

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF THE NORTHERN TERRITORY

Petition

Registration No:	26
Title:	Kennel/cattery Lot 3296 De Caen Close Virginia
Presented on:	14 June 2006
Presented by:	Mr Warren
Referred To:	Planning and Lands
Response due:	17 October 2006
Response received:	25 July 2006
Response presented:	22 August 2006

Petition

To the Honourable the Speaker and Members of the Legislative Assembly of the Northern Territory

We, the undersigned, respectfully showeth that: the Development Consent Authority has approved the development of a kennel and cattery on Lot 3296 De Caen Close, Virginia that is not compatible with the current dense housing in the area.

Despite the current RL1 zoning (which should be RR) the block in question is too small (1.75Ha) according to the Litchfield Area Plan 2004 for such a development and far too close to many existing homes, all within 500m.

Your petitioners therefore humbly pray that the Development Consent Authority approval be overturned by our Parliament.

And your petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

Response

The Development Consent Authority (DCA) approved a kennel development on Section 3296, Hundred of Bagot on 8 June 2006. During the public consultation phase many of the surrounding residents objected to the proposal.

During its initial consideration of the proposal on 17 March 2006, the DCA deferred consideration of the application, specifically to obtain additional information necessary to enable proper consideration of the application. The additional information was forwarded to the submitters. The DCA reconsidered the application at the hearing of 19 May 2006, which was open to the public with submitters invited to attend.

I understand that many surrounding residents conveyed their concerns to the DCA by formal submission to the application, or by speaking at the DCA hearings.

In approving the development, the DCA recognised the potential impact on the residential amenity and placed conditions on Development Permit DP06/0264 to achieve the following:

- Limiting outdoor access for dogs to a maximum of four hours a day (except when held on a lead by the operator);
- Requiring extensive noise abatement works,;
- Limiting the number of dogs outdoors at any one time to 10; and
- Removal of waste to avoid creation of a nuisance.

I consider that these measures will offer some reassurance that the development will have minimal impact on the residential amenity of the area. I also note that any failure of the operator to comply with a condition of approval can result in enforcement action by the DCA.

The DCA, has in my view, acted properly in its consideration of this matter and whilst the outcome is not to the satisfaction of the petitioners, I see no basis for its decision to be overturned.