

Town of Victoria Park Local Planning Scheme No.2 – Schedule of Submissions

No.	Reference	Capacity	Suburb	Summary of Submission	Officer Response
1.	4991252	Owner	St James	<p>1. Tree Preservation Encourages the Town to consider amending the scheme to strengthen the protection of existing trees on private land</p>	<p>1. It is recognised that there is growing pressure on urban tree canopy from infill development and that there is an absence of appropriate mechanisms in the State planning framework to retain and protect trees on private land.</p> <p>In response to submissions it is recommended that modifications are made to LPS2 to include provisions to facilitate the preparation of a Significant Tree Register, in keeping with the WAPCs established preferred approach to tree retention on private land within local planning schemes, as a first step to affording registered significant trees a greater level of protection under the scheme.</p> <p>In addition to including the Significant Tree Register provisions within LPS2, it is recommended that the Town prepares a local planning policy that stipulates the circumstances in which the removal of a tree on private land requires development approval in accordance with emerging industry practice.</p>
2.	4992831	Owner	Lathlain	<p>1. Site Specific - Empire Bar Supports the potential redevelopment of the Empire Bar site car park.</p>	<p>1. Noted.</p>
3.	4994390	Owner Occupier	Victoria Park	<p>1. Tree Preservation Concerns that new development will result in the loss of mature trees.</p> <p>2. Loss of green/open space Concerns that new development will result in insufficient green space.</p> <p>3. Traffic and Parking Concerns that new development will result in increased traffic and parking issues.</p> <p>4. Location of new development Supports new development to take place along transport corridors but not in suburban areas.</p>	<p>1. It is recognised that there is growing pressure on urban tree canopy from infill development and that there is an absence of appropriate mechanisms in the State planning framework to retain and protect trees on private land.</p> <p>In response to submissions it is recommended that modifications are made to LPS2 to include provisions to facilitate the preparation of a Significant Tree Register, in keeping with the WAPCs established preferred approach to tree retention on private land within local planning schemes, as a first step to affording registered significant trees a greater level of protection under the scheme.</p> <p>In addition to including the Significant Tree Register provisions within LPS2, it is recommended that the Town prepares a local planning policy that stipulates the circumstances in which the removal of a tree on private land requires development approval in accordance with emerging industry practice.</p> <p>2. Noted. All new development is required to provide 'open space' on private land in accordance with the R-Codes.</p> <p>3. Noted. The Town's Integrated Transport Strategy and Parking Management Plan outline detailed guidance for managing the Town's transport network and parking to support the Town as liveable inner-city community. The Town will continue to implement these strategies in response to the needs of a growing population.</p> <p>4. Noted - LPS2 implements the Local Planning Strategy which directs population and housing growth towards certain locations of the Town; primarily activity centres and urban corridors and generally limiting growth in established lower density suburban areas.</p>
4.	4994801	Owner Occupier	East Victoria Park	<p>1. Location of new development Concerns that there is too much low-density residential areas (R20-R30) within the Town given housing shortages and these areas should be considered for R40 or higher.</p>	<p>1. Noted - LPS2 implements the Local Planning Strategy which directs population and housing growth towards certain locations of the Town; primarily activity centres and urban corridors and generally limiting growth in established lower density suburban areas.</p>
5.	4995329	Owner	Victoria Park	<p>1. Removal of restrictions on Multiple Dwellings Does not support the removal restrictions on multiple dwellings.</p> <p>2. Traffic and Parking Concerns that new development will result in increased traffic and parking issues.</p>	<p>1. For areas with density codes of R20 (parts of Lathlain, East Victoria Park and St James) and R30 (parts of Carlisle, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park, St James) the removal of restrictions on multiple dwellings under LPS2 presents no change to the number of dwellings that can be constructed on any property or the permitted building heights, which remain limited to a maximum of two storeys, than currently permitted under TPS1. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.</p> <p>For areas with density codes of R40 within the Town's Residential Character Area (parts of Burswood, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park), the proposed modification allows for an increase in the number of dwellings that can be constructed via the development</p>

					<p>of multiple dwellings, however, building heights (limited to a maximum of two storeys) and other primary development controls remain comparable. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.</p> <p>Advice from the Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage (DPLH) suggests that re-introducing restrictions on multiple dwellings in certain area in LPS2 is unlikely to be supported by the Western Australian Planning Commission for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restricting multiple dwellings in not an appropriate planning mechanism for the conservation and retention of character dwellings and streetscapes. A heritage area or heritage list is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town seeks to retain character dwellings. A local planning policy is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town is seeking a certain streetscape character appearance. <p>In line with DPLH advice it is recommended that no modification be made to LPS2 in response to submissions received on the character theme, with the exception of a minor adjustment to the wording of the Clause 9 Scheme Aim related to places of heritage significance and character to reflect the above recommended approach, and that other planning mechanisms be investigated as the most appropriate planning instruments to promote the retention of character dwellings and streetscape character.</p> <p>2. Noted. The Town's Integrated Transport Strategy and Parking Management Plan, endorsed by Council in 2022, outline detailed guidance for managing the Town's transport network and parking to support the Town as liveable inner city community. The Town will continue to implement these strategies in response to the needs of a growing population.</p>
6.	4995497	Owner Occupier	Victoria Park	<p>1. Removal of restrictions on Multiple Dwellings Does not support the removal restrictions on multiple dwellings.</p> <p>2. Loss of green/open space Concerns that change will place too much pressure on existing green space.</p> <p>3. Traffic and Parking Concerns that new development will result in increased traffic and parking issues.</p> <p>4. Location of new development Supports new development to take place along transport corridors but not in suburban areas.</p>	<p>1. For areas with density codes of R20 (parts of Lathlain, East Victoria Park and St James) and R30 (parts of Carlisle, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park, St James) the removal of restrictions on multiple dwellings under LPS2 presents no change to the number of dwellings that can be constructed on any property or the permitted building heights, which remain limited to a maximum of two storeys, than currently permitted under TPS1. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.</p> <p>For areas with density codes of R40 within the Town's Residential Character Area (parts of Burswood, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park), the proposed modification allows for an increase in the number of dwellings that can be constructed via the development of multiple dwellings, however, building heights (limited to a maximum of two storeys) and other primary development controls remain comparable. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.</p> <p>Advice from the Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage (DPLH) suggests that re-introducing restrictions on multiple dwellings in certain area in LPS2 is unlikely to be supported by the Western Australian Planning Commission for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restricting multiple dwellings in not an appropriate planning mechanism for the conservation and retention of character dwellings and streetscapes. A heritage area or heritage list is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town seeks to retain character dwellings. A local planning policy is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town is seeking a certain streetscape character appearance. <p>In line with DPLH advice it is recommended that no modification be made to LPS2 in response to submissions received on the character theme, with the exception of a minor adjustment to the wording of the Clause 9 Scheme Aim related to places of heritage significance and character to reflect the above recommended approach, and that other planning mechanisms be investigated as the most appropriate planning instruments to promote the retention of character dwellings and streetscape character.</p> <p>2. Noted. The Town's Public Open Space Strategy provides for upgrades to local public open space to support a growing population.</p> <p>3. Noted. The Town's Integrated Transport Strategy and Parking Management Plan outline detailed guidance for managing the</p>

					<p>Town's transport network and parking to support the Town as liveable inner-city community. The Town will continue to implement these strategies in response to the needs of a growing population.</p> <p>4. Noted - LPS2 implements the Local Planning Strategy which directs population and housing growth towards certain locations of the Town; primarily activity centres and urban corridors and generally limiting growth in established lower density suburban areas.</p>
7.	4995527	Owner Occupier	East Victoria Park	<p>1. Site Specific - Jarrah Road, East Victoria Park Encourages the Town to change the R-code for Jarrah Road, East Victoria Park from R20 to R40 to support medium density development</p>	<p>1. Noted - LPS2 implements the Local Planning Strategy which directs population and housing growth towards certain locations of the Town; primarily activity centres and urban corridors and generally limiting growth in established lower density suburban areas.</p> <p>The Local Planning Strategy objective for the East Victoria Park (West) Neighbourhood, including Jarrah Road, is to maintain the existing low-scale, low density residential character of the neighbourhood therefore no density change for this area is contemplated under LPS2.</p>
8.	4995819	Owner	Victoria Park	<p>1. Removal of restrictions on Multiple Dwellings Does not support the removal restrictions on multiple dwellings. Concern that the change will result in degradation of local character.</p>	<p>1. For areas with density codes of R20 (parts of Lathlain, East Victoria Park and St James) and R30 (parts of Carlisle, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park, St James) the removal of restrictions on multiple dwellings under LPS2 presents no change to the number of dwellings that can be constructed on any property or the permitted building heights, which remain limited to a maximum of two storeys, than currently permitted under TPS1. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.</p> <p>For areas with density codes of R40 within the Town's Residential Character Area (parts of Burswood, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park), the proposed modification allows for an increase in the number of dwellings that can be constructed via the development of multiple dwellings, however, building heights (limited to a maximum of two storeys) and other primary development controls remain comparable. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.</p> <p>Advice from the Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage (DPLH) suggests that re-introducing restrictions on multiple dwellings in certain area in LPS2 is unlikely to be supported by the Western Australian Planning Commission for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restricting multiple dwellings in not an appropriate planning mechanism for the conservation and retention of character dwellings and streetscapes. A heritage area or heritage list is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town seeks to retain character dwellings. A local planning policy is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town is seeking a certain streetscape character appearance. <p>In line with DPLH advice it is recommended that no modification be made to LPS2 in response to submissions received on the character theme, with the exception of a minor adjustment to the wording of the Clause 9 Scheme Aim related to places of heritage significance and character to reflect the above recommended approach, and that other planning mechanisms be investigated as the most appropriate planning instruments to promote the retention of character dwellings and streetscape character.</p>
9.	4996549	Owner	Carlisle	<p>1. General LPS2 Comments Supports the content of the scheme.</p>	1. Noted.
10.	4997720	Owner Occupier	East Victoria Park	<p>1. Removal of restrictions on Multiple Dwellings Does not support the removal restrictions on multiple dwellings.</p> <p>2. Traffic and Parking Concerns that new development will result in increased traffic and parking issues.</p> <p>3. Effect on property values Concerns that new development will negatively affect property values.</p>	<p>1. For areas with density codes of R20 (parts of Lathlain, East Victoria Park and St James) and R30 (parts of Carlisle, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park, St James) the removal of restrictions on multiple dwellings under LPS2 presents no change to the number of dwellings that can be constructed on any property or the permitted building heights, which remain limited to a maximum of two storeys, than currently permitted under TPS1. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.</p> <p>For areas with density codes of R40 within the Town's Residential Character Area (parts of Burswood, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park), the proposed modification allows for an increase in the number of dwellings that can be constructed via the development</p>

				<p>4. Amenity and Safety Concerns that new development will result in increased crime.</p>	<p>of multiple dwellings, however, building heights (limited to a maximum of two storeys) and other primary development controls remain comparable. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.</p> <p>Advice from the Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage (DPLH) suggests that re-introducing restrictions on multiple dwellings in certain area in LPS2 is unlikely to be supported by the Western Australian Planning Commission for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restricting multiple dwellings is not an appropriate planning mechanism for the conservation and retention of character dwellings and streetscapes. A heritage area or heritage list is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town seeks to retain character dwellings. A local planning policy is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town is seeking a certain streetscape character appearance. <p>In line with DPLH advice it is recommended that no modification be made to LPS2 in response to submissions received on the character theme, with the exception of a minor adjustment to the wording of the Clause 9 Scheme Aim related to places of heritage significance and character to reflect the above recommended approach, and that other planning mechanisms be investigated as the most appropriate planning instruments to promote the retention of character dwellings and streetscape character.</p> <p>2. Noted. The Town's Integrated Transport Strategy and Parking Management Plan, endorsed by Council in 2022, outline detailed guidance for managing the Town's transport network and parking to support the Town as liveable inner-city community. The Town will continue to implement these strategies in response to the needs of a growing population.</p> <p>3. Noted. Property values are not a planning matter and outside the scope of LPS2.</p> <p>4. Noted. Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles are applied within the R-Codes, precinct structure plans and local planning policies in the local planning framework. Other matters relating to safety and security are outside the scope of LPS2.</p>
11.	4997998	Owner	Lathlain	<p>1. Site Specific - Gallipoli Street, Lathlain Concern that upcoding of two commercial properties in Gallipoli Street, Lathlain may negatively impact neighbouring properties.</p> <p>2. Traffic and Parking Concerns that new development will result in increased traffic and parking issues.</p>	<p>1. Noted. The Local Planning Strategy recommends that the land occupied by commercial uses in the Gallipoli Street local centre having a suitable commercial zone applied. A 'Local Centre' zone and density code of R40 is considered suitable for the local context.</p> <p>2. Noted. The Town's Integrated Transport Strategy and Parking Management Plan outline detailed guidance for managing the Town's transport network and parking to support the Town as liveable inner-city community. The Town will continue to implement these strategies in response to the needs of a growing population.</p>
12.	4998055	Owner	Carlisle	<p>1. General LPS2 Comments Hard to follow given the format and number of changes proposed to the scheme text and map.</p>	<p>1. Noted. Explanatory information in addition to the scheme text and map including a 'key changes' map has been provided in the public advertising material.</p>
13.	4998057	Owner	St James	<p>1. Site Specific - St James Future Investigation Area Query on the status of the St James Future Investigation Area and why this area has not been included for upcoding in LPS2.</p>	<p>1. The Local Planning Strategy identifies parts of St James (primarily properties along Hill View Terrace and Berwick Street) as a Future Investigation Area (FIA) for consideration for medium density development subject to further engagement with the community. The St James FIA is identified as a Short-Long Term (1-5 years) action of the Strategy. The work is currently scheduled to be undertaken in the 24/25 financial year (subject to Council budget approval), following the completion of this work the outcomes will inform a strategic amendment to LPS2.</p>
14.	4999119	Owner	Victoria Park	<p>1. Removal of restrictions on Multiple Dwellings Does not support the removal restrictions on multiple dwellings.</p>	<p>1. For areas with density codes of R20 (parts of Lathlain, East Victoria Park and St James) and R30 (parts of Carlisle, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park, St James) the removal of restrictions on multiple dwellings under LPS2 presents no change to the number of dwellings that can be constructed on any property or the permitted building heights, which remain limited to a maximum of two storeys, than currently permitted under TPS1. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.</p> <p>For areas with density codes of R40 within the Town's Residential Character Area (parts of Burswood, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park), the proposed modification allows for an increase in the number of dwellings that can be constructed via the development of multiple dwellings, however, building heights (limited to a maximum of two storeys) and other primary development controls remain comparable. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will</p>

				<p>continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.</p> <p>Advice from the Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage (DPLH) suggests that re-introducing restrictions on multiple dwellings in certain area in LPS2 is unlikely to be supported by the Western Australian Planning Commission for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restricting multiple dwellings in not an appropriate planning mechanism for the conservation and retention of character dwellings and streetscapes. A heritage area or heritage list is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town seeks to retain character dwellings. A local planning policy is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town is seeking a certain streetscape character appearance. <p>In line with DPLH advice it is recommended that no modification be made to LPS2 in response to submissions received on the character theme, with the exception of a minor adjustment to the wording of the Clause 9 Scheme Aim related to places of heritage significance and character to reflect the above recommended approach, and that other planning mechanisms be investigated as the most appropriate planning instruments to promote the retention of character dwellings and streetscape character.</p>	
15.	4999254	Owner	Lathlain	<p>1. Site Specific - Various properties Lathlain Does not support the upcoding of various properties in Lathlain from R20 to R60.</p> <p>2. Traffic and Parking Concerns that new development will result in increased traffic and parking issues.</p> <p>3. Amenity and Safety Concerns that new development will negatively impact safety and security in the area.</p>	<p>1. Noted - the Local Planning Strategy designates selected properties in the catchment of Burswood Station and Victoria Park Station as Future Investigation Areas for consideration as medium and/or higher density development. To ensure LPS2 reflects the built form density of existing apartment buildings within this area a R60 density code has been applied to relevant sites.</p> <p>2. Noted. The Town's Integrated Transport Strategy and Parking Management Plan, endorsed by Council in 2022, outline detailed guidance for managing the Town's transport network and parking to support the Town as liveable inner-city community. The Town will continue to implement these strategies in response to the needs of a growing population.</p> <p>3. Noted. Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles are applied within the R-Codes, precinct structure plans and local planning polices in the local planning framework. Other matters relating to safety and security are outside the scope of LPS2.</p>
16.	4999644	Owner	East Victoria Park	<p>1. Removal of restrictions on Multiple Dwellings Does not support the removal restrictions on multiple dwellings. Concern that the change will result in degradation of local character.</p>	<p>1. For areas with density codes of R20 (parts of Lathlain, East Victoria Park and St James) and R30 (parts of Carlisle, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park, St James) the removal of restrictions on multiple dwellings under LPS2 presents no change to the number of dwellings that can be constructed on any property or the permitted building heights, which remain limited to a maximum of two storeys, than currently permitted under TPS1. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.</p> <p>For areas with density codes of R40 within the Town's Residential Character Area (parts of Burswood, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park), the proposed modification allows for an increase in the number of dwellings that can be constructed via the development of multiple dwellings, however, building heights (limited to a maximum of two storeys) and other primary development controls remain comparable. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.</p> <p>Advice from the Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage (DPLH) suggests that re-introducing restrictions on multiple dwellings in certain area in LPS2 is unlikely to be supported by the Western Australian Planning Commission for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restricting multiple dwellings in not an appropriate planning mechanism for the conservation and retention of character dwellings and streetscapes. A heritage area or heritage list is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town seeks to retain character dwellings. A local planning policy is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town is seeking a certain streetscape character appearance. <p>In line with DPLH advice it is recommended that no modification be made to LPS2 in response to submissions received on the character theme, with the exception of a minor adjustment to the wording of the Clause 9 Scheme Aim related to places of heritage significance and character to reflect the above recommended approach, and that other planning mechanisms be investigated as the most appropriate planning instruments to promote the retention of character dwellings and streetscape character.</p>

					character.
17.	4999896	Owner	Victoria Park	<p>1. Removal of restrictions on Multiple Dwellings Does not support the removal restrictions on multiple dwellings. Concern that the change will result in degradation of local character and nothing is in place to manage the change of pace of development.</p> <p>2. Traffic and Parking Concerns that new development will result in increased traffic and parking issues.</p> <p>3. Amenity and Safety Concerns that new development will have negative impacts on local amenity.</p>	<p>1. For areas with density codes of R20 (parts of Lathlain, East Victoria Park and St James) and R30 (parts of Carlisle, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park, St James) the removal of restrictions on multiple dwellings under LPS2 presents no change to the number of dwellings that can be constructed on any property or the permitted building heights, which remain limited to a maximum of two storeys, than currently permitted under TPS1. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.</p> <p>For areas with density codes of R40 within the Town's Residential Character Area (parts of Burswood, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park), the proposed modification allows for an increase in the number of dwellings that can be constructed via the development of multiple dwellings, however, building heights (limited to a maximum of two storeys) and other primary development controls remain comparable. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.</p> <p>Advice from the Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage (DPLH) suggests that re-introducing restrictions on multiple dwellings in certain area in LPS2 is unlikely to be supported by the Western Australian Planning Commission for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restricting multiple dwellings in not an appropriate planning mechanism for the conservation and retention of character dwellings and streetscapes. A heritage area or heritage list is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town seeks to retain character dwellings. A local planning policy is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town is seeking a certain streetscape character appearance. <p>In line with DPLH advice it is recommended that no modification be made to LPS2 in response to submissions received on the character theme, with the exception of a minor adjustment to the wording of the Clause 9 Scheme Aim related to places of heritage significance and character to reflect the above recommended approach, and that other planning mechanisms be investigated as the most appropriate planning instruments to promote the retention of character dwellings and streetscape character.</p> <p>2. Noted. The Town's Integrated Transport Strategy and Parking Management Plan, endorsed by Council in 2022, outline detailed guidance for managing the Town's transport network and parking to support the Town as liveable inner-city community. The Town will continue to implement these strategies in response to the needs of a growing population.</p> <p>3. Noted. Amenity issues such as overshadowing, overlooking and solar access are controlled through the planning framework, particularly the R-Codes.</p>
18.	4999931	Owner	Victoria Park	<p>1. Removal of restrictions on Multiple Dwellings Does not support the removal restrictions on multiple dwellings. Concern that the change will result in degradation of local character.</p>	<p>1. For areas with density codes of R20 (parts of Lathlain, East Victoria Park and St James) and R30 (parts of Carlisle, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park, St James) the removal of restrictions on multiple dwellings under LPS2 presents no change to the number of dwellings that can be constructed on any property or the permitted building heights, which remain limited to a maximum of two storeys, than currently permitted under TPS1. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.</p> <p>For areas with density codes of R40 within the Town's Residential Character Area (parts of Burswood, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park), the proposed modification allows for an increase in the number of dwellings that can be constructed via the development of multiple dwellings, however, building heights (limited to a maximum of two storeys) and other primary development controls remain comparable. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.</p> <p>Advice from the Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage (DPLH) suggests that re-introducing restrictions on multiple dwellings in certain area in LPS2 is unlikely to be supported by the Western Australian Planning Commission for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restricting multiple dwellings in not an appropriate planning mechanism for the conservation and retention of character dwellings and streetscapes. A heritage area or heritage list is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town seeks to retain character dwellings.

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A local planning policy is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town is seeking a certain streetscape character appearance. <p>In line with DPLH advice it is recommended that no modification be made to LPS2 in response to submissions received on the character theme, with the exception of a minor adjustment to the wording of the Clause 9 Scheme Aim related to places of heritage significance and character to reflect the above recommended approach, and that other planning mechanisms be investigated as the most appropriate planning instruments to promote the retention of character dwellings and streetscape character.</p>	
19.	4999940	Owner Occupier	Victoria Park	<p>1. Removal of restrictions on Multiple Dwellings Does not support the removal restrictions on multiple dwellings.</p> <p>2. Traffic and Parking Concerns that new development will result in increased traffic and parking issues.</p> <p>3. Amenity and Safety Concerns that new development will have negative impacts on local amenity including overshadowing of existing properties and loss of local character.</p>	<p>1. For areas with density codes of R20 (parts of Lathlain, East Victoria Park and St James) and R30 (parts of Carlisle, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park, St James) the removal of restrictions on multiple dwellings under LPS2 presents no change to the number of dwellings that can be constructed on any property or the permitted building heights, which remain limited to a maximum of two storeys, than currently permitted under TPS1. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.</p> <p>For areas with density codes of R40 within the Town's Residential Character Area (parts of Burswood, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park), the proposed modification allows for an increase in the number of dwellings that can be constructed via the development of multiple dwellings, however, building heights (limited to a maximum of two storeys) and other primary development controls remain comparable. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.</p> <p>Advice from the Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage (DPLH) suggests that re-introducing restrictions on multiple dwellings in certain area in LPS2 is unlikely to be supported by the Western Australian Planning Commission for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restricting multiple dwellings is not an appropriate planning mechanism for the conservation and retention of character dwellings and streetscapes. A heritage area or heritage list is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town seeks to retain character dwellings. A local planning policy is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town is seeking a certain streetscape character appearance. <p>In line with DPLH advice it is recommended that no modification be made to LPS2 in response to submissions received on the character theme, with the exception of a minor adjustment to the wording of the Clause 9 Scheme Aim related to places of heritage significance and character to reflect the above recommended approach, and that other planning mechanisms be investigated as the most appropriate planning instruments to promote the retention of character dwellings and streetscape character.</p> <p>2. Noted. The Town's Integrated Transport Strategy and Parking Management Plan, endorsed by Council in 2022, outline detailed guidance for managing the Town's transport network and parking to support the Town as liveable inner-city community. The Town will continue to implement these strategies in response to the needs of a growing population.</p> <p>3. Noted. Amenity issues such as overshadowing are controlled through the planning framework, particularly the R-Codes. The Town's Local Planning Policy 25 - Streetscapes continues to apply within these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.</p>
20.	5000327	Owner	Victoria Park	<p>1. Removal of restrictions on Multiple Dwellings Does not support the removal restrictions on multiple dwellings.</p>	<p>1. For areas with density codes of R20 (parts of Lathlain, East Victoria Park and St James) and R30 (parts of Carlisle, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park, St James) the removal of restrictions on multiple dwellings under LPS2 presents no change to the number of dwellings that can be constructed on any property or the permitted building heights, which remain limited to a maximum of two storeys, than currently permitted under TPS1. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.</p> <p>For areas with density codes of R40 within the Town's Residential Character Area (parts of Burswood, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park), the proposed modification allows for an increase in the number of dwellings that can be constructed via the development of multiple dwellings, however, building heights (limited to a maximum of two storeys) and other primary development controls</p>

				<p>remain comparable. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.</p> <p>Advice from the Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage (DPLH) suggests that re-introducing restrictions on multiple dwellings in certain area in LPS2 is unlikely to be supported by the Western Australian Planning Commission for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restricting multiple dwellings in not an appropriate planning mechanism for the conservation and retention of character dwellings and streetscapes. A heritage area or heritage list is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town seeks to retain character dwellings. A local planning policy is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town is seeking a certain streetscape character appearance. <p>In line with DPLH advice it is recommended that no modification be made to LPS2 in response to submissions received on the character theme, with the exception of a minor adjustment to the wording of the Clause 9 Scheme Aim related to places of heritage significance and character to reflect the above recommended approach, and that other planning mechanisms be investigated as the most appropriate planning instruments to promote the retention of character dwellings and streetscape character.</p>	
21.	5001524	Owner Occupier	Victoria Park	<p>1. Removal of restrictions on Multiple Dwellings Does not support the removal restrictions on multiple dwellings. Concern that the change will result in degradation of local character and community feel of area.</p> <p>2. Traffic and Parking Concerns that new development will result in increased traffic and parking issues.</p>	<p>1. For areas with density codes of R20 (parts of Lathlain, East Victoria Park and St James) and R30 (parts of Carlisle, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park, St James) the removal of restrictions on multiple dwellings under LPS2 presents no change to the number of dwellings that can be constructed on any property or the permitted building heights, which remain limited to a maximum of two storeys, than currently permitted under TPS1. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.</p> <p>For areas with density codes of R40 within the Town's Residential Character Area (parts of Burswood, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park), the proposed modification allows for an increase in the number of dwellings that can be constructed via the development of multiple dwellings, however, building heights (limited to a maximum of two storeys) and other primary development controls remain comparable. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.</p> <p>Advice from the Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage (DPLH) suggests that re-introducing restrictions on multiple dwellings in certain area in LPS2 is unlikely to be supported by the Western Australian Planning Commission for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restricting multiple dwellings in not an appropriate planning mechanism for the conservation and retention of character dwellings and streetscapes. A heritage area or heritage list is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town seeks to retain character dwellings. A local planning policy is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town is seeking a certain streetscape character appearance. <p>In line with DPLH advice it is recommended that no modification be made to LPS2 in response to submissions received on the character theme, with the exception of a minor adjustment to the wording of the Clause 9 Scheme Aim related to places of heritage significance and character to reflect the above recommended approach, and that other planning mechanisms be investigated as the most appropriate planning instruments to promote the retention of character dwellings and streetscape character.</p> <p>2. Noted. The Town's Integrated Transport Strategy and Parking Management Plan, endorsed by Council in 2022, outline detailed guidance for managing the Town's transport network and parking to support the Town as liveable inner-city community. The Town will continue to implement these strategies in response to the needs of a growing population.</p>
22.	5001616	Owner	Lathlain	<p>1. Removal of restrictions on Multiple Dwellings Does not support the removal restrictions on multiple dwellings. Concerns that new development will diminish local character.</p>	<p>1. For areas with density codes of R20 (parts of Lathlain, East Victoria Park and St James) and R30 (parts of Carlisle, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park, St James) the removal of restrictions on multiple dwellings under LPS2 presents no change to the number of dwellings that can be constructed on any property or the permitted building heights, which remain limited to a maximum of two storeys, than currently permitted under TPS1. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily</p>

					<p>LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.</p> <p>For areas with density codes of R40 within the Town’s Residential Character Area (parts of Burswood, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park), the proposed modification allows for an increase in the number of dwellings that can be constructed via the development of multiple dwellings, however, building heights (limited to a maximum of two storeys) and other primary development controls remain comparable. The Town’s local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.</p> <p>Advice from the Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage (DPLH) suggests that re-introducing restrictions on multiple dwellings in certain area in LPS2 is unlikely to be supported by the Western Australian Planning Commission for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restricting multiple dwellings in not an appropriate planning mechanism for the conservation and retention of character dwellings and streetscapes. A heritage area or heritage list is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town seeks to retain character dwellings. A local planning policy is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town is seeking a certain streetscape character appearance. <p>In line with DPLH advice it is recommended that no modification be made to LPS2 in response to submissions received on the character theme, with the exception of a minor adjustment to the wording of the Clause 9 Scheme Aim related to places of heritage significance and character to reflect the above recommended approach, and that other planning mechanisms be investigated as the most appropriate planning instruments to promote the retention of character dwellings and streetscape character.</p>
23.	5001677	Owner Occupier	Victoria Park	<p>1. Removal of restrictions on Multiple Dwellings Does not support the removal restrictions on multiple dwellings. Concerns that new development will diminish local character and recommends less areas should be subject to the change.</p>	<p>1. For areas with density codes of R20 (parts of Lathlain, East Victoria Park and St James) and R30 (parts of Carlisle, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park, St James) the removal of restrictions on multiple dwellings under LPS2 presents no change to the number of dwellings that can be constructed on any property or the permitted building heights, which remain limited to a maximum of two storeys, than currently permitted under TPS1. The Town’s local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.</p> <p>For areas with density codes of R40 within the Town’s Residential Character Area (parts of Burswood, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park), the proposed modification allows for an increase in the number of dwellings that can be constructed via the development of multiple dwellings, however, building heights (limited to a maximum of two storeys) and other primary development controls remain comparable. The Town’s local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.</p> <p>Advice from the Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage (DPLH) suggests that re-introducing restrictions on multiple dwellings in certain area in LPS2 is unlikely to be supported by the Western Australian Planning Commission for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restricting multiple dwellings in not an appropriate planning mechanism for the conservation and retention of character dwellings and streetscapes. A heritage area or heritage list is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town seeks to retain character dwellings. A local planning policy is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town is seeking a certain streetscape character appearance. <p>In line with DPLH advice it is recommended that no modification be made to LPS2 in response to submissions received on the character theme, with the exception of a minor adjustment to the wording of the Clause 9 Scheme Aim related to places of heritage significance and character to reflect the above recommended approach, and that other planning mechanisms be investigated as the most appropriate planning instruments to promote the retention of character dwellings and streetscape character.</p>
24.	5001703	Owner Occupier	Victoria Park	<p>1. Removal of restrictions on Multiple Dwellings Does not support the removal restrictions on multiple dwellings. Concern that</p>	<p>1. For areas with density codes of R20 (parts of Lathlain, East Victoria Park and St James) and R30 (parts of Carlisle, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park, St James) the removal of restrictions on multiple dwellings under LPS2 presents no change to the number of</p>

the change will result in degradation of local character and community feel of area.

dwellings that can be constructed on any property or the permitted building heights, which remain limited to a maximum of two storeys, than currently permitted under TPS1. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.

For areas with density codes of R40 within the Town's Residential Character Area (parts of Burswood, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park), the proposed modification allows for an increase in the number of dwellings that can be constructed via the development of multiple dwellings, however, building heights (limited to a maximum of two storeys) and other primary development controls remain comparable. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.

Advice from the Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage (DPLH) suggests that re-introducing restrictions on multiple dwellings in certain area in LPS2 is unlikely to be supported by the Western Australian Planning Commission for the following reasons:

- Restricting multiple dwellings in not an appropriate planning mechanism for the conservation and retention of character dwellings and streetscapes.
- A heritage area or heritage list is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town seeks to retain character dwellings.
- A local planning policy is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town is seeking a certain streetscape character appearance.

In line with DPLH advice it is recommended that no modification be made to LPS2 in response to submissions received on the character theme, with the exception of a minor adjustment to the wording of the Clause 9 Scheme Aim related to places of heritage significance and character to reflect the above recommended approach, and that other planning mechanisms be investigated as the most appropriate planning instruments to promote the retention of character dwellings and streetscape character.

25. 5001923 Owner Lathlain

1. Removal of restrictions on Multiple Dwellings
Does not support the removal restrictions on multiple dwellings or any high-rise development.

1. For areas with density codes of R20 (parts of Lathlain, East Victoria Park and St James) and R30 (parts of Carlisle, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park, St James) the removal of restrictions on multiple dwellings under LPS2 presents no change to the number of dwellings that can be constructed on any property or the permitted building heights, which remain limited to a maximum of two storeys, than currently permitted under TPS1. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.

For areas with density codes of R40 within the Town's Residential Character Area (parts of Burswood, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park), the proposed modification allows for an increase in the number of dwellings that can be constructed via the development of multiple dwellings, however, building heights (limited to a maximum of two storeys) and other primary development controls remain comparable. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.

Advice from the Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage (DPLH) suggests that re-introducing restrictions on multiple dwellings in certain area in LPS2 is unlikely to be supported by the Western Australian Planning Commission for the following reasons:

- Restricting multiple dwellings in not an appropriate planning mechanism for the conservation and retention of character dwellings and streetscapes.
- A heritage area or heritage list is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town seeks to retain character dwellings.
- A local planning policy is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town is seeking a certain streetscape character appearance.

In line with DPLH advice it is recommended that no modification be made to LPS2 in response to submissions received on the character theme, with the exception of a minor adjustment to the wording of the Clause 9 Scheme Aim related to places of heritage significance and character to reflect the above recommended approach, and that other planning mechanisms be investigated as the most appropriate planning instruments to promote the retention of character dwellings and streetscape character.

26. 5004287 Owner Lathlain

1. Removal of restrictions on Multiple Dwellings

1. For areas with density codes of R20 (parts of Lathlain, East Victoria Park and St James) and R30 (parts of Carlisle, Victoria Park,

		Occupier		Does not support the removal restrictions on multiple dwellings or any high-rise development.	<p>East Victoria Park, St James) the removal of restrictions on multiple dwellings under LPS2 presents no change to the number of dwellings that can be constructed on any property or the permitted building heights, which remain limited to a maximum of two storeys, than currently permitted under TPS1. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.</p> <p>For areas with density codes of R40 within the Town's Residential Character Area (parts of Burswood, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park), the proposed modification allows for an increase in the number of dwellings that can be constructed via the development of multiple dwellings, however, building heights (limited to a maximum of two storeys) and other primary development controls remain comparable. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.</p> <p>Advice from the Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage (DPLH) suggests that re-introducing restrictions on multiple dwellings in certain area in LPS2 is unlikely to be supported by the Western Australian Planning Commission for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restricting multiple dwellings is not an appropriate planning mechanism for the conservation and retention of character dwellings and streetscapes. A heritage area or heritage list is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town seeks to retain character dwellings. A local planning policy is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town is seeking a certain streetscape character appearance. <p>In line with DPLH advice it is recommended that no modification be made to LPS2 in response to submissions received on the character theme, with the exception of a minor adjustment to the wording of the Clause 9 Scheme Aim related to places of heritage significance and character to reflect the above recommended approach, and that other planning mechanisms be investigated as the most appropriate planning instruments to promote the retention of character dwellings and streetscape character.</p>
27.	5004573	Occupier	Lathlain	<p>1. General LPS2 Comments Supports the content of the scheme.</p>	1. Noted.
28.	5004639	Owner Occupier	Lathlain	<p>1. Site specific - various properties on Rutland Ave, Lathlain Does not support the upcoding from R20 to R60 of various properties on Rutland Ave, Lathlain.</p> <p>2. Traffic and Parking Concerns that new development will result in increased traffic and negatively impact on walkability.</p>	<p>1. Noted - the Local Planning Strategy designates selected properties in the catchment of Burswood Station and Victoria Park Station as Future Investigation Areas for consideration as medium and/or higher density development. To ensure LPS2 reflects the built form density of existing apartment buildings within this area a R60 density code has been applied to relevant sites.</p> <p>2. Noted. The Town's Integrated Transport Strategy and Parking Management Plan, endorsed by Council in 2022, outline detailed guidance for managing the Town's transport network and parking to support the Town as liveable inner-city community. The Town will continue to implement these strategies in response to the needs of a growing population.</p>
29.	5005037	Owner	Lathlain	<p>1. General LPS2 Comments Does not support any new development above two storeys. Concerns that new development will diminish local character and should be located elsewhere.</p>	1. Noted. Building heights are determined by the R-Codes for each density code. LPS2 implements the Local Planning Strategy which directs population and housing growth towards certain locations of the Town; primarily activity centres and urban corridors and generally limiting growth in established lower density suburban areas. The R-Codes applicable to the lower density suburban areas (R20, R30 and R40) only allow for development up to 2 storeys.
30.	5008758	Owner	Carlisle	<p>1. General LPS2 Comments Does not support any new development above two storeys.</p> <p>2. Traffic and Parking Concerns that new development will result in increased traffic and negatively impact parking.</p> <p>3. Location of new development Only supports 3 storey development or above on main roads or near major facilities.</p>	<p>1. Noted. Building heights are determined by the R-Codes for each density code.</p> <p>2. Noted. The Town's Integrated Transport Strategy and Parking Management Plan, endorsed by Council in 2022, outline detailed guidance for managing the Town's transport network and parking to support the Town as liveable inner-city community. The Town will continue to implement these strategies in response to the needs of a growing population.</p> <p>3. Noted - LPS2 implements the Local Planning Strategy which directs population and housing growth towards certain locations of the Town; primarily activity centres and urban corridors and generally limiting growth in established lower density suburban areas. The R-Codes applicable to the lower density suburban areas (R20, R30 and R40) only allow for development up to 2 storeys.</p>
31.	5009614	Owner Occupier	East Victoria Park	<p>1. Removal of restrictions on Multiple Dwellings Does not support the removal restrictions on multiple dwellings. Concerns that new development will diminish local character and amenity.</p>	1. For areas with density codes of R20 (parts of Lathlain, East Victoria Park and St James) and R30 (parts of Carlisle, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park, St James) the removal of restrictions on multiple dwellings under LPS2 presents no change to the number of dwellings that can be constructed on any property or the permitted building heights, which remain limited to a maximum of two storeys, than currently permitted under TPS1. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily

				<p>LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.</p> <p>For areas with density codes of R40 within the Town’s Residential Character Area (parts of Burswood, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park), the proposed modification allows for an increase in the number of dwellings that can be constructed via the development of multiple dwellings, however, building heights (limited to a maximum of two storeys) and other primary development controls remain comparable. The Town’s local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.</p> <p>Advice from the Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage (DPLH) suggests that re-introducing restrictions on multiple dwellings in certain area in LPS2 is unlikely to be supported by the Western Australian Planning Commission for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restricting multiple dwellings in not an appropriate planning mechanism for the conservation and retention of character dwellings and streetscapes. A heritage area or heritage list is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town seeks to retain character dwellings. A local planning policy is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town is seeking a certain streetscape character appearance. <p>In line with DPLH advice it is recommended that no modification be made to LPS2 in response to submissions received on the character theme, with the exception of a minor adjustment to the wording of the Clause 9 Scheme Aim related to places of heritage significance and character to reflect the above recommended approach, and that other planning mechanisms be investigated as the most appropriate planning instruments to promote the retention of character dwellings and streetscape character.</p>
32.	5010284	Owner Occupier	East Victoria Park	<p>1. Removal of restrictions on Multiple Dwellings Does not support the removal restrictions on multiple dwellings. Concerns that new development will diminish local character and amenity.</p> <p>2. Traffic and Parking Concerns that new development will result in increased traffic and negatively impact parking.</p> <p>3. Amenity and Safety Concerns that new development will result in increased crime and reduce safety.</p> <p>1. For areas with density codes of R20 (parts of Lathlain, East Victoria Park and St James) and R30 (parts of Carlisle, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park, St James) the removal of restrictions on multiple dwellings under LPS2 presents no change to the number of dwellings that can be constructed on any property or the permitted building heights, which remain limited to a maximum of two storeys, than currently permitted under TPS1. The Town’s local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.</p> <p>For areas with density codes of R40 within the Town’s Residential Character Area (parts of Burswood, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park), the proposed modification allows for an increase in the number of dwellings that can be constructed via the development of multiple dwellings, however, building heights (limited to a maximum of two storeys) and other primary development controls remain comparable. The Town’s local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.</p> <p>Advice from the Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage (DPLH) suggests that re-introducing restrictions on multiple dwellings in certain area in LPS2 is unlikely to be supported by the Western Australian Planning Commission for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restricting multiple dwellings in not an appropriate planning mechanism for the conservation and retention of character dwellings and streetscapes. A heritage area or heritage list is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town seeks to retain character dwellings. A local planning policy is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town is seeking a certain streetscape character appearance. <p>In line with DPLH advice it is recommended that no modification be made to LPS2 in response to submissions received on the character theme, with the exception of a minor adjustment to the wording of the Clause 9 Scheme Aim related to places of heritage significance and character to reflect the above recommended approach, and that other planning mechanisms be investigated as the most appropriate planning instruments to promote the retention of character dwellings and streetscape character.</p> <p>2. Noted. The Town's Integrated Transport Strategy and Parking Management Plan, endorsed by Council in 2022, outline detailed guidance for managing the Town's transport network and parking to support the Town as liveable inner-city community. The Town will continue to implement these strategies in response to the needs of a growing population.</p>

					3. Noted. Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles are applied within the R-Codes, precinct structure plans and local planning polices in the local planning framework. Other matters relating to safety and security are outside the scope of LPS2.
33.	5010327	Owner Occupier	Carlisle	<p>1. Site Specific - Carlisle Town Centre, 47 Planet Street Concerns that development will adversely impact on amenity via overshadowing.</p> <p>2. Traffic and Parking Concerns that new development will result in increased traffic and negatively impact parking. Requests that the site continue to be maintained as a car park.</p>	<p>1. Noted. Amenity issues such as overshadowing are controlled through the planning framework, particularly the R-Codes and will apply to this site should it be developed.</p> <p>2. Noted. The Town's Integrated Transport Strategy and Parking Management Plan, endorsed by Council in 2022, outline detailed guidance for managing the Town's transport network and parking to support the Town as liveable inner-city community. The Town will continue to implement these strategies in response to the needs of a growing population.</p>
34.	5011317	Owner	St James	<p>1. Site Specific - 1 Boundary Road, St James Request consideration for No.1 Boundary Road, St James to be up coded to RAC4 and zoned Local Centre as per recommended changes to adjoining properties at No.1057-1059 and No.1061-1065 Albany Highway, St James to support the expansion of the local centre.</p> <p>Concerns that the redevelopment of No.1057-1059 and No.1061-1065 Albany Highway will have negative impacts on the amenity of No.1 Boundary Road by way of overlooking, overshadowing and noise and that this will diminish the value of the property.</p>	<p>1. Noted. The Local Planning Strategy identifies that No.1057-1095 and No.1061-1065 Albany Highway St James as existing commercial properties in both built form and use and recommends that LPS2 designate a suitable commercial zoning to these properties (resulting in the recommended 'Local Centre' zone and RAC4 [Neighbourhood Centre] r-coding).</p> <p>An objective of the Local Planning Strategy for St James is to maintain the existing low-scale, low density residential character of the neighbourhood.</p> <p>No.1 Boundary Road, St James contains a single house and the request to change this property from 'Residential' (R30) to 'Local Centre' (RAC4) is not supported as it would be inconsistent with the Local Planning Strategy.</p>
35.	5013841	Owner Occupier	East Victoria Park	<p>1. Removal of restrictions on Multiple Dwellings Does not support the removal restrictions on multiple dwellings.</p>	<p>1. For areas with density codes of R20 (parts of Lathlain, East Victoria Park and St James) and R30 (parts of Carlisle, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park, St James) the removal of restrictions on multiple dwellings under LPS2 presents no change to the number of dwellings that can be constructed on any property or the permitted building heights, which remain limited to a maximum of two storeys, than currently permitted under TPS1. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.</p> <p>For areas with density codes of R40 within the Town's Residential Character Area (parts of Burswood, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park), the proposed modification allows for an increase in the number of dwellings that can be constructed via the development of multiple dwellings, however, building heights (limited to a maximum of two storeys) and other primary development controls remain comparable. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.</p> <p>Advice from the Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage (DPLH) suggests that re-introducing restrictions on multiple dwellings in certain area in LPS2 is unlikely to be supported by the Western Australian Planning Commission for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restricting multiple dwellings is not an appropriate planning mechanism for the conservation and retention of character dwellings and streetscapes. A heritage area or heritage list is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town seeks to retain character dwellings. A local planning policy is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town is seeking a certain streetscape character appearance. <p>In line with DPLH advice it is recommended that no modification be made to LPS2 in response to submissions received on the character theme, with the exception of a minor adjustment to the wording of the Clause 9 Scheme Aim related to places of heritage significance and character to reflect the above recommended approach, and that other planning mechanisms be investigated as the most appropriate planning instruments to promote the retention of character dwellings and streetscape character.</p>
36.	5013879	Owner Occupier	East Victoria Park	<p>1. Removal of restrictions on Multiple Dwellings Does not support the removal restrictions on multiple dwellings. Concerns that new development will degrade local character. Encourages the Town to adopt policies that protect local character.</p> <p>2. Site Specific - Edward Millen Reserve</p>	<p>1. For areas with density codes of R20 (parts of Lathlain, East Victoria Park and St James) and R30 (parts of Carlisle, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park, St James) the removal of restrictions on multiple dwellings under LPS2 presents no change to the number of dwellings that can be constructed on any property or the permitted building heights, which remain limited to a maximum of two storeys, than currently permitted under TPS1. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.</p>

				<p>Requests that the Town progresses plans for the redevelopment of Edward Millen Reserve.</p> <p>3. Site specific - Albany Highway and Shepperton Road Requests that the Town focuses on fixing the Albany Highway and Shepperton Road intersection.</p>	<p>For areas with density codes of R40 within the Town's Residential Character Area (parts of Burswood, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park), the proposed modification allows for an increase in the number of dwellings that can be constructed via the development of multiple dwellings, however, building heights (limited to a maximum of two storeys) and other primary development controls remain comparable. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.</p> <p>Advice from the Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage (DPLH) suggests that re-introducing restrictions on multiple dwellings in certain area in LPS2 is unlikely to be supported by the Western Australian Planning Commission for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restricting multiple dwellings is not an appropriate planning mechanism for the conservation and retention of character dwellings and streetscapes. A heritage area or heritage list is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town seeks to retain character dwellings. A local planning policy is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town is seeking a certain streetscape character appearance. <p>In line with DPLH advice it is recommended that no modification be made to LPS2 in response to submissions received on the character theme, with the exception of a minor adjustment to the wording of the Clause 9 Scheme Aim related to places of heritage significance and character to reflect the above recommended approach, and that other planning mechanisms be investigated as the most appropriate planning instruments to promote the retention of character dwellings and streetscape character.</p> <p>2. Noted. The timing of the redevelopment of Edward Millen Reserve is outside the scope of LPS2.</p> <p>3. Noted. Alterations to the Albany Highway and Shepperton Road intersection is outside the scope of LPS2.</p>
37.	5016688	Owner	St James	<p>1. Site Specific - 1 Boundary Road, St James Request consideration for No.1 Boundary Road, St James to be up coded to RAC4 and zoned Local Centre as per recommended changes to adjoining properties at 1057-1059 and 1061-1065 Albany Highway, St James to provide for a more feasible redevelopment site.</p> <p>Concerns that the redevelopment of No.1057-1059 and No.1061-1065 Albany Highway will have negative impacts on the amenity of No.1 Boundary Road by way of overlooking, overshadowing and noise and that this will diminish the value of the property.</p>	<p>1. Noted. The Local Planning Strategy identifies that No.1057-1095 and No.1061-1065 Albany Highway St James as existing commercial properties in both built form and use and recommends that LPS2 designate a suitable commercial zoning to these properties (resulting in the recommended 'Local Centre' zone and RAC4 [Neighbourhood Centre] r-coding).</p> <p>An objective of the Local Planning Strategy for St James is to maintain the existing low-scale, low density residential character of the neighbourhood.</p> <p>No.1 Boundary Road, St James contains a single house and the request to change this property from 'Residential' (R30) to 'Local Centre' (RAC4) is not supported as it would be inconsistent with the Local Planning Strategy.</p>
38.	5020620	Owner	Victoria Park	<p>1. General LPS2 Comments Does not support scheme, however, no comments provided.</p>	1. Noted.
39.	5021177	Owner	Victoria Park	<p>1. General LPS2 Comments Does not support scheme, however, no comments provided.</p>	1. Noted.
40.	5021652	Owner	Victoria Park	<p>1. General LPS2 Comments Supports the content of the scheme.</p>	1. Noted.
41.	5021671	Owner	Kensington	<p>1. Removal of restrictions on Multiple Dwellings Does not object to the proposed change.</p>	1. Noted.
42.	5025071	Occupier	East Victoria Park	<p>1. General LPS2 Comments Supports opportunities for increased residential densities to support housing choice.</p>	1. Noted.
43.	5030258	Owner Occupier	Victoria Park	<p>1. Removal of restrictions on Multiple Dwellings Does not support the removal restrictions on multiple dwellings. Does not support development over 3 storeys in height. Concerns that high rise development is detrimental to public health and local character.</p>	<p>1. For areas with density codes of R20 (parts of Lathlain, East Victoria Park and St James) and R30 (parts of Carlisle, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park, St James) the removal of restrictions on multiple dwellings under LPS2 presents no change to the number of dwellings that can be constructed on any property or the permitted building heights, which remain limited to a maximum of two storeys, than currently permitted under TPS1. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.</p> <p>For areas with density codes of R40 within the Town's Residential Character Area (parts of Burswood, Victoria Park, East Victoria</p>

				<p>Park), the proposed modification allows for an increase in the number of dwellings that can be constructed via the development of multiple dwellings, however, building heights (limited to a maximum of two storeys) and other primary development controls remain comparable. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.</p> <p>Advice from the Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage (DPLH) suggests that re-introducing restrictions on multiple dwellings in certain area in LPS2 is unlikely to be supported by the Western Australian Planning Commission for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restricting multiple dwellings in not an appropriate planning mechanism for the conservation and retention of character dwellings and streetscapes. A heritage area or heritage list is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town seeks to retain character dwellings. A local planning policy is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town is seeking a certain streetscape character appearance. <p>In line with DPLH advice it is recommended that no modification be made to LPS2 in response to submissions received on the character theme, with the exception of a minor adjustment to the wording of the Clause 9 Scheme Aim related to places of heritage significance and character to reflect the above recommended approach, and that other planning mechanisms be investigated as the most appropriate planning instruments to promote the retention of character dwellings and streetscape character.</p>	
44.	5030289	Owner	East Victoria Park	<p>1. Removal of restrictions on Multiple Dwellings Does not support the removal restrictions on multiple dwellings. Concerns that new development will diminish local character.</p>	<p>1. For areas with density codes of R20 (parts of Lathlain, East Victoria Park and St James) and R30 (parts of Carlisle, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park, St James) the removal of restrictions on multiple dwellings under LPS2 presents no change to the number of dwellings that can be constructed on any property or the permitted building heights, which remain limited to a maximum of two storeys, than currently permitted under TPS1. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.</p> <p>For areas with density codes of R40 within the Town's Residential Character Area (parts of Burswood, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park), the proposed modification allows for an increase in the number of dwellings that can be constructed via the development of multiple dwellings, however, building heights (limited to a maximum of two storeys) and other primary development controls remain comparable. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.</p> <p>Advice from the Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage (DPLH) suggests that re-introducing restrictions on multiple dwellings in certain area in LPS2 is unlikely to be supported by the Western Australian Planning Commission for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restricting multiple dwellings in not an appropriate planning mechanism for the conservation and retention of character dwellings and streetscapes. A heritage area or heritage list is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town seeks to retain character dwellings. A local planning policy is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town is seeking a certain streetscape character appearance. <p>In line with DPLH advice it is recommended that no modification be made to LPS2 in response to submissions received on the character theme, with the exception of a minor adjustment to the wording of the Clause 9 Scheme Aim related to places of heritage significance and character to reflect the above recommended approach, and that other planning mechanisms be investigated as the most appropriate planning instruments to promote the retention of character dwellings and streetscape character.</p>
45.	5033248	Owner	Victoria Park	<p>1. Removal of restrictions on Multiple Dwellings Does not support the removal restrictions on multiple dwellings. Concerns that new development will diminish local character.</p> <p>2. Traffic and Parking Concerns that new development will result in increased traffic and negatively impact parking.</p>	<p>1. For areas with density codes of R20 (parts of Lathlain, East Victoria Park and St James) and R30 (parts of Carlisle, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park, St James) the removal of restrictions on multiple dwellings under LPS2 presents no change to the number of dwellings that can be constructed on any property or the permitted building heights, which remain limited to a maximum of two storeys, than currently permitted under TPS1. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.</p> <p>For areas with density codes of R40 within the Town's Residential Character Area (parts of Burswood, Victoria Park, East Victoria</p>

3. Loss of greenspace and wildlife

Concerns that new development will result in loss of trees and wildlife.

Park), the proposed modification allows for an increase in the number of dwellings that can be constructed via the development of multiple dwellings, however, building heights (limited to a maximum of two storeys) and other primary development controls remain comparable. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.

Advice from the Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage (DPLH) suggests that re-introducing restrictions on multiple dwellings in certain area in LPS2 is unlikely to be supported by the Western Australian Planning Commission for the following reasons:

- Restricting multiple dwellings in not an appropriate planning mechanism for the conservation and retention of character dwellings and streetscapes.
- A heritage area or heritage list is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town seeks to retain character dwellings.
- A local planning policy is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town is seeking a certain streetscape character appearance.

In line with DPLH advice it is recommended that no modification be made to LPS2 in response to submissions received on the character theme, with the exception of a minor adjustment to the wording of the Clause 9 Scheme Aim related to places of heritage significance and character to reflect the above recommended approach, and that other planning mechanisms be investigated as the most appropriate planning instruments to promote the retention of character dwellings and streetscape character. 2. Noted. The Town's Integrated Transport Strategy and Parking Management Plan, endorsed by Council in 2022, outline detailed guidance for managing the Town's transport network and parking to support the Town as liveable inner-city community. The Town will continue to implement these strategies in response to the needs of a growing population.

3. It is recognised that there is growing pressure on urban tree canopy from infill development and that there is an absence of appropriate mechanisms in the State planning framework to retain and protect trees on private land.

In response to submissions it is recommended that modifications are made to LPS2 to include provisions to facilitate the preparation of a Significant Tree Register, in keeping with the WAPCs established preferred approach to tree retention on private land within local planning schemes, as a first step to affording registered significant trees a greater level of protection under the scheme.

In addition to including the Significant Tree Register provisions within LPS2, it is recommended that the Town prepares a local planning policy that stipulates the circumstances in which the removal of a tree on private land requires development approval in accordance with emerging industry practice.

46.

5033251

Owner
Occupier

Victoria
Park

1. Removal of restrictions on Multiple Dwellings

Does not support the removal restrictions on multiple dwellings. Concerns that new development will diminish local character.

1. For areas with density codes of R20 (parts of Lathlain, East Victoria Park and St James) and R30 (parts of Carlisle, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park, St James) the removal of restrictions on multiple dwellings under LPS2 presents no change to the number of dwellings that can be constructed on any property or the permitted building heights, which remain limited to a maximum of two storeys, than currently permitted under TPS1. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.

For areas with density codes of R40 within the Town's Residential Character Area (parts of Burswood, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park), the proposed modification allows for an increase in the number of dwellings that can be constructed via the development of multiple dwellings, however, building heights (limited to a maximum of two storeys) and other primary development controls remain comparable. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.

Advice from the Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage (DPLH) suggests that re-introducing restrictions on multiple dwellings in certain area in LPS2 is unlikely to be supported by the Western Australian Planning Commission for the following reasons:

- Restricting multiple dwellings in not an appropriate planning mechanism for the conservation and retention of character dwellings and streetscapes.
- A heritage area or heritage list is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town seeks to retain character dwellings.
- A local planning policy is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town is seeking a certain streetscape character

				<p>appearance.</p> <p>In line with DPLH advice it is recommended that no modification be made to LPS2 in response to submissions received on the character theme, with the exception of a minor adjustment to the wording of the Clause 9 Scheme Aim related to places of heritage significance and character to reflect the above recommended approach, and that other planning mechanisms be investigated as the most appropriate planning instruments to promote the retention of character dwellings and streetscape character.</p>
47.	5033253	Owner Occupier	Carlisle	<p>1. Removal of restrictions on Multiple Dwellings Does not support the removal restrictions on multiple dwellings. Concerns that new development will diminish local character.</p> <p>1. For areas with density codes of R20 (parts of Lathlain, East Victoria Park and St James) and R30 (parts of Carlisle, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park, St James) the removal of restrictions on multiple dwellings under LPS2 presents no change to the number of dwellings that can be constructed on any property or the permitted building heights, which remain limited to a maximum of two storeys, than currently permitted under TPS1. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.</p> <p>For areas with density codes of R40 within the Town's Residential Character Area (parts of Burswood, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park), the proposed modification allows for an increase in the number of dwellings that can be constructed via the development of multiple dwellings, however, building heights (limited to a maximum of two storeys) and other primary development controls remain comparable. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.</p> <p>Advice from the Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage (DPLH) suggests that re-introducing restrictions on multiple dwellings in certain area in LPS2 is unlikely to be supported by the Western Australian Planning Commission for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restricting multiple dwellings in not an appropriate planning mechanism for the conservation and retention of character dwellings and streetscapes. A heritage area or heritage list is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town seeks to retain character dwellings. A local planning policy is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town is seeking a certain streetscape character appearance. <p>In line with DPLH advice it is recommended that no modification be made to LPS2 in response to submissions received on the character theme, with the exception of a minor adjustment to the wording of the Clause 9 Scheme Aim related to places of heritage significance and character to reflect the above recommended approach, and that other planning mechanisms be investigated as the most appropriate planning instruments to promote the retention of character dwellings and streetscape character.</p>
48.	5033254	Owner	Carlisle	<p>1. Removal of restrictions on Multiple Dwellings Does not support the removal restrictions on multiple dwellings. Concerns that new development will diminish local character.</p> <p>1. For areas with density codes of R20 (parts of Lathlain, East Victoria Park and St James) and R30 (parts of Carlisle, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park, St James) the removal of restrictions on multiple dwellings under LPS2 presents no change to the number of dwellings that can be constructed on any property or the permitted building heights, which remain limited to a maximum of two storeys, than currently permitted under TPS1. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.</p> <p>For areas with density codes of R40 within the Town's Residential Character Area (parts of Burswood, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park), the proposed modification allows for an increase in the number of dwellings that can be constructed via the development of multiple dwellings, however, building heights (limited to a maximum of two storeys) and other primary development controls remain comparable. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.</p> <p>Advice from the Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage (DPLH) suggests that re-introducing restrictions on multiple dwellings in certain area in LPS2 is unlikely to be supported by the Western Australian Planning Commission for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restricting multiple dwellings in not an appropriate planning mechanism for the conservation and retention of character dwellings and streetscapes. A heritage area or heritage list is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town seeks to retain character dwellings.

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A local planning policy is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town is seeking a certain streetscape character appearance. <p>In line with DPLH advice it is recommended that no modification be made to LPS2 in response to submissions received on the character theme, with the exception of a minor adjustment to the wording of the Clause 9 Scheme Aim related to places of heritage significance and character to reflect the above recommended approach, and that other planning mechanisms be investigated as the most appropriate planning instruments to promote the retention of character dwellings and streetscape character.</p>	
49.	5042496	Owner Occupier	Carlisle	<p>1. Removal of restrictions on Multiple Dwellings Does not support the removal restrictions on multiple dwellings. Concerns that new development will diminish local character.</p> <p>2. Amenity and Safety Concerns that new development will result in increased crime.</p> <p>3. Loss of trees and wildlife Concerns that new development will result in loss of trees and wildlife.</p>	<p>1. For areas with density codes of R20 (parts of Lathlain, East Victoria Park and St James) and R30 (parts of Carlisle, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park, St James) the removal of restrictions on multiple dwellings under LPS2 presents no change to the number of dwellings that can be constructed on any property or the permitted building heights, which remain limited to a maximum of two storeys, than currently permitted under TPS1. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.</p> <p>For areas with density codes of R40 within the Town's Residential Character Area (parts of Burswood, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park), the proposed modification allows for an increase in the number of dwellings that can be constructed via the development of multiple dwellings, however, building heights (limited to a maximum of two storeys) and other primary development controls remain comparable. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.</p> <p>Advice from the Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage (DPLH) suggests that re-introducing restrictions on multiple dwellings in certain area in LPS2 is unlikely to be supported by the Western Australian Planning Commission for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restricting multiple dwellings is not an appropriate planning mechanism for the conservation and retention of character dwellings and streetscapes. A heritage area or heritage list is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town seeks to retain character dwellings. A local planning policy is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town is seeking a certain streetscape character appearance. <p>In line with DPLH advice it is recommended that no modification be made to LPS2 in response to submissions received on the character theme, with the exception of a minor adjustment to the wording of the Clause 9 Scheme Aim related to places of heritage significance and character to reflect the above recommended approach, and that other planning mechanisms be investigated as the most appropriate planning instruments to promote the retention of character dwellings and streetscape character.</p> <p>2. Noted. Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles are applied within the R-Codes, precinct structure plans and local planning policies in the local planning framework. Other matters relating to safety and security are outside the scope of LPS2.</p> <p>3. It is recognised that there is growing pressure on urban tree canopy from infill development and that there is an absence of appropriate mechanisms in the State planning framework to retain and protect trees on private land.</p> <p>In response to submissions it is recommended that modifications are made to LPS2 to include provisions to facilitate the preparation of a Significant Tree Register, in keeping with the WAPCs established preferred approach to tree retention on private land within local planning schemes, as a first step to affording registered significant trees a greater level of protection under the scheme.</p> <p>In addition to including the Significant Tree Register provisions within LPS2, it is recommended that the Town prepares a local planning policy that stipulates the circumstances in which the removal of a tree on private land requires development approval in accordance with emerging industry practice.</p>
50.	5042530	Owner Occupier	East Victoria Park	<p>1. Removal of restrictions on Multiple Dwellings Does not support the removal restrictions on multiple dwellings. Concerns that</p>	<p>1. For areas with density codes of R20 (parts of Lathlain, East Victoria Park and St James) and R30 (parts of Carlisle, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park, St James) the removal of restrictions on multiple dwellings under LPS2 presents no change to the number of</p>

				<p>new development will diminish local character.</p> <p>2. Traffic and Parking Concerns that new development will result in increased traffic and negatively impact parking.</p>	<p>dwellings that can be constructed on any property or the permitted building heights, which remain limited to a maximum of two storeys, than currently permitted under TPS1. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.</p> <p>For areas with density codes of R40 within the Town's Residential Character Area (parts of Burswood, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park), the proposed modification allows for an increase in the number of dwellings that can be constructed via the development of multiple dwellings, however, building heights (limited to a maximum of two storeys) and other primary development controls remain comparable. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.</p> <p>Advice from the Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage (DPLH) suggests that re-introducing restrictions on multiple dwellings in certain area in LPS2 is unlikely to be supported by the Western Australian Planning Commission for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restricting multiple dwellings is not an appropriate planning mechanism for the conservation and retention of character dwellings and streetscapes. A heritage area or heritage list is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town seeks to retain character dwellings. A local planning policy is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town is seeking a certain streetscape character appearance. <p>In line with DPLH advice it is recommended that no modification be made to LPS2 in response to submissions received on the character theme, with the exception of a minor adjustment to the wording of the Clause 9 Scheme Aim related to places of heritage significance and character to reflect the above recommended approach, and that other planning mechanisms be investigated as the most appropriate planning instruments to promote the retention of character dwellings and streetscape character.</p> <p>2. Noted. The Town's Integrated Transport Strategy and Parking Management Plan, endorsed by Council in 2022, outline detailed guidance for managing the Town's transport network and parking to support the Town as liveable inner-city community. The Town will continue to implement these strategies in response to the needs of a growing population.</p>
51.	5047298	Owner Occupier	East Victoria Park	<p>1. General LPS2 Comments Does not support new development that increases residential densities.</p> <p>2. Amenity and Safety Concerns that new development will diminish amenity through overlooking and overshadowing.</p> <p>3. Traffic and Parking Concerns that new development will result in increased traffic and negatively impact parking.</p> <p>4. Effect on Property Values Concerns that new development will negatively affect property values.</p>	<p>1. Noted - Under the State Government's Central Sub-Regional Planning Framework each local government is required to meet an infill dwelling target of additional dwelling growth to 2050. LPS2 implements the Local Planning Strategy which directs population and housing growth towards certain locations of the Town; primarily activity centres and urban corridors and generally limiting growth in established lower density suburban areas.</p> <p>2. Noted. Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles are applied within the R-Codes, precinct structure plans and local planning policies in the local planning framework. Other matters relating to safety and security are outside the scope of LPS2.</p> <p>3. Noted. The Town's Integrated Transport Strategy and Parking Management Plan, endorsed by Council in 2022, outline detailed guidance for managing the Town's transport network and parking to support the Town as liveable inner city community. The Town will continue to implement these strategies in response to the needs of a growing population.</p> <p>4. Noted. Property values are not a planning matter and outside the scope of LPS2.</p>
52.	5047963	Owner	Victoria Park	<p>1. General LPS2 Comments Does not support new development that increases residential densities around Raphael Park, Victoria Park.</p> <p>2. Traffic and Parking Concerns that new development will result in increased traffic and negatively impact parking.</p> <p>3. Increased pressure on infrastructure</p>	<p>1. LPS2 implements the Local Planning Strategy which directs population and housing growth towards certain locations of the Town; primarily activity centres and urban corridors and generally limiting growth in established lower density suburban areas. No changes to residential densities are proposed under LPS2 for the Raphael Precinct (noting that changes are being considered to the north-eastern parts of this area under the Albany Highway Precinct Structure Plan currently under development).</p> <p>2. Noted. The Town's Integrated Transport Strategy and Parking Management Plan, endorsed by Council in 2022, outline detailed guidance for managing the Town's transport network and parking to support the Town as liveable inner city community. The Town will continue to implement these strategies in response to the needs of a growing population.</p>

				Concerns that existing infrastructure - sewerage and local greenspace amenities cannot cope with additional population growth.	3. Noted. Service agencies are aware of the population and dwelling growth proposed as part of the Local Planning Strategy and LPS2 and will use these forecasts to inform their forward planning to upgrade infrastructure as required. The Town's Public Open Space Strategy is currently being implemented to ensure the access, quality and supply to local public open space is meeting the needs of the current future population.
53.	5054366	Owner	Victoria Park	<p>1. Removal of restrictions on Multiple Dwellings Does not support the removal restrictions on multiple dwellings.</p> <p>2. Amenity and Safety Concerns that new development will increase instances of crime and antisocial behaviour.</p>	<p>1. For areas with density codes of R20 (parts of Lathlain, East Victoria Park and St James) and R30 (parts of Carlisle, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park, St James) the removal of restrictions on multiple dwellings under LPS2 presents no change to the number of dwellings that can be constructed on any property or the permitted building heights, which remain limited to a maximum of two storeys, than currently permitted under TPS1. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.</p> <p>For areas with density codes of R40 within the Town's Residential Character Area (parts of Burswood, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park), the proposed modification allows for an increase in the number of dwellings that can be constructed via the development of multiple dwellings, however, building heights (limited to a maximum of two storeys) and other primary development controls remain comparable. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.</p> <p>Advice from the Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage (DPLH) suggests that re-introducing restrictions on multiple dwellings in certain area in LPS2 is unlikely to be supported by the Western Australian Planning Commission for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restricting multiple dwellings in not an appropriate planning mechanism for the conservation and retention of character dwellings and streetscapes. A heritage area or heritage list is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town seeks to retain character dwellings. A local planning policy is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town is seeking a certain streetscape character appearance. <p>In line with DPLH advice it is recommended that no modification be made to LPS2 in response to submissions received on the character theme, with the exception of a minor adjustment to the wording of the Clause 9 Scheme Aim related to places of heritage significance and character to reflect the above recommended approach, and that other planning mechanisms be investigated as the most appropriate planning instruments to promote the retention of character dwellings and streetscape character.</p> <p>2. Noted. Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles are applied within the R-Codes, precinct structure plans and local planning polices in the local planning framework. Other matters relating to safety and security are outside the scope of LPS2.</p>
54.	5054519	Owner	Victoria Park	<p>1. Removal of restrictions on Multiple Dwellings Does not support the removal restrictions on multiple dwellings. Concerns that new development will diminish local character.</p> <p>2. Amenity and Safety Concerns that new development will increase instances of crime and reduce safety.</p> <p>3. Traffic and Parking Concerns that new development will negatively impact availability of on-street parking.</p>	<p>1. For areas with density codes of R20 (parts of Lathlain, East Victoria Park and St James) and R30 (parts of Carlisle, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park, St James) the removal of restrictions on multiple dwellings under LPS2 presents no change to the number of dwellings that can be constructed on any property or the permitted building heights, which remain limited to a maximum of two storeys, than currently permitted under TPS1. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.</p> <p>For areas with density codes of R40 within the Town's Residential Character Area (parts of Burswood, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park), the proposed modification allows for an increase in the number of dwellings that can be constructed via the development of multiple dwellings, however, building heights (limited to a maximum of two storeys) and other primary development controls remain comparable. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.</p> <p>Advice from the Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage (DPLH) suggests that re-introducing restrictions on multiple dwellings in certain area in LPS2 is unlikely to be supported by the Western Australian Planning Commission for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restricting multiple dwellings in not an appropriate planning mechanism for the conservation and retention of character dwellings and streetscapes. A heritage area or heritage list is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town seeks to retain character dwellings.

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A local planning policy is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town is seeking a certain streetscape character appearance. <p>In line with DPLH advice it is recommended that no modification be made to LPS2 in response to submissions received on the character theme, with the exception of a minor adjustment to the wording of the Clause 9 Scheme Aim related to places of heritage significance and character to reflect the above recommended approach, and that other planning mechanisms be investigated as the most appropriate planning instruments to promote the retention of character dwellings and streetscape character.</p> <p>2. Noted. Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles are applied within the R-Codes, precinct structure plans and local planning policies in the local planning framework. Other matters relating to safety and security are outside the scope of LPS2.</p> <p>3. The Town's Parking Management Plan, endorsed by Council in 2022, outlines detailed guidance for managing the on-street parking to support the Town as liveable inner city community. The Town will continue to implement the plan in response to the needs of a growing population.</p>	
55.	5054834	Owner Occupier	East Victoria Park	<p>1. General LPS2 Comments Does not support new development above two storeys.</p> <p>2. Amenity Concerns that new development over two storeys will cause overshadowing issues.</p>	<p>1. Building heights are determined by the R-Codes for each density code. LPS2 implements the Local Planning Strategy which directs population and housing growth towards certain locations of the Town; primarily activity centres and urban corridors and generally limiting growth in established lower density suburban areas. The R-Codes applicable to the lower density suburban areas (R20, R30 and R40) only allow for development up to 2 storeys.</p> <p>2. Noted. Amenity issues such as overshadowing are controlled through the planning framework, particularly the R-Codes.</p>
56.	5059876	Owner Occupier	East Victoria Park	<p>1. Removal of restrictions on Multiple Dwellings Does not support the removal restrictions on multiple dwellings. Concerns that new development will diminish local character.</p> <p>2. Location of new development Supports new development to occur on transport corridors such as Shepperton Road and Albany Highway.</p> <p>3. Traffic and Parking Concerns that new development will result in increased traffic and negatively impact parking.</p>	<p>1. For areas with density codes of R20 (parts of Lathlain, East Victoria Park and St James) and R30 (parts of Carlisle, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park, St James) the removal of restrictions on multiple dwellings under LPS2 presents no change to the number of dwellings that can be constructed on any property or the permitted building heights, which remain limited to a maximum of two storeys, than currently permitted under TPS1. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.</p> <p>For areas with density codes of R40 within the Town's Residential Character Area (parts of Burswood, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park), the proposed modification allows for an increase in the number of dwellings that can be constructed via the development of multiple dwellings, however, building heights (limited to a maximum of two storeys) and other primary development controls remain comparable. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.</p> <p>Advice from the Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage (DPLH) suggests that re-introducing restrictions on multiple dwellings in certain area in LPS2 is unlikely to be supported by the Western Australian Planning Commission for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restricting multiple dwellings is not an appropriate planning mechanism for the conservation and retention of character dwellings and streetscapes. A heritage area or heritage list is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town seeks to retain character dwellings. A local planning policy is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town is seeking a certain streetscape character appearance. <p>In line with DPLH advice it is recommended that no modification be made to LPS2 in response to submissions received on the character theme, with the exception of a minor adjustment to the wording of the Clause 9 Scheme Aim related to places of heritage significance and character to reflect the above recommended approach, and that other planning mechanisms be investigated as the most appropriate planning instruments to promote the retention of character dwellings and streetscape character.</p> <p>2. Noted - LPS2 implements the Local Planning Strategy which directs population and housing growth towards certain locations of the Town; primarily activity centres and urban corridors (inclusive of the Albany Highway precinct planning area) and generally limiting growth in established lower density suburban areas.</p>

					3. Noted. The Town's Integrated Transport Strategy and Parking Management Plan, endorsed by Council in 2022, outline detailed guidance for managing the Town's transport network and parking to support the Town as liveable inner city community. The Town will continue to implement these strategies in response to the needs of a growing population.
57.	5065530	Occupier	Curtin University or Bentley	1. General LPS2 Comments Request that the community be better consulted on changes. Concerns that area is already too cluttered.	1. Noted. Consultation has been carried out for LPS2 for 90 days in accordance with legislative requirements and following extensive community engagement on the Local Planning Strategy that has informed the content of LPS2.
58.	5065612	Owner	East Victoria Park	1. Site Specific - Jarrah Road, East Vic Park Requests that properties on the northern side of Jarrah Road be zoned R30 or R40 (proposed R20) given the extent of development permitted on the southern side (high density aged care facilities) and being within walking distance to Curtin University. 2. Site Specific - Various properties between Burswood Road and rail line, Burswood Recommends properties in this area allow for greater density of development (at least 3-4 storeys) given the proximity to amenities, public transport and high-density development. 3. Removal of restrictions on Multiple Dwellings Support the removal restrictions on multiple dwellings. 4. General LPS2 Comments Generally supportive of the content of LPS2 and would like to see changes more widespread.	1. Noted - LPS2 implements the Local Planning Strategy which directs population and housing growth towards certain locations of the Town; primarily activity centres and urban corridors and generally limiting growth in established lower density suburban areas. The Local Planning Strategy objective for the East Victoria Park (West) Neighbourhood, including Jarrah Road, is to maintain the existing low-scale, low density residential character of the neighbourhood therefore no density change for this area is contemplated under LPS2. 2. Noted. This part of Victoria Park is coded R40 under LPS2 and allows for medium-density development up to two storeys. The Local Planning Strategy recognises the area between Harper Street, Kitchener Avenue, Gresham Street and Shepperton Road in proximity to Victoria Park Station as a Future Investigation Area for consideration for dwelling infill as a Short-Long Term Action to be completed within 1-5 years. 3. Noted. 4. Noted.
59.	5066991	Occupier	East Victoria Park	1. Site Specific - No.333 Victoria Park Drive, Burswood Concern that No.333 Victoria Park Drive, Burswood is not reserved under the Scheme Map (noting that it is reserved for Parks and Recreation under the Metropolitan Region Scheme).	1. Noted. LPS2 does not apply to the area defined as "Resort Lands" as per Section 7 of the Casino (Burswood Island) Agreement Act 1985, where State and Local government planning approvals do not apply (See Clause 6 note). This area includes No.33 Victoria Park Drive, Burswood therefore no zone or reserve is applied under LPS2.
60.	5067189	Owner	Carlisle	1. Site Specific - 130-136 Oats Street, Carlisle Concerns that new development resulting from the proposed changes to 130-136 Oats Street, Carlisle will result in increased traffic and road safety issues.	1. Noted. No.130-136 Oats Street, Carlisle is proposed to change from 'Commercial' – 'R30' under TPS1 to 'Mixed Use' – 'RAC-4 (Neighbourhood Centre) under LPS2. A 'Mixed Use' zone and density code of RAC-4 is considered suitable for the local context. The Town's Integrated Transport Strategy and Parking Management Plan, endorsed by Council in 2022, outline detailed guidance for managing the Town's transport network and parking to support the Town as liveable inner-city community. The Town will continue to implement these strategies in response to the needs of a growing population.
61.	5068800	Other - Consultant on behalf of owner	Victoria Park	1. Site Specific - Vicinity Centres (Vic Park Central) General comments supportive of LPS2 Supportive of the Albany Highway Precinct Structure Plan vision for the area. Concerns that LPS2 Clause 32 – No.7 Albany Highway District Centre and Mixed Use zones, B) Victoria Park Shopping Area – District Centre Zone – maintains the built form controls of TPS1 and does not support the progressive development of the site as envisaged by the Albany Highway Precinct Structure Plan. Requests that Clause 32 be modified to expediate the application of the Albany Highway Precinct Structure Plan.	1. Not supported. Inconsistent with recommendations of the Local Planning Strategy which recommends that the current TPS1 zones and densities be transitioned to the new LPS2 until further updates are recommended via preparation of the Albany Highway Precinct Structure Plan.
62.	5069120	Owner	Curtin University or Bentley	1. Technology Park, Bentley Concerns that the proposed planning controls are overly restrictive and do not support good outcomes in the area. Requests that land use permissibility in the area be made more flexible and that building height and setback requirements be removed.	1. Noted. In response to submissions and to better provide for the implementation of the Bentley-Curtin Specialised Activity Centre Plan (WAPC, 2018) it is recommended that modifications be made to LPS2 to more closely align built form and land use controls with the BCSACP high level vision and guidance for the area while supporting that further detailed precinct planning be undertaken to refine development controls.
63.	5076716	Occupier	East Victoria	1. General LPS2 Comments	1. Noted. The form and manner of LPS is a per the Model Scheme Text format prescribed by the Planning and Development

			Park	Comments that the scheme is " vague, full of jargon and uninspiring".	Regulations
64.	5077032	Owner Occupier	East Victoria Park	<p>1. Removal of restrictions on Multiple Dwellings Does not support the removal restrictions on multiple dwellings. Concerns that new development will diminish local character.</p>	<p>1. For areas with density codes of R20 (parts of Lathlain, East Victoria Park and St James) and R30 (parts of Carlisle, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park, St James) the removal of restrictions on multiple dwellings under LPS2 presents no change to the number of dwellings that can be constructed on any property or the permitted building heights, which remain limited to a maximum of two storeys, than currently permitted under TPS1. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.</p> <p>For areas with density codes of R40 within the Town's Residential Character Area (parts of Burswood, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park), the proposed modification allows for an increase in the number of dwellings that can be constructed via the development of multiple dwellings, however, building heights (limited to a maximum of two storeys) and other primary development controls remain comparable. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.</p> <p>Advice from the Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage (DPLH) suggests that re-introducing restrictions on multiple dwellings in certain area in LPS2 is unlikely to be supported by the Western Australian Planning Commission for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restricting multiple dwellings in not an appropriate planning mechanism for the conservation and retention of character dwellings and streetscapes. A heritage area or heritage list is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town seeks to retain character dwellings. A local planning policy is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town is seeking a certain streetscape character appearance. <p>In line with DPLH advice it is recommended that no modification be made to LPS2 in response to submissions received on the character theme, with the exception of a minor adjustment to the wording of the Clause 9 Scheme Aim related to places of heritage significance and character to reflect the above recommended approach, and that other planning mechanisms be investigated as the most appropriate planning instruments to promote the retention of character dwellings and streetscape character.</p>
65.	5078875	Owner	Victoria Park	<p>1. Removal of restrictions on Multiple Dwellings Does not support the removal restrictions on multiple dwellings. Concerns that new development will diminish local character.</p>	<p>1. For areas with density codes of R20 (parts of Lathlain, East Victoria Park and St James) and R30 (parts of Carlisle, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park, St James) the removal of restrictions on multiple dwellings under LPS2 presents no change to the number of dwellings that can be constructed on any property or the permitted building heights, which remain limited to a maximum of two storeys, than currently permitted under TPS1. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.</p> <p>For areas with density codes of R40 within the Town's Residential Character Area (parts of Burswood, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park), the proposed modification allows for an increase in the number of dwellings that can be constructed via the development of multiple dwellings, however, building heights (limited to a maximum of two storeys) and other primary development controls remain comparable. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.</p> <p>Advice from the Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage (DPLH) suggests that re-introducing restrictions on multiple dwellings in certain area in LPS2 is unlikely to be supported by the Western Australian Planning Commission for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restricting multiple dwellings in not an appropriate planning mechanism for the conservation and retention of character dwellings and streetscapes. A heritage area or heritage list is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town seeks to retain character dwellings. A local planning policy is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town is seeking a certain streetscape character appearance. <p>In line with DPLH advice it is recommended that no modification be made to LPS2 in response to submissions received on the character theme, with the exception of a minor adjustment to the wording of the Clause 9 Scheme Aim related to places of heritage significance and character to reflect the above recommended approach, and that other planning mechanisms be</p>

					investigated as the most appropriate planning instruments to promote the retention of character dwellings and streetscape character.
66.	5079168	Owner	Carlisle	<p>1. Amenity and Safety Concerns that public spaces bring anti-social behaviour. Requests greater policing of such areas.</p>	1. Noted. Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles are applied within the R-Codes, precinct structure plans and local planning polices in the local planning framework. Other matters relating to safety and security are outside the scope of LPS2.
67.	5080922	Owner Occupier	Burswood	<p>1. Site Specific - 62 Rushton Street, Burswood Does not support additional uses proposed for former lunch bar at 62 Rushton Street, Burswood.</p> <p>2. Traffic and Parking Concerns that new commercial uses at the site will result in increased traffic and negatively impact the availability of on street parking in the area.</p> <p>3. Amenity and Safety Concerns that the building is in poor condition and another commercial use will cause odour issues.</p>	<p>1. Noted. The Town's Local Planning Policy No.3 - 'Non-Residential Uses In or Adjacent to Residential Areas' encourages "the re-use of existing purpose built non-residential buildings for a mix of appropriate local convenience/service and commercial uses where it results in an economically viable use of the building and provides a service to the community". As a former lunch bar/corner store in both built form and land use No.62 Rushton Street, Burswood can deliver on this objective.</p> <p>2. Noted. Corner store sites such as No.62 Rushton Street, Burswood can provide local amenities within walkable distances for predominantly residential areas. The Town's Integrated Transport Strategy and Parking Management Plan, endorsed by Council in 2022, outline detailed guidance for managing the Town's transport network and parking to support the Town as liveable inner-city community. The Town will continue to implement these strategies in response to the needs of a growing population.</p> <p>3. Noted. LPS2 cannot enforce the maintenance of buildings. Issues offensive odours are dealt under the <i>Environmental Protection Act 1986</i> and are outside of the scope of LPS2.</p>
68.	5081838	Owner	East Victoria Park	<p>1. Removal of restrictions on Multiple Dwellings Does not support the removal restrictions on multiple dwellings. Concerns that new development will diminish local character. Do not support development above 3 storeys.</p> <p>2. Traffic and Parking Concerns that new development will result in increased traffic and negatively impact parking.</p>	<p>1. For areas with density codes of R20 (parts of Lathlain, East Victoria Park and St James) and R30 (parts of Carlisle, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park, St James) the removal of restrictions on multiple dwellings under LPS2 presents no change to the number of dwellings that can be constructed on any property or the permitted building heights, which remain limited to a maximum of two storeys, than currently permitted under TPS1. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.</p> <p>For areas with density codes of R40 within the Town's Residential Character Area (parts of Burswood, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park), the proposed modification allows for an increase in the number of dwellings that can be constructed via the development of multiple dwellings, however, building heights (limited to a maximum of two storeys) and other primary development controls remain comparable. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.</p> <p>Advice from the Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage (DPLH) suggests that re-introducing restrictions on multiple dwellings in certain area in LPS2 is unlikely to be supported by the Western Australian Planning Commission for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restricting multiple dwellings in not an appropriate planning mechanism for the conservation and retention of character dwellings and streetscapes. A heritage area or heritage list is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town seeks to retain character dwellings. A local planning policy is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town is seeking a certain streetscape character appearance. <p>In line with DPLH advice it is recommended that no modification be made to LPS2 in response to submissions received on the character theme, with the exception of a minor adjustment to the wording of the Clause 9 Scheme Aim related to places of heritage significance and character to reflect the above recommended approach, and that other planning mechanisms be investigated as the most appropriate planning instruments to promote the retention of character dwellings and streetscape character.</p> <p>2. The Town's Integrated Transport Strategy and Parking Management Plan, endorsed by Council in 2022, outline detailed guidance for managing the Town's transport network and parking to support the Town as liveable inner-city community. The Town will continue to implement these strategies in response to the needs of a growing population.</p>
69.	5082562	Owner	Victoria Park	<p>1. Removal of restrictions on Multiple Dwellings Does not support the removal restrictions on multiple dwellings. Concerns that new development will diminish local character.</p> <p>2. Amenity and Safety</p>	<p>1. For areas with density codes of R20 (parts of Lathlain, East Victoria Park and St James) and R30 (parts of Carlisle, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park, St James) the removal of restrictions on multiple dwellings under LPS2 presents no change to the number of dwellings that can be constructed on any property or the permitted building heights, which remain limited to a maximum of two storeys, than currently permitted under TPS1. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential</p>

				<p>Concerns that new development will cause overshadowing and overlooking issues.</p> <p>3. Traffic and Parking Concerns that new development will result in increased traffic and negatively impact parking.</p> <p>4. Pressure on infrastructure and public spaces Concerns that new development will increase pressure on use of local parks.</p>	<p>development.</p> <p>For areas with density codes of R40 within the Town's Residential Character Area (parts of Burswood, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park), the proposed modification allows for an increase in the number of dwellings that can be constructed via the development of multiple dwellings, however, building heights (limited to a maximum of two storeys) and other primary development controls remain comparable. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.</p> <p>Advice from the Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage (DPLH) suggests that re-introducing restrictions on multiple dwellings in certain area in LPS2 is unlikely to be supported by the Western Australian Planning Commission for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restricting multiple dwellings is not an appropriate planning mechanism for the conservation and retention of character dwellings and streetscapes. A heritage area or heritage list is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town seeks to retain character dwellings. A local planning policy is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town is seeking a certain streetscape character appearance. <p>In line with DPLH advice it is recommended that no modification be made to LPS2 in response to submissions received on the character theme, with the exception of a minor adjustment to the wording of the Clause 9 Scheme Aim related to places of heritage significance and character to reflect the above recommended approach, and that other planning mechanisms be investigated as the most appropriate planning instruments to promote the retention of character dwellings and streetscape character.</p> <p>2. Noted. Amenity issues such as overshadowing and overlooking are controlled through the planning framework, particularly the R-Codes.</p> <p>3. Noted. The Town's Integrated Transport Strategy and Parking Management Plan, endorsed by Council in 2022, outline detailed guidance for managing the Town's transport network and parking to support the Town as liveable inner-city community. The Town will continue to implement these strategies in response to the needs of a growing population.</p> <p>4. Noted. The Town's Public Open Space Strategy provides for upgrades to local public open space to support a growing population.</p>
70.	5082568	Owner Occupier	Lathlain	<p>1. Site Specific - Empire Bar Does not support No.14 Cornwall Street changing from R20 to R60. Concerns that the development resulting from the increased density may cause overshadowing and overlooking issues.</p>	<p>1. Noted. The Local Planning Strategy identifies No.14 Cornwall Street as being within a Future Investigation Area suitable for medium or higher density development. The proposed R60 density is considered appropriate for the local context and limits development to a maximum height of 3 storeys.</p> <p>Amenity issues such as overshadowing and overlooking are controlled through the planning framework, particularly the R-Codes which will apply to any new development of this site. Notably, where the site being developed and an affected adjoining property are subject to different density codes the development requirements for overshadowing and overlooking is determined by reference to the lower density code.</p>
71.	5083648	Owner	East Victoria Park	<p>1. Pressure on infrastructure and public spaces Concerns that local infrastructure cannot cope with further population growth.</p> <p>2. Traffic and Parking Concerns that new development will result in increased traffic on suburban streets.</p>	<p>1. Noted. Service agencies are aware of the population and dwelling growth proposed as part of the Local Planning Strategy and LPS2 and will use these forecasts to inform their forward planning to upgrade infrastructure as required.</p> <p>2. Noted. The Town's Integrated Transport Strategy and Parking Management Plan, endorsed by Council in 2022, outline detailed guidance for managing the Town's transport network and parking to support the Town as liveable inner-city community. The Town will continue to implement these strategies in response to the needs of a growing population.</p>
72.	5092551	Owner	East Victoria Park	<p>1. Traffic and Parking Concerns that new development will result in increased traffic and negatively impact parking.</p> <p>2. Tree Preservation Concerns that new development will result in the loss of trees</p>	<p>1. Noted. The Town's Integrated Transport Strategy and Parking Management Plan, endorsed by Council in 2022, outline detailed guidance for managing the Town's transport network and parking to support the Town as liveable inner-city community. The Town will continue to implement these strategies in response to the needs of a growing population.</p> <p>2. It is recognised that there is growing pressure on urban tree canopy from infill development and that there is an absence of appropriate mechanisms in the State planning framework to retain and protect trees on private land.</p> <p>In response to submissions it is recommended that modifications are made to LPS2 to include provisions to facilitate the</p>

				<p>preparation of a Significant Tree Register, in keeping with the WAPCs established preferred approach to tree retention on private land within local planning schemes, as a first step to affording registered significant trees a greater level of protection under the scheme.</p> <p>In addition to including the Significant Tree Register provisions within LPS2, it is recommended that the Town prepares a local planning policy that stipulates the circumstances in which the removal of a tree on private land requires development approval in accordance with emerging industry practice.</p>
73.	5092879	Owner	East Victoria Park	<p>1. Tree Preservation Concerns that new development will result in the loss of trees. Recommend that the scheme includes requirements for all new houses to be built to a higher sustainability outcomes.</p> <p>2. Traffic and Parking Concerns that new development will result in increased traffic and negatively impact parking.</p>
74.	5096203	Owner Occupier	Victoria Park	<p>1. Removal of restrictions on Multiple Dwellings Does not support the removal restrictions on multiple dwellings. Concerns that new development will diminish local character.</p> <p>2. Amenity and Safety Concerns that new development will cause overshadowing, overlooking issues, noise issues and increase anti-social behaviour</p> <p>3. Traffic and Parking Concerns that new development will result in increased traffic and negatively impact parking.</p>

1. It is recognised that there is growing pressure on urban tree canopy from infill development and that there is an absence of appropriate mechanisms in the State planning framework to retain and protect trees on private land.

In response to submissions it is recommended that modifications are made to LPS2 to include provisions to facilitate the preparation of a Significant Tree Register, in keeping with the WAPCs established preferred approach to tree retention on private land within local planning schemes, as a first step to affording registered significant trees a greater level of protection under the scheme.

In addition to including the Significant Tree Register provisions within LPS2, it is recommended that the Town prepares a local planning policy that stipulates the circumstances in which the removal of a tree on private land requires development approval in accordance with emerging industry practice.

2. Noted. The Town's Integrated Transport Strategy and Parking Management Plan, endorsed by Council in 2022, outline detailed guidance for managing the Town's transport network and parking to support the Town as liveable inner-city community. The Town will continue to implement these strategies in response to the needs of a growing population.

1. For areas with density codes of R20 (parts of Lathlain, East Victoria Park and St James) and R30 (parts of Carlisle, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park, St James) the removal of restrictions on multiple dwellings under LPS2 presents no change to the number of dwellings that can be constructed on any property or the permitted building heights, which remain limited to a maximum of two storeys, than currently permitted under TPS1. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.

For areas with density codes of R40 within the Town's Residential Character Area (parts of Burswood, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park), the proposed modification allows for an increase in the number of dwellings that can be constructed via the development of multiple dwellings, however, building heights (limited to a maximum of two storeys) and other primary development controls remain comparable. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.

Advice from the Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage (DPLH) suggests that re-introducing restrictions on multiple dwellings in certain area in LPS2 is unlikely to be supported by the Western Australian Planning Commission for the following reasons:

- Restricting multiple dwellings is not an appropriate planning mechanism for the conservation and retention of character dwellings and streetscapes.
- A heritage area or heritage list is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town seeks to retain character dwellings.
- A local planning policy is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town is seeking a certain streetscape character appearance.

In line with DPLH advice it is recommended that no modification be made to LPS2 in response to submissions received on the character theme, with the exception of a minor adjustment to the wording of the Clause 9 Scheme Aim related to places of heritage significance and character to reflect the above recommended approach, and that other planning mechanisms be investigated as the most appropriate planning instruments to promote the retention of character dwellings and streetscape character.

2. Noted. Amenity issues such as overshadowing, overlooking and solar access are controlled through the planning framework, particularly the R-Codes. Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles are applied within the R-Codes, precinct structure plans and local planning policies in the local planning framework. Other matters relating to safety and security

					are outside the scope of LPS2.
					3. Noted. The Town's Integrated Transport Strategy and Parking Management Plan, endorsed by Council in 2022, outline detailed guidance for managing the Town's transport network and parking to support the Town as liveable inner-city community. The Town will continue to implement these strategies in response to the needs of a growing population.
75.	5100747	Owner Occupier	Carlisle	<p>1. Removal of restrictions on Multiple Dwellings Does not support the removal restrictions on multiple dwellings. Does not support development of 3 storeys or higher.</p> <p>2. Amenity and Safety Concerns that new development will increase crime.</p> <p>3. Effect on property values Concerns that new development will negatively affect property values.</p>	<p>1. For areas with density codes of R20 (parts of Lathlain, East Victoria Park and St James) and R30 (parts of Carlisle, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park, St James) the removal of restrictions on multiple dwellings under LPS2 presents no change to the number of dwellings that can be constructed on any property or the permitted building heights, which remain limited to a maximum of two storeys, than currently permitted under TPS1. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.</p> <p>For areas with density codes of R40 within the Town's Residential Character Area (parts of Burswood, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park), the proposed modification allows for an increase in the number of dwellings that can be constructed via the development of multiple dwellings, however, building heights (limited to a maximum of two storeys) and other primary development controls remain comparable. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.</p> <p>Advice from the Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage (DPLH) suggests that re-introducing restrictions on multiple dwellings in certain area in LPS2 is unlikely to be supported by the Western Australian Planning Commission for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restricting multiple dwellings is not an appropriate planning mechanism for the conservation and retention of character dwellings and streetscapes. A heritage area or heritage list is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town seeks to retain character dwellings. A local planning policy is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town is seeking a certain streetscape character appearance. <p>In line with DPLH advice it is recommended that no modification be made to LPS2 in response to submissions received on the character theme, with the exception of a minor adjustment to the wording of the Clause 9 Scheme Aim related to places of heritage significance and character to reflect the above recommended approach, and that other planning mechanisms be investigated as the most appropriate planning instruments to promote the retention of character dwellings and streetscape character.</p> <p>2. Noted. Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles are applied within the R-Codes, precinct structure plans and local planning policies in the local planning framework. Other matters relating to safety and security are outside the scope of LPS2.</p> <p>3. Noted. Property values are not a planning matter and outside the scope of LPS2.</p>
76.	5101646	Owner	Curtin University or Bentley	<p>1. Technology Park, Bentley The LPS2 scheme provisions fail to bring the strategic objectives of WAPCs higher order Bentley-Curtin Specialised Activity Centre Plan and the Local Planning Strategy into the local planning framework as intended. Built form and land use controls are prohibitively restrictive.</p> <p>The retention of the existing TPS1 development and land use controls fails to adequately address State Planning Policy 4.2 - Activity Centres for Perth and Peel to support the renewal of existing centres.</p> <p>Concerns with the restrictiveness of the definition for "research and development" and associated land use permissibility in the Special Use zone.</p>	<p>1. Noted. In response to submissions and to better provide for the implementation of the Bentley-Curtin Specialised Activity Centre Plan (WAPC, 2018) it is recommended that modifications be made to LPS2 to more closely align built form and land use controls with the BCSACP high level vision and guidance for the area while supporting that further detailed precinct planning be undertaken to refine development controls.</p>
77.	5101661	Owner	Curtin University or Bentley	<p>1. Technology Park, Bentley The LPS2 scheme provisions fail to bring the strategic objectives of WAPCs higher order Bentley-Curtin Specialised Activity Centre Plan and the Local Planning Strategy into the local planning framework as intended. Built form</p>	<p>1. Noted. In response to submissions and to better provide for the implementation of the Bentley-Curtin Specialised Activity Centre Plan (WAPC, 2018) it is recommended that modifications be made to LPS2 to more closely align built form and land use controls with the BCSACP high level vision and guidance for the area while supporting that further detailed precinct planning be undertaken to refine development controls.</p>

				<p>and land use controls are prohibitively restrictive.</p> <p>The retention of the existing TPS1 development and land use controls fails to adequately address State Planning Policy 4.2 - Activity Centres for Perth and Peel to support the renewal of existing centres.</p> <p>Concerns with the restrictiveness of the definition for "research and development" and associated land use permissibility in the Special Use zone.</p>	
78.	5102843	Owner	Curtin University or Bentley	<p>1. Technology Park, Bentley</p> <p>The LPS2 scheme provisions fail to bring the strategic objectives of WAPCs higher order Bentley-Curtin Specialised Activity Centre Plan and the Local Planning Strategy into the local planning framework as intended. Built form and land use controls are prohibitively restrictive.</p> <p>The retention of the existing TPS1 development and land use controls fails to adequately address State Planning Policy 4.2 - Activity Centres for Perth and Peel to support the renewal of existing centres.</p> <p>Concerns with the restrictiveness of the definition for "research and development" and associated land use permissibility in the Special Use zone.</p>	<p>1. Noted. In response to submissions and to better provide for the implementation of the Bentley-Curtin Specialised Activity Centre Plan (WAPC, 2018) it is recommended that modifications be made to LPS2 to more closely align built form and land use controls with the BCSACP high level vision and guidance for the area while supporting that further detailed precinct planning be undertaken to refine development controls.</p>
79.	5104744	Owner	East Victoria Park	<p>1. Removal of restrictions on Multiple Dwellings Does not support the removal restrictions on multiple dwellings.</p> <p>2. Tree Preservation Concerns that new development will result in the loss of trees.</p> <p>3. Traffic and Parking Concerns that new development will result in increased traffic and negatively impact parking.</p>	<p>1. For areas with density codes of R20 (parts of Lathlain, East Victoria Park and St James) and R30 (parts of Carlisle, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park, St James) the removal of restrictions on multiple dwellings under LPS2 presents no change to the number of dwellings that can be constructed on any property or the permitted building heights, which remain limited to a maximum of two storeys, than currently permitted under TPS1. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.</p> <p>For areas with density codes of R40 within the Town's Residential Character Area (parts of Burswood, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park), the proposed modification allows for an increase in the number of dwellings that can be constructed via the development of multiple dwellings, however, building heights (limited to a maximum of two storeys) and other primary development controls remain comparable. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.</p> <p>Advice from the Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage (DPLH) suggests that re-introducing restrictions on multiple dwellings in certain area in LPS2 is unlikely to be supported by the Western Australian Planning Commission for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restricting multiple dwellings is not an appropriate planning mechanism for the conservation and retention of character dwellings and streetscapes. A heritage area or heritage list is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town seeks to retain character dwellings. A local planning policy is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town is seeking a certain streetscape character appearance. <p>In line with DPLH advice it is recommended that no modification be made to LPS2 in response to submissions received on the character theme, with the exception of a minor adjustment to the wording of the Clause 9 Scheme Aim related to places of heritage significance and character to reflect the above recommended approach, and that other planning mechanisms be investigated as the most appropriate planning instruments to promote the retention of character dwellings and streetscape character.</p> <p>2. It is recognised that there is growing pressure on urban tree canopy from infill development and that there is an absence of appropriate mechanisms in the State planning framework to retain and protect trees on private land.</p> <p>In response to submissions it is recommended that modifications are made to LPS2 to include provisions to facilitate the preparation of a Significant Tree Register, in keeping with the WAPCs established preferred approach to tree retention on private land within local planning schemes, as a first step to affording registered significant trees a greater level of protection under</p>

				<p>the scheme.</p> <p>In addition to including the Significant Tree Register provisions within LPS2, it is recommended that the Town prepares a local planning policy that stipulates the circumstances in which the removal of a tree on private land requires development approval in accordance with emerging industry practice.</p> <p>3. Noted. The Town's Integrated Transport Strategy and Parking Management Plan, endorsed by Council in 2022, outline detailed guidance for managing the Town's transport network and parking to support the Town as liveable inner-city community. The Town will continue to implement these strategies in response to the needs of a growing population.</p>	
80.	5109474	Other - Consultant on behalf of owner	South Perth and East Victoria Park	<p>1. Site Specific - McDonalds Restaurant - Albany Highway, East Vic Park and Berwick Street, South Perth stores.</p> <p><u>East Vic Park Store</u> Supports zoning, land use definitions and development standards applicable to this site. Do no support - any development standards that would restrict McDonalds ability to redevelop the site or access to the site.</p> <p><u>South Perth Store</u> Support the land use definitions and development standards applicable to this site. Do no support - the zone changing from 'Commercial' to 'Mixed Use' - request that the land be zoned 'Service Commercial'.</p> <p>Do not support any development standards that would restrict McDonalds ability to redevelop the site or access to the site.</p> <p>2. Land Use Definition - Fast Food Outlet - Drive Through Do not support the proposed classification of 'Fast Food Outlet - Drive Through' as an 'A' (advertised) use (currently classified as a 'Fast food Outlet' - 'P' (permitted) use. Request that 'Fast Food Outlet - Drive Through' be classified as a 'P' (permitted) use in District Centres and 'D' (discretionary) use in Mixed Use zones.</p>	<p><u>East Vic Park Store</u> Noted. LPS2 does not propose any development standards that would restrict vehicle movements to the East Vic Park or South Perth sites.</p> <p>Do not support. Inconsistent with recommendations of the Local Planning Strategy relating to the McCallum-Canning neighbourhood identified for higher density mixed use (residential and commercial) development.</p> <p>2. Do not support. An 'A' (discretionary) land use permissibility for 'fast food outlet – drive through' is considered appropriate to achieve the 'Mixed Use' zone objectives related to "active uses at street level" and the Scheme Aim that "promote active transport use through balancing the needs or pedestrians, cyclists and public transport users with those of private motor vehicles".</p>
81.	5112654	Owner Occupier	East Victoria Park	<p>1. Removal of restrictions on Multiple Dwellings Does not support the removal restrictions on multiple dwellings. Concerns that new development will diminish local character.</p>	<p>1. For areas with density codes of R20 (parts of Lathlain, East Victoria Park and St James) and R30 (parts of Carlisle, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park, St James) the removal of restrictions on multiple dwellings under LPS2 presents no change to the number of dwellings that can be constructed on any property or the permitted building heights, which remain limited to a maximum of two storeys, than currently permitted under TPS1. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.</p> <p>For areas with density codes of R40 within the Town's Residential Character Area (parts of Burswood, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park), the proposed modification allows for an increase in the number of dwellings that can be constructed via the development of multiple dwellings, however, building heights (limited to a maximum of two storeys) and other primary development controls remain comparable. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.</p> <p>Advice from the Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage (DPLH) suggests that re-introducing restrictions on multiple dwellings in certain area in LPS2 is unlikely to be supported by the Western Australian Planning Commission for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restricting multiple dwellings in not an appropriate planning mechanism for the conservation and retention of character dwellings and streetscapes. A heritage area or heritage list is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town seeks to retain character dwellings. A local planning policy is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town is seeking a certain streetscape character appearance.

				In line with DPLH advice it is recommended that no modification be made to LPS2 in response to submissions received on the character theme, with the exception of a minor adjustment to the wording of the Clause 9 Scheme Aim related to places of heritage significance and character to reflect the above recommended approach, and that other planning mechanisms be investigated as the most appropriate planning instruments to promote the retention of character dwellings and streetscape character.	
82.	5112672	Owner Occupier	Victoria Park	<p>1. Removal of restrictions on Multiple Dwellings Does not support the removal restrictions on multiple dwellings. Concerns that new development will diminish local character.</p> <p>2. Traffic and Parking Concerns that new development will result in increased traffic and negatively impact parking.</p> <p>3. Effect on property values Concerns that new development will negatively affect property values.</p>	<p>1. For areas with density codes of R20 (parts of Lathlain, East Victoria Park and St James) and R30 (parts of Carlisle, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park, St James) the removal of restrictions on multiple dwellings under LPS2 presents no change to the number of dwellings that can be constructed on any property or the permitted building heights, which remain limited to a maximum of two storeys, than currently permitted under TPS1. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.</p> <p>For areas with density codes of R40 within the Town's Residential Character Area (parts of Burswood, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park), the proposed modification allows for an increase in the number of dwellings that can be constructed via the development of multiple dwellings, however, building heights (limited to a maximum of two storeys) and other primary development controls remain comparable. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.</p> <p>Advice from the Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage (DPLH) suggests that re-introducing restrictions on multiple dwellings in certain area in LPS2 is unlikely to be supported by the Western Australian Planning Commission for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restricting multiple dwellings is not an appropriate planning mechanism for the conservation and retention of character dwellings and streetscapes. A heritage area or heritage list is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town seeks to retain character dwellings. A local planning policy is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town is seeking a certain streetscape character appearance. <p>In line with DPLH advice it is recommended that no modification be made to LPS2 in response to submissions received on the character theme, with the exception of a minor adjustment to the wording of the Clause 9 Scheme Aim related to places of heritage significance and character to reflect the above recommended approach, and that other planning mechanisms be investigated as the most appropriate planning instruments to promote the retention of character dwellings and streetscape character.</p> <p>2. Noted. The Town's Integrated Transport Strategy and Parking Management Plan, endorsed by Council in 2022, outline detailed guidance for managing the Town's transport network and parking to support the Town as liveable inner-city community. The Town will continue to implement these strategies in response to the needs of a growing population.</p> <p>3. Noted. Property values are not a planning matter and outside the scope of LPS2.</p>
83.	5113415	Owner	Curtin University or Bentley	<p>1. Technology Park, Bentley The LPS2 scheme provisions fail to bring the strategic objectives of WAPCs higher order Bentley-Curtin Specialised Activity Centre Plan and the Local Planning Strategy into the local planning framework as intended. Built form and land use controls are prohibitively restrictive.</p> <p>The retention of the existing TPS1 development and land use controls fails to adequately address State Planning Policy 4.2 - Activity Centres for Perth and Peel to support the renewal of existing centres.</p> <p>Concerns with the restrictiveness of the definition for "research and development" and associated land use permissibility in the Special Use zone.</p>	<p>1. Noted. In response to submissions and to better provide for the implementation of the Bentley-Curtin Specialised Activity Centre Plan (WAPC, 2018) it is recommended that modifications be made to LPS2 to more closely align built form and land use controls with the BCSACP high level vision and guidance for the area while supporting that further detailed precinct planning be undertaken to refine development controls.</p>
84.	5116262	Owner	Curtin University or Bentley	<p>1. Technology Park, Bentley The LPS2 scheme provisions fail to bring the strategic objectives of WAPCs higher order Bentley-Curtin Specialised Activity Centre Plan and the Local Planning Strategy into the local planning framework as intended. Built form</p>	<p>1. Noted. In response to submissions and to better provide for the implementation of the Bentley-Curtin Specialised Activity Centre Plan (WAPC, 2018) it is recommended that modifications be made to LPS2 to more closely align built form and land use controls with the BCSACP high level vision and guidance for the area while supporting that further detailed precinct planning be undertaken to refine development controls.</p>

				<p>and land use controls are prohibitively restrictive.</p> <p>The retention of the existing TPS1 development and land use controls fails to adequately address State Planning Policy 4.2 - Activity Centres for Perth and Peel to support the renewal of existing centres.</p> <p>Concerns with the restrictiveness of the definition for "research and development" and associated land use permissibility in the Special Use zone.</p>	
85.	5125160	Owner	Victoria Park	<p>1. Area Specific - Development near Victoria Park Primary School</p> <p>Concerns that development in proximity to Victoria Park Primary School will cause overshadowing, increase traffic and detract from character of the area.</p> <p>Concerns that LPS2 does not make provision for the redevelopment of existing private schools that could change use in the future.</p>	<p>1. Do not support. The TPS1 Precinct Plan provisions relating to potential amenity impacts of the expansion or intensification of the use of the school are effectively replaced by the Regulations Deemed Clause 67 - Matters to be considered by local government.</p>
86.	5130693	Owner Occupier	East Victoria Park	<p>1. Tree Preservation</p> <p>Concerns that new development will result in the loss of trees. Request that development approval be required for the removal of mature trees on private property.</p>	<p>1. It is recognised that there is growing pressure on urban tree canopy from infill development and that there is an absence of appropriate mechanisms in the State planning framework to retain and protect trees on private land.</p> <p>In response to submissions it is recommended that modifications are made to LPS2 to include provisions to facilitate the preparation of a Significant Tree Register, in keeping with the WAPCs established preferred approach to tree retention on private land within local planning schemes, as a first step to affording registered significant trees a greater level of protection under the scheme.</p> <p>In addition to including the Significant Tree Register provisions within LPS2, it is recommended that the Town prepares a local planning policy that stipulates the circumstances in which the removal of a tree on private land requires development approval in accordance with emerging industry practice.</p>
87.	5140278	Owner	East Victoria Park	<p>1. Removal of restrictions on Multiple Dwellings</p> <p>Does not support the removal restrictions on multiple dwellings. Concerns that new development will diminish local character.</p>	<p>1. For areas with density codes of R20 (parts of Lathlain, East Victoria Park and St James) and R30 (parts of Carlisle, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park, St James) the removal of restrictions on multiple dwellings under LPS2 presents no change to the number of dwellings that can be constructed on any property or the permitted building heights, which remain limited to a maximum of two storeys, than currently permitted under TPS1. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.</p> <p>For areas with density codes of R40 within the Town's Residential Character Area (parts of Burswood, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park), the proposed modification allows for an increase in the number of dwellings that can be constructed via the development of multiple dwellings, however, building heights (limited to a maximum of two storeys) and other primary development controls remain comparable. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.</p> <p>Advice from the Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage (DPLH) suggests that re-introducing restrictions on multiple dwellings in certain area in LPS2 is unlikely to be supported by the Western Australian Planning Commission for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restricting multiple dwellings is not an appropriate planning mechanism for the conservation and retention of character dwellings and streetscapes. A heritage area or heritage list is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town seeks to retain character dwellings. A local planning policy is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town is seeking a certain streetscape character appearance. <p>In line with DPLH advice it is recommended that no modification be made to LPS2 in response to submissions received on the character theme, with the exception of a minor adjustment to the wording of the Clause 9 Scheme Aim related to places of heritage significance and character to reflect the above recommended approach, and that other planning mechanisms be investigated as the most appropriate planning instruments to promote the retention of character dwellings and streetscape character.</p>

88.	5158268	Owner Occupier	Victoria Park	<p>1. Site Specific - Ursula Frayne Does not support that the Town Planning Scheme No.1 Precinct Plan provisions relating to the development of Ursula Frayne are not retained in LPS2, specifically - <i>"The existing schools and the Association for the Blind are acceptable uses within the precinct. Any further expansion or intensification of the uses, however, will not be permitted, where it involves significant loss of existing housing or will impinge on the amenity of surrounding residents"</i>. Requests that the TPS1 precinct plan provisions be retained in LPS2.</p>	<p>1. Do not support. The TPS1 Precinct Plan provisions relating to potential amenity impacts of the expansion or intensification of the use of the school are effectively replaced by the Regulations Deemed Clause 67 - Matters to be considered by local government.</p>
89.	5160899	Owner	Claremont	<p>1. Tree Preservation Concerns that the scheme does not protect trees on private property.</p>	<p>1. It is recognised that there is growing pressure on urban tree canopy from infill development and that there is an absence of appropriate mechanisms in the State planning framework to retain and protect trees on private land.</p> <p>In response to submissions it is recommended that modifications are made to LPS2 to include provisions to facilitate the preparation of a Significant Tree Register, in keeping with the WAPCs established preferred approach to tree retention on private land within local planning schemes, as a first step to affording registered significant trees a greater level of protection under the scheme.</p> <p>In addition to including the Significant Tree Register provisions within LPS2, it is recommended that the Town prepares a local planning policy that stipulates the circumstances in which the removal of a tree on private land requires development approval in accordance with emerging industry practice.</p>
90.	5162089	Owner	Cottesloe	<p>1. Tree Preservation Concerns that the scheme does not protect trees on private property.</p>	<p>1. It is recognised that there is growing pressure on urban tree canopy from infill development and that there is an absence of appropriate mechanisms in the State planning framework to retain and protect trees on private land.</p> <p>In response to submissions it is recommended that modifications are made to LPS2 to include provisions to facilitate the preparation of a Significant Tree Register, in keeping with the WAPCs established preferred approach to tree retention on private land within local planning schemes, as a first step to affording registered significant trees a greater level of protection under the scheme.</p> <p>In addition to including the Significant Tree Register provisions within LPS2, it is recommended that the Town prepares a local planning policy that stipulates the circumstances in which the removal of a tree on private land requires development approval in accordance with emerging industry practice.</p>
91.	5164969	Other - Consultant on behalf of land owner	Curtin University or Bentley	<p>1. Site Specific - Morling College, Bentley Do not support LPS2 in its current form due to building height and land use restrictions relating to the Morling College, Bentley site.</p> <p>Concerns that the LPS2 provisions relating to this site contradicts the objectives for the area as outlined in State Planning documents (such as the Central Sub-Regional Framework and Bentley-Curtin Specialised Activity Centre Plan).</p> <p>Request that 'Education Establishment' and 'Office' be designated as 'P' permitted uses in the Special Use Zone (SU2) - Residential and Special Facilities.</p> <p>Request that land use permissibility for broader residential opportunities such as student, employee and visitor accommodation be increased. Specifically by including 'Multiple Dwellings' as a 'D'</p>	<p>It is recommended that modifications be made to LPS2, 'SU2 - Residential and Special Facilities' to better recognise the Bentley-Curtin Specialised Activity Centre Plan (BCSACP) through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - removing the SU2 zoning table to allow land use permissibility to be assessed more flexibly in accordance with the zone purpose and the BCSACP. - Replacing built form controls with requirements for all development to be in accordance with an approved precinct structure plan and/or local development plan prepared with regard to the BCSACP. <p><u>Built Form</u> It is recognised that the LPS2 built form controls (which maintain low buildings heights with large setbacks) restrict development within the 'SU2 - Residential and Special Facilities' including the Morling College site.</p> <p>The Bentley-Curtin Specialised Activity Centre Structure Plan (WAPC, 2018) envisages greater development potential than what is proposed under LPS2 for the 'SU2 - Residential and Special Facilities' built form controls.</p> <p>It is recommended that modifications be made to the SU2 development provisions to better recognise the Bentley-Curtin Specialised Activity Centre Plan (BCSACP) through replacing built form controls with requirements for all development to be in accordance with an approved precinct structure plan and/or local development plan prepared with regard to the BCSACP.</p>

				<p><u>Land Use</u></p> <p>It is recognised that the LPS2 'SU2 - Residential and Special Facilities' land use controls, that restrict land uses to those for the purposes of aged persons accommodation and specialised public services only with limited ancillary uses contemplated, are restrictive for sites such as Morling College that do not primarily provide for such facilities.</p> <p>The BCSACP designates the LPS2 'SU2 - Residential and Special Facilities' zone as a 'Special Use and Education' precinct and anticipates existing uses <i>'to remain and may redevelop and grow in scale and intensity over time'</i>.</p> <p>Notably the BCSACP Structure Plan designates the Morling College site as 'Education – Institution' meaning <i>"institutions with an educational purpose and activities associated with education"</i> and does not suggest that residential uses (via the application of a 'Mixed Use' or similar designation) are anticipated for the 'Special Use and Education' precinct. Nevertheless, it is recommended that modifications be made to the SU2 land use controls to provide greater flexibility in recognition of the Bentley-Curtin Specialised Activity Centre Plan (BCSACP) through modifying the zone purpose statement and zoning table to give regard to the Bentley-Curtin Specialised Activity Centre Plan.</p>	
92.	5165178	Owner Occupier	Victoria Park	<p>1. Site Specific - Ursula Frayne Does not support that the Town Planning Scheme No.1 Precinct Plan provisions relating to the development of Ursula Frayne are not retained in LPS2. Concerns that the removal of these clauses will allow the school to expand into surrounding residential areas and cause adverse amenity impacts particularly in regard to noise.</p> <p>Concerns that further development of the school will enhance traffic and parking problems in the area.</p>	<p>1. Do not support. The TPS1 Precinct Plan provisions relating to potential amenity impacts of the expansion or intensification of the use of the school are effectively replaced by the Regulations Deemed Clause 67 - Matters to be considered by local government.</p>
93.	5170646	Owner	Burswood	<p>1. Traffic and Parking Does not support the removal of minimum parking requirements for residential development under Clause 26. Has concerns that this will increase parking issues.</p> <p>2. General LPS2 Comments Does not believe that the objectives for the District Centre should include 'a broad range of employment opportunities to encourage diversity' as this is outside the schemes control.</p>	<p>1. Noted. The Town's Parking Management Plan, endorsed by Council in 2022, outlines detailed guidance for managing parking to support the Town as liveable inner city community. The Town will continue to implement the strategy in response to the needs of a growing population.</p> <p>2. Noted.</p>
94.	5171363	Owner Occupier	Carlisle	<p>1. Removal of restrictions on Multiple Dwellings Does not support the removal restrictions on multiple dwellings. Concerns that new development will diminish local character.</p> <p>2. Traffic and Parking Concerns that new development will result in increased traffic and negatively impact parking.</p> <p>3. Amenity and Safety Concerns that new development will increase crime and visual clutter on bin days.</p> <p>4. Tree Preservation and green spaces Comments that the Scheme should provide for more trees and green spaces.</p>	<p>1. For areas with density codes of R20 (parts of Lathlain, East Victoria Park and St James) and R30 (parts of Carlisle, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park, St James) the removal of restrictions on multiple dwellings under LPS2 presents no change to the number of dwellings that can be constructed on any property or the permitted building heights, which remain limited to a maximum of two storeys, than currently permitted under TPS1. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.</p> <p>For areas with density codes of R40 within the Town's Residential Character Area (parts of Burswood, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park), the proposed modification allows for an increase in the number of dwellings that can be constructed via the development of multiple dwellings, however, building heights (limited to a maximum of two storeys) and other primary development controls remain comparable. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.</p> <p>Advice from the Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage (DPLH) suggests that re-introducing restrictions on multiple dwellings in certain area in LPS2 is unlikely to be supported by the Western Australian Planning Commission for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restricting multiple dwellings in not an appropriate planning mechanism for the conservation and retention of character

					<p> dwellings and streetscapes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A heritage area or heritage list is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town seeks to retain character dwellings. • A local planning policy is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town is seeking a certain streetscape character appearance. <p>In line with DPLH advice it is recommended that no modification be made to LPS2 in response to submissions received on the character theme, with the exception of a minor adjustment to the wording of the Clause 9 Scheme Aim related to places of heritage significance and character to reflect the above recommended approach, and that other planning mechanisms be investigated as the most appropriate planning instruments to promote the retention of character dwellings and streetscape character.</p> <p>2. Noted. The Town's Integrated Transport Strategy and Parking Management Plan, endorsed by Council in 2022, outline detailed guidance for managing the Town's transport network and parking to support the Town as liveable inner city community. The Town will continue to implement these strategies in response to the needs of a growing population.</p> <p>3. Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles are applied within the R-Codes, precinct structure plans and local planning policies in the local planning framework. Other matters relating to safety and security are outside the scope of LPS2. The management of waste collection is outside the scope of LPS2.</p> <p>4. It is recognised that there is growing pressure on urban tree canopy from infill development and that there is an absence of appropriate mechanisms in the State planning framework to retain and protect trees on private land.</p> <p>In response to submissions it is recommended that modifications are made to LPS2 to include provisions to facilitate the preparation of a Significant Tree Register, in keeping with the WAPCs established preferred approach to tree retention on private land within local planning schemes, as a first step to affording registered significant trees a greater level of protection under the scheme.</p> <p>In addition to including the Significant Tree Register provisions within LPS2, it is recommended that the Town prepares a local planning policy that stipulates the circumstances in which the removal of a tree on private land requires development approval in accordance with emerging industry practice.</p> <p>The Town's Public Open Space Strategy provides for upgrades to local public open space to support a growing population.</p>
95.	5171368	Owner Occupier	Carlisle	<p>1. Removal of restrictions on Multiple Dwellings Does not support the removal restrictions on multiple dwellings.</p> <p>2. Traffic and Parking Concerns that new development will result in increased traffic and negatively impact parking.</p> <p>3. Amenity and Safety Concerns that new development will cause overlooking and overshadowing issues.</p> <p>4. Effect on Property Values Concerns that new development will negatively affect property values.</p>	<p>1. For areas with density codes of R20 (parts of Lathlain, East Victoria Park and St James) and R30 (parts of Carlisle, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park, St James) the removal of restrictions on multiple dwellings under LPS2 presents no change to the number of dwellings that can be constructed on any property or the permitted building heights, which remain limited to a maximum of two storeys, than currently permitted under TPS1. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.</p> <p>For areas with density codes of R40 within the Town's Residential Character Area (parts of Burswood, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park), the proposed modification allows for an increase in the number of dwellings that can be constructed via the development of multiple dwellings, however, building heights (limited to a maximum of two storeys) and other primary development controls remain comparable. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.</p> <p>Advice from the Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage (DPLH) suggests that re-introducing restrictions on multiple dwellings in certain area in LPS2 is unlikely to be supported by the Western Australian Planning Commission for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Restricting multiple dwellings is not an appropriate planning mechanism for the conservation and retention of character dwellings and streetscapes. • A heritage area or heritage list is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town seeks to retain character dwellings. • A local planning policy is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town is seeking a certain streetscape character appearance.

					<p>In line with DPLH advice it is recommended that no modification be made to LPS2 in response to submissions received on the character theme, with the exception of a minor adjustment to the wording of the Clause 9 Scheme Aim related to places of heritage significance and character to reflect the above recommended approach, and that other planning mechanisms be investigated as the most appropriate planning instruments to promote the retention of character dwellings and streetscape character.</p> <p>2. Noted. The Town's Integrated Transport Strategy and Parking Management Plan, endorsed by Council in 2022, outline detailed guidance for managing the Town's transport network and parking to support the Town as liveable inner city community. The Town will continue to implement these strategies in response to the needs of a growing population.</p> <p>3. Noted. Amenity issues such as overlooking and overshadowing are controlled via the R-Codes.</p> <p>4. Noted. Property values are not a planning matter and outside the scope of LPS2.</p>
96.	5171378	Owner Occupier	East Victoria Park	<p>1. Removal of restrictions on Multiple Dwellings Does not support the removal restrictions on multiple dwellings. Concerns that new development will diminish local character.</p> <p>2. Traffic and Parking Concerns that new development will result in increased traffic and negatively impact parking.</p> <p>3. Amenity and Safety Concerns that new development will cause overlooking issues.</p> <p>4. Preservation of trees Concerns that new development will contribute to a loss of trees.</p>	<p>1. For areas with density codes of R20 (parts of Lathlain, East Victoria Park and St James) and R30 (parts of Carlisle, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park, St James) the removal of restrictions on multiple dwellings under LPS2 presents no change to the number of dwellings that can be constructed on any property or the permitted building heights, which remain limited to a maximum of two storeys, than currently permitted under TPS1. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.</p> <p>For areas with density codes of R40 within the Town's Residential Character Area (parts of Burswood, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park), the proposed modification allows for an increase in the number of dwellings that can be constructed via the development of multiple dwellings, however, building heights (limited to a maximum of two storeys) and other primary development controls remain comparable. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.</p> <p>Advice from the Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage (DPLH) suggests that re-introducing restrictions on multiple dwellings in certain area in LPS2 is unlikely to be supported by the Western Australian Planning Commission for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restricting multiple dwellings in not an appropriate planning mechanism for the conservation and retention of character dwellings and streetscapes. A heritage area or heritage list is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town seeks to retain character dwellings. A local planning policy is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town is seeking a certain streetscape character appearance. <p>In line with DPLH advice it is recommended that no modification be made to LPS2 in response to submissions received on the character theme, with the exception of a minor adjustment to the wording of the Clause 9 Scheme Aim related to places of heritage significance and character to reflect the above recommended approach, and that other planning mechanisms be investigated as the most appropriate planning instruments to promote the retention of character dwellings and streetscape character.</p> <p>2. Noted. The Town's Integrated Transport Strategy and Parking Management Plan, endorsed by Council in 2022, outline detailed guidance for managing the Town's transport network and parking to support the Town as liveable inner city community. The Town will continue to implement these strategies in response to the needs of a growing population.</p> <p>3. Noted. Amenity issues such as overlooking are controlled via the R-Codes.</p> <p>4. It is recognised that there is growing pressure on urban tree canopy from infill development and that there is an absence of appropriate mechanisms in the State planning framework to retain and protect trees on private land.</p> <p>In response to submissions it is recommended that modifications are made to LPS2 to include provisions to facilitate the preparation of a Significant Tree Register, in keeping with the WAPCs established preferred approach to tree retention on private land within local planning schemes, as a first step to affording registered significant trees a greater level of protection under the scheme.</p>

					In addition to including the Significant Tree Register provisions within LPS2, it is recommended that the Town prepares a local planning policy that stipulates the circumstances in which the removal of a tree on private land requires development approval in accordance with emerging industry practice.
97.	5179287	Owner Occupier	Lathlain	<p>1. Site Specific - Castle Way, Lathlain Does not support the proposed increase in R-Code (from R20 to R60) of properties on the northern side of Castle Way, Lathlain.</p> <p>2. Traffic and Parking Concerns that new development will result in increased traffic in the area to the detriment of people walking and cycling.</p> <p>3. Tree Preservation Concerns that new development will result in the loss of tree and native habitat for Carnaby Cockatoos.</p>	<p>1. Noted. The proposed densities are consistent with recommendations of the Local Planning Strategy which designates selected properties in the catchment of Burswood Station and Victoria Park Station as Future Investigation Areas for consideration as medium and/or higher density development. To ensure LPS2 reflects the built form density of existing apartment buildings within this area a R60 density code has been applied to relevant sites.</p> <p>2. Noted. The Town's Integrated Transport Strategy and Parking Management Plan, endorsed by Council in 2022, outline detailed guidance for managing the Town's transport network and parking to support the Town as liveable inner city community. The Town will continue to implement these strategies in response to the needs of a growing population.</p> <p>3. It is recognised that there is growing pressure on urban tree canopy from infill development and that there is an absence of appropriate mechanisms in the State planning framework to retain and protect trees on private land.</p> <p>In response to submissions it is recommended that modifications are made to LPS2 to include provisions to facilitate the preparation of a Significant Tree Register, in keeping with the WAPCs established preferred approach to tree retention on private land within local planning schemes, as a first step to affording registered significant trees a greater level of protection under the scheme.</p> <p>In addition to including the Significant Tree Register provisions within LPS2, it is recommended that the Town prepares a local planning policy that stipulates the circumstances in which the removal of a tree on private land requires development approval in accordance with emerging industry practice.</p>
98.	5179315	Owner Occupier	East Victoria Park	<p>1. Removal of restrictions on Multiple Dwellings Does not support the removal restrictions on multiple dwellings. Concerns that new development will diminish local character.</p> <p>2. Location of new development Encourage new development to be directed to suitable locations (near commercial centres and along main transport routes).</p>	<p>1. For areas with density codes of R20 (parts of Lathlain, East Victoria Park and St James) and R30 (parts of Carlisle, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park, St James) the removal of restrictions on multiple dwellings under LPS2 presents no change to the number of dwellings that can be constructed on any property or the permitted building heights, which remain limited to a maximum of two storeys, than currently permitted under TPS1. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.</p> <p>For areas with density codes of R40 within the Town's Residential Character Area (parts of Burswood, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park), the proposed modification allows for an increase in the number of dwellings that can be constructed via the development of multiple dwellings, however, building heights (limited to a maximum of two storeys) and other primary development controls remain comparable. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.</p> <p>Advice from the Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage (DPLH) suggests that re-introducing restrictions on multiple dwellings in certain area in LPS2 is unlikely to be supported by the Western Australian Planning Commission for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restricting multiple dwellings is not an appropriate planning mechanism for the conservation and retention of character dwellings and streetscapes. A heritage area or heritage list is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town seeks to retain character dwellings. A local planning policy is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town is seeking a certain streetscape character appearance. <p>In line with DPLH advice it is recommended that no modification be made to LPS2 in response to submissions received on the character theme, with the exception of a minor adjustment to the wording of the Clause 9 Scheme Aim related to places of heritage significance and character to reflect the above recommended approach, and that other planning mechanisms be investigated as the most appropriate planning instruments to promote the retention of character dwellings and streetscape character.</p>

					2. Noted - LPS2 implements the Local Planning Strategy which directs population and housing growth towards certain locations of the Town; primarily activity centres and urban corridors and generally limiting growth in established lower density suburban areas.
99.	5179334	Owner	Curtin University or Bentley	<p>1. Technology Park, Bentley The LPS2 scheme provisions fail to bring the strategic objectives of WAPCs higher order Bentley-Curtin Specialised Activity Centre Plan and the Local Planning Strategy into the local planning framework as intended. Built form and land use controls are prohibitively restrictive.</p> <p>The retention of the existing TPS1 development and land use controls fails to adequately address State Planning Policy 4.2 - Activity Centres for Perth and Peel to support the renewal of existing centres.</p> <p>Concerns with the restrictiveness of the definition for "research and development" and associated land use permissibility in the Special Use zone.</p>	1. Noted. In response to submissions and to better provide for the implementation of the Bentley-Curtin Specialised Activity Centre Plan (WAPC, 2018) it is recommended that modifications be made to LPS2 to more closely align built form and land use controls with the BCSACP high level vision and guidance for the area while supporting that further detailed precinct planning be undertaken to refine development controls.
100.	5179488	Owner Occupier	South Perth	<p>1. Tree Preservation Encourages the Town to consider amending the scheme to strengthen the protection of existing trees on private land</p>	<p>1. It is recognised that there is growing pressure on urban tree canopy from infill development and that there is an absence of appropriate mechanisms in the State planning framework to retain and protect trees on private land.</p> <p>In response to submissions it is recommended that modifications are made to LPS2 to include provisions to facilitate the preparation of a Significant Tree Register, in keeping with the WAPCs established preferred approach to tree retention on private land within local planning schemes, as a first step to affording registered significant trees a greater level of protection under the scheme.</p> <p>In addition to including the Significant Tree Register provisions within LPS2, it is recommended that the Town prepares a local planning policy that stipulates the circumstances in which the removal of a tree on private land requires development approval in accordance with emerging industry practice.</p>
101.	5179886	Owner Occupier	Victoria Park	<p>1. Site Specific - Visibility Site, Victoria Park Comments on the carbon impact of demolishing and redeveloping the site and that any new development will need to mitigate amenity issues to local residents including noise, overlooking and maintaining local character.</p> <p>Comments that the existing use of the site is a significant community asset and should be retained.</p>	1. Noted. LPS2 does not force development to occur. Amenity issues such as overshadowing, overlooking and solar access are controlled through the planning framework, particularly the R-Codes and will apply to the redevelopment of the site.
102.	5180177	Other - Consultant on behalf of owner	Curtin University or Bentley	<p>1. Site Specific - Juniper / Rowethorpe Village, Bentley Land Use - Request that 'Hospital' be designated as a 'P' (permitted) rather than 'D' (discretionary) use in the SU2 Special Use zone.</p> <p>'Residential Aged Care Facility' definition - request that 'residential aged care facility' land use definition be amended as per recent WAPC consultation for planning reform.</p> <p>Building heights - concerns that the LPS2 prescribed building heights are more onerous than what is contained in the Rowethorpe Village masterplan. recommend that the building height limitations should be removed.</p> <p>Requirement for a Local Development Plan - Concerns that the requirement for a Local Development Plan does not recognise the existence of the Rowthorpe Village Masterplan. Request that the requirement for an LDP should be removed.</p> <p>Car Parking - Does not support Clause 26(2) that provides for maximum parking standards to be applied to residential development. Request that this clause be removed or modified so as not to apply to Rowethorpe Village.</p>	<p>In response to the submission is recommended that modifications be made to LPS2 to better recognise the Bentley-Curtin Specialised Activity Centre Plan (BCSACP) and existing Council endorsed masterplans for key sites including the 'Rowethorpe Village masterplan' through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - removing the SU2 zoning table to allow land use permissibility to be assessed more flexibly in accordance with the BCSACP - clarifying that existing Council endorsed masterplans will be recognised as LDPs under the scheme to inform built form controls. <p>1. It is recognised that the LPS2 built form controls (which maintain low buildings heights and large setbacks) and land use controls (that restrict land uses to those for the purposes of aged persons accommodation and specialised public services only with limited ancillary uses contemplated) restrict development within the 'SU2 - Residential and Special Facilities' special use zone and do not reflect the existing Council endorsed Rowethorpe Village masterplan.</p> <p>It is recommended that modifications be made to LPS2 to better recognise the Bentley-Curtin Specialised Activity Centre Plan (BCSACP) and existing Council endorsed masterplans for key sites including the 'Rowethorpe Village masterplan' through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - removing the SU2 zoning table to allow land use permissibility to be assessed more flexibly in accordance with the BCSACP

					<p>- clarifying that existing Council endorsed masterplans will be recognised as LDPs under the scheme to inform built form controls.</p> <p>Clause 26(2) provides for maximum parking standards to be applied to residential development through the preparation of a structure plan, local development plan or local planning policy, however, does not suggest that a maximum parking standard should be applied to any specific area or site. Excluding a property from Clause 26(2) in the absence of preparing a suitable planning instrument under this clause is not supported.</p>
103.	5180452	Owner	Safety Bay	<p>1. Tree Preservation Encourages the Town to consider amending the scheme to strengthen the protection of existing trees on private land</p>	<p>1. It is recognised that there is growing pressure on urban tree canopy from infill development and that there is an absence of appropriate mechanisms in the State planning framework to retain and protect trees on private land.</p> <p>In response to submissions it is recommended that modifications are made to LPS2 to include provisions to facilitate the preparation of a Significant Tree Register, in keeping with the WAPCs established preferred approach to tree retention on private land within local planning schemes, as a first step to affording registered significant trees a greater level of protection under the scheme.</p> <p>In addition to including the Significant Tree Register provisions within LPS2, it is recommended that the Town prepares a local planning policy that stipulates the circumstances in which the removal of a tree on private land requires development approval in accordance with emerging industry practice.</p>
104.	5180619	Owner	Lathlain	<p>1. Tree Preservation Encourages the Town to consider amending the scheme to strengthen the protection of existing trees on private land</p>	<p>1. It is recognised that there is growing pressure on urban tree canopy from infill development and that there is an absence of appropriate mechanisms in the State planning framework to retain and protect trees on private land.</p> <p>In response to submissions it is recommended that modifications are made to LPS2 to include provisions to facilitate the preparation of a Significant Tree Register, in keeping with the WAPCs established preferred approach to tree retention on private land within local planning schemes, as a first step to affording registered significant trees a greater level of protection under the scheme.</p> <p>In addition to including the Significant Tree Register provisions within LPS2, it is recommended that the Town prepares a local planning policy that stipulates the circumstances in which the removal of a tree on private land requires development approval in accordance with emerging industry practice.</p>
105.	5180786	Owner	Cottesloe	<p>1. Tree Preservation Encourages the Town to consider amending the scheme to strengthen the protection of existing trees on private land</p>	<p>1. It is recognised that there is growing pressure on urban tree canopy from infill development and that there is an absence of appropriate mechanisms in the State planning framework to retain and protect trees on private land.</p> <p>In response to submissions it is recommended that modifications are made to LPS2 to include provisions to facilitate the preparation of a Significant Tree Register, in keeping with the WAPCs established preferred approach to tree retention on private land within local planning schemes, as a first step to affording registered significant trees a greater level of protection under the scheme.</p> <p>In addition to including the Significant Tree Register provisions within LPS2, it is recommended that the Town prepares a local planning policy that stipulates the circumstances in which the removal of a tree on private land requires development approval in accordance with emerging industry practice.</p>
106.	5181054	Owner	Yokine	<p>1. Tree Preservation Encourages the Town to consider amending the scheme to strengthen the protection of existing trees on private land</p>	<p>1. It is recognised that there is growing pressure on urban tree canopy from infill development and that there is an absence of appropriate mechanisms in the State planning framework to retain and protect trees on private land.</p> <p>In response to submissions it is recommended that modifications are made to LPS2 to include provisions to facilitate the preparation of a Significant Tree Register, in keeping with the WAPCs established preferred approach to tree retention on private land within local planning schemes, as a first step to affording registered significant trees a greater level of protection under the scheme.</p> <p>In addition to including the Significant Tree Register provisions within LPS2, it is recommended that the Town prepares a local</p>

					planning policy that stipulates the circumstances in which the removal of a tree on private land requires development approval in accordance with emerging industry practice.
107.	5181238	Owner Occupier	East Victoria Park	1. Tree Preservation Encourages the Town to consider amending the scheme to strengthen the protection of existing trees on private land	<p>1. It is recognised that there is growing pressure on urban tree canopy from infill development and that there is an absence of appropriate mechanisms in the State planning framework to retain and protect trees on private land.</p> <p>In response to submissions it is recommended that modifications are made to LPS2 to include provisions to facilitate the preparation of a Significant Tree Register, in keeping with the WAPCs established preferred approach to tree retention on private land within local planning schemes, as a first step to affording registered significant trees a greater level of protection under the scheme.</p> <p>In addition to including the Significant Tree Register provisions within LPS2, it is recommended that the Town prepares a local planning policy that stipulates the circumstances in which the removal of a tree on private land requires development approval in accordance with emerging industry practice.</p>
108.	5181273	Owner	Willagee	1. Tree Preservation Encourages the Town to consider amending the scheme to strengthen the protection of existing trees on private land	<p>1. It is recognised that there is growing pressure on urban tree canopy from infill development and that there is an absence of appropriate mechanisms in the State planning framework to retain and protect trees on private land.</p> <p>In response to submissions it is recommended that modifications are made to LPS2 to include provisions to facilitate the preparation of a Significant Tree Register, in keeping with the WAPCs established preferred approach to tree retention on private land within local planning schemes, as a first step to affording registered significant trees a greater level of protection under the scheme.</p> <p>In addition to including the Significant Tree Register provisions within LPS2, it is recommended that the Town prepares a local planning policy that stipulates the circumstances in which the removal of a tree on private land requires development approval in accordance with emerging industry practice.</p>
109.	5181277	Owner	Kardinya	1. Tree Preservation Encourages the Town to consider amending the scheme to strengthen the protection of existing trees on private land	<p>1. It is recognised that there is growing pressure on urban tree canopy from infill development and that there is an absence of appropriate mechanisms in the State planning framework to retain and protect trees on private land.</p> <p>In response to submissions it is recommended that modifications are made to LPS2 to include provisions to facilitate the preparation of a Significant Tree Register, in keeping with the WAPCs established preferred approach to tree retention on private land within local planning schemes, as a first step to affording registered significant trees a greater level of protection under the scheme.</p> <p>In addition to including the Significant Tree Register provisions within LPS2, it is recommended that the Town prepares a local planning policy that stipulates the circumstances in which the removal of a tree on private land requires development approval in accordance with emerging industry practice.</p>
110.	5181283	Owner	Kardinya	1. Tree Preservation Encourages the Town to consider amending the scheme to strengthen the protection of existing trees on private land	<p>1. It is recognised that there is growing pressure on urban tree canopy from infill development and that there is an absence of appropriate mechanisms in the State planning framework to retain and protect trees on private land.</p> <p>In response to submissions it is recommended that modifications are made to LPS2 to include provisions to facilitate the preparation of a Significant Tree Register, in keeping with the WAPCs established preferred approach to tree retention on private land within local planning schemes, as a first step to affording registered significant trees a greater level of protection under the scheme.</p> <p>In addition to including the Significant Tree Register provisions within LPS2, it is recommended that the Town prepares a local planning policy that stipulates the circumstances in which the removal of a tree on private land requires development approval in accordance with emerging industry practice.</p>
111.	5181358	Owner	Willetton	1. Tree Preservation Encourages the Town to consider amending the scheme to strengthen the	1. It is recognised that there is growing pressure on urban tree canopy from infill development and that there is an absence of appropriate mechanisms in the State planning framework to retain and protect trees on private land.

				protection of existing trees on private land	<p>In response to submissions it is recommended that modifications are made to LPS2 to include provisions to facilitate the preparation of a Significant Tree Register, in keeping with the WAPCs established preferred approach to tree retention on private land within local planning schemes, as a first step to affording registered significant trees a greater level of protection under the scheme.</p> <p>In addition to including the Significant Tree Register provisions within LPS2, it is recommended that the Town prepares a local planning policy that stipulates the circumstances in which the removal of a tree on private land requires development approval in accordance with emerging industry practice.</p>
112.	5181462	Owner	Curtin University or Bentley	<p>1. Tree Preservation Encourages the Town to consider amending the scheme to strengthen the protection of existing trees on private land</p>	<p>1. It is recognised that there is growing pressure on urban tree canopy from infill development and that there is an absence of appropriate mechanisms in the State planning framework to retain and protect trees on private land.</p> <p>In response to submissions it is recommended that modifications are made to LPS2 to include provisions to facilitate the preparation of a Significant Tree Register, in keeping with the WAPCs established preferred approach to tree retention on private land within local planning schemes, as a first step to affording registered significant trees a greater level of protection under the scheme.</p> <p>In addition to including the Significant Tree Register provisions within LPS2, it is recommended that the Town prepares a local planning policy that stipulates the circumstances in which the removal of a tree on private land requires development approval in accordance with emerging industry practice.</p>
113.	5181782	Occupier	Kensington	<p>1. Tree Preservation Encourages the Town to consider amending the scheme to strengthen the protection of existing trees on private land</p>	<p>1. It is recognised that there is growing pressure on urban tree canopy from infill development and that there is an absence of appropriate mechanisms in the State planning framework to retain and protect trees on private land.</p> <p>In response to submissions it is recommended that modifications are made to LPS2 to include provisions to facilitate the preparation of a Significant Tree Register, in keeping with the WAPCs established preferred approach to tree retention on private land within local planning schemes, as a first step to affording registered significant trees a greater level of protection under the scheme.</p> <p>In addition to including the Significant Tree Register provisions within LPS2, it is recommended that the Town prepares a local planning policy that stipulates the circumstances in which the removal of a tree on private land requires development approval in accordance with emerging industry practice.</p>
114.	5183340	Owner Occupier	Victoria Park	<p>1. General LPS2 comments Comments regarding the size of apartments not being adequate. Comments in regard to the expansion of the Perth metropolitan area and the need to be prepared.</p> <p>2. Traffic and Parking Concerns with traffic worsening with new development.</p>	<p>1. Noted. The R-Codes provide controls for minimum apartment sizes. The control of development for the wider Perth Metropolitan area is guided by the State Government's Perth and Peel @3.5 million strategy and associated sub regional framework for urban consolidation. LPS2 reflects the directions of these policies.</p> <p>2. Noted. The Town's Integrated Transport Strategy and Parking Management Plan, endorsed by Council in 2022, outline detailed guidance for managing the Town's transport network and parking to support the Town as liveable inner-city community. The Town will continue to implement these strategies in response to the needs of a growing population.</p>
115.	5183371	Other - Consultant on behalf of owner	Curtin University or Bentley	<p>1. Site Specific - Swancare, Bentley Recommends modifications to LPS2 to more closely align the 'Special Use 2 - Residential and Special Facilities Zone' development provisions to be more consistent with the Bentley Park Estate Masterplan (endorsed by Council in 2020).</p>	<p>1. Noted. In response to submissions and to better provide for the implementation of the Bentley-Curtin Specialised Activity Centre Plan (WAPC, 2018) it is recommended that modifications be made to the LPS2 Special Use Zone No.2 - Residential and Special Facilities to more closely align built form and land use controls with the BCSACP high level vision as well as existing Council endorsed masterplans for key sites within SU2 (including the 'Rowethorpe Village masterplan').</p>
116.	5183738	Other - Consultant on behalf of owner	Burswood	<p>1. Site Specific - Lathlain Place, Lathlain Support changes to Lathlain Place (eastern side) from Residential R40 to Local Centre RAC4 to support change of uses to existing development and future redevelopment.</p>	<p>1. Noted.</p>
117.	5183836	Owner	Bicton	<p>1. Tree Preservation Encourages the Town to consider amending the scheme to strengthen the protection of existing trees on private land</p>	<p>1. It is recognised that there is growing pressure on urban tree canopy from infill development and that there is an absence of appropriate mechanisms in the State planning framework to retain and protect trees on private land.</p>

					<p>In response to submissions it is recommended that modifications are made to LPS2 to include provisions to facilitate the preparation of a Significant Tree Register, in keeping with the WAPCs established preferred approach to tree retention on private land within local planning schemes, as a first step to affording registered significant trees a greater level of protection under the scheme.</p> <p>In addition to including the Significant Tree Register provisions within LPS2, it is recommended that the Town prepares a local planning policy that stipulates the circumstances in which the removal of a tree on private land requires development approval in accordance with emerging industry practice.</p>
118.	5183930	Owner	St James	<p>1. LPS2 General Comments Supports the general content of LPS2.</p> <p>2. Site Specific - Hillview Terrace and Berwick St, St James Does not support that the Hillview Terrace and Berwick St portions of St James (Local Planning Strategy Future Investigation Area) have not been included in LPS2 for changes from low to medium density residential development.</p>	<p>1. Noted.</p> <p>2. Noted. The Local Planning Strategy identifies this property as being within the 'St James- Future Investigation Area' for consideration for medium density development subject to further engagement with the community. This work is scheduled to be undertaken in the 24/25 financial year (subject to Council budget approval), following the completion of this work the outcomes will inform a strategic amendment to LPS2. Interim modifications to properties in this area are not supported.</p>
119.	5184071	Owner	East Victoria Park	<p>1. Tree Preservation Encourages the Town to consider amending the scheme to strengthen the protection of existing trees on private land</p>	<p>1. It is recognised that there is growing pressure on urban tree canopy from infill development and that there is an absence of appropriate mechanisms in the State planning framework to retain and protect trees on private land.</p> <p>In response to submissions it is recommended that modifications are made to LPS2 to include provisions to facilitate the preparation of a Significant Tree Register, in keeping with the WAPCs established preferred approach to tree retention on private land within local planning schemes, as a first step to affording registered significant trees a greater level of protection under the scheme.</p> <p>In addition to including the Significant Tree Register provisions within LPS2, it is recommended that the Town prepares a local planning policy that stipulates the circumstances in which the removal of a tree on private land requires development approval in accordance with emerging industry practice.</p>
120.	5184083	Occupier	Lathlain	<p>1. LPS2 General Comments Supports LPS2, however, no comments provided.</p>	<p>1. Noted.</p>
121.	5184688	Owner Occupier	East Fremantle	<p>1. Tree Preservation Encourages the Town to consider amending the scheme to strengthen the protection of existing trees on private land</p>	<p>1. It is recognised that there is growing pressure on urban tree canopy from infill development and that there is an absence of appropriate mechanisms in the State planning framework to retain and protect trees on private land.</p> <p>In response to submissions it is recommended that modifications are made to LPS2 to include provisions to facilitate the preparation of a Significant Tree Register, in keeping with the WAPCs established preferred approach to tree retention on private land within local planning schemes, as a first step to affording registered significant trees a greater level of protection under the scheme.</p> <p>In addition to including the Significant Tree Register provisions within LPS2, it is recommended that the Town prepares a local planning policy that stipulates the circumstances in which the removal of a tree on private land requires development approval in accordance with emerging industry practice.</p>
122.	5184951	Occupier	St James	<p>1. Tree Preservation Encourages the Town to consider amending the scheme to strengthen the protection of existing trees on private land</p>	<p>1. It is recognised that there is growing pressure on urban tree canopy from infill development and that there is an absence of appropriate mechanisms in the State planning framework to retain and protect trees on private land.</p> <p>In response to submissions it is recommended that modifications are made to LPS2 to include provisions to facilitate the preparation of a Significant Tree Register, in keeping with the WAPCs established preferred approach to tree retention on private land within local planning schemes, as a first step to affording registered significant trees a greater level of protection under the scheme.</p> <p>In addition to including the Significant Tree Register provisions within LPS2, it is recommended that the Town prepares a local planning policy that stipulates the circumstances in which the removal of a tree on private land requires development approval</p>

					in accordance with emerging industry practice.
123.	5185571	Owner Occupier	Victoria Park	1. Tree Preservation Encourages the Town to consider amending the scheme to strengthen the protection of existing trees on private land	<p>1. It is recognised that there is growing pressure on urban tree canopy from infill development and that there is an absence of appropriate mechanisms in the State planning framework to retain and protect trees on private land.</p> <p>In response to submissions it is recommended that modifications are made to LPS2 to include provisions to facilitate the preparation of a Significant Tree Register, in keeping with the WAPCs established preferred approach to tree retention on private land within local planning schemes, as a first step to affording registered significant trees a greater level of protection under the scheme.</p> <p>In addition to including the Significant Tree Register provisions within LPS2, it is recommended that the Town prepares a local planning policy that stipulates the circumstances in which the removal of a tree on private land requires development approval in accordance with emerging industry practice.</p>
124.	5185665	Owner	East Victoria Park	1. Tree Preservation Encourages the Town to consider amending the scheme to strengthen the protection of existing trees on private land	<p>1. It is recognised that there is growing pressure on urban tree canopy from infill development and that there is an absence of appropriate mechanisms in the State planning framework to retain and protect trees on private land.</p> <p>In response to submissions it is recommended that modifications are made to LPS2 to include provisions to facilitate the preparation of a Significant Tree Register, in keeping with the WAPCs established preferred approach to tree retention on private land within local planning schemes, as a first step to affording registered significant trees a greater level of protection under the scheme.</p> <p>In addition to including the Significant Tree Register provisions within LPS2, it is recommended that the Town prepares a local planning policy that stipulates the circumstances in which the removal of a tree on private land requires development approval in accordance with emerging industry practice.</p>
125.	5186794	Owner	East Victoria Park	1. Tree Preservation Encourages the Town to consider amending the scheme to strengthen the protection of existing trees on private land	<p>1. It is recognised that there is growing pressure on urban tree canopy from infill development and that there is an absence of appropriate mechanisms in the State planning framework to retain and protect trees on private land.</p> <p>In response to submissions it is recommended that modifications are made to LPS2 to include provisions to facilitate the preparation of a Significant Tree Register, in keeping with the WAPCs established preferred approach to tree retention on private land within local planning schemes, as a first step to affording registered significant trees a greater level of protection under the scheme.</p> <p>In addition to including the Significant Tree Register provisions within LPS2, it is recommended that the Town prepares a local planning policy that stipulates the circumstances in which the removal of a tree on private land requires development approval in accordance with emerging industry practice.</p>
126.	5187644	Owner	South Perth	1. Tree Preservation Encourages the Town to consider amending the scheme to strengthen the protection of existing trees on private land	<p>1. It is recognised that there is growing pressure on urban tree canopy from infill development and that there is an absence of appropriate mechanisms in the State planning framework to retain and protect trees on private land.</p> <p>In response to submissions it is recommended that modifications are made to LPS2 to include provisions to facilitate the preparation of a Significant Tree Register, in keeping with the WAPCs established preferred approach to tree retention on private land within local planning schemes, as a first step to affording registered significant trees a greater level of protection under the scheme.</p> <p>In addition to including the Significant Tree Register provisions within LPS2, it is recommended that the Town prepares a local planning policy that stipulates the circumstances in which the removal of a tree on private land requires development approval in accordance with emerging industry practice.</p>
127.	5189719	Owner	East Victoria Park	1. Removal of restrictions on Multiple Dwellings Does not support the removal restrictions on multiple dwellings. Concerns that new development will diminish local character.	1. For areas with density codes of R20 (parts of Lathlain, East Victoria Park and St James) and R30 (parts of Carlisle, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park, St James) the removal of restrictions on multiple dwellings under LPS2 presents no change to the number of dwellings that can be constructed on any property or the permitted building heights, which remain limited to a maximum of

				<p>two storeys, than currently permitted under TPS1. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.</p> <p>For areas with density codes of R40 within the Town's Residential Character Area (parts of Burswood, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park), the proposed modification allows for an increase in the number of dwellings that can be constructed via the development of multiple dwellings, however, building heights (limited to a maximum of two storeys) and other primary development controls remain comparable. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.</p> <p>Advice from the Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage (DPLH) suggests that re-introducing restrictions on multiple dwellings in certain area in LPS2 is unlikely to be supported by the Western Australian Planning Commission for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restricting multiple dwellings is not an appropriate planning mechanism for the conservation and retention of character dwellings and streetscapes. A heritage area or heritage list is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town seeks to retain character dwellings. A local planning policy is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town is seeking a certain streetscape character appearance. <p>In line with DPLH advice it is recommended that no modification be made to LPS2 in response to submissions received on the character theme, with the exception of a minor adjustment to the wording of the Clause 9 Scheme Aim related to places of heritage significance and character to reflect the above recommended approach, and that other planning mechanisms be investigated as the most appropriate planning instruments to promote the retention of character dwellings and streetscape character.</p>	
128.	5189976	Other - Consultant on behalf of owner	Curtin University or Bentley	<p>1. Technology Park, Bentley The LPS2 scheme provisions fail to bring the strategic objectives of WAPCs higher order Bentley-Curtin Specialised Activity Centre Plan and the Local Planning Strategy into the local planning framework as intended. Built form and land use controls are prohibitively restrictive.</p> <p>The retention of the existing TPS1 development and land use controls fails to adequately address State Planning Policy 4.2 - Activity Centres for Perth and Peel to support the renewal of existing centres.</p> <p>Concerns with the restrictiveness of the definition for "research and development" and associated land use permissibility in the Special Use zone.</p>	<p>1. Noted. In response to submissions and to better provide for the implementation of the Bentley-Curtin Specialised Activity Centre Plan (WAPC, 2018) it is recommended that modifications be made to LPS2 to more closely align built form and land use controls with the BCSACP high level vision and guidance for the area while supporting that further detailed precinct planning be undertaken to refine development controls.</p>
129.	5190034	Owner Occupier	Lathlain	<p>1. Increased pressure on infrastructure Concerns that existing infrastructure - sewerage and local greenspace amenities cannot cope with additional population growth.</p> <p>2. Traffic and Parking Concerns that new development will result in increased traffic and negatively impact parking.</p> <p>3. Amenity and Safety Concerns that new development will increase crime and reduce safety.</p>	<p>1. Noted. Service agencies are aware of the population and dwelling growth proposed as part of the Local Planning Strategy and LPS2 and will use these forecasts to inform their forward planning to upgrade infrastructure as required. The Town's Public Open Space Strategy provides for upgrades to local public open space to support a growing population.</p> <p>2. Noted. The Town's Integrated Transport Strategy and Parking Management Plan, endorsed by Council in 2022, outline detailed guidance for managing the Town's transport network and parking to support the Town as liveable inner-city community. The Town will continue to implement these strategies in response to the needs of a growing population.</p> <p>3. Noted. Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles are applied within the R-Codes, precinct structure plans and local planning policies in the local planning framework. Other matters relating to safety and security are outside the scope of LPS2.</p>
130.	5190321	Owner	Burswood	<p>1. Environmental Concerns Comments in regard to the need for development to be climate responsive including; utilising renewable energies, combatting sea level rise, providing heat wave refuges, providing habitat for wildlife, increasing tree canopy and combating invasive species.</p>	<p>1. The LPS2 'Aims of Scheme' and subsequent development provisions intend to contribute to more climate responsive and sustainable development within the scope of a local planning scheme.</p> <p>2. Noted - LPS2 implements the Local Planning Strategy which directs population and housing growth towards certain locations of the Town; primarily activity centres and urban corridors and generally limiting growth in established lower density suburban areas.</p>

				<p>2. Location of new development Support for densification to occur around transport nodes.</p> <p>3. Supporting trees Comments requesting development controls that support the planting of trees on private land such as deep soil zones, maximum site coverage and requirements for porous paving. Requests penalties for removing trees and requirements for removed trees to be replaced at a 6:1 ratio.</p> <p>4. Design and amenity of new development Comments in support of new development maintaining minimum garden sizes, dwellings to have cross ventilation and access to natural light.</p>	<p>3. It is recommended that modifications be made to LPS2 to include supplementary provisions to the deemed provisions to facilitate the preparation of a Significant Tree Register.</p> <p>4. Noted. Design of dwellings including access to natural light and cross ventilation are controlled via the R-Codes.</p>
131.	5190341	Owner	Claremont	<p>1. Tree Preservation Encourages the Town to consider amending the scheme to strengthen the protection of existing trees on private land</p>	<p>1. It is recognised that there is growing pressure on urban tree canopy from infill development and that there is an absence of appropriate mechanisms in the State planning framework to retain and protect trees on private land.</p> <p>In response to submissions it is recommended that modifications are made to LPS2 to include provisions to facilitate the preparation of a Significant Tree Register, in keeping with the WAPCs established preferred approach to tree retention on private land within local planning schemes, as a first step to affording registered significant trees a greater level of protection under the scheme.</p> <p>In addition to including the Significant Tree Register provisions within LPS2, it is recommended that the Town prepares a local planning policy that stipulates the circumstances in which the removal of a tree on private land requires development approval in accordance with emerging industry practice.</p>
132.	5191665	Owner Occupier	Lathlain	<p>1. Area Specific - Lathlain Does not support properties being coded R60 in Lathlain.</p>	<p>1. Noted. The proposed densities are consistent with recommendations of the Local Planning Strategy which designates selected properties in the catchment of Burswood Station and Victoria Park Station as Future Investigation Areas for consideration as medium and/or higher density development. To ensure LPS2 reflects the built form density of existing apartment buildings within this area a R60 density code has been applied to relevant sites.</p>
133.	5191996	Owner	Bicton	<p>1. Tree Preservation Encourages the Town to consider amending the scheme to strengthen the protection of existing trees on private land</p>	<p>1. It is recognised that there is growing pressure on urban tree canopy from infill development and that there is an absence of appropriate mechanisms in the State planning framework to retain and protect trees on private land.</p> <p>In response to submissions it is recommended that modifications are made to LPS2 to include provisions to facilitate the preparation of a Significant Tree Register, in keeping with the WAPCs established preferred approach to tree retention on private land within local planning schemes, as a first step to affording registered significant trees a greater level of protection under the scheme.</p> <p>In addition to including the Significant Tree Register provisions within LPS2, it is recommended that the Town prepares a local planning policy that stipulates the circumstances in which the removal of a tree on private land requires development approval in accordance with emerging industry practice.</p>
134.	5192002	Owner	Melville	<p>1. Tree Preservation Encourages the Town to consider amending the scheme to strengthen the protection of existing trees on private land</p>	<p>1. It is recognised that there is growing pressure on urban tree canopy from infill development and that there is an absence of appropriate mechanisms in the State planning framework to retain and protect trees on private land.</p> <p>In response to submissions it is recommended that modifications are made to LPS2 to include provisions to facilitate the preparation of a Significant Tree Register, in keeping with the WAPCs established preferred approach to tree retention on private land within local planning schemes, as a first step to affording registered significant trees a greater level of protection under the scheme.</p> <p>In addition to including the Significant Tree Register provisions within LPS2, it is recommended that the Town prepares a local planning policy that stipulates the circumstances in which the removal of a tree on private land requires development approval in accordance with emerging industry practice.</p>
135.	5192042	Owner	Kardinya	<p>1. Tree Preservation</p>	<p>1. It is recognised that there is growing pressure on urban tree canopy from infill development and that there is an absence of</p>

				Encourages the Town to consider amending the scheme to strengthen the protection of existing trees on private land	<p>appropriate mechanisms in the State planning framework to retain and protect trees on private land.</p> <p>In response to submissions it is recommended that modifications are made to LPS2 to include provisions to facilitate the preparation of a Significant Tree Register, in keeping with the WAPCs established preferred approach to tree retention on private land within local planning schemes, as a first step to affording registered significant trees a greater level of protection under the scheme.</p> <p>In addition to including the Significant Tree Register provisions within LPS2, it is recommended that the Town prepares a local planning policy that stipulates the circumstances in which the removal of a tree on private land requires development approval in accordance with emerging industry practice.</p>
136.	5192214	Other - Consultant on behalf of owner	Victoria Park	<p>1. Site Specific - Connect Victoria Park Various Mackie Street and Cargill Street, Victoria Park</p> <p>Request that various properties owned by Connect Victoria Park on Mackie Street and Cargill Street, Victoria Park be considered for upcoding from R30 to R60 to allow for multiple dwellings and increase housing diversity in the area.</p> <p>Comments recognising the intended future-built form outcome proposed for the area under the Albany Highway Precinct Structure Plan.</p>	<p>1. Noted. As per Local Planning Strategy Action AH.3 recommend LPS2 continues with transitioning the current TPS1 zones and densities to LPS2 until further updates are recommended via preparation of the AHPSP.</p> <p>Note that No.39 Mackie Street is located outside of the AHPSP boundary and not envisioned to be included. No.39 Mackie Street contains an existing strata development with 10x apartments on a 1016m² (R30) lot. This site benefits from LPSP2 Clause 26(3) that supports the redevelopment of existing residential buildings with densities greater than those set out in the scheme map.</p>
137.	5192276	Owner	East Victoria Park	<p>1. Tree Preservation</p> <p>Encourages the Town to consider amending the scheme to strengthen the protection of existing trees on private land</p>	<p>1. It is recognised that there is growing pressure on urban tree canopy from infill development and that there is an absence of appropriate mechanisms in the State planning framework to retain and protect trees on private land.</p> <p>In response to submissions it is recommended that modifications are made to LPS2 to include provisions to facilitate the preparation of a Significant Tree Register, in keeping with the WAPCs established preferred approach to tree retention on private land within local planning schemes, as a first step to affording registered significant trees a greater level of protection under the scheme.</p> <p>In addition to including the Significant Tree Register provisions within LPS2, it is recommended that the Town prepares a local planning policy that stipulates the circumstances in which the removal of a tree on private land requires development approval in accordance with emerging industry practice.</p>
138.	5192285	Owner	City Beach	<p>1. Tree Preservation</p> <p>Encourages the Town to consider amending the scheme to strengthen the protection of existing trees on private land</p>	<p>1. It is recognised that there is growing pressure on urban tree canopy from infill development and that there is an absence of appropriate mechanisms in the State planning framework to retain and protect trees on private land.</p> <p>In response to submissions it is recommended that modifications are made to LPS2 to include provisions to facilitate the preparation of a Significant Tree Register, in keeping with the WAPCs established preferred approach to tree retention on private land within local planning schemes, as a first step to affording registered significant trees a greater level of protection under the scheme.</p> <p>In addition to including the Significant Tree Register provisions within LPS2, it is recommended that the Town prepares a local planning policy that stipulates the circumstances in which the removal of a tree on private land requires development approval in accordance with emerging industry practice.</p>
139.	5192394	Owner Occupier	East Fremantle	<p>1. Tree Preservation</p> <p>Encourages the Town to consider amending the scheme to strengthen the protection of existing trees on private land</p>	<p>1. It is recognised that there is growing pressure on urban tree canopy from infill development and that there is an absence of appropriate mechanisms in the State planning framework to retain and protect trees on private land.</p> <p>In response to submissions it is recommended that modifications are made to LPS2 to include provisions to facilitate the preparation of a Significant Tree Register, in keeping with the WAPCs established preferred approach to tree retention on private land within local planning schemes, as a first step to affording registered significant trees a greater level of protection under the scheme.</p> <p>In addition to including the Significant Tree Register provisions within LPS2, it is recommended that the Town prepares a local planning policy that stipulates the circumstances in which the removal of a tree on private land requires development approval</p>

					in accordance with emerging industry practice.
140.	5193610	Occupier	Burswood	<p>1. Site Specific - Lathlain Place, Lathlain Support changes to Lathlain Place (eastern side) from Residential R40 to Local Centre RAC4 to support change of uses to existing development and future redevelopment.</p>	1. Noted.
141.	5193646	Owner Occupier	City Beach	<p>1. General LPS2 Comments Supports the content of the scheme, however, no comments provided.</p>	1. Noted.
142.	5193921	Other - Consultant on behalf of owner	Northbridge	<p>1. Clause 33 - Additional site and development requirements for areas covered by structure plan or local development plan Concern that absence of 'Scheduled E' relating to Clause 33 'Additional site and development requirements for areas covered by structure plan or local development plan' means that Clause 33 will be removed from the scheme.</p>	1. Noted. The absence of Schedule E is the result of an administrative error following modifications to LPS2 prior to advertising at the direction of the WAPC. Clause 33 will remain in LPS2 however will be modified to state "There are no additional requirements that apply to this Scheme." in accordance with the Model Scheme Text.
143.	5194420	Other - Consultant on behalf of owner	Victoria Park	<p>1. Site Specific - No.3 Columbo Street, Victoria Park 1. Site within 'Residential' zone approved for 'Office' use (and has operated as an office for 23 years). 2. Do not support the zoning of the subject site as 'Residential'. 3. Do not support the ongoing status of the site's use as a non-conforming use. 4. Request the Town amend Draft LPS2's scheme map (and all relevant provisions of draft LPS2) by zoning lots 76, 77 and 123 Colombo Street as 'Mixed Use'.</p>	<p>1. Noted. 2. Noted. 3. Noted. In the preparation of LPS2 an audit of existing sites operating as non-residential uses within the residential zones of the scheme area (such as existing convenience stores, shops, café and offices). This audit has seen a number of properties listed under Clause 19 - Additional uses. Additional uses allow for uses that would otherwise not be permitted under the zone applicable to specific properties. Additional uses have been applied to such properties to support appropriate change of use for existing commercial properties and to encourage the re-use of existing purpose-built non-residential buildings within residential zones. No.3 Colombo Street was not identified in this audit, however, it would be appropriate to apply the same principles to this site in lieu of the requested rezoning to 'Mixed Use' which is not supported. 4. Noted. Not supported - inconsistent with the Local Planning Strategy which recommends that the current TPS1 zones and densities be transitioned to the new LPS2 for the Residential Character Area neighbourhood. Notably the property is within the proposed boundary of the Albany Highway Precinct Structure Plan (currently underway) that will inform a strategic amendment to LPS2. Interim modifications to properties prior to the completion of the AHPSP are not supported.</p>
144.	5194478	Owner	Kensington	<p>1. Tree Preservation Encourages the Town to consider amending the scheme to strengthen the protection of existing trees on private land</p>	<p>1. It is recognised that there is growing pressure on urban tree canopy from infill development and that there is an absence of appropriate mechanisms in the State planning framework to retain and protect trees on private land. In response to submissions it is recommended that modifications are made to LPS2 to include provisions to facilitate the preparation of a Significant Tree Register, in keeping with the WAPCs established preferred approach to tree retention on private land within local planning schemes, as a first step to affording registered significant trees a greater level of protection under the scheme. In addition to including the Significant Tree Register provisions within LPS2, it is recommended that the Town prepares a local planning policy that stipulates the circumstances in which the removal of a tree on private land requires development approval in accordance with emerging industry practice.</p>
145.	5194610	Owner	Victoria Park	<p>1. Removal of restrictions on Multiple Dwellings Does not support the removal restrictions on multiple dwellings. Concerns that new development will diminish local character. 2. Traffic and Parking Concerns that new development will result in increased traffic and negatively impact on road safety.</p>	<p>1. For areas with density codes of R20 (parts of Lathlain, East Victoria Park and St James) and R30 (parts of Carlisle, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park, St James) the removal of restrictions on multiple dwellings under LPS2 presents no change to the number of dwellings that can be constructed on any property or the permitted building heights, which remain limited to a maximum of two storeys, than currently permitted under TPS1. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development. For areas with density codes of R40 within the Town's Residential Character Area (parts of Burswood, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park), the proposed modification allows for an increase in the number of dwellings that can be constructed via the development of multiple dwellings, however, building heights (limited to a maximum of two storeys) and other primary development controls remain comparable. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.</p>

				<p>Advice from the Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage (DPLH) suggests that re-introducing restrictions on multiple dwellings in certain area in LPS2 is unlikely to be supported by the Western Australian Planning Commission for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restricting multiple dwellings is not an appropriate planning mechanism for the conservation and retention of character dwellings and streetscapes. A heritage area or heritage list is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town seeks to retain character dwellings. A local planning policy is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town is seeking a certain streetscape character appearance. <p>In line with DPLH advice it is recommended that no modification be made to LPS2 in response to submissions received on the character theme, with the exception of a minor adjustment to the wording of the Clause 9 Scheme Aim related to places of heritage significance and character to reflect the above recommended approach, and that other planning mechanisms be investigated as the most appropriate planning instruments to promote the retention of character dwellings and streetscape character.</p> <p>2. Noted. The Town's Integrated Transport Strategy and Parking Management Plan, endorsed by Council in 2022, outline detailed guidance for managing the Town's transport network and parking to support the Town as liveable inner-city community. The Town will continue to implement these strategies in response to the needs of a growing population.</p>	
146.	5194638	Owner	Sinagra	<p>1. Tree Preservation Encourages the Town to consider amending the scheme to strengthen the protection of existing trees on private land</p>	<p>1. It is recognised that there is growing pressure on urban tree canopy from infill development and that there is an absence of appropriate mechanisms in the State planning framework to retain and protect trees on private land.</p> <p>In response to submissions it is recommended that modifications are made to LPS2 to include provisions to facilitate the preparation of a Significant Tree Register, in keeping with the WAPCs established preferred approach to tree retention on private land within local planning schemes, as a first step to affording registered significant trees a greater level of protection under the scheme.</p> <p>In addition to including the Significant Tree Register provisions within LPS2, it is recommended that the Town prepares a local planning policy that stipulates the circumstances in which the removal of a tree on private land requires development approval in accordance with emerging industry practice.</p>
147.	5194855	Owner	Bicton	<p>1. Tree Preservation Encourages the Town to consider amending the scheme to strengthen the protection of existing trees on private land</p>	<p>1. It is recognised that there is growing pressure on urban tree canopy from infill development and that there is an absence of appropriate mechanisms in the State planning framework to retain and protect trees on private land.</p> <p>In response to submissions it is recommended that modifications are made to LPS2 to include provisions to facilitate the preparation of a Significant Tree Register, in keeping with the WAPCs established preferred approach to tree retention on private land within local planning schemes, as a first step to affording registered significant trees a greater level of protection under the scheme.</p> <p>In addition to including the Significant Tree Register provisions within LPS2, it is recommended that the Town prepares a local planning policy that stipulates the circumstances in which the removal of a tree on private land requires development approval in accordance with emerging industry practice.</p>
148.	5194868	Owner	Lathlain	<p>1. Area Specific - Lathlain Concerns that new development at properties near Great Eastern Highway (Empire Bar site and other residential properties being upcoded) will have adverse impacts on the local area including; increased traffic, reduce availability of on street parking, overshadowing and increase crime.</p>	<p>1. Noted. The Local Planning Strategy designates selected properties in the catchment of Burswood Station and Victoria Park Station as Future Investigation Areas for consideration as medium and/or higher density development. To ensure LPS2 reflects the built form density of existing apartment buildings within this area a R60 density code has been applied to relevant sites.</p> <p>The Town's Integrated Transport Strategy and Parking Management Plan, endorsed by Council in 2022, outline detailed guidance for managing the Town's transport network and parking to support the Town as liveable inner-city community. The Town will continue to implement these strategies in response to the needs of a growing population.</p> <p>Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles are applied within the R-Codes, precinct structure plans and local planning polices in the local planning framework. Other matters relating to safety and security are outside the scope</p>

					of LPS2.
149.	5194996	Owner	Lathlain	<p>1. Specific Site - Lathlain Place Local Centre and surrounds</p> <p>1. Comments in regard to the history of ownership, development and land use of properties on Lathlain Place, Lathlain.</p> <p>2. Comments that LPS2 will prevent properties on Kessack and Howick Street redevelopment as Multiple Dwellings.</p> <p>3. Concerns raised that the development at No.12 Lathlain Place is not operating in accordance with its development approval specifically in regard to management of the car parking facilities and waste management.</p> <p>4. Requests that the current TPS1 zoning (Residential) remain in place on the eastern side of Lathlain Place.</p> <p>5. Concerns in regards to businesses on the western side of Lathlain Place operating alfresco areas blocking the footpath.</p>	<p>1. Noted.</p> <p>2. Noted. Properties fronting Kessack and Howick Street are permitted to be developed as multiple dwellings as part of a mixed use development under LPS2 (noting that multiple dwellings are discouraged at the ground level under Clause 32 - Schedule C.</p> <p>3. Noted. Operation of existing land use not within scope fo LPS2.</p> <p>4. Noted. Not supported - Inconsistent with recommendations of the Local Planning Strategy relating to 'Activity Centres and Employment Areas'.</p> <p>5. Noted. Operation of existing land use not within scope of LPS2.</p>
150.	5195166	Owner Occupier	Victoria Park	<p>1. Traffic and Parking</p> <p>Concerns that new development will result in increased traffic and negatively impact on road safety and the availability of on street parking.</p>	<p>1. Noted. The Town's Integrated Transport Strategy and Parking Management Plan, endorsed by Council in 2022, outline detailed guidance for managing the Town's transport network and parking to support the Town as liveable inner-city community. The Town will continue to implement these strategies in response to the needs of a growing population.</p>
151.	5195446	Owner	East Victoria Park	<p>1. Tree Preservation</p> <p>Encourages the Town to consider amending the scheme to strengthen the protection of existing trees on private land</p>	<p>1. It is recognised that there is growing pressure on urban tree canopy from infill development and that there is an absence of appropriate mechanisms in the State planning framework to retain and protect trees on private land.</p> <p>In response to submissions it is recommended that modifications are made to LPS2 to include provisions to facilitate the preparation of a Significant Tree Register, in keeping with the WAPCs established preferred approach to tree retention on private land within local planning schemes, as a first step to affording registered significant trees a greater level of protection under the scheme.</p> <p>In addition to including the Significant Tree Register provisions within LPS2, it is recommended that the Town prepares a local planning policy that stipulates the circumstances in which the removal of a tree on private land requires development approval in accordance with emerging industry practice.</p>
152.	5195460	Owner	Wembley	<p>1. Tree Preservation</p> <p>Encourages the Town to consider amending the scheme to strengthen the protection of existing trees on private land.</p> <p>2. Amenity - HAZID Assessments</p> <p>Requests that the Town consider hazard assessments for activities such as wood fires, storm water discharge to the Swan River and light pollution resulting from development.</p>	<p>1. It is recognised that there is growing pressure on urban tree canopy from infill development and that there is an absence of appropriate mechanisms in the State planning framework to retain and protect trees on private land.</p> <p>In response to submissions it is recommended that modifications are made to LPS2 to include provisions to facilitate the preparation of a Significant Tree Register, in keeping with the WAPCs established preferred approach to tree retention on private land within local planning schemes, as a first step to affording registered significant trees a greater level of protection under the scheme.</p> <p>In addition to including the Significant Tree Register provisions within LPS2, it is recommended that the Town prepares a local planning policy that stipulates the circumstances in which the removal of a tree on private land requires development approval in accordance with emerging industry practice.</p> <p>2. The application of HAZID assessments for activities such as wood fires, storm water discharge to the Swan River and light pollution resulting from development are not within the scope of LPS2.</p>
153.	5195643	Owner	Wembley	<p>1. Tree Preservation</p> <p>Encourages the Town to consider amending the scheme to strengthen the protection of existing trees on private land</p>	<p>1. It is recognised that there is growing pressure on urban tree canopy from infill development and that there is an absence of appropriate mechanisms in the State planning framework to retain and protect trees on private land.</p> <p>In response to submissions it is recommended that modifications are made to LPS2 to include provisions to facilitate the preparation of a Significant Tree Register, in keeping with the WAPCs established preferred approach to tree retention on private land within local planning schemes, as a first step to affording registered significant trees a greater level of protection under the scheme.</p>

					In addition to including the Significant Tree Register provisions within LPS2, it is recommended that the Town prepares a local planning policy that stipulates the circumstances in which the removal of a tree on private land requires development approval in accordance with emerging industry practice.
154.	5195819	Owner	South Perth	<p>1. Tree Preservation Encourages the Town to consider amending the scheme to strengthen the protection of existing trees on private land</p>	<p>1. It is recognised that there is growing pressure on urban tree canopy from infill development and that there is an absence of appropriate mechanisms in the State planning framework to retain and protect trees on private land.</p> <p>In response to submissions it is recommended that modifications are made to LPS2 to include provisions to facilitate the preparation of a Significant Tree Register, in keeping with the WAPCs established preferred approach to tree retention on private land within local planning schemes, as a first step to affording registered significant trees a greater level of protection under the scheme.</p> <p>In addition to including the Significant Tree Register provisions within LPS2, it is recommended that the Town prepares a local planning policy that stipulates the circumstances in which the removal of a tree on private land requires development approval in accordance with emerging industry practice.</p>
155.	5195887	Owner	Applecross	<p>1. Tree Preservation Encourages the Town to consider amending the scheme to strengthen the protection of existing trees on private land</p>	<p>1. It is recognised that there is growing pressure on urban tree canopy from infill development and that there is an absence of appropriate mechanisms in the State planning framework to retain and protect trees on private land.</p> <p>In response to submissions it is recommended that modifications are made to LPS2 to include provisions to facilitate the preparation of a Significant Tree Register, in keeping with the WAPCs established preferred approach to tree retention on private land within local planning schemes, as a first step to affording registered significant trees a greater level of protection under the scheme.</p> <p>In addition to including the Significant Tree Register provisions within LPS2, it is recommended that the Town prepares a local planning policy that stipulates the circumstances in which the removal of a tree on private land requires development approval in accordance with emerging industry practice.</p>
156.	5197078	Owner	Victoria Park	<p>1. Traffic and Parking Concerns that new development will result in increased traffic and negatively impact on road safety and the availability of on street parking.</p> <p>2. Character Concerns that protections associated with the Raphael Park precinct (ie building style) will be lost under the new scheme</p>	<p>1. Noted. The Town's Integrated Transport Strategy and Parking Management Plan, endorsed by Council in 2022, outline detailed guidance for managing the Town's transport network and parking to support the Town as liveable inner city community. The Town will continue to implement these strategies in response to the needs of a growing population.</p> <p>2. Noted. The Town's Local Planning Policy 25 - Streetscapes continues to apply within these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.</p>
157.	5197559	Owner Occupier	Carlisle	<p>1. Site Specific - 87 Bishopgate Street, Carlisle Support for property to be rezoned from 'Residential' to 'Local Centre' to reflect existing commercial use and support future redevelopment opportunities to contribute to the Carlisle town centre.</p>	<p>1. Noted.</p>
158.	5197608	Other - Neighbour	Lathlain	<p>1. Site Specific - 214 Great Eastern Highway, Lathlain Concerns that the redevelopment of this site would result in the loss of three significant trees.</p>	<p>1. Noted. Recommend modifications to LPS2 to include supplementary provisions to the deemed provisions to facilitate the preparation of a Significant Tree Register and facilitate the process for trees to be nominated noting that this site is owned by the Town of Victoria Park.</p>
159.	5197614	Owner	Victoria Park	<p>1. General LPS2 comments Concerns that the scheme does not go far enough to encourage more expansive density.</p>	<p>1. Noted - LPS2 implements the Local Planning Strategy which directs population and housing growth towards certain locations of the Town; primarily activity centres and urban corridors and is in keeping with the directions of the State Sub-Regional Planning Framework for urban consolidation.</p>
160.	5197867	Owner	St James	<p>1. General LPS2 comments Comments stating overall support for the scheme.</p> <p>2. Land Use definition - 'hosted accommodation' Comments noting that 'hosted accommodation' is not yet included as a model scheme text land use therefore it seems presumptive for LPS2 to include this land use as a definition.</p>	<p>1. Noted.</p> <p>2. Noted. The Western Australian Planning Commission has endorsed the inclusion of the definition for 'Hosted Accommodation' in approving the LPS2 for public advertising.</p> <p>3. Noted.</p>

				<p>3. Removal of restrictions on Multiple Dwellings Supports the removal of restrictions on multiple dwellings within the Town's Residential Character Area</p> <p>4. Site Specific - 1057-1065 Albany Highway, St James Supports the change of zoning for these properties from 'Residential' to 'Local Centre'</p>	4. Noted
161.	5197887	Owner Occupier	Victoria Park	<p>1. Area Specific - Albany Highway, Victoria Park and East Victoria Park Concerns with the prospect of 32 storey development being contemplated on Albany Highway. Preference for development to be limited to approximately 7 storeys.</p>	1. Noted. There is no change to the building heights permitted in this area under LPS2 as in accordance with the Local Planning Strategy the current TPS1 zones and densities have been transitioned to the new LPS2 until further updates are recommended via preparation of the Albany Highway Precinct Structure Plan (currently underway).
162.	5197915	Owner	Lathlain	<p>1. Tree Preservation Concerns with the loss of trees on private land as a result of new development.</p> <p>2. General comments Does not support additional development opportunities within the Town.</p>	<p>1. For areas with density codes of R20 (parts of Lathlain, East Victoria Park and St James) and R30 (parts of Carlisle, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park, St James) the removal of restrictions on multiple dwellings under LPS2 presents no change to the number of dwellings that can be constructed on any property or the permitted building heights, which remain limited to a maximum of two storeys, than currently permitted under TPS1. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.</p> <p>For areas with density codes of R40 within the Town's Residential Character Area (parts of Burswood, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park), the proposed modification allows for an increase in the number of dwellings that can be constructed via the development of multiple dwellings, however, building heights (limited to a maximum of two storeys) and other primary development controls remain comparable. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.</p> <p>Advice from the Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage (DPLH) suggests that re-introducing restrictions on multiple dwellings in certain area in LPS2 is unlikely to be supported by the Western Australian Planning Commission for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restricting multiple dwellings is not an appropriate planning mechanism for the conservation and retention of character dwellings and streetscapes. A heritage area or heritage list is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town seeks to retain character dwellings. A local planning policy is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town is seeking a certain streetscape character appearance. <p>In line with DPLH advice it is recommended that no modification be made to LPS2 in response to submissions received on the character theme, with the exception of a minor adjustment to the wording of the Clause 9 Scheme Aim related to places of heritage significance and character to reflect the above recommended approach, and that other planning mechanisms be investigated as the most appropriate planning instruments to promote the retention of character dwellings and streetscape character.</p> <p>2. Noted - LPS2 implements the Local Planning Strategy which directs population and housing growth towards certain locations of the Town; primarily activity centres and urban corridors and generally limiting growth in established lower density suburban areas.</p>
163.	5198537	Owner Occupier	Lathlain	<p>1. Site Specific - 214 Great Eastern Highway, Lathlain Concerns that the redevelopment of this site would result in the loss of three significant trees. Requests that these three trees be protected under the scheme.</p>	1. Noted. Recommend modifications to LPS2 to include supplementary provisions to the deemed provisions to facilitate the preparation of a Significant Tree Register and facilitate the process for trees to be nominated noting that this site is owned by the Town of Victoria Park.
164.	5198641	Owner Occupier	Lathlain	<p>1. Site Specific - Castle Way, Lathlain Does not support the proposed increase in R-Code (from R20 to R60) of properties on the northern side of Castle Way, Lathlain.</p> <p>2. Traffic and Parking Concerns that new development will result in increased traffic.</p>	<p>1. Noted. The proposed densities are consistent with recommendations of the Local Planning Strategy which designates selected properties in the catchment of Burswood Station and Victoria Park Station as Future Investigation Areas for consideration as medium and/or higher density development. To ensure LPS2 reflects the built form density of existing apartment buildings within this area a R60 density code has been applied to relevant sites.</p> <p>2. Noted. The Town's Integrated Transport Strategy and Parking Management Plan, endorsed by Council in 2022, outline detailed guidance for managing the Town's transport network and parking to support the Town as liveable inner city community.</p>

				<p>3. Environment Concerns that development in the area would negatively impact on black cockatoos.</p> <p>4. Amenity and Safety Concerns that new development will result in reduced privacy for neighbours.</p>	<p>The Town will continue to implement these strategies in response to the needs of a growing population.</p> <p>3. Noted. Recommend modifications to LPS2 to include supplementary provisions to the deemed provisions to facilitate the preparation of a Significant Tree Register and facilitate the process for trees to be nominated noting that this site is owned by the Town of Victoria Park.</p> <p>4. Noted. Amenity issues such as overlooking are controlled through the R-Codes.</p>
165.	5198945	Other - Consultant on behalf of owner	Victoria Park	<p>1. Site specific - No.249 Albany Highway, Victoria Park Does not support the allowable building height controls applicable to 249 Albany Highway, Victoria Park. Requests that the area on the southern side of Albany Highway, Cargill Street to McMaster Street, should be allowed a building height of 4-5 storeys or a maximum of 15m - 18m.</p> <p>Commentary on the strategic basis and built form outcomes in support of the request.</p>	<p>1. Noted. The Local Planning Strategy recommends that the current TPS1 zones and densities be transitioned to the new LPS2 until further updates are recommended via preparation of the Albany Highway Precinct Structure Plan (currently underway). Interim measures to modify LPS2 not supported.</p>
166.	5199564	Owner	Carlisle	<p>1. Tree Preservation Encourages the Town to consider amending the scheme to strengthen the protection of existing trees on private land</p>	<p>1. It is recognised that there is growing pressure on urban tree canopy from infill development and that there is an absence of appropriate mechanisms in the State planning framework to retain and protect trees on private land.</p> <p>In response to submissions it is recommended that modifications are made to LPS2 to include provisions to facilitate the preparation of a Significant Tree Register, in keeping with the WAPCs established preferred approach to tree retention on private land within local planning schemes, as a first step to affording registered significant trees a greater level of protection under the scheme.</p> <p>In addition to including the Significant Tree Register provisions within LPS2, it is recommended that the Town prepares a local planning policy that stipulates the circumstances in which the removal of a tree on private land requires development approval in accordance with emerging industry practice.</p>
167.	5200628	Owner Occupier	Victoria Park	<p>1. Site Specific - 484 Albany Highway, Victoria Park Does not support the TPS1 development controls pertaining to this site being applied under LPS2 pending the outcomes of the Albany Highway Precinct Structure Plan that envisages development at a far greater scale. Concerns that retaining these controls within LPS2 will delay the statutory implementation of the Albany Highway Precinct Structure Plan and place an additional administrative burden on the advancement of the local planning framework.</p> <p><u>Recommendations</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Replace the R60 density code with R-AC0 - Delete ASR7 including the entirety of the development standards from Schedule C of the Scheme. - In place of ASR7, include a clause that requires development to be in accordance with the adopted Albany Highway Precinct Structure Plan. <p>Further commentary on alternative options to expediate transitioning the Albany Highway Precinct Structure Plan into LPS2 including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consider adopting the provisions of ASR7 as a LPP that can be easily revoked upon adoption of the AHPSP. - Consider including text within LPS2 noting that the provisions only have effect until the adoption of the AHPSP (ie a sunset clause). 	<p>1. Noted. The Local Planning Strategy recommends that the current TPS1 zones and densities be transitioned to the new LPS2 until further updates are recommended via preparation of the Albany Highway Precinct Structure Plan (currently underway). Interim modifications to properties prior to the completion of the AHPSP are not supported.</p>
168.	E001	Other - Consultant on behalf of owner	Victoria Park	<p>1. Removal of additional use rights for Motor Vehicle Sales Premises - Various sites Does not support the Town Planning Scheme No.1 additional use rights granted to various motor vehicle sales premises being replaced with non-conforming use rights. Reasons stated for the non-support include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Dealer requirements to upgrade the built form and corporate image of their 	<p>Under Town Planning Scheme No.1 (TPS1) existing car dealerships in the areas of Victoria Park and Burswood, where 'motor vehicle and marine sales premises' is designated as an 'X' (prohibited) land use in the 'Commercial' and 'District Centre' zones, are approved for 'motor vehicle and marine sales premises' as an 'additional use'. The 'additional use' scheme provisions allow the existing car yards to continue to operate and be extended or added to without the application of non-conforming use rights under the scheme.</p>

				<p>facilities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Uncertainty caused by the level of discretion afforded to the Town under non-confirming use rights. - The effect of Prime Marketing Areas agreements affecting dealerships ability to relocate. - Businesses closing and land sitting vacant. - Extensive recent and planned investments in current businesses. - Wider economic impact on the surrounding area as the dealerships attract lots of people to the area. - Loss of local employment. - the non-confirming use classification may inadvertently increase the number of open air display format for car sales. - prohibiting the land use directly conflicts with the future strategic planning framework intended for the Albany Highway Precinct. - the retention of car dealerships will assist the Town in achieving its long terms strategic vision for the location. - the contribution of John Hughes and his dealerships to Victoria Park. <p>Request that the LPS2 zoning table be modified to allow 'motor vehicle, boat, or caravan sales' within the 'Mixed Use' zone and that the existing additional use rights attached to the subject properties from TPS1 be transferred to LPS2.</p>	<p>As advertised, draft LPS2 designates 'motor vehicle, boat and caravan sales' as an 'X' (prohibited) land use in both the 'Mixed Use' and 'District Centre' zones that apply to these areas, however, proposes that the TPS1 additional use rights be revoked. The rationale for removing the additional use rights for existing "motor vehicle sales premises" include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The advancement of the Town's strategic planning framework since 2015, including the adoption of the Local Planning Strategy (2022). - Initiation of the Albany Highway Precinct Structure Planning project – including findings of the Albany Highway Tomorrow report that suggests a strong community preference that car yards move on from the area. - Updates to the Regulations (2015) relating to non-confirming uses (included in TPS1 since 2017 and proposed in LPS2) that provide more detailed guidance related to development of sites containing non-confirming uses than what was not in place at the time of Amendment 60. <p>Since the preparation of draft LPS2, the Albany Highway Precinct Structure Plan (AHPSP) has progressed and, on this matter, identifies that "car-based activity will be adapted and retained to protect their economic contribution to the Precinct.". On the basis that the AHPSP contemplates the continuation of existing 'motor vehicle and marine sales premises' it is recommended that the TPS1 additional use provisions for properties within this area be retained pending final recommendations via the AHPSP.</p> <p>Reinstating the 'additional use' of 'motor vehicle, boat and caravan sales' for existing car yards is intended to give existing car yards the opportunity to extend, modify and upgrade their premises in accordance with the market changes and manufacturer requirements, as requested in submissions received, but without providing the opportunity for the use to extend to other land zoned 'Mixed Use' under LPS2.</p>
169.	E002	Owner Occupier	Lathlain	<p>1. Site Specific - Castle Way, Lathlain Does not support the proposed increase from R20 to R60 on Castle Way, Lathlain</p> <p>2. Traffic and Parking Concerns that new development will result in increased traffic and pose safety risks to pedestrians.</p> <p>3. Character Concerns that new development will be unattractive and not fit in with the local character.</p> <p>4. Effect on Property Values Concerns that new development will decrease property values.</p>	<p>1. Noted. The proposed densities are consistent with recommendations of the Local Planning Strategy which designates selected properties in the catchment of Burswood Station and Victoria Park Station as Future Investigation Areas for consideration as medium and/or higher density development. To ensure LPS2 reflects the built form density of existing apartment buildings within this area a R60 density code has been applied to relevant sites.</p> <p>2. Noted. The Town's Integrated Transport Strategy and Parking Management Plan, endorsed by Council in 2022, outline detailed guidance for managing the Town's transport network and parking to support the Town as liveable inner-city community. The Town will continue to implement these strategies in response to the needs of a growing population.</p> <p>3. The Town's Local Planning Policy 25 - Streetscapes continues to apply within these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.</p> <p>4. Noted. Property values are not a planning matter and outside the scope of LPS2.</p>
170.	E003	Other - Consultant on behalf of owner	Burswood	<p>1. Site specific - 21 Harvey Street, Burswood Support the inclusion of Medical Centre 'A' and Office 'D' as additional uses for No.21 Harvey Street, Burswood to support the existing use of the site and allow for changes to comparable uses in the future.</p>	<p>1. Noted.</p>
171.	E004	Owner	Lathlain	<p>1. Area Specific - Rutland Ave, Lathlain Does not support the proposed increase from R40 to R60 for various properties on Rutland Ave, Lathlain.</p> <p>2. Traffic and Parking Concerns that new development will reduce the availability of on street parking.</p> <p>3. Effect on property values</p>	<p>1. Noted. The proposed densities are consistent with recommendations of the Local Planning Strategy which designates selected properties in the catchment of Burswood Station and Victoria Park Station as Future Investigation Areas for consideration as medium and/or higher density development. To ensure LPS2 reflects the built form density of existing apartment buildings within this area a R60 density code has been applied to relevant sites.</p> <p>2. Noted. The Town's Integrated Transport Strategy and Parking Management Plan, endorsed by Council in 2022, outline detailed guidance for managing the Town's transport network and parking to support the Town as liveable inner city community. The Town will continue to implement these strategies in response to the needs of a growing population.</p>

				Concerns that change will negatively affect property values. 4. Amenity and Safety Concerns that high density development causes social problems.	3. Noted. Property values are not a planning matter and outside the scope of LPS2. 4. Noted. Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles are applied within the R-Codes, precinct structure plans and local planning polices in the local planning framework. Other matters relating to safety and security are outside the scope of LPS2.
172.	E005	Owner	Lathlain	1. Area Specific - Rutland Ave, Lathlain Does not support the proposed increase from R40 to R60 for various properties on Rutland Ave, Lathlain. Requests that properties not be zoned any higher than R40. Requests that parts of Lathlain coded R20 be changed to R30 to allow for gradual increases in density. Requests that the density controls of R40 be amended to be consistent with R20 or R30. Requests that no area in Lathlain allow for R60 development or any development over two storeys in height.	1. Noted. The proposed densities are consistent with recommendations of the Local Planning Strategy which designates selected properties in the catchment of Burswood Station and Victoria Park Station as Future Investigation Areas for consideration as medium and/or higher density development. To ensure LPS2 reflects the built form density of existing apartment buildings within this area a R60 density code has been applied to relevant sites. LPS2 implements the Local Planning Strategy which directs population and housing growth towards certain locations of the Town; primarily activity centres and urban corridors and generally limiting growth in established lower density suburban areas therefore wider changes to the Lathlain neighbourhood are not supported.
173.	E006	Owner	Bentley	1. LPS2 General Comments Comments indicating support for LPS2 as long as it is in consultation with the community.	1. Noted. Consultation has been carried out for LPS2 for 90 days in accordance with legislative requirements and following extensive community engagement on the Local Planning Strategy that has informed the content of LPS2.
174.	E007	Other referral agency	Kensington	1. Department of Biodiversity, Conservation and Attractions referral comments 1. Comments that Local Planning Scheme should recognise the interaction between the Swan and Canning Rivers Management Act 2006 and the Planning and Development Act 2005 for planning within and around the Swan and Canning Rivers. 2. Request that the Swan Canning Development Control Area (DCA) should be identified as an advisory note on the LPS2 scheme map. 3. Request that Clause - 12 Relationship with region planning scheme, should also identify approval requirements for development which impacts the Swan Canning DCA. 4. Comments noting changes to zoning and density at properties near the river at the corner of Canning Highway and Berwick Street. 5. Recommends that the local planning framework include a Foreshore Interface Strategy.	The points raised in the Department of Biodiversity, Conservation and Attractions submission are noted however do not warrant any modifications to LPS2. 1. Noted. 2. Noted. Seek DPLH advice on appropriateness of accommodating request. 3. Seek DPLH advice on appropriateness of accommodating request. 4. Changes to properties at Canning Highway and Berwick Street intersection do not change the density applicable under TPS1 (R80). 5. Noted. The Town is in the process of preparing a new Environment Plan 2023-2028 which includes consideration and recommended actions relating to managing the foreshore interface between the rivers and urban areas of the Town.
175.	E008	Other referral agency	Fremantle	1. Department of Communities referral comments Support for the removal of restrictions on multiple dwellings in certain areas.	The points raised in the Department of Communities submission are noted however do not warrant any modifications to LPS2. 1. Noted.
176.	E009	Other Consultant on behalf of owner	Lathlain	1. Site Specific - Empire Bar, Lathlain Request that the ASR3 area applicable to the site be amended to better reflect the existing development and future vision for the site by applying a 'Mixed Use' zone to all of the site with exception of Lot 67 Maple Street and Lot 42 Cornwall Street. Request for building height controls to be modified to reflect the requested additional 'Mixed Use' zoned area. Commentary that the requirement for a Local Development Plan add	1. Supported. In response to submissions and to better recognise the existing development of the site modifications are proposed to ASR3 to allow for appropriate redevelopment without adding additional layers to the local planning framework.

				<p>unnecessary layers to the planning framework and should be removed. Suggest that a clause that reference the R-Codes development controls (in the absence of an LDP) would provide sufficient certainty to landowners and neighbours.</p> <p>Recommended wording: "In the absence of an approved local development for lots zoned Mixed Use, non-residential buildings shall be designed in accordance with the street and side setback requirements of the R-Codes with regard to the Residential RAC-3 density code."</p>	
177.	E010	Other - Consultant on behalf of owner	Bentley	<p>1. Technology Park, Bentley The LPS2 scheme provisions fail to bring the strategic objectives of WAPCs higher order Bentley-Curtin Specialised Activity Centre Plan and the Local Planning Strategy into the local planning framework as intended. Built form and land use controls are prohibitively restrictive.</p> <p>The retention of the existing TPS1 development and land use controls fails to adequately address State Planning Policy 4.2 - Activity Centres for Perth and Peel to support the renewal of existing centres.</p> <p>Concerns with the restrictiveness of the definition for "research and development" and associated land use permissibility in the Special Use zone.</p>	<p>1. Noted. In response to submissions and to better provide for the implementation of the Bentley-Curtin Specialised Activity Centre Plan (WAPC, 2018) it is recommended that modifications be made to LPS2 to more closely align built form and land use controls with the BCSACP high level vision and guidance for the area while supporting that further detailed precinct planning be undertaken to refine development controls.</p>
178.	E011	Other - Consultant on behalf of owner	Bentley	<p>1. Technology Park, Bentley The LPS2 scheme provisions fail to bring the strategic objectives of WAPCs higher order Bentley-Curtin Specialised Activity Centre Plan and the Local Planning Strategy into the local planning framework as intended. Built form and land use controls are prohibitively restrictive.</p> <p>The retention of the existing TPS1 development and land use controls fails to adequately address State Planning Policy 4.2 - Activity Centres for Perth and Peel to support the renewal of existing centres.</p> <p>Concerns with the restrictiveness of the definition for "research and development" and associated land use permissibility in the Special Use zone.</p>	<p>1. Noted. In response to submissions and to better provide for the implementation of the Bentley-Curtin Specialised Activity Centre Plan (WAPC, 2018) it is recommended that modifications be made to LPS2 to more closely align built form and land use controls with the BCSACP high level vision and guidance for the area while supporting that further detailed precinct planning be undertaken to refine development controls.</p>
179.	E012	Other - Consultant on behalf of owner	Bentley	<p>1. Technology Park, Bentley The LPS2 scheme provisions fail to bring the strategic objectives of WAPCs higher order Bentley-Curtin Specialised Activity Centre Plan and the Local Planning Strategy into the local planning framework as intended. Built form and land use controls are prohibitively restrictive.</p> <p>The retention of the existing TPS1 development and land use controls fails to adequately address State Planning Policy 4.2 - Activity Centres for Perth and Peel to support the renewal of existing centres.</p> <p>Concerns with the restrictiveness of the definition for "research and development" and associated land use permissibility in the Special Use zone.</p>	<p>1. Noted. In response to submissions and to better provide for the implementation of the Bentley-Curtin Specialised Activity Centre Plan (WAPC, 2018) it is recommended that modifications be made to LPS2 to more closely align built form and land use controls with the BCSACP high level vision and guidance for the area while supporting that further detailed precinct planning be undertaken to refine development controls.</p>
180.	E013	Other - Consultant on behalf of owner	East Victoria Park	<p>1. Site Specific - No.167-No.169 Bank Street, Carlisle Concerns that the proposed 'Light Industry' zone is inconsistent with the strategic planning framework for the area, reduces the scope of redevelopment opportunities and does not allow for residential uses.</p> <p>LPS2 should be building on and reflect the significant State investment in the area via METRONET.</p>	<p>The Local Planning Strategy recommends that the Oats Street Station neighbourhood, inclusive of 167-169 Bank street, Carlisle, be designated as a Precinct Planning Area to investigate opportunities for higher density mixed use development.</p> <p>The Strategy recommends that the current TPS1 zones and densities be transitioned to the new LPS2 until further updates are recommended via preparation of the Oats Street Precinct Structure Plan which the Town has commenced in mid-2023. Interim modifications to properties prior to the completion of the Oats Street Precinct</p>

				<p>Waiting for the Precinct Structure Planning for the area that is currently underway is unnecessary and will delay the redevelopment of the area.</p> <p>Request that the 'Light Industry' zone applicable to the area be replaced with a 'Centre' zone to support the preparation and operation of a Precinct Structure Plan.</p>	<p>Structure Plan are not supported.</p> <p>The points raised in the submissions are noted however as the requested change is inconsistent with recommendations of the Local Planning Strategy and ongoing preparation of the Oats Street Precinct Structure Plan it is not recommended that any modifications are made to LPS2 in response to the submission.</p>
181.	E014	Other - Consultant on behalf of owner	Bentley	<p>1. Technology Park, Bentley</p> <p>The LPS2 scheme provisions fail to bring the strategic objectives of WAPCs higher order Bentley-Curtin Specialised Activity Centre Plan and the Local Planning Strategy into the local planning framework as intended. Built form and land use controls are prohibitively restrictive.</p> <p>The retention of the existing TPS1 development and land use controls fails to adequately address State Planning Policy 4.2 - Activity Centres for Perth and Peel to support the renewal of existing centres.</p> <p>Concerns with the restrictiveness of the definition for "research and development" and associated land use permissibility in the Special Use zone.</p>	<p>1. Noted. In response to submissions and to better provide for the implementation of the Bentley-Curtin Specialised Activity Centre Plan (WAPC, 2018) it is recommended that modifications be made to LPS2 to more closely align built form and land use controls with the BCSACP high level vision and guidance for the area while supporting that further detailed precinct planning be undertaken to refine development controls.</p>
182.	E015	Owner Occupier	Victoria Park	<p>1. Site Specific - No.18-20 Duncan Street</p> <p>Does not changes that allow the redevelopment of No.18-20 Duncan Street, Victoria Park. Requests that the same provisions applicable under Town Planning Scheme No.1 apply to the site.</p> <p>2. Amenity and Safety</p> <p>Concerns with the potential noise from air conditioning units of new development.</p>	<p>1. No changes to No.18-20 Duncan Street, Victoria Park is proposed under LPS2.</p> <p>2. Amenity issues such as noise are controlled by other legislation, primarily the Environmental Protection Act 1986, and are outside the scope of LPS2.</p>
183.	E016	Other - Consultant on behalf of owner	East Victoria Park	<p>1. Site Specific - No.2-6 Mint Street, East Victoria Park</p> <p>Comments in support of the preparation of the new Scheme.</p> <p>Concerns that the Scheme map only includes No.2 Mint Street within the District Centre zone and excludes No.6 Mint Street making it inconsistent with the built form strategy for the Albany Highway Precinct Structure Plan.</p> <p>Comments questioning whether the inclusion of 'Local Centre' and 'District Centre' zones is consistent with the Model Scheme Text format that only includes a single 'Centre' zone.</p>	<p>1. Noted. The Local Planning Strategy recommends that the current TPS1 zones and densities be transitioned to the new LPS2 until further updates are recommended via preparation of the Albany Highway Precinct Structure Plan (currently underway). Interim modifications to properties prior to the completion of the AHPSP are not supported.</p> <p>The Western Australian Planning Commission has endorsed the inclusion of the 'Local Centre' and 'District Centre' zones in LPS2 for public advertising and reflective of pending updates to the model scheme text</p>
184.	E017	Owner Occupier	East Victoria Park	<p>1. Removal of restrictions on Multiple Dwellings</p> <p>Do not support the removal of restrictions on multiple dwellings. Concerns that new development will detract from the character of the area.</p> <p>Requests that should the restrictions on multiple dwellings be removed that the Town apply strict primary controls that cannot be varied to protect local character.</p>	<p>1. For areas with density codes of R20 (parts of Lathlain, East Victoria Park and St James) and R30 (parts of Carlisle, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park, St James) the removal of restrictions on multiple dwellings under LPS2 presents no change to the number of dwellings that can be constructed on any property or the permitted building heights, which remain limited to a maximum of two storeys, than currently permitted under TPS1. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.</p> <p>For areas with density codes of R40 within the Town's Residential Character Area (parts of Burswood, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park), the proposed modification allows for an increase in the number of dwellings that can be constructed via the development of multiple dwellings, however, building heights (limited to a maximum of two storeys) and other primary development controls remain comparable. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.</p> <p>Advice from the Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage (DPLH) suggests that re-introducing restrictions on multiple dwellings in certain area in LPS2 is unlikely to be supported by the Western Australian Planning Commission for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restricting multiple dwellings in not an appropriate planning mechanism for the conservation and retention of character dwellings and streetscapes.

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A heritage area or heritage list is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town seeks to retain character dwellings. • A local planning policy is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town is seeking a certain streetscape character appearance. <p>In line with DPLH advice it is recommended that no modification be made to LPS2 in response to submissions received on the character theme, with the exception of a minor adjustment to the wording of the Clause 9 Scheme Aim related to places of heritage significance and character to reflect the above recommended approach, and that other planning mechanisms be investigated as the most appropriate planning instruments to promote the retention of character dwellings and streetscape character.</p>	
185.	E018	Owner	Burswood	<p>1. Removal of additional use rights for Motor Vehicle Sales Premises - Various sites, Burswood</p> <p>Does not support the Town Planning Scheme No.1 additional use rights granted to various motor vehicle sales premises being replaced with non-conforming use rights.</p> <p>Comments that 'motor vehicle sales' and 'warehouse/storage' land use is consistent with the objectives of the 'Mixed Use' zone.</p> <p>Comments in support of the park opposite No.10-12 Asquith Street, Burswood being reserved for 'Public Open Space'.</p> <p>Requests that the LPS2 zoning table be amended to allow 'motor vehicle, boat and caravan sales' and 'warehouse/storage' as approvable land uses in the 'Mixed Use' zone.</p>	<p>Under Town Planning Scheme No.1 (TPS1) existing car dealerships in the areas of Victoria Park and Burswood, where 'motor vehicle and marine sales premises' is designated as an 'X' (prohibited) land use in the 'Commercial' and 'District Centre' zones, are approved for 'motor vehicle and marine sales premises' as an 'additional use'. The 'additional use' scheme provisions allow the existing car yards to continue to operate and be extended or added to without the application of non-conforming use rights under the scheme.</p> <p>As advertised, draft LPS2 designates 'motor vehicle, boat and caravan sales' as an 'X' (prohibited) land use in both the 'Mixed Use' and 'District Centre' zones that apply to these areas, however, proposes that the TPS1 additional use rights be revoked. The rationale for removing the additional use rights for existing "motor vehicle sales premises" include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The advancement of the Town's strategic planning framework since 2015, including the adoption of the Local Planning Strategy (2022). - Initiation of the Albany Highway Precinct Structure Planning project – including findings of the Albany Highway Tomorrow report that suggests a strong community preference that car yards move on from the area. - Updates to the Regulations (2015) relating to non-conforming uses (included in TPS1 since 2017 and proposed in LPS2) that provide more detailed guidance related to development of sites containing non-conforming uses than what was not in place at the time of Amendment 60. <p>Since the preparation of draft LPS2, the Albany Highway Precinct Structure Plan (AHPSP) has progressed and, on this matter, identifies that "car-based activity will be adapted and retained to protect their economic contribution to the Precinct.". On the basis that the AHPSP contemplates the continuation of existing 'motor vehicle and marine sales premises' it is recommended that the TPS1 additional use provisions for properties within this area be retained pending final recommendations via the AHPSP.</p> <p>Reinstating the 'additional use' of 'motor vehicle, boat and caravan sales' for existing car yards is intended to give existing car yards the opportunity to extend, modify and upgrade their premises in accordance with the market changes and manufacturer requirements, as requested in submissions received, but without providing the opportunity for the use to extend to other land zoned 'Mixed Use' under LPS2.</p>
186.	E019	Owner	Burswood	<p>1. Removal of additional use rights for Motor Vehicle Sales premises - No.18 Twickenham Road, Burswood</p> <p>Does not support the Town Planning Scheme No.1 additional use rights granted to various motor vehicle sales premises being replaced with non-conforming use rights.</p> <p>Comments that 'motor vehicle sales' and 'warehouse/storage' land use is consistent with the objectives of the 'Mixed Use' zone.</p> <p>Requests that the LPS2 zoning table be amended to allow 'motor vehicle, boat</p>	<p>Under Town Planning Scheme No.1 (TPS1) existing car dealerships in the areas of Victoria Park and Burswood, where 'motor vehicle and marine sales premises' is designated as an 'X' (prohibited) land use in the 'Commercial' and 'District Centre' zones, are approved for 'motor vehicle and marine sales premises' as an 'additional use'. The 'additional use' scheme provisions allow the existing car yards to continue to operate and be extended or added to without the application of non-conforming use rights under the scheme.</p> <p>As advertised, draft LPS2 designates 'motor vehicle, boat and caravan sales' as an 'X' (prohibited) land use in both the 'Mixed Use' and 'District Centre' zones that apply to these areas, however, proposes that the TPS1 additional use rights be revoked. The rationale for removing the additional use rights for existing "motor vehicle sales premises"</p>

and caravan sales' and 'warehouse/storage' as approvable land uses in the 'Mixed Use' zone.

include:

- The advancement of the Town's strategic planning framework since 2015, including the adoption of the Local Planning Strategy (2022).
- Initiation of the Albany Highway Precinct Structure Planning project – including findings of the Albany Highway Tomorrow report that suggests a strong community preference that car yards move on from the area.
- Updates to the Regulations (2015) relating to non-conforming uses (included in TPS1 since 2017 and proposed in LPS2) that provide more detailed guidance related to development of sites containing non-conforming uses than what was not in place at the time of Amendment 60.

Since the preparation of draft LPS2, the Albany Highway Precinct Structure Plan (AHPSP) has progressed and, on this matter, identifies that "car-based activity will be adapted and retained to protect their economic contribution to the Precinct.". On the basis that the AHPSP contemplates the continuation of existing 'motor vehicle and marine sales premises' it is recommended that the TPS1 additional use provisions for properties within this area be retained pending final recommendations via the AHPSP.

Reinstating the 'additional use' of 'motor vehicle, boat and caravan sales' for existing car yards is intended to give existing car yards the opportunity to extend, modify and upgrade their premises in accordance with the market changes and manufacturer requirements, as requested in submissions received, but without providing the opportunity for the use to extend to other land zoned 'Mixed Use' under LPS2.

187. E020 Owner Occupier Victoria Park

- 1. Removal of restrictions on Multiple Dwellings**
Do not support the removal of restrictions on multiple dwellings.
- 2. Amenity and Safety**
Concerns that new development will cause overlooking and noise issues for neighbouring properties and increase anti-social behaviour issues.
- 3. Traffic and Parking**
Concerns that new development will cause additional traffic
- 4. Location of new development**
Comments that apartment type development is better suited to Albany Highway and Shepperton Road

1. For areas with density codes of R20 (parts of Lathlain, East Victoria Park and St James) and R30 (parts of Carlisle, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park, St James) the removal of restrictions on multiple dwellings under LPS2 presents no change to the number of dwellings that can be constructed on any property or the permitted building heights, which remain limited to a maximum of two storeys, than currently permitted under TPS1. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.

For areas with density codes of R40 within the Town's Residential Character Area (parts of Burswood, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park), the proposed modification allows for an increase in the number of dwellings that can be constructed via the development of multiple dwellings, however, building heights (limited to a maximum of two storeys) and other primary development controls remain comparable. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.

Advice from the Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage (DPLH) suggests that re-introducing restrictions on multiple dwellings in certain area in LPS2 is unlikely to be supported by the Western Australian Planning Commission for the following reasons:

- Restricting multiple dwellings is not an appropriate planning mechanism for the conservation and retention of character dwellings and streetscapes.
- A heritage area or heritage list is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town seeks to retain character dwellings.
- A local planning policy is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town is seeking a certain streetscape character appearance.

In line with DPLH advice it is recommended that no modification be made to LPS2 in response to submissions received on the character theme, with the exception of a minor adjustment to the wording of the Clause 9 Scheme Aim related to places of heritage significance and character to reflect the above recommended approach, and that other planning mechanisms be investigated as the most appropriate planning instruments to promote the retention of character dwellings and streetscape character.

2. Noted. Amenity issues such as overlooking are controlled via the R-Codes. Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles are applied within the R-Codes, precinct structure plans and local planning policies in the local planning framework. Other matters relating to safety and security are outside the scope of LPS2.

					<p>3. Noted. The Town's Integrated Transport Strategy and Parking Management Plan, endorsed by Council in 2022, outline detailed guidance for managing the Town's transport network and parking to support the Town as liveable inner city community. The Town will continue to implement these strategies in response to the needs of a growing population.</p> <p>4. Noted - LPS2 implements the Local Planning Strategy which directs population and housing growth towards certain locations of the Town; primarily activity centres, including Albany Highway and urban corridors and generally limiting growth in established lower density suburban areas.</p>
188.	E021	Other - Consultant on behalf of owner	Bentley	<p>1. Technology Park, Bentley The LPS2 scheme provisions fail to bring the strategic objectives of WAPCs higher order Bentley-Curtin Specialised Activity Centre Plan and the Local Planning Strategy into the local planning framework as intended. Built form and land use controls are prohibitively restrictive.</p> <p>The retention of the existing TPS1 development and land use controls fails to adequately address State Planning Policy 4.2 - Activity Centres for Perth and Peel to support the renewal of existing centres.</p> <p>Concerns with the restrictiveness of the definition for "research and development" and associated land use permissibility in the Special Use zone.</p>	<p>1. Noted. In response to submissions and to better provide for the implementation of the Bentley-Curtin Specialised Activity Centre Plan (WAPC, 2018) it is recommended that modifications be made to LPS2 to more closely align built form and land use controls with the BCSACP high level vision and guidance for the area while supporting that further detailed precinct planning be undertaken to refine development controls.</p>
189.	E022	Other - Consultant on behalf of owner	Victoria Park	<p>1. Site Specific - No.1 King George Street, Victoria Park <u>Maximum Building Height</u> Do not support the reduction in maximum building height from 6 storeys to 4 storeys due to LPS2 not carrying forward the TPS1 provisions of the Raphael Precinct. Noting that the Town's concurrent Albany Highway Precinct Structure Plan project built form strategy proposes up to 8 storeys for the site.</p> <p>Suggest that the Town adopt an interim local planning policy or amend existing LPP27 ' Building Height Controls' to retain the provisions of the TPS1 precinct plans where they permit greater building height than is permissible under the applicable R-Code of LPS2.</p> <p><u>Zoning</u> Request that the property be included in the 'District Centre' zone (rather than the proposed 'Residential') under LPS2 for the following reasons: - the property has operated for non-residential uses for decade - the property is located only 45m from Albany Hwy and operates in a similar manner to existing adjacent commercial properties - due to the location and surrounding land uses the property possesses limited amenity value for residential uses. - the adjoining ROW should not be treated as the 'natural boundary' of the 'district centre' as elsewhere along Albany Highway the 'district centre' zone extends beyond ROWs. - the floor area restriction applied to the additional uses of 'Office' and 'Medical Centre' are arbitrary given other commercial land uses that could be approved within the 'Residential' zone could be approved to a much greater floor area. - the location, surrounding land uses and historical and current land uses of the property are more aligned with the District Centre zone.</p>	<p><u>Maximum Building Height</u> The TPS1 Raphael Precinct development standards that apply to 1 King George Street do not permit building height to a maximum of 6 storeys. The Raphael Precinct development standards state that "development shall generally be in keeping with the R-Codes" – further references to permitted building heights greater than the R-Codes relate to other areas within the precinct. While it is recognised that the Albany Highway Precinct Structure Plan (AHPSP) built form strategy proposes up to 8 storeys for the site, interim modifications to LPS2 are not supported until the updates recommended via the AHPSP are finalised.</p> <p><u>Zoning</u> The Local Planning Strategy recommends that the current TPS1 zones and densities be transitioned to the new LPS2 until further updates are recommended via preparation of the Albany Highway Precinct Structure Plan (AHPSP).</p> <p>The AHPSP has progressed to Council adopting a preferred growth scenario (July 2023) and direction, currently underway, to prepare the precinct structure plan documentation that will inform appropriate amendments to the local planning scheme. Interim modification to LPS2 is not supported until the updates recommended via the AHPSP are finalised.</p> <p>The comments related to the floor area restrictions applied to the additional uses of 'Office' and 'Medical Centre' are noted. Proposed modifications to Clause 32 results in properties developed for non-residential only development for all land zoned 'Residential' to comply with applicable R-Code primary controls (including plot ratio controls) reducing the need to restrict maximum net lettable area. On this basis a modification to LPS2 to delete the maximum net lettable area clause applicable to this site for the 'Office' and 'Medical Centre' additional uses is recommended.</p>
190.	E023	Other - Consultant on behalf of owner	East Victoria Park	<p>1. Site Specific - Swansea Street Markets Concerns that the proposed 'Light Industry' zone is inconsistent with the strategic planning framework for the area, reduces the scope of redevelopment opportunities and does not allow for residential uses.</p>	<p>1. Noted. The Local Planning Strategy recommends that the current TPS1 zones and densities be transitioned to the new LPS2 until further updates are recommended via preparation of the Oats Street Precinct Structure Plan (currently underway). Interim modifications to properties prior to the completion of the Oats Street Precinct Structure Plan are not supported.</p>

				<p>LPS2 should be building on and reflect the significant State investment in the area via METRONET.</p> <p>The provision of 'medical centre' and 'consulting room' uses will not undermine existing industrial land uses.</p> <p>The Swansea Street Markets provides community benefit and should not be a non-permitted use that relies on non-conforming use rights to continue to operate.</p> <p>Waiting for the Precinct Structure Planning for the area that is currently underway is unnecessary and will delay the redevelopment of the area.</p> <p>Request that the 'Light Industry' zone applicable to the area be replaced with a 'Centre' or 'Urban Development' zone to support the preparation and operation of a Precinct Structure Plan.</p>	
191.	E024	Owner	East Victoria Park	<p>1. Site Specific - No.885 Albany Highway, East Victoria Park</p> <p>Concerns that LPS2 assigns to different zoning to the Victoria Arcade land holding - 'District Centre' (R60) applicable to the building footprint and 'Residential' (R30) applicable to the commercial parking area at the rear of the building.</p> <p>The car park is an essential component of the approved commercial use of the land and therefore it would be more appropriately zoned for commercial purposes.</p> <p>Comments in regards to the historical and current vehicle access through the site.</p> <p>Request that the car parking area (Lot 46) be included in the 'District Centre' zone.</p>	<p>1. Noted. Not supported. Inconsistent with the Local Planning Strategy which recommends that the current TPS1 zones and densities be transitioned to the new LPS2 for the Residential Character Area neighbourhood.</p> <p>It is recognised that there is merit in the site being included within the District Centre zone despite not previously being advertised as being within the proposed boundary of the Albany Highway Precinct Structure Plan (AHPSP). In response to submissions received during community consultation on preferred growth scenarios for the AHPSP (1st -28th May 2023) the site is recommended to be included within the boundary of the draft AHPSP (currently underway). Interim changes to zones or densities under LPS2 are not supported until further updates are recommended via preparation of the AHPSP.</p>
192.	E025	Other referral agency	Perth	<p>1. Public Transport Authority referral comments</p> <p>1. Comments reiterating PTA feedback on LPP40 Burswood Station East Development Standards and Public Realm improvements as they apply in the vicinity of Burswood Station.</p> <p>2. Notification that part of the Scheme area falls within the PTA's 'Protection Zone' (being within 100m of the rail corridor) therefore development applications received for this area should be referred to the PTA for comment and the application of appropriate conditions.</p> <p>3. Comments noting that development in proximity to the Railway Corridor is required to be supported by an acoustic assessment in accordance with State Planning Policy 5.4 - Road and Rail Noise.</p> <p>4. Comments noting that the frequency of trains on the Armadale Line are planned to increase in frequency in the future and this will increase instances of noise.</p> <p>5. Advising of the PTAs Station Access Strategies for Burswood, Victoria Park, Carlisle and Oats Street stations that can support the development of the Town's transport network.</p>	<p>The points raised in the Public Transport Authority submission are noted however do not warrant any modifications to LPS2.</p> <p>1. Noted.</p> <p>2. Noted. Comments addressed via assessment of development applications under the Scheme.</p> <p>3. Noted. Comments addressed via assessment of development applications under the Scheme.</p> <p>4. Noted.</p> <p>5. Noted. PTA Station Access Strategies closely aligned with recommendations of the Town's Integrated Transport Strategy (2022).</p>
193.	E026	Other referral	Leederville	<p>1. Water Corporation referral comments</p>	<p>In response to the Water Corporation submission are noted. Modifications recommended to Special Use zone SU1 - Technology Park to better facilitate the implementation of the Bentley-Curtin Specialised Activity Centre Plan inclusive of appropriate land</p>

		agency		<p>1. Water - note that reticulated water is available to all developed areas of the Town. Comments highlighting that upgrades to reticulated water mains may be required as areas that allow for increased density develop and that future developers will be responsible for the upgrades.</p> <p>2. Wastewater - note that reticulated sewerage is planned or available in most areas within the Town. Comments highlighting that upgrades to sewerage may be required as areas that allow for increased density develop and that future developers will be responsible for the upgrades.</p> <p>3. Drainage - note that some of the scheme area falls within drainage catchments and that future development will need to compensate for additional flows on their land.</p> <p>4. SU1 Special Use zone - Technology Park. the Water Corporation owns a compensating basin on Hayman Road within the SU1 precinct. Note that 'drainage' or public purpose' are not listed uses therefore would be deemed 'x' (not permitted) uses. Request that 'Drainage' or 'Public Purpose' are recognised within the SU1 zoning table as permissible uses or that the land is excluded from the SU1 zone and instead granted an appropriate reservation.</p>	<p>use permissibility to recognise the 'Drainage' function of the Water Corporation site.</p> <p>The other points raised in the submissions are noted however do not warrant any modifications to LPS2.</p> <p>1. Noted. Comments addressed via assessment of development applications under the Scheme.</p> <p>2. Noted. Comments addressed via assessment of development applications under the Scheme.</p> <p>3. Comments addressed via assessment of development applications under the Scheme.</p> <p>4. Noted. Modifications recommended to Special Use zone SU1 - Technology Park to better facilitate the implementation of the Bentley-Curtin Specialised Activity Centre Plan inclusive of appropriate land use permissibility.</p>
194.	E027	Owner	Carlisle	<p>1. Removal of restriction on Multiple Dwellings Does not support the removal of restrictions on multiple dwellings. Concerned that new development will not reflect existing character of the area.</p> <p>2. Effect on property values Comments that buildings that are built in keeping with the character for the area are good for property values.</p>	<p>1. For areas with density codes of R20 (parts of Lathlain, East Victoria Park and St James) and R30 (parts of Carlisle, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park, St James) the removal of restrictions on multiple dwellings under LPS2 presents no change to the number of dwellings that can be constructed on any property or the permitted building heights, which remain limited to a maximum of two storeys, than currently permitted under TPS1. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.</p> <p>For areas with density codes of R40 within the Town's Residential Character Area (parts of Burswood, Victoria Park, East Victoria Park), the proposed modification allows for an increase in the number of dwellings that can be constructed via the development of multiple dwellings, however, building heights (limited to a maximum of two storeys) and other primary development controls remain comparable. The Town's local planning policies that relate to residential character (primarily LPP25 – Streetscapes) will continue to apply in these areas to reinforce local residential character requirements for all residential development.</p> <p>Advice from the Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage (DPLH) suggests that re-introducing restrictions on multiple dwellings in certain area in LPS2 is unlikely to be supported by the Western Australian Planning Commission for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restricting multiple dwellings is not an appropriate planning mechanism for the conservation and retention of character dwellings and streetscapes. A heritage area or heritage list is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town seeks to retain character dwellings. A local planning policy is the appropriate planning mechanism to use if the Town is seeking a certain streetscape character appearance. <p>In line with DPLH advice it is recommended that no modification be made to LPS2 in response to submissions received on the character theme, with the exception of a minor adjustment to the wording of the Clause 9 Scheme Aim related to places of heritage significance and character to reflect the above recommended approach, and that other planning mechanisms be investigated as the most appropriate planning instruments to promote the retention of character dwellings and streetscape character.</p> <p>2. Noted. Property values are not a planning matter and outside the scope of LPS2.</p>
195.	E028	Other referral agency	Jandakot	<p>1. ATCO Gas referral comments A number of sites within the Scheme area falls within the WAPC draft Development Control 4.3 Trigger Distance for ATCO infrastructure. Any</p>	<p>The points raised in the ATCO Gas submission are noted however do not warrant any modifications to LPS2.</p> <p>1. Noted. Comments addressed via assessment of development applications under the Scheme.</p>

				<p>sensitive land use or high density community use development requires further consultation and referral to ATCO for comment, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No.1-5 Bow River Crescent and No.60 Victoria Park Drive, Burswood - Empire Bar site, Lathlain - Burswood Station East Precinct - No.6 Raleigh Street and No.45 Bishopgate Street, Carlisle - SU1 - Technology Park, Bentley - SU2 - Residential and Special Facilities, Bentley <p>Future development of these sites may require additional safety measures to mitigate against the risk of the high pressure gas line. Recommend all excavation work occurring within 15m of Critical Assets Infrastructure first contact 'dial before you dig' to determine the location of gas infrastructure and provide notification of works being undertaken to ATCO.</p>	
196.	E029	Owner	Carlisle	<p>1. Removal of restriction on Multiple Dwellings Supports the removal of restrictions on multiple dwellings in certain areas. Comments supportive of this approach to combat urban sprawl.</p>	1. Noted.
197.	E030	Other referral agency	Perth	<p>1. Main Roads WA referral comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Albany Highway, Orrong Road, Great Eastern Highway and Canning Highway are proclaimed State Roads which traverse the Local Government Area. As the City is aware, Manning Road may become a Primary Regional Road in the near future, which would be under the care and control of Main Roads WA. 2. Recommendations that the Town amends the scheme text so that setbacks are measured from the edge of Primary Regional Road reserves. 3. Statement that where alternative access is available, Main Roads' preference is for allotments to not have direct access onto the Primary Regional Road as reflected within Development Control Policy 5.1 Regional Roads (Vehicular Access) and Main Roads Driveway Policy. 4. Recommendations that the Town considers introducing provisions to restrict access from Primary Regional Roads. 5. Comments relating to Planning Control Area 142 that is in place to protect land required for the future upgrades of Orrong Road until it may be reserved for Primary Regional Roads in the Metropolitan Region Scheme. 6. Comments advising that the upgrade and widening of Canning Highway, Albany Highway and Orrong Road is not in the Main Roads current 4 year forward estimated construction program. 7. Comments advising that all developments incorporating a sensitive land use identified under State Planning Policy 5.4 - Road and Rail buffer zone may require the submission and assessment of an Acoustic Report. 8. Comments advising that pre-consultation is encouraged to be undertaken in accordance with the Transport Impact Assessment Guidelines (August 2016) to ensure transport matters relating to State Roads are addressed early in the development application process. 	<p>The points raised in the Main Roads WA submissions are noted however do not warrant any modifications to LPS2.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted. 2. Noted. Not supported. Existing planning mechanisms including the Metropolitan Regional Planning Scheme and Development Control Policy 5.1 Regional roads (vehicular access) require development proposals to be referred to Main Roads WA for all development abutting or proposing access to Primary Regional Road Reserves and allows the opportunity for matters including setbacks and access to be taken into consideration in the determination of development applications. 3. Noted. Comments addressed via requirements for referral to Main Roads WA in the assessment of development applications under the Scheme that allows the opportunity for matters including setbacks and access to be taken into consideration in the determination of development applications. 4. Noted. Not supported for reasons listed in responses 2 and 3 above. 5. Noted. 6. Noted. 7. Noted. Comments addressed via assessment of development applications under the Scheme. 8. Noted. Comments addressed via assessment of development applications under the Scheme.
198.	E031	Other referral agency	Perth	<p>Heritage Council Referral Comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Comments recognising the Heritage Council's records of historic heritage significance within the Scheme area, including the following nine (9) State Registered places: 	<p>In response to the Heritage Council submission it is recommended that the LPS2 Scheme Aim under Clause 9(c) be replaced with the following to offer further support for places of heritage significance and clarify the Town's approach to protecting places of identified character.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">To protect and enhance places of cultural heritage significance and neighbourhoods or streets of identified character</p>

- P2176 Edward Millen Home (fmr)
 - P2219 Victoria Park Police Station
 - P2220 Broken Hill Hotel, Victoria Park
 - P2222 Victoria Park Post Office
 - P2225 St Peter's Anglican Church & Memorial Hall
 - P3372 Kent Street Senior High School
 - P3459 Victoria Park Primary School
 - P3570 Old Burswood Canal
 - P3898 Windmill & Wishing Well
2. Comments noting that under draft LPS2, no change is proposed to the Town's recently adopted (June 2022) Heritage List and/or amended Local Heritage Survey (LHS).
 3. Comments advising that the State Registered place P3570 Old Burswood Canal partially falls within the Burswood Lakes Structure Plan area, which is proposed for normalisation under draft LPS2 and whether the Town may wish to consider supplementary or additional provisions relating to development within or in close proximity to the State Registered place.
 4. Further recommendations that the LPS2 Schedule A supplemental provisions which allow for development to occur without approval (Clause 61) should be amended to exclude State Registered and other heritage protected places.
 5. Comments requesting that State Registered place P3898 Windmill and Wishing Well (Lot 300 Albany Highway Victoria Park) be considered for a 'Public Open Space' reservation from 'Mixed Use' zone to better reflect the use of the land.
 6. Comments noting that the 'Albany Highway District Centre and Mixed Use' zones contain various places of cultural heritage significance, including P3459 Victoria Park Primary School, P2219 Victoria Park Police Station, P2222 Victoria Park Post Office, which are entered on the State Register and that the Town may wish to consider additional provisions for this area to ensure that future development of heritage protected places respects the heritage values of the place and is guided by appropriate development controls.
 7. Recommendations that the Town may wish to modify the 'Aims of the Scheme' (Part 9) to reflect the Town's Local Planning Strategy heritage objectives and with SPP3.5.

The other points raised in the submission are noted however do not warrant any modifications to LPS2.

1. Noted.
2. Noted.
3. Noted. It is recommended that the Scheme Aim under Clause 9(c) be modified to include places of heritage significance. The Town's existing Heritage List under the Scheme includes the Old Burswood Canal as a Category 1 listing.
4. Noted. Clause 61 of the deemed provisions does not apply to "heritage-protected place", which is defined in clause 1A of the deemed provisions to include a place on the State Register of Heritage Places.
5. Noted. Support – recommend modification to replace 'Mixed Use' zone with 'Public Open Space' reserve over Lot 300 (No.152) Albany Highway, Victoria Park consistent with Public Open Space Strategy and preliminary recommendations of the Albany Highway Precinct Structure Plan (currently underway).
6. Noted. Consideration of places of heritage significance is within the scope of the Albany Highway Precinct Structure Plan (project currently underway).
7. Noted. Recommend that the Scheme Aim under Clause 9(c) be replaced with the following to offer further support for places of cultural heritage significance.

Existing LPS2 Scheme Aim:

(c) To ensure development protects and enhances the desired character and amenity of neighbourhoods and streets.

Suggested wording to modify Cl.9 Scheme Aim (c):

(c) To protect places of cultural heritage significance and to ensure development protects and enhances the desired character and amenity of neighbourhoods and streets.