

To - MRSC.vic.gov.au

From –

P21-8138

Email -

Re: Objection to Planning Application PLN2020/496

We wish to strongly convey our objection and deep concerns in relation to the abovementioned Planning Application.

We have not consulted with any planning professionals in this regard but have gone on line and noted that the land is in a Rural Conservation Zone. The provisions of RCZ refer to such things as -

- Protect and enhance the natural environment, landscape, faunal habitat
- Development should be consistent with sustainable land management taking into account the conservation values and environmental sensitivity of the locality
- Agricultural use should be consistent with the conservation of environment and landscape values of the area.

The approval of the above application would surely be in stark conflict with the intentions of the zoning.

We also note the “Intensive Animal Production” is a prohibited use with RCZ. Surely, dog breeding at this level would fall into this category of land use.

Other than the above concerns which relate to the Councils Planning Scheme which should in effect offer enough grounds to refuse the application, we also object in relation to the loss of amenity for ourselves and in particular our neighbours who are [REDACTED].

The noise emitted from such an enterprise would be totally unacceptable and unfair to the neighbourhood and destroy the peaceful lifestyle which they/we thought the zoning would provide! We make the point that 18 [REDACTED] could each potentially produce two litters per year with puppies not coming under the control of the permit until they are 6 months of age. So, they could well be on the property until then. It is quite possible that each [REDACTED] could have an average of 4-5 pups at any given time which means the noise level would be significantly higher than the noise from 22 dogs mentioned in the Permit Application. Do the maths.

It is anticipated that the traffic flow would increase significantly as this would be a full-on commercial venture with potential owners viewing puppies, visiting puppies, collecting puppies, staff traffic and deliveries.

The potential for odour is also a concern with this many dogs. Even with strict management practice this could be a huge problem, let alone if this was not adhered to!

From an ethical point of view, surely puppy farming is something the government has been waging a war against for some time? Yes, there are back yard puppy farms who do not attend to the welfare of the dogs and this applicant could well promise that their dogs will be well looked after, however, the simple fact is that the dogs are kept in enclosures full time, they are not treated as a family pet, do not enjoy working the property with their owner, restricted from going on long walks and generally live a life they do not deserve. They are nothing more than breeding machines! Even if they get out into an exercise

area, they are still treated simply as a 'money producing commodity'. Thousands of dogs are euthanised daily with thousands more begging for good homes. Our animal welfare shelters are bursting at the seams and yet, breeding continues at an alarming rate. Paying huge money for a dog does not guarantee the animal secures a loving life-long home, with many of these 'designer dogs' ending up in shelters due to a change of plan (or heart) on the owner's behalf. So, why contribute to this problem?

All the promises in the world put down on paper from this applicant cannot guarantee it will function within a given law. The unnecessary waste of time and rate payer's money it would take to thoroughly monitor such an industry by the MRSC would be unacceptable. Funds and precious time that could be far better spent on environmental issues! The potential for this 'puppy farm' to become a real problem for the MRSC is only too obvious.

We see this as an opportunity for MRSC to take a stand against this dreadful industry and say NO.....if this is allowed to proceed then a precedent will be set and the future of our unique area at a huge risk.....not to mention the miserable lives of the unfortunate dogs who will be kept there.

We sincerely hope that you refuse this application.

Yours faithfully

A solid black rectangular redaction box covering the signature area.

P21-7898



10 February, 2021

Macedon Ranges Shire Council
Planning Department
P O Box 151
Kyneton VIC 3444

PLN/2020/496 – 64 Boundary Road, WOODEND NORTH VIC 3442

USE and DEVELOPMENT OF LAND FOR DOMESTIC ANIMAL HUSBANDRY (DOG BREEDING 18 FEMALE AND 4 MALES)

Dear Council

I strongly object to the above development. I live and farm in the vicinity of this proposed development, and while not directly affected, care deeply for the protection of this area which is zoned Rural Conservation and bordered by land zoned for agricultural purposes.

There is no planning impetus for a puppy farm in a Rural Conservation Zone. I am deeply concerned at continued efforts by those who would like to industrialise and commercialise this area, and for their own profit, giving no regard for how their actions will affect their neighbours or the environment. These efforts are undermining the integrity of Rural Conservation Zoning and are offensive to those of us who would like to see the Rural Conservation Zoning maintained intact.

In my view the establishment of such a puppy farm will substantially lead to the degradation of the environment – an environment which is naturally and historically unique and which I believe needs to be preserved in the interest of the greater region and community. The mass and bulk of buildings proposed

for the operation is not in keeping with land zoned for rural conservation, nor is the light and noise that will be emitted from its operation.

A puppy farm, and one with this many dogs, is not a good fit in a Rural Conservation Zone, an area which is currently a wildlife sanctuary. On any given day wildlife including Emu's and their chicks, ducks, kangaroos, the occasional wallaby currently roam freely around our wonderful lanes and pastures. Indeed, the Council encourages us to plant native trees to encourage this wildlife. The noise these dogs make on mass is a threat to this wildlife. The noise these dogs make on mass will pollute the environment, in general, for neighbours, and for us walkers who seek solitude in this beautiful and otherwise quiet part of the countryside. The farming of lap-dogs is not an agricultural pursuit and they are not dogs destined for farm work. This type of commercial operation will contribute nothing to the environment.

As well as the above, surely the question of the immorality of puppy farming – that is, messing with genes and creating new breeds of dogs when there are already thousands of dogs in shelters waiting for owners, cannot escape a Responsible Authority which purports to value conservation and wildlife, when making decisions regarding this application.

The future and protection of our unique environment relies on a Responsible Authority that values and works to protect the environment and the wildlife that inhabits it. We, who have chosen to live here count on and trust that such Responsible Authority will do the right thing, when reviewing applications for purely commercial ventures, to protect the integrity of this Rural Conservation Zone. Thank you.

Yours faithfully

██████████

Maria Nunez

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, 3 February 2021 2:43 PM
To: Macedon Ranges Shire Council
Subject: Yousef Taibeh PN/2020/496

For Yousef Taibeh.

This is to notify you that I wish to object to establishment of a puppy farm at 64 Boundary Rd Woodend. A fuller submission to follow at a later date (as soon as possible).

[REDACTED],

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED].

[REDACTED]

Maria Nunez

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, 3 February 2021 10:56 AM
To: Macedon Ranges Shire Council
Subject: PLN/2020/496

Dear Yousef,

My family and I strongly object to the proposed puppy farm and we will be making a formal submission in due course.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Maria Nunez

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, 3 February 2021 10:56 AM
To: Macedon Ranges Shire Council
Subject: PLN/2020/496

Dear Yousef,

Please be advised I will be making an objection to the above planning permit.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Sent from my iPhone

Permit Application PLN/2020/684 Objection

As this Permit Application is a formal and time limited process for a facility that has the potential to significantly impact our amenity we feel it necessary to lodge a formal objection.

In case it becomes relevant or necessary to be relied upon we note that the notice we received didn't specify a date by which we had to submit an objection.

We are the owners and residents [REDACTED] and have concerns about the permit application for a breeding kennel at 64 Boundary Rd. Our property and home [REDACTED] kennel and therefore will be most impacted.

We chose to reside and retire in the country to enjoy the quiet and serenity of the location at [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] [REDACTED] have developed and continue to develop a large country garden. As a result we spend most of the day outside especially in our garden areas which are [REDACTED] and outdoor exercise areas. This outdoor lifestyle is fundamental to our enjoyment and wellbeing.

We expect the MRSC to determine if the proposed breeding kennel activity is consistent with the Rural Conservation zoning and the objectives of the Council's Biodiversity Strategy that underpins the Rural Conservation zoning. In considering whether dog breeding is consistent with the Rural Conservation zoning the Council should also consider whether the large size of the proposed kennel (18 [REDACTED] and 4 dogs) is appropriate.

Our particular concerns about a breeding kennel at 64 Boundary Rd include the potential noise impact on our lifestyle and overall amenity, the added traffic impact of the kennel activity on the unsealed part of Boundary Road, the possibility of dogs escaping and attacking local sheep and the possible effect of waste on the local aquifers.

If approved we expect the applicant to operate a well run facility and that the risk of dogs escaping is low. However if granted we understand the permit will survive a change of ownership and a future owner would not necessarily run the facility with the same rigour and discipline as we expect the applicant will do.

We have reviewed the Acoustics Report provided by the applicant and observe it contains a range of errors and anomalies. For example it refers in several places to our property as 67 Boundary Rd [REDACTED] there are discrepancies in the type of construction to be used, and conflicting statements about the number of dogs to be exercised at any one time.

We note the noise modelling that the Acoustic adviser has undertaken and we ask that if the permit application is approved the Council impose the following permit conditions in addition to any others the Council would be expected to include;

- the permit should only cover the housing and breeding of King Charles Spaniel and Poodles as we note the acoustic results in part are determined by the size and choice of dog breeds.
- the Council should set the upper noise limits generated by the kennel activities as measured at our property boundary at the levels modelled by the applicant's Acoustics Adviser (35dbA in the daytime and evening and 13dbA at night) and the applicant should be required to test these levels are being met six months after beginning operations and as part of each annual audit.
- the dogs should only be exercised outside individually and only in the Exercise Pen that according to the acoustic modelling contributes the lowest noise impact on our property or very close to this area. The Acoustics Report records the lowest noise contribution will come from Pen 3 but we question whether the Pen numbering may be incorrect as intuitively we would expect the lowest noise contribution to come from Pen 1 the furthest from [REDACTED].

In addition to these noise related permit conditions we ask the Council to include conditions that ensure any waste does not pollute the local aquifers and does not cause unacceptable smells at our property. Excessively bright external lighting should also not be permitted.

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Permit Application PLN 2020/684 Objection Addendum

In addition to our objection submitted on 9 February 2021 we ask that if the Council does approve the Permit Application the following additional conditions should be added to any conditions applied by the Council including those we sought in our initial submission;

- as well as the average sound level limits measured at [REDACTED] with 64 Boundary Road (Laeq 35 dbA in the daytime and evening and 13 d [REDACTED] could also be maximum levels set at 5dbA above the ambient background noise levels during daytime, evening and at night.
- there should be a Noise Management Plan agreed to clarify for all parties how to deal with any excessive noise generated by the kennels

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]