Schedule of Submissions

Application for Development Approval (Town ref: 5.2025.73.1) –

Telecommunications Infrastructure (Mobile Phone Tower) –

42 Bishopsgate Street LATHLAIN - Lot: 1 Dia: 26715

No.	Submission Reference Online Survey Id or CM9 Ref:	Description of Affected Property	Owner and/or Occupier	Submission Position	Summary of Submission Comments
1.	Online Survey Id: 139055 & Duplicate Email CM9 ref: D26/65515	Saleham Street LATHLAIN	Owner	Object to the proposal	a) Public advertising - The council has been in possession of this document (proposal) since 7/04/2025 and almost one and half years later gives the public 3 weeks to comment. 3 weeks is not enough time to consider such a serious impacting proposal for the Lathlain community. b) Proximity to residential properties - Reality, the positioning of this monopole is on Goddard street using an address of 42 Bishopsgate St. It is no more than 40 metres from the footpath of neighbours on Goddard Street. They walk out their front door, and if this proposal goes ahead it will towering in front of them. c) Compatibility with public open space - This 30 metre monopole, as a result of the scale of its size is clearly out of character, incompatible with its surroundings. The proposed location will be affecting play ground areas, car park spacing, BBQ areas, walk paths. Wonderful Park amenities have been provided by the Victoria Park council but, who would want to sit, eat, entertain, walk, allow their children to play under or near one of these Telecommunications monopoles? Not Me. d) Visual screening - This proposed structure will not be hidden by trees. It is 10 metres higher that the tallest trees in its vicinity, i.e. higher than 2 houses stacked on top of the highest trees in the area. The trees attempting to hide from view wont succeed and wont live for ever. e) Electromagnetic energy emissions - The Electromagnetic Energy Report was brief and came across as making light of the severe damaging permanent effects of Electromagnet Radiation (EMR/EME). I.e. The report mentioned a Microwave Oven and the Sun; there is a protective cage within a microwave oven. We are protected from the Sun by the Earth's magnetic field and the Earth's atmosphere. There is no protection or protective cage around the antennae of these monopoles. f) Alternative locations - I emphasise adhering strictly to all Guidelines and Standards in relation to the above proposal is vital and to take into account the reasons why a smaller, similar project near 156 Orrong road was initially rejected in July 2019 also apply to this proposal. This proposal is a much larger project than the one on Orrong Road and will impact more residents due to a very popular park in the area. g) Assessment recommendation - The personnel making the decision to erect this structure on behalf of Telstra Optus and Vodafone ought walk around Goddard street and the surrounding Eagles football fields and see for themselves the damaging effect it will have on this beautiful Park environment. h) Noise emissions - I see no mention of noise or Humming that may arise from the operation of the monopole in the proposal. i) Property value - Summary of reasons for my objection A. Have no doubt, the value of property will drop in the immediate vicinity of this monopole if constructed and many of my neighbours have mentioned this point to me. B. I personally would not buy a house anywhere within 500metres visibility of one of these objects. C. NOBODY knows how the radiation from these objects affects them personally. D. I will be able to see this abhorrent sight directly from the front porch of my house. It will be a very upsetting sight for me. E. if this proposal is to go ahead I Will Certainly consider selling my house before its construction and I have owned

No.	Submission Reference Online Survey Id or CM9 Ref:	Description of Affected Property	Owner and/or Occupier	Submission Position	Summary of Submission Comments
					property in Lathlain since 1993. F. People, human beings are instinctively fearful of these monopoles and do not want to live near them and that includes me.
2.	139049	Goddard Street LATHLAIN	Owner	Object to the proposal	You've got to be kidding, right?! It's about time this council started listening to the people. Too much has been messed up in this area because of an ignorant or weak council. Stand up for us!!!
3.	139043	McCartney Crescent LATHLAIN	Owner	Object to the proposal	There following 4 key reasons clearly demonstrate why this should not proceed in the specified location, especially given the fact there is an existing Telstra tower less than 800m away within Lathlain where this can be co-located and not impact the community or facilities being provided.||--------|***ITEM 1|Section 2.3 Co-location Opportunities|"State, Federal and Local government legislation encourages the use of existing telecommunication facilities for the colocation of antennas. Telstra's standard site selection process flags potential colocation options during its initial stage of candidate selection. In this case, there are no other suitable existing structures near the proposed facility location on which the proposed Telstra facility could co-locate"||"As shown, there are no other suitable existing or proposed mobile telecommunications facilities within close proximity of the required coverage target area. Existing facilities in the general area will not provide coverage to the targeted area. Based on this assessment, the construction of a new telecommunications facility is the most practicable option to deliver coverage and capacity to the targeted area."|----|This section falsely represents the available locations by purposely omiting the existing Telstra tower less than 800m away (see attachment) while citing the only towers available were 900m+ away and unsuitable.||Tower 6100022 - TELSTRA|156 ORRONG RD LOT 1 DP022362 LATHLAIN WA 6100 |(-31.96476°, 115.91032°)||As such, this should not progress as it does not adhere to State, Federal and Local government legislation in using existing telecommunication facilities for colocation. Serious scrutiny should be performed against this submission.|--------||***ITEM 2|Section 5.1 Telecommunications Act 1997|"As the proposed facility does not meet the criteria mentioned above, the applicant is not empowered to undertake the proposed works without approval under Western Australian legislation and must obtain planning consent from Shire of Wyndham East Kimberley."|---|Is this not for the Town of Victoria Park?|--------||***ITEM 3|Section 5.3 The Deployment Code|Subclause 4.1.4 |"(i) The primary requirement for installing the base station at the proposed location is to maintain and improve service in the Belmont area and surrounds."|---|Why is a base station being installed in Lathlain to improve services in Belmont which is not even part of the Towns responsibility, especially not rate payers or residents affected by its location.|--------||***ITEM 4|6.3 State Planning Policy No. 5.2 – Telecommunications|Table 5: Assessment against State Planning Policy 5.2, Policy Measure 5.1.1|"Be located where it will not be prominently visible from significant viewing locations such as scenic routes, lookouts and recreation sites;"|---|This response completely omits the fact of a community green space, multiple fixed structures with picnic tables, a skate park and basketball court being within metres of the proposed location and a direct breach of policy.|----||"Telecommunications infrastructure should be co-located and whenever possible... Overhead lines and towers should be co-located with existing infrastructure and/or within an existing infrastructure corridor and/or mounted on existing or proposed buildings"|---|Again, this complete omits the fact of an existing tower being less than 800m away from the proposed site and the response represents another direct breach of policy.
4.	139034	Goddard Street LATHLAIN Online Survey Id:	Owner	Neither support or object	We are assuming the temporary mobile tower near the skate park is removed.|
5.	138994	Enfield Street LATHLAIN	Owner	Object to the proposal	I understand the need for more infrastructure such as this tower, but don't understand why it needs to be in plain sight in a newly created beautiful public open space. This tower would be better located on the grounds or incorporated into the buildings nearby at the Perth Demons or Eagles Facilities. It would be in a similar location, yet would not be an eye sore for local residents.
6.	138968	Howick Street	Owner	Object to the	Negative impact on local amenity|Eye sore to local area|Negative impact on local fauna and flora |Goes against parks

No.	Submission Reference Online Survey Id or CM9 Ref:	Description of Affected Property	Owner and/or Occupier	Submission Position	Summary of Submission Comments
		LATHLAIN		proposal	and recreation zoning |Loss and disruption of Community activity area |Local community has already lost a large area to West Coast Eagles development |Liaise with WCE to put on their grounds or buildings|Parking space will be impacted|This DA is not clear and limited to the proposal with regard to tree loss|Community zones are being constantly encroached
7.	138870	Goddard Street LATHLAIN	Owner	Object to the proposal	Please find an alternative low impact area. Families use the park, skate park and basketball court daily. It will be a waste ratepayers money to take this away from us. Not only will it have an effect on people but if trees are cleared to make way for the project it will destroy important habitat for the local birds and red tail cockatoos. The cockatoos frequent this area and use the purpose built cockatoo trough right next to the communications tower currently, this will be devastating to the wildlife, not to mention will be a total eyesore to the area. There must be a better alternative
8.	138735	Egham Road LATHLAIN	Occupier	Object to the proposal	I am a resident of Lathlain and regularly frequent this park space for exercise and with my friends and family for unstructured outdoor play time. I'm opposed to the plan as it will reduce the park space significantly and restrict access to some of the facilities (basketball court). This park was only recently updated and it feels a shame to lose more space. Please could a lower impact location be considered.
9.	138703	Gallipoli Street LATHLAIN	Owner	Object to the proposal	I wish to object to the proposed telecommunications infrastructure facility at this location.||As a local resident who lives in the area, I am concerned about the visual impact that a 30-metre-high monopole and associated infrastructure will have on the surrounding environment. The proposed structure would be significantly higher than existing vegetation and surrounding development, making it a prominent and intrusive feature within the local landscape.|I am also concerned that the development will require the removal of mature trees and vegetation within an area. Mature trees provide important environmental and aesthetic benefits, including habitat for wildlife, shade, and visual screening. Once removed, these values cannot be easily or quickly replaced.|The land is currently part of a Regional Open Space reserve and, in my view, the scale and appearance of the proposed telecommunications facility is inconsistent with the open, natural character of the area. The equipment would detract from the area enjoyed by nearby residents and users of the surrounding open space.||An alternative locations (eg on top of grandstand where it previously was located) would have a lesser impact on the local environment.
10.	138694	Rayment Street LATHLAIN	Owner	Object to the proposal	Suburb already has low and declining tree canopy cover. Location will dominate streetscape and permanently remove access to area of newly created pubic open space and recreational facilities.|Put communication infrastructure back onto proposed grandstand or WCE facilities where it will not impact liveability and ecology of suburb.
11.	138689	Enfield Street LATHLAIN	Owner (1 of 3)	Object to the proposal	I come to the area regularly and love walking around the area. To cut down trees and put a huge tower in the area would ruin a well designed well utilised area. Put the tower in the football grounds where there is space.
12.	138687	Enfield Street LATHLAIN	Owner (2 of 3)	Object to the proposal	It will ruin the parkland. Its an area well used by children, dog walkers, familes etc and putting a huge tower will ruin a lovely well designed area. Put it in the football grounds. Use the parking area or come of the grassed areas.
13.	138686	Forster Avenue LATHLAIN	Owner	Object to the proposal	I often use visit this area with my grand children and would be concerned of impacts it might have on their health and I walk past this area daily and do not welcome the visual and environmental impact it would have on the area.
14.	138685	Enfield Street LATHLAIN	Owner (3 of 3)	Object to the proposal	The space has many trees which are habitat to various birds species, the area is well utilised by the local residents as well as people that come from other areas. Put it on top of the grandstand or in the football grounds as leave the beautiful park area as is.
15.	138670	Cornwall Street LATHLAIN	Owner	Object to the proposal	Value of my property and area will be affected
16.	138661	Forster Avenue LATHLAIN	Owner	Object to the proposal	I do not support:|• Removal of established trees and vegetation||• 🗼 30.5m tower towering above the existing tree canopy||• 🏘️ Very close to surrounding homes and highly visible from residential streets||• 🌿 Loss of amenity in an area designated for community activity/passive recreation||• 🚧 Permanent fenced compound, equipment shelter and associated infrastructure in the park||• 📡 Designed to accommodate additional telecommunications carriers in future||• 🗓️ Potential lease of up to 20 years, making this effectively a long-term/permanent location||• 📍 Located on the residential edge of a huge precinct, rather than further within the park or integrated with future

No.	Submission Reference Online Survey Id or CM9 Ref:	Description of Affected Property	Owner and/or Occupier	Submission Position	Summary of Submission Comments
					sporting/grandstand infrastructure||• ⮌ No apparent plan to relocate it when the broader Lathlain Park redevelopment occurs
17.	138659	Howick Street LATHLAIN	Owner	Object to the proposal	My kids and family use the park the proposed monopole will be installed. Removing green space will adversely affect the use of this beautiful park. ||We enjoy the birds that frequent the park and believe the construction will negatively impact the local wildlife.
18.	138652	Midgley Street LATHLAIN	Owner	Object to the proposal	Such a beautiful suburb we need all the play-space for kids such a shame that this keeps happening!!!!
19.	138651	Cookham Road LATHLAIN	Owner	Object to the proposal	
20.	138650	Egham Road LATHLAIN	Owner	Object to the proposal	To: Town of Victoria Park / Western Australian Planning Commission||I wish to formally object to the proposed telecommunications facility at 42 Bishopsgate Street, Lathlain, comprising a 30-metre monopole, antennas reaching a maximum overall height of approximately 30.5 metres, and associated equipment and compound.||While I acknowledge the importance of telecommunications infrastructure and the need for reliable mobile services, my objection is therefore not to telecommunications infrastructure generally, but to the proposed location, scale and visual and environmental impacts of this particular facility.||1. Significant visual impact on the surrounding residential area||A structure approximately 30.5 metres high is a substantial vertical structure in this location and will be visible from surrounding residential properties and public areas.||The applicant relies heavily on existing mature vegetation to minimise the visual impact of the facility. However, the application documents themselves indicate that a number of existing trees will need to be removed and that additional pruning may be required to facilitate construction and crane access.||This creates a concern that the vegetation relied upon to screen the tower will itself be reduced as a consequence of the development.||I request that the decision-maker carefully assess the actual long-term visual impact of the full 30.5-metre structure, including views from surrounding residential properties after the proposed tree removal and pruning have occurred, rather than relying solely on existing vegetation as screening.||2. Removal and impact on established vegetation||The submitted arborist report identifies trees that are likely to require removal to facilitate installation of the monopole and associated infrastructure.||The report states that trees 1–3 and 7–8 would likely need to be removed and also identifies potential pruning requirements associated with crane access.||This is a significant consideration given the contribution that established vegetation makes to the character, amenity and landscape quality of Lathlain.||I request that the proposal be assessed on the basis of the landscape that will actually exist following construction, including the loss of established trees, rather than the existing landscape shown in the application photographs.||I also request that the applicant demonstrate whether the facility, access, services and foundation can be redesigned or relocated to retain more of the existing mature vegetation.||3. Alternative siting within the subject property||The applicant's planning report confirms that four potential locations on the same property were considered.||The report states that the alternative locations were capable of providing the required RF coverage but were rejected for planning reasons including their proximity to residences, lack of screening and proximity to Lathlain Primary School.||This demonstrates that siting considerations can materially affect the planning and amenity impacts of the facility.||I therefore request that the decision-maker independently scrutinise the site-selection assessment and require the applicant to provide sufficient evidence that the proposed location is genuinely the least visually intrusive and least amenity-impacting practicable location.||In particular, the assessment should consider whether a different position, orientation, height or design could achieve the necessary telecommunications objective while retaining more mature vegetation and reducing visibility from surrounding homes.||4. Scale and design of the proposed structure||The proposal involves a 30-metre monopole with antennas taking the maximum height to approximately 30.5 metres.||The height is substantial relative to the surrounding residential environment.||The WA Government's telecommunications planning guidelines recognise that telecommunications facilities should be located and designed to minimise adverse impacts on the visual character and amenity of surrounding areas and residential areas.||I ask that consideration be given to whether the proposed height and design are the minimum reasonably necessary to achieve the stated telecommunications objectives.||If the applicant maintains that 30 metres is essential,

No.	Submission Reference Online Survey Id or CM9 Ref:	Description of Affected Property	Owner and/or Occupier	Submission Position	Summary of Submission Comments
					I request that the technical evidence supporting that precise height be made available and assessed, including whether a lower structure, a different location, or a combination of alternative infrastructure could provide an acceptable level of service.||5. Protection of residential amenity||The surrounding locality includes established residential properties. A telecommunications structure of this height has the potential to become a prominent feature in views from nearby homes and streets.||The assessment should therefore consider the cumulative effect of:||* the height of the monopole;|* the antenna headframe;|* the equipment compound;|* removal and pruning of existing vegetation;|* visibility from surrounding residences;|* the long-term appearance of the structure; and|* the effect on the established landscape character of Lathlain.||I ask that these impacts be considered together rather than treating each individual impact in isolation.||6. Regional Open Space / Parks and Recreation setting||The proposed site is within land reserved as Parks and Recreation / Regional Open Space under the Metropolitan Region Scheme.||Given the nature and strategic importance of this land, I ask that particular care be taken to ensure that telecommunications infrastructure does not unnecessarily compromise the landscape character, recreational setting or visual amenity of the area.||The fact that telecommunications infrastructure may be necessary does not, in my view, remove the requirement to achieve an appropriate location and design with the least practicable impact.||7. Request for further assessment||Before the application is determined, I respectfully request that the following matters be fully assessed and addressed:||1. The actual visual impact of the complete 30.5-metre structure from surrounding residential properties and public areas.|2. The effect of removing the trees identified in the arborist report.|3. The effect of additional pruning required for construction and crane access.|4. Whether the proposed facility can be relocated or redesigned to retain more established vegetation.|5. Whether a lower structure could meet the telecommunications objectives.|6. Whether all practicable alternative sites and configurations have been adequately investigated.|7. Whether the proposed location represents the least visually intrusive practicable option.|8. The long-term landscape and residential amenity impacts of the proposal.||Conclusion||I respectfully request that Development Application 5.2025.73.1 not be approved in its current form.||If the telecommunications objective can be demonstrated to be necessary, I ask that the applicant be required to investigate a substantially less visually intrusive solution, including alternative siting, reduced height and/or a design that allows greater retention of the existing mature vegetation.||I ask that this submission be provided to the Western Australian Planning Commission and fully considered as part of the determination of the application.||Yours sincerely,|Michelle Bonner |
21.	138599	Lathlain WA 6100	Occupier	Object to the proposal	This is taking away valuable parkland and public space and I don't want an eyesore or RF radiation on my street.
22.	138543 & 138542	Streatley Road LATHLAIN	Owner	Object to the proposal	
23.	138512	Gallipoli Street LATHLAIN	Owner	Object to the proposal	Too close to housing, a primary school and devastation of trees and parkland.
24.	138492	Custance Street LATHLAIN	Owner	Object to the proposal	I take my kids to play here all the time at the basketball hoop and skateboard. The temporary tower has been an inconvenience and an eyesore but we were told it was just temporary while the grandstand (its original location) was redeveloped. Now they want to take out valuable green space with a permanent eyesore. Why can't it go on the grandstand where it originally was or on top of the Eagles building. There is no good reason to destroy more open green space
25.	138439	Forster Avenue LATHLAIN	Owner	Object to the proposal	Residential area, should be incorporated into the into the buildings as part of the football club project as it has been. Not clearing more trees and increasing heat and reducing the amenability of the public space that is HEAVILY used. ||• Removal/impact of established trees and vegetation||• 🗼 30.5m tower towering above the existing tree canopy||• 🏘️ Very close to surrounding homes and highly visible from residential streets||• 🔥 Loss of amenity in an area designated for community activity/passive recreation||• 🚧 Permanent fenced compound, equipment shelter and associated infrastructure in the park||• 📡 Designed to accommodate additional telecommunications carriers in future||• 🗓️ Potential lease of up to 20 years, making this effectively a long-term/permanent location||• 📍 Located on the residential edge of a huge precinct, rather than further within the park or integrated with future sporting/grandstand infrastructure||• 🔄 No apparent plan to relocate it when the broader Lathlain Park redevelopment occurs|

No.	Submission Reference Online Survey Id or CM9 Ref:	Description of Affected Property	Owner and/or Occupier	Submission Position	Summary of Submission Comments
26.	138432	Howick Street LATHLAIN	Owner	Object to the proposal	Whilst it would be aesthetically displeasing, there would be concerns over the placement of such a structure near play and park grounds as well as native environments.||I admit I am no tech expert but with the recent and anticipated planned reconstruction of the grandstands at Lathlain (Mineral Resources) Park, isn't there some way of incorporating this structure within those works where it would be less obtrusive?
27.	138395	Goddard Street LATHLAIN	Owner (1 of 2)	Object to the proposal	
28.	138381	McCartney Crescent LATHLAIN	Owner	Object to the proposal	As an owner and resident of 4 McCartney Crescent, living directly opposite the proposed location, we will be impacted. When the current arrangement was erected, as residents we were told that this was temporary and that the cell distribution network would be reinstalled on to the grandstand upon redevelopment. As expected, but corporate lying to the people again. A structure like this will diminish the ambiance of the location, and continue to industralise. If this project goes ahead, what will Telstra or the other monetising this do to improve the immediate parkland?
29.	138377	Mars Street CARLISLE	Owner	Object to the proposal	
30.	138366	Goddard Street LATHLAIN	Owner (1 of 2)	Object to the proposal	We strongly oppose the proposed location of the telecommunications tower and believe it will have a significant and long-term impact on our home, our streetscape and our enjoyment of Lathlain Park.||We live directly opposite this section of the park. The proposal is not simply for a small piece of telecommunications equipment: it includes a 30.5-metre-high monopole, telecommunications equipment, a 2.4-metre security fence and compound, underground services and infrastructure capable of accommodating additional telecommunications carriers in the future.||The tower would extend approximately 10 metres above the existing tree canopy and would therefore become a dominant visual feature when viewed from our home and the surrounding residential streets. We currently look across to an established, green and relatively natural edge of Lathlain Park. Replacing part of that outlook with a 30-metre telecommunications structure and fenced utility compound would fundamentally change the character of this part of the neighbourhood.||We are particularly concerned about the impact on the mature vegetation that currently provides screening, shade, habitat and an attractive transition between the park and surrounding homes. The documentation indicates that multiple established trees may require removal, with further vegetation potentially affected by construction access and underground services. This is especially concerning when the remaining trees are then relied upon to reduce the visual impact of the tower.||The impact is also potentially extremely long term. The proposed leasing arrangements allow for occupation for up to 20 years, meaning a decision made now could affect residents and park users until approximately 2046. The infrastructure has also been designed to accommodate additional carriers, so the visual impact may increase beyond what is shown in the initial Telstra configuration.||Our concern is not opposition to telecommunications infrastructure or improved mobile coverage. We understand that the existing equipment associated with the old Perth Football Club grandstand needs a long-term solution. Our concern is why that solution needs to be placed on the residential, landscaped edge of such a large public precinct.||Lathlain Park contains extensive sporting and developed areas and is subject to a major long-term redevelopment plan. We believe there should be a thorough investigation of alternatives that locate the tower farther from surrounding homes or integrate it with existing or future sporting, lighting or built infrastructure.||The proposed location effectively transfers the visual and environmental impact of this infrastructure from the existing developed football facilities to an established green area immediately adjoining residents. We do not believe that represents an improvement in planning or community amenity.||Once the tower is constructed and a long-term lease is established, relocating it is likely to become substantially more difficult. We therefore believe it is essential that the best location for the next 20 years is determined before construction occurs, rather than accepting the currently proposed location because it provides a convenient solution to the immediate need to relocate equipment from the old grandstand.||For residents directly opposite the site, this is not an abstract planning issue. It means the potential loss of mature trees, a substantially altered outlook from our homes, a 30.5-metre tower dominating the skyline, additional fenced commercial infrastructure within our local park, and a permanent change to an area of Lathlain that we currently value for its open, green character.||We therefore strongly request that the proposal not proceed in its current location and that alternative locations within the broader Lathlain Park precinct, particularly locations farther from residential properties and capable of integration with existing or future built infrastructure, be properly investigated.

No.	Submission Reference Online Survey Id or CM9 Ref:	Description of Affected Property	Owner and/or Occupier	Submission Position	Summary of Submission Comments
31.	138365	Getting Street LATHLAIN	Owner	Object to the proposal	
32.	138359	McCartney Crescent LATHLAIN	Owner	Object to the proposal	Make the tower apart of the new Lathlain oval development
33.	138355	Egham Road LATHLAIN	Owner	Object to the proposal	Consideration for a lower impact location. Such a structure and the necessary fencing etc will be an eyesore on an otherwise pleasant public space
34.	138349	Gallipoli Street LATHLAIN	Owner	Object to the proposal	To close to surrounding homes|Loss of designated community space|Loss of trees |Impact on bird life |Inconsiderate to the local community
35.	138343	Bishopsgate Street LATHLAIN	Owner	Object to the proposal	Lack of consultation, the tower is too high for a high density area and it will remove open community space.
36.	138337	Roberts Road LATHLAIN	Owner	Object to the proposal	I object on the grounds of; Visual impact of unsightly tower ; Loss of flora in a much needed area to support native wildlife ; Birds that are normally in our suburb will have less places to visit and breed; more public land needs to be available for residents; application has an automatic right to add more unsightly infrastructure.
37.	138331	Egham Road LATHLAIN	Owner	Object to the proposal	The unnecessary loss of public open space and removal of mature tree canopy is an affront to local residents.p and ratepayers.|The tower will drive down property prices because of its unsightly nature.|Any microwave tower proposed should be located in the grounds of the Perth Oval, which is where the current infrastructure is.
38.	138329	Enfield Street LATHLAIN	Owner	Object to the proposal	My kids use that park all the time, Would be a real eyesore for the community
39.	138328	Egham Road LATHLAIN	Owner	Object to the proposal	Loss of recreational space and it will be an eyesore.
40.	138326	Howick Street LATHLAIN	Owner	Object to the proposal	The removal of any more large trees from the area is unacceptable. We already have minimal canopy in the area and the loss of more can't be justified.
41.	138325	Goddard Street LATHLAIN	Owner	Object to the proposal	This proposal upsets the natural space of the area. The area should be left without any tower installed.
42.	138324 & 138323	Band Street|Lathlain|WA|6100|AUSTRALIA	Owner	Object to the proposal	This is an area I walk in most days, and see kids playing and people enjoying the free space. Apart from the ovals which are often occupied by sporting events, this is the only grassed area. There are always people enjoying the basketball and picnic tables too.
43.	138322	Forster Avenue LATHLAIN	Owner	Object to the proposal	The construction of this massive tower directly compromises the aesthetic integrity of our public park, transforming a peaceful community sanctuary into an urban eyesore. |
44.	138316	Cornwall Street LATHLAIN	Owner	Object to the proposal	We do not want clearing of yet more native trees in our suburb.
45.	138314	Enfield Street LATHLAIN	Owner	Object to the proposal	Loss of parkland and amenity developed as part of the Lathlain Park redevelopment is a poor outcome. Understand the need to telecommunications infrastructure which should remain part of the grandstand. Redevelopment of the Perth Demons facilities should be fastracked and not blocked by ToVP
46.	138311	Forster Avenue LATHLAIN	Owner	Object to the proposal	Recreational space will be removed. The tower will be ugly and the lovely area does not need this tower at all.
47.	138307	Saleham Street LATHLAIN	Owner	Object to the proposal	This is a community park which I walk my dogs and where we meet for picnics and coffee. This will ruin the lovely ambiance of the park. It is a residential area and will be an eyesore. Why is this not being located in a light industrial/commercial area rather than near a residential area?
48.	138306	Egham Road LATHLAIN	Owner	Object to the proposal	We have roosting endangered cockatoos in the area. This proposal impacts their existing environment, along with the trees that have already been taken down. It will also be an eyesore for what is a beautiful park. I do not support this proposal and believe the town should consider other places for its placement
49.	138304	Gallipoli Street LATHLAIN	Owner (1 of 2)	Object to the proposal	Please don't place this equipment in existing parkland. This will create unnecessary eyesore on the landscape, reduce access to parkland that is frequented by the community and will impact fauna and flora of the area. Use nearby public buildings such as the stadium grandstand or Eagles buildings or nearby rail corridors for this tower. |Leave the beautiful

No.	Submission Reference Online Survey Id or CM9 Ref:	Description of Affected Property	Owner and/or Occupier	Submission Position	Summary of Submission Comments
					parks for the community.
50.	138303	Gallipoli Street LATHLAIN	Owner (1 of 2)	Object to the proposal	My kids play here every day after school, taking away any space is a terrible idea, the whole community uses rgos space.
51.	138297	Goddard Street LATHLAIN	Owner	Object to the proposal	The proposed removal of trees and vegetation should be avoided, especially after the removal of 99 trees for the Eagles facility. Trees add to the urban canopy, provide shade and habitat, in a park that provides community amenity. The temporary tower is a blight at the moment and this proposal is for a higher tower, which, coupled with a fenced compound will significantly reduce my enjoyment of a park I go to daily. There is no plan to relocate it when the new grandstand at Lathlain is built and there is a 20 year lease. The tower should be put in a lower impact site and not where trees have to be impacted. These trees provide roosting habitat for endangered black cockatoos and other birds. I have lived in Lathlain for over 30 years, and see the area being continually degraded by poor planning decisions. I strongly object to this proposal.
52.	138293	Goddard Street LATHLAIN	Owner	Object to the proposal	Removal of mature trees and green open space directly contradicts the direction that the councils require about tree canopy and streetscape. In a world where there is diminishing green space, it utterly ridiculous that this kind of infrastructure is being considered. Especially in a built up residential area.
53.	138290	Bishopsgate Street CARLISLE	Owner	Object to the proposal	Removal/impact of established trees and vegetation, very close to surrounding homes and highly visible from residential streets, loss of amenity in an area designated for community activity/passive recreation (we frequently use this area before after school and on weekends)
54.	138289	Maple Street LATHLAIN	Owner	Support the proposal	
55.	138288	Getting Street LATHLAIN	Owner	Object to the proposal	This tower will be situated right in the middle of a residential area and in a community park and skate park. I think another location should be sourced.
56.	138286	Mars Street CARLISLE	Owner	Object to the proposal	We bought our house in this area for the beautiful open park and spaces. A massive tower will impact this
57.	138285	Rayment Street LATHLAIN	Owner	Object to the proposal	We use this public area every day for the gardens, shade trees and walks.|I would prefer the public space to remain.|Lathlain is already impacted by lack of car parking and traffic congestion because of the football teams. Plus the Redtails use this area and existing trees for many months of the year. 98 trees have already been removed and we need to keep all the remaining large trees that are situated on the proposed site.|Preferably in side the football site |And request that a further review of location of infrastructure to be completed. And that this current proposal be sent to all surrounding Lathlain community, By mail urgently.
58.	138279	Staines Street LATHLAIN	Owner (1 of 2)	Object to the proposal	Huge eye saw, impact to the environment, many other locations to build such tower
59.	138277	Goddard Street LATHLAIN	Owner (2 of 2)	Object to the proposal	This will be located in a public place where small children play and I believe will negatively impact the aesthetic appeal of the park and is unnecessary
60.	138274	Staines Street LATHLAIN	Owner	Object to the proposal	
61.	138272 & 138273	Kessack Street LATHLAIN	Occupier	Object to the proposal	
62.	138271	Goddard Street LATHLAIN	Owner	Object to the proposal	Hideous tower on the middle of a kids skatepark and playground. Find somewhere less obtrusive to put it.
63.	138270	Egham Road LATHLAIN	Owner	Neither support or object	Will this require removal of any of the large tree's in that area as we have already seen lots of established trees removed in the suburb
64.	138268	Staines Street LATHLAIN	Owner (2 of 2)	Object to the proposal	We love the play space and park and don’t want to see the environment disrupted and occupied by such a structure. Also the removal of mature trees is shocking to hear!!
65.	138267	Enfield Street LATHLAIN	Owner	Object to the proposal	The health impacts a community tower will have on children being so close to residential and play areas
66.	138065	Midgley Street LATHLAIN	Owner	Object to the proposal	Choose a lower impact location

No.	Submission Reference Online Survey Id or CM9 Ref:	Description of Affected Property	Owner and/or Occupier	Submission Position	Summary of Submission Comments
67.	138028	Rayment Street LATHLAIN	Owner	Object to the proposal	We can't afford to lose trees and have more leisure spaces stolen for tech. Our planet has gone past the 1.5degree heating that scientists have modelled as causing deaths of numerous species and negative effects on health and shelter and resources for humans. Trees take so long to establish. Nature and space allows for sanity. Last thing we need is more concrete, metal and electronics.|Put it on a roof where there can't already be any green/nature.
68.	138006 & 138007	Howick Street LATHLAIN	Owner	Object to the proposal	Loss of park space and trees. Huge ugly fence on otherwise open and well used parklands. Current temporary tower is already an eye sore and blocking park of park and seating area next to basketball ball court. Also currently blocking this space.
69.	137927	Staines Street LATHLAIN	Occupier	Object to the proposal	I don't agree with the development, as I'm not happy that they want to get rid of trees in my area.
70.	137874	Goddard Street LATHLAIN	Owner	Object to the proposal	My children play here. It is a park. Why isnt it being mounted on the new, tall buildings that have just been completed at lathlain oval?
71.	137855	Harper Street BURSWOOD	Occupier	Object to the proposal	Surely there is a more suitable spot not effecting trees or park area.
72.	137816	Gibbs Street EAST CANNINGTON	Owner	Object to the proposal	Far too invasive. We walk here several times a week and travel here specifically, bypassing closer parks, to enjoy the greenery and open space. This project will likely influence our experience of this space and hinder our desire to use this park. Please seek a low impact location.
73.	137802	Egham Road LATHLAIN	Owner	Object to the proposal	Hello. My family and I object to the proposal on the basis of its cumulative impact on the amenity, vegetation and recreational use of the Lathlain Park precinct.||This area has already undergone substantial redevelopment in recent years, including the loss of a significant number of trees and changes to areas previously available for community use. As a nearby resident, I am concerned that this proposal represents another incremental loss of public amenity within an area that is intended primarily for recreation and open space.||The proposal requires further tree removal. This is particularly concerning given the previous loss of trees in the precinct, the habitat they provide for local birdlife, their contribution to shade and neighbourhood amenity, and the importance of retaining and increasing urban tree canopy. The impact should not be assessed simply by looking at the trees affected by this application in isolation; it should be considered in the context of the cumulative tree and vegetation loss that has already occurred at Lathlain Park.||There also appears to be an inconsistency within the application material regarding the extent of tree removal. The planning report refers to four trees being removed, while the arborist's conclusions appear to identify five trees as likely requiring removal. I believe this discrepancy should be clarified before the proposal is determined, particularly given that further tree loss is one of the significant impacts of the development.||I am also concerned about the impact on the existing community recreation area. The basketball courts and small skate facility are regularly used by local children and families. Temporary fencing and infrastructure in this location has already reduced the usable area and interfered with the normal use of these facilities, including balls entering fenced areas. From observation, use of this area appears to have declined since these restrictions were introduced. A permanent telecommunications compound would further entrench infrastructure within what should primarily remain a community recreation space.||There is also existing parking pressure around Lathlain Park, particularly when Perth Football Club games and other sporting activities are being held. Further permanent infrastructure and associated access requirements should not come at the expense of parking or the practical use of the precinct by existing sporting and community users.||The visual impact is also significant. A telecommunications structure of approximately 30 metres in height is a substantial piece of infrastructure within a predominantly residential area and its upper sections cannot realistically be screened by surrounding vegetation.||Finally, I do not believe the application adequately demonstrates that this is the least-impacting location reasonably available. The alternative locations considered appear to be concentrated within the same general property. Before permanently sacrificing further trees and community amenity, I believe alternative locations within the broader area, including opportunities to locate or co-locate the infrastructure on less sensitive land, should be more thoroughly investigated.||For these reasons, I ask that the proposal not be approved in its current location and that the applicant instead be required to investigate an alternative site that avoids or substantially reduces further tree loss, impacts on established community recreation space, visual amenity and parking.||Thanks for considering our views.
74.	137801	Goddard Street	Owner	Object to the	I walk through the park daily and support a proposal in a lower impact area

No.	Submission Reference Online Survey Id or CM9 Ref:	Description of Affected Property	Owner and/or Occupier	Submission Position	Summary of Submission Comments
		LATHLAIN		proposal	
75.	137715	Goddard Street LATHLAIN	Owner (1 of 2)	Object to the proposal	No detailed planning to show the proposed location and affect on the park it would occupy. |No mention why this location is being proposed instead of on top of future or existing infrastructure on the football grounds. |Concerns about loss of highly popular basketball/grass area. |Current temporary infrastructure is not maintained well enough to demonstrate commitment to high quality public park space.
76.	137688	Goddard Street LATHLAIN	Owner	Object to the proposal	Im concerned in the impact the tower will have on home prices. ||Towers were previously constructed on the existing footy stand. It should be feasible to keep that temporary one in place until such time that is built and can be reinstalled. ||It seems counterintuitive to have a phone tower in the middle of a park and destroy the natural aesthetic of the area. Seems odd to build it there when you have buildings and commercial urban structures already in place on the corner of Bishopsgate and Goddard. ||I could live with one being in the area but I think there's just a better place for it 100m up the road where the commercial buildings exist.
77.	D26/61387	Goddard Street LATHLAIN	Owner	Object to the proposal	Electromagnetic energy emissions – as a nearby resident with young children, my primary concern regarding the proposal is potential RF electromagnetic energy exposure to surrounding residences. Before forming a view on the proposal, I request the complete Environmental EME Report for the proposed facility, including the maximum predicted cumulative exposure as a percentage of the ARPANSA public exposure standard and, if available, predicted exposure at residential properties along Goddard Street, particularly in the vicinity of 21 Goddard Street. I would also appreciate clarification as to how predicted exposure from the proposed facility compares with the existing telecommunications equipment currently located on the Perth Football Club grandstand.
78.	D26/65514	Staines Street LATHLAIN	Owner	Object to the proposal	I don't like the proposal for the following reasons: 1) The area is a recreational park and it will detract from its beauty 2) It may affect the price of property 3) I don't like radiation so close to the public 4) I don't like that a tree will be cut down
79.	D26/65549	Saleham Street LATHLAIN	Owner	Object to the proposal	Three weeks is very short time to consider such a serious impacting proposal for the Lathlain community. The position of this monopole is too close to many houses with impact to residents health. The proposed location will be affecting play ground and park just recently build for children. This proposal is not compatible with its surroundings.