

# Submission DR40 - Kepnock Residents Action Group - Costs of Doing Business: Retail Trade Industry - Case study

---

## **OUTCOME OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING ISSUES IN OUR CASE STUDY.**

**For an individual assessment of the planning and zoning issues raised in our Case Study – Kepnock Residents Action Group Submission DR 35, the following outcome is advised:-**

1. The Minister has approved the Masters development on low density residential A land.
2. There is no right of appeal for the 3 appellants – which includes 70 nearby residents.
3. The Minister has added that his approval is the catalyst for further development of the precinct as commercial/retail – despite its current zoning and the protection it affords to those residents under the current Town Plan.
4. There is no like precedent – in the 15 year register of Government call-ins. Ours is No 43
5. There is an application for a huge shopping centre currently before Council- believed to be Coles. It is reasonable to assume the Minister publicly supports this application, although not yet decided. If approved by Council this application will also be appealed.
6. Does this mean that, should the Council approve the Coles shopping centre, and it is appealed, the Minister will follow the same process – just to satisfy the duopoly?
7. This approval is despite the call-in feedback confirming a majority “NO” response to the Minister’s question as to whether there was a “state interest” – the only grounds on which he can exercise his Ministerial power. .
8. There is no over-riding need.
9. It is a hardware store – not an urgent community facility.
10. There are alternative commercial sites – which would provide NO detriments.
11. This is part of the national duopoly war and gives Woolworths a “competitive edge” over Coles – with long term adverse impact on the community.
12. This would appear to be blatant abuse of the system- by the powerful - with great detriment to the road network, the amenity, the environment and the nearby school.
13. Our community currently has over 180 vacant shop sites and is economically depressed.
14. The claim that the approval will bring economic benefits to the community on that site is farcical. That site would provide local home construction for 5 years, whereas a Masters store will provide its benefits – whatever they are –on appropriately zoned land. This site should not be sacrificed to the duopoly at great cost to small and local business, when other commercial options exist.

**So – despite all the lip service given by Councils, Governments and the duopoly – powerful land owner, Governments and developers continue to manipulate planning and zoning laws to the disadvantage of Australian small business, local communities and local jobs.**

**They do great dis-service to the retail trade because this is not a level playing- field . It is not competition – it is manipulation and monopolisation.**