

Letters to the Editor

HILLS GAZETTE, Saturday, August 19, 2006

Vocal minority 'selfish'

RE: Letter, "Village-style homes overdue" (*Hills Gazette*, August 12).

I would like to challenge some of the points made by the writers of this letter.

Our association is fully aware of the need for retirement accommodation but believes it should be close to

all services and good public transport, not in the middle of nowhere.

Providing a small number of retirement units as a justification for increasing the population by 7000 people is self-defeating; those extra thousands will in turn need retirement units.

In recent years 14 small units have been built in the centre of Mundaring but the council did not zone them for retirement, although this is an ideal location. There are other proposals for retirement accommodation in the town centre that cannot go ahead because the sewage plant is at full capacity. Is the council really dinkum about helping the ageing population or simply development driven?

No one would argue there is a need for cheap housing but, given that we can look forward to ever increasing fuel prices, does it make sense to make people who

are retired and on a tight budget travel even further?

Wherever urban development has taken place, greed ensures it doesn't stop with one small village.

A recent poll showed 98 per cent of Hills residents do not want more urban development. Is this a "vocal minority"? The real "selfishness" is the attitude that people should be happy to destroy what they have enjoyed all their lives simply because their circumstances have changed.

Mike Davies,
Chairman,
Stoneville Progress Association.

Lots unsuitable for elderly

RE: Letter by G. and S. Bennetts of Greenmount (*Hills Gazette*, August 12).

As an informed member of the community, I have sought out the facts as they are available regarding these proposed new housing developments.

The information I have been provided by the developers and the shire about these new developments indicates these homesites are not in convenient locations for retirees, nor are they close to shops, major transport routes or medical services.

I feel the Bennetts may have been misinformed about the quality and location of these proposed new town sites. I also disagree with the Bennetts' letter that Hills people are selfish. This view is frequently a catch-cry of those who have not yet

looked beyond the surface.

The people of the Hills are, mostly, environmentally aware and informed. They are aware of the devastating effect such housing sites could have on the physical and social environments.

Such effects would also affect the entire Perth population, especially in terms of water catchment.

My final plea goes to others who have opinions like the Bennetts: please become informed about high density development in the Perth Hills.

With the increasing fuel prices and our need to rely on more sustainable transport methods, putting people a long way from the city centre and a long way from vital services is not the way to go.

Maria Northcote,
Parkerville.

In favour of Hills villages

G. AND S. Bennetts are absolutely right when they say we need smaller service lots close to shops and medical services in the Hills.

That is precisely the problem with the proposed developments in Stoneville and Parkerville: they are not close to shops and medical services. To warehouse elderly people 10km from such services is bad urban planning and downright cruel. Village style lots

should be built in the Hills, but near the shops and medical facilities in Mundaring and Glen Forrest.

For the cost of providing adequate infrastructure and services to the Stoneville and Parkerville developments, the State and Local Governments could hook up three times as many homes down on the "flats".

Rusty Geller,
Hovea.

Time to stop urban sprawl

RE: Letter by G. and S. Bennetts of Greenmount (*Hills Gazette*, August 12).

On the other side of the argument is strong pent-up demand to see smart, environmentally sustainable developments in the Hills.

Creating new town sites

adjacent to a national park is ludicrous.

Any new developments must occur in the existing infrastructure. Perth takes up an area larger than greater London - it is time to stop the sprawl.

J. and J. Hurst,
Maylands.