

**From: Brad Williams Sent: Thu 6/07/2006 9:36 AM**

**To:** info@saveperthhills.org

**Subject:** Parkerville, Stoneville developments.

Dear Sir/Madam

What you are failing to realise is that there is a great demand from current hills residents for smaller blocks. Many of the aging population wishes to remain in their beloved hills environment but are unable to look after their current half acres or larger properties. They are faced with no other choice but to go down the hill. The smaller lots enable them to remain in the area they know and not suffer from a feelings of detachment and confusion. I know this to be true from personal experience.

What would happen if our early hills settlers decided that they did not want "small" blocks within the hills area.? What would happen if they said we don't want any blocks smaller than 5 acres.? The hills would of course remain very hilly and untouched but then again most of us wouldn't be able to live here.

Your groups attitude seems to be "somewhere, but not in my back yard "

Whilst I disagree with 400sqm building lots, I don't see 750sqm to 1000sqm blocks being a problem. The occassional grouping of units within the developments is also a good idea, similar to the small unit developments around the Mundaring centre.

Please feel free to print this on your newsletter or website.

---

**Below is a reply:**

**From:** Mike Davies

Chairman, Stoneville Progress Association

**To:** Brad Williams **Sent:** Thursday, July 06, 2006 12:10 PM

**Subject:** Re: Parkerville, Stoneville developments.

Hi Brad,

I'm pleased to see that as the Principle of Rundin Realty you are getting involved in this debate. However your comment about our group's attitude is wide of the mark. The 'backyard' we are concerned about is Perth's backyard - an area from Muchea to Serpentine for which we are seeking protective legislation.

We state on our website that we too are concerned about retirement housing. However we are concerned that such housing is located on routes served by good public transport and is close to shops and services. The 2 proposed developments fit neither of these essential criteria - I have discussed this with Officers of the Hills Support Group and the RSL who are of the same mind. I'm acutely aware of the problems of finding retirement accommodation locally - you personally sold my mother the unit she still occupies in Craig Street behind your offices, an ideal location. Isn't it interesting however that the Council and a Real Estate Industry, so acutely aware of the shortage of such accommodation, never specified that those Craig Street units (and 8 more that have recently been built next door) be zoned for retirement ?

When we met the Minister for Planning recently her adviser stated that the Parkerville and Stoneville developments "are in the wrong place". Furthermore, the idea of importing 7000 people into the area whilst providing a limited number of retirement units seems, to put it politely, very 'fuzzy logic' since those thousands will in turn need such accommodation.

Many members of the local Real Estate Industry have told me, in confidence, that they do not want these developments. Only recently one of them said to me that "If these proposals go ahead you'll see the Hills cleared" - his car now displays one of our car stickers. If you wish to confirm this with him please ring me and I'll give you his phone number. He knows that once this type of development is accepted, the need for large tracts of sub-dividable land near Perth will trigger the rezoning of existing rural land as has happened elsewhere.

Thanks for your input Brad. We will put your letter on our website along with my response - we want to express both sides of the argument. I feel in conclusion I must ask one question: is your attitude influenced in any way by the fact that your Company is the agent for the Parkerville development?

Regards,

Mike Davies

Chairman

Stoneville Progress Association

## Reply to reply

**From:** Brad Williams **Sent:** Thursday, July 06, 2006 5:03 PM

**To:** Mike Davies

**Subject:** Re: Parkerville, Stoneville developments.

Dear Mike

Please do not confuse my comment with entering a debate. I will reply to your email and say no more.

\*You state that I am wide of the mark with my backyard statement. You say you are looking to protect from Muchea to Serpentine yet it is your backyard of Stoneville and Parkerville that you are so negatively enthusiastic about. Could this be because you feel that your road will experience an increase in traffic ?

\*You say you are concerned about the retirees and potential retirees. These developments go a long way to solving the problems associated with an older population yet you reject them and offer no alternative solution.

\* You are worried about public transport. I feel sure that as the population grows so to would the public transport availability.

\*You seem to have ignored my original point that there is a huge number of hills residents that require these smaller blocks now. They don't want to shift to a unit in a far away suburb. Support for the Parkerville development has been overwhelming. From young families to retirees, their need for a hills block has been intense. They are a silent majority.

\* I am not interested in an agent with one of your stickers.

\* I am proud that Rundin Property Consultants has been chosen to market the Parkerville land. I have lived in the hills for over 35 years and I understand well the needs and wants of it's residents. I fail to understand how a short term hills resident such as yourself feels that they have their finger on the pulse of the needs of hills people. As I said earlier, I feel your attitude may be influenced by a more personal agenda.

Lastly, the Parkerville development will be good for the hills people and hills businesses. It is well thought out and designed to incorporate a hills living feel and lifestyle. It offers 30% public open space with direct access to the State Forrest. It is very much in keeping with a hills environment.

Regards

Brad Williams