Perth	0.6%	(1)
Other: Road not adequate	0.6%	(1)
Other: Road requires significant upgrade with current traffic load. Townsite would no longer be safe to cross the road	0.6%	(1)
Other: roads not built for this level of traffic	0.6%	(1)
Other: rubbish	0.6%	(1)
Other: safety	0.6%	(1)
Other: school children	0.6%	(1)
Other: spoils rural character	0.6%	(1)
Other: Time to get anywhere. Increased animal deaths on the road	0.6%	(1)
Other: too busy	0.6%	(1)
Other: Too congested	0.6%	(1)
Other: Toodyay Road won't be able to handle the extra stress on its surface	0.6%	(1)
Other: TRUCKS	0.6%	(1)
Other: Very dangerous now. Also proposed more trucks at gravel pit site at Red Swan (opp. Dryandra Road)	0.6%	(1)
Other: When I turn into my property on Toodyay Rd, I always have cars overtaking me on the right hand side or the gravel (verge).	0.6%	(1)
Other: Wildlife can be injured plus drivers. Uncaring and speed	0.6%	(1)
Other: Will need dual carriageway to Midland	0.6%	(1)

9. Do you wish the existing commercial centre and townsite businesses to form the basis of the new commercial centre?

Yes		73.8%	(118)
No		18.8%	(30)
TOTAL		92.5%	148 (160)
10. Do you think there should be a light industrial centre?			
Yes		30.6%	(49)
No		66.2%	(106)
TOTAL		96.9%	155 (160)
11. Do you wish the townsite to be as self sustainable as possible in terms of water provision?			
Yes		81.9%	(131)
No		10.6%	(17)
TOTAL		92.5%	148 (160)
12. Do you wish the townsite to be as self sustainable as possible in terms of sewerage provision?			
Yes		81.9%	(131)
No		9.4%	(15)
TOTAL		91.2%	146 (160)
13. Do you wish the townsite to be as self sustainable as possible in terms of power provision?			
Yes		66.9%	(107)
No		23.8%	(38)
TOTAL		90.6%	145 (160)

Hills Lifestyle and Environment

14. Do you think the proposed townsite will positively or adversely affect our unique environmental assets? (e.g. wetlands, creeks, the Reserve, wildlife)

Positive effect		3.1%	(5)
Adverse effect		93.1%	(149)
TOTAL		96.2%	154 (160)

15. Do you believe the proposed townsite and population expansion will have a positive or adverse effect on the “Hills Lifestyle”?

Positive effect		8.1%	(13)
Adverse effect		86.9%	(139)
TOTAL		95.0%	152 (160)

16. Do you think that the existing Pony Club land should be retained for recreational use of the community and for local events?

Yes		94.4%	(151)
No		1.2%	(2)
TOTAL		95.6%	153 (160)

Consultation and Community Engagement**17. Have you received information from Port Bouvard and/or their consultants SMR?**

Yes		71.2%	(114)
No		20.6%	(33)
TOTAL		91.9%	147 (160)

18. Are you happy with the community consultation process conducted by Port Bouvard and SMR?

Yes		18.8%	(30)
No		75.0%	(120)
TOTAL		93.8%	150 (160)

19. Do you think that the Morangup community should be consulted on what is proposed for Gidgegannup?

Yes		61.3%	(98)
No		30.6%	(49)
TOTAL		91.9%	147 (160)

[Go back to Management Interface](#)

Powered By phpESP, v(2.1.1)