

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS - OBJECTIONS

Attachment 2

#	Submitter	Comments	Response
1	Patricia Carmichael	<p>) Concerns with proposed setbacks (of 0m);</p> <p>) Concerns for visual privacy;</p> <p>) LDP is silent on plot ratio.</p>	<p>) Setbacks are proposed for a minor portion of the frontage at 0m to encourage landmark, activated and commercial development on the corner of Congdon Street and Railway Street. Nil setbacks are for a minor portion of the street frontage only and will generally graduate to setback of 2m – 4m for the majority of the frontage. Setbacks are similar to the development at 136 Railway Street and will not adversely impact the streetscape. The built form is appropriate for the context of the site within 150m of a train station.</p> <p>) Clause 5.4.1 / 6.4.1 of the R-Codes identifies visual privacy requirements. Visual Privacy will be assessed under the R20 requirements of the R-Codes. No additional provisions are required.</p> <p>) Table 4 of the R-Codes requires a maximum plot ratio of 0.7 for multiple dwellings and mixed use development on lots coded R60.</p>
2	Grant Gibson	<p>) Concerns with proposed setbacks (of 0m);</p> <p>) Concerns for visual privacy;</p> <p>) LDP is silent on plot ratio;</p> <p>) Seeks maximum plot ratio of 0.7:1.0.; and</p>	<p>) Setbacks are proposed for a minor portion of the frontage at 0m to encourage landmark, activated and commercial development on the corner of Congdon Street and Railway Street. Nil setbacks are for a minor portion of the street frontage only and will generally graduate to setback of 2m – 4m for the majority of the frontage. Setbacks are similar to the development at 136 Railway Street and will not adversely impact the streetscape. The built form is appropriate for the context of the site within 150m of a train station.</p> <p>) Clause 5.4.1 / 6.4.1 of the R-Codes identifies visual privacy requirements. Visual Privacy will be assessed under the R20 requirements of the R-Codes. No additional provisions are required.</p> <p>) Table 4 of the R-Codes requires a maximum plot ratio of 0.7 for multiple dwellings and mixed use development coded R60.</p> <p>) Plot ratio of 0.7 is applicable under Table 7 of the R-Codes.</p>

#	Submitter	Comments	Response
) Concerns with car parking structure on Railway Street at the boundary – height of structure (1.2m) will impact streetscape.) The height of a possible undercroft parking structure is limited to 1.2m for consistency with street walls and fences requirements of the R-Codes (Clause 5.2.4 / 6.2.2) to ensure the structure does not adversely impose on the streetscape, and for consistency with the existing streetscape, which includes street fencing.
3	Tim Lee	<p>) Considers LDP too open-ended and not specific enough;</p> <p>) Concerns with proposed setback (of 0m instead of 2m);</p> <p>) LDP silent on plot ratio, open space and visual privacy provisions;</p> <p>) Seeks maximum plot ratio of 0.7:1.0; minimum 45% of site as open space; and seeks visual privacy in accordance with 6.4.1 C1.1, Part 6 of R-Codes - with no variation (i.e. no application of design principles).</p>	<p>) The LDP provides an appropriate level of development control to guide developers and provide certainty to the local community. The LDP must be read in conjunction with the Local Planning Scheme and R-Codes, which identify other relevant detailed development requirements for the site.</p> <p>) Setbacks are proposed for a minor portion of the frontage at 0m to encourage landmark, activated and commercial development on the corner of Congdon Street and Railway Street. Nil setbacks are for a minor portion of the street frontage only and will generally graduate to setback of 2m – 4m for the majority of the frontage. Setbacks are similar to the development at 136 Railway Street and will not adversely impact the streetscape.</p> <p>) Plot ratio, open space and visual privacy are addressed under the relevant Clauses of the R-Codes. No additional provisions are required.</p> <p>) Plot ratio, open space and visual privacy are addressed under the relevant Clauses of the R-Codes. No additional provisions are required.</p>
4	Rowena Lee	Comments as per 3 above, from Tim Lee of same address.	As Above
5	Mercedes Elliot) Concerns with proposed setback (of 0m to) Setbacks are proposed for a minor portion of the frontage at 0m to

#	Submitter	Comments	Response
		<p>Railway Street); and</p> <p>) LDP is silent on plot ratio, open space and visual privacy provisions.</p>	<p>encourage landmark, activated and commercial development on the corner of Congdon Street and Railway Street. Nil setbacks are for a minor portion of the street frontage only and will generally graduate to setback of 2m – 4m for the majority of the frontage. Setbacks are similar to the development at 136 Railway Street and will not adversely impact the streetscape.</p> <p>) Plot ratio, open space and visual privacy are addressed under the relevant Clauses of the R-Codes. No additional provisions are required.</p>
6	Neil Campbell	<p>) Concerns with proposed setback (0m to any boundary);</p> <p>) Concerns with second exit due to perceived increase in traffic hazard;</p> <p>) Seeks 4m setbacks; and minimum 45% of site as open space.</p>	<p>) Setbacks are proposed for a minor portion of the frontage at 0m to encourage landmark, activated and commercial development on the corner of Congdon Street and Railway Street. Nil setbacks are for a minor portion of the street frontage only and will generally graduate to setback of 2m – 4m for the majority of the frontage. Setbacks are similar to the development at 136 Railway Street and will not adversely impact the streetscape.</p> <p>) The LDP includes two existing lots, each of which require street access. Whilst it is anticipated that development will occur over the collective site, this is not guaranteed and access provision must be considered for each lot. In accordance with the WAPC transport impact assessment guidelines, a Traffic Impact Statement is required where between 10 – 100 dwellings are proposed. Town of Cottesloe technical traffic engineers will undertake an assessment of access/ egress points and crossovers.</p> <p>) Noted. Proposed setbacks are site specific to deliver a landmark development and are considered appropriate to maintain an attractive streetscape manage amenity impacts for adjoining properties. Open space is addressed under Table 1 / Table 4 of the R-Codes and is not proposed to be modified as R60 provisions are appropriate.</p>
7	Surendran Selladurai	<p>) Concerns with outdoor living in front setback areas because presumed</p>	<p>) Outdoor living areas in street setback areas will activate street frontages and contribute to passive surveillance. This will be</p>

#	Submitter	Comments	Response
		<p>reduction in opposing setback and consequent impact on neighbours;</p> <p>) Concerned about impact of Design WA;</p> <p>) Overshadowing controls need to be tightened in LDP to minimise impact on adjoining properties; and</p> <p>) LDP is silent on plot ratio, open space and visual privacy provisions;</p> <p>) Seeks maximum plot ratio of 0.7:1.0; minimum 45% of site as open space; and seeks visual privacy in accordance with 6.4.1 C1.1, Part 6 of R-Codes - with no variation (i.e. no application of design principles).</p>	<p>applicable to street fronting dwellings only with rear dwellings (abutting side/ rear boundaries) including OLA as typically expected. Side and rear setbacks shall be provided in accordance 5.1.3 / 6.1.4 and table 2a / 2b of the R-Codes.</p> <p>) Once finalised, Design WA will provide the state planning policy framework and replace part of, or all of the R-Codes. For provisions included in this LDP which are site specific, this LDP will continue to apply.</p> <p>) Overshadowing is assessed under Clause 5.4.2/ 6.4.2 of the R-codes and will be assessed under the adjoining residential density coding requirements of R20. No additional provisions are required.</p> <p>) Plot ratio, open space and visual privacy are addressed under the relevant Clauses of the R-Codes. No additional provisions are required.</p> <p>) Plot ratio, open space and visual privacy are addressed under the relevant Clauses of the R-Codes. No additional provisions are necessary.</p>
8	Amy Barber	Comments as per 6 above, from Neil Campbell of same address.	As above
9	Rosie Walsh	<p>) LDP lacks detail;</p> <p>) Concerns with variations to LPS 3 and R-Codes;</p>	<p>) The LDP provides an appropriate level of development control to guide developers and provide a level of certainty to the local community. The LDP must be read in conjunction with the Local Planning Scheme and R-Codes, which identifies other relevant applicable development requirements for the site.</p> <p>) Permitted variation to LPS 3 and the R-Codes are 'Requirements' 1 – 10.</p>

#	Submitter	Comments	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none">) Setbacks should be as per R-Codes;) Vehicle access is problematic and development will generate traffic congestion;) Seeks minimum 45% of site as open space. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">) Side and rear setbacks are required to be provided as per the R-Codes. For street setbacks, the LDP provide a site responsive set of requirements which encourage landmark development and activated streetscapes.) A Traffic Report was prepared by Don Veal Traffic Consultant as part of the amendment to the Local Planning Scheme and identified that the street network was capable of accommodating development at the R60 density coding.) Open space is required in accordance with Table 1 / Table 4 of the R-Codes. No additional provisions are necessary.
10	Jack Walsh	<ul style="list-style-type: none">) LDP lacks detail and doesn't reflect drawings provided by applicant;) Concerns with setback (of 0m in lieu of 2m);) Setback at corner of Railway and Congdon is dangerous;) Vehicle access is poorly sited. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">) The LDP has been prepared to respond to the requirements of the site and provide general development provisions which will enable the delivery of an appropriate built form. It is not the role of the LDP to display specific building locations or design control.) Setbacks are proposed for a minor portion of the frontage at 0m to encourage landmark, activated and commercial development on the corner of Congdon Street and Railway Street. Nil setbacks are for a minor portion of the street frontage only and will generally graduate to setback of 2m – 4m for the majority of the frontage. Setbacks are similar to the development at 136 Railway Street and will not adversely impact the streetscape.) The existing truncation at the corner of 128 Railway Parade is provided to ensure vehicle safety.) Vehicle access is generally provided on the LDP for detailed investigations at the time of the Development Application as flexibility may be required. The crossover location on Railway Parade is located at the furthest point from the corner to maximise vehicle safety.

#	Submitter	Comments	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none">) Seeks maximum plot ratio of 0.7:1.0; and minimum 45% of site as open space. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">) Open space is required in accordance with Table 1 / Table 4 of the R-Codes. No additional provisions are necessary.
11	Richard Hazlewood	<ul style="list-style-type: none">) Concerns with proposed setback (0m);) Concerns with site having two points of access/egress;) Seeks 4m setbacks generally and minimum 45% of site as open space. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">) Setbacks are proposed for a minor portion of the frontage at 0m to encourage landmark, activated and commercial development on the corner of Congdon Street and Railway Street. Nil setbacks are for a minor portion of the street frontage only and will generally graduate to setback of 2m – 4m for the majority of the frontage. Setbacks are similar to the development at 136 Railway Street and will not adversely impact the streetscape.) The LDP includes two existing lots, each of which require street access. Whilst it is anticipated that development will occur over the collective site, this is not guaranteed and access provision must be considered for each lot. A traffic assessment and/ or Town of Cottesloe technical traffic assessment will be required for a development application which proposes access to Railway Parade.) Varied setbacks are proposed to achieve a site responsive built form outcome. With the exception of the nil setback permitted to the corner and for 20% of the frontage, setbacks are generally consistent with the R-Codes (minimum 2m).
12	Marjorie Hutchinson	<ul style="list-style-type: none">) Concerns with proposed setback (0m);) Concerns with access/egress on Congdon Street – dangerous and will cause traffic conflict; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">) Setbacks are proposed for a minor portion of the frontage at 0m to encourage landmark, activated and commercial development on the corner of Congdon Street and Railway Street. Nil setbacks are for a minor portion of the street frontage only and will generally graduate to setback of 2m – 4m for the majority of the frontage. Setbacks are similar to the development at 136 Railway Street and will not adversely impact the streetscape.) A Traffic Report was prepared by Don Veal Traffic Consultant as part of the amendment to the Local Planning Scheme and identified that the street network was capable of accommodating development at the R60 density coding. Further investigation of access will be required at Development Application stage.

#	Submitter	Comments	Response
		<p>) LDP is silent on plot ratio, open space and visual privacy provisions.</p> <p>) Seeks maximum plot ratio of 0.7:1.0; minimum 45% of site as open space; and seeks visual privacy in accordance with 6.4.1 C1.1, Part 6 of R-Codes - with no variation (i.e. no application of design principles).</p>	<p>) Plot ratio, open space and visual privacy are addressed under the relevant Clauses of the R-Codes. No additional provisions are required.</p> <p>) Plot ratio, open space and visual privacy are addressed under the relevant Clauses of the R-Codes. No additional provisions are required.</p>
13	Nicola Butler	<p>) Concerns with proposed setback (of 0m in lieu of 2m);</p> <p>) LDP is silent on plot ratio, open space and visual privacy provisions;</p> <p>) Seeks maximum plot ratio of 0.7:1.0; minimum 45% of site as open space; and seeks visual privacy in accordance with 6.4.1 C1.1, Part 6 of R-Codes - with no variation (i.e. no application of design principles).</p>	<p>) Setbacks are proposed for a minor portion of the frontage at 0m to encourage landmark, activated and commercial development on the corner of Congdon Street and Railway Street. Nil setbacks are for a minor portion of the street frontage only and will generally graduate to setback of 2m – 4m for the majority of the frontage. Setbacks are similar to the development at 136 Railway Street and will not adversely impact the streetscape.</p> <p>) Plot ratio, open space and visual privacy are addressed under the relevant Clauses of the R-Codes. No additional provisions are required.</p> <p>) Plot ratio, open space and visual privacy are addressed under the relevant Clauses of the R-Codes. No additional provisions are required.</p>
14	Myffy Walters and Adam Hill	<p>) Concerns with proposed setback (of 0m in lieu of 2m);</p>	<p>) Setbacks are proposed for a minor portion of the frontage at 0m to encourage landmark, activated and commercial development on the corner of Congdon Street and Railway Street. Nil setbacks are for a minor portion of the street frontage only and will generally graduate to setback of 2m – 4m for the majority of the frontage. Setbacks are similar to the development at 136 Railway Street and will not</p>

#	Submitter	Comments	Response
		<p>) LDP is silent on plot ratio, open space and visual privacy provisions.</p> <p>) Seeks maximum plot ratio of 0.7:1.0; minimum 45% of site as open space; and seeks visual privacy in accordance with 6.4.1 C1.1, Part 6 of R-Codes - with no variation (i.e. no application of design principles).</p>	<p>adversely impact the streetscape.</p> <p>) Plot ratio, open space and visual privacy are addressed under the relevant Clauses of the R-Codes. No additional provisions are required.</p> <p>) Plot ratio, open space and visual privacy are addressed under the relevant Clauses of the R-Codes. No additional provisions are required.</p>
15	Cathy Campbell	<p>) Concerns with proposed setback (of 0m);</p> <p>) Concerns with access/egress on Congdon Street – dangerous and will cause traffic conflict;</p> <p>) LDP is silent on plot ratio, open space and visual privacy provisions.</p> <p>) Seeks 4m setbacks generally; maximum plot ratio of 0.7:1.0; minimum 45% of site as open space; and seeks visual privacy in accordance with 6.4.1 C1.1, Part 6 of R-Codes - with no variation (i.e. no</p>	<p>) Setbacks are proposed for a minor portion of the frontage at 0m to encourage landmark, activated and commercial development on the corner of Congdon Street and Railway Street. Nil setbacks are for a minor portion of the street frontage only and will generally graduate to setback of 2m – 4m for the majority of the frontage. Setbacks are similar to the development at 136 Railway Street and will not adversely impact the streetscape.</p> <p>) A Traffic Report was prepared by Don Veal Traffic Consultant as part of the amendment to the Local Planning Scheme and identified that the street network was capable of accommodating development at the R60 density coding. Further investigation of access will be required at Development Application stage.</p> <p>) Plot ratio, open space and visual privacy are addressed under the relevant Clauses of the R-Codes. No additional provisions are required.</p> <p>) Plot ratio, open space and visual privacy are addressed under the relevant Clauses of the R-Codes. No additional provisions are required.</p>

#	Submitter	Comments	Response
		application of design principles).	
16	Hilton Butler	Comments as per 13 above, from Nicola Butler of same address.	As above
17	Siobhan Beilin	<p>) Concerns with proposed setback (of 0m);</p> <p>) LDP silent on plot ratio.</p>	<p>) Setbacks are proposed for a minor portion of the frontage at 0m to encourage landmark, activated and commercial development on the corner of Congdon Street and Railway Street. Nil setbacks are for a minor portion of the street frontage only and will generally graduate to setback of 2m – 4m for the majority of the frontage. Setbacks are similar to the development at 136 Railway Street and will not adversely impact the streetscape.</p> <p>) Plot ratio for multiple dwellings is addressed under Table 4 of the R-Codes. No additional provisions are required.</p>
18	Peter Dickson	<p>) Concerns with proposed setback (of 0m);</p> <p>) LDP silent on plot ratio, open space and visual privacy provisions;</p> <p>) Seeks 2m setbacks generally; maximum plot ratio of 0.7:1.0; and minimum 45% of site as open space.</p>	<p>) Setbacks are proposed for a minor portion of the frontage at 0m to encourage landmark, activated and commercial development on the corner of Congdon Street and Railway Street. Nil setbacks are for a minor portion of the street frontage only and will generally graduate to setback of 2m – 4m for the majority of the frontage. Setbacks are similar to the development at 136 Railway Street and will not adversely impact the streetscape.</p> <p>) Plot ratio, open space and visual privacy are addressed under the relevant Clauses of the R-Codes. No additional provisions are required.</p> <p>) Setbacks are generally consistent with the R-Codes (minimum 2m), with the exception for the minor allowance for nil setbacks. Plot ratio and open space are addressed under Table 1 and Table 4 of the R-Codes.</p>
19	Brad Osborne	<p>) Concerns for amenity arising from excessive bulk and inappropriate built form; and</p>	<p>) The LDP does not permit excessive building bulk and maintains consistency with the R-Codes and Local Planning Scheme 3 for plot ratio, open space and building height, overshadowing and lot</p>

#	Submitter	Comments	Response
		<p>) LDP silent on plot ratio, open space and visual privacy provisions.</p> <p>) Seeks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - maximum plot ratio of 0.7:1.0 with no variations allowed; - minimum open space of 45% of site with no variations allowed; - visual privacy in accordance with 6.4.1 C1.1, Part 6 of R-Codes - with no variation (i.e. no application of design principles); - generic minimum setback to all boundaries of 2m; - all development within 20m of adjoining lots to be setback 6m from street boundary with no variations allowed; - development to be setback minimum of 3m to southern and western property boundaries with no variations allowed; - prohibit nil setback to the street; - remove reference to incursions from LDP, or more clearly define what constitutes an incursion; - prohibit covered structures as part of outdoor living areas within front setbacks; and 	<p>boundary setbacks etc. The LDP proposed a minor reduction to street setbacks to activate the corner of the site and promote commercial and landmark development. The built form is consistent with the development at 136 Railway Parade and will improve the amenity of the location.</p> <p>) Plot ratio, open space and visual privacy are addressed under the relevant Clauses of the R-Codes. No additional provisions are required.</p> <p>) Plot ratio, open space and visual privacy are addressed under the relevant Clauses of the R-Codes. No additional provisions are required.</p> <p>Requirements for lot boundary setbacks, street setbacks and location of outdoor living areas are proposed to activate the street, promote commercial and landmark development in a strategic location less than 150m from a train station. Street setbacks are consistent with development directly to the west (136 Railway and beyond) and are appropriate for the context of the site. The provisions are otherwise generally consistent with the R-Codes and will not adversely impact the amenity of adjoining properties.</p> <p>Overshadowing of adjoining properties is consistent with the R20 requirements of the R-Codes to ensure an equitable assessment outcome for adjoining residents.</p>

#	Submitter	Comments	Response
		- limit overshadowing impacts to 10% of adjoining sites.	

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS - SUPPORTIVE SUBMISSIONS

Attachment 1

#	Submitter	Comments	Response
1	John Franetovich) Support the approval of the development plan.	Noted
2	Kristy Barrett No address provided) Support the revised LDP.	Noted
3	Janice Rooney) Like the concept of the living areas / small village development.) Will improve the area immensely.	Noted
4	Colin Heath) Full support.) Will complement the amenity of the area.	Noted
5	Craig Smith) Support the approval of the revised LDP.) The plan is a conservative solution for the site that respects existing development.	Noted
6	Ethicos Institute) The revised LDP meets with our approval.	Noted
7	Carla Tomas Andres and Alexander de Mendoza) Agree with the revised LDP.	Noted
8	Professor Peter Newman OA No address provided) Strong supporter of the Swanbourne Village.) The area around rail stations should be increased in density to optimize the value of living near a rail option.	Noted

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS - SUPPORTIVE SUBMISSIONS

Attachment 1

#	Submitter	Comments	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none">) The Perth and Peel Plan as well as Metronet suggests significant density is needed around stations.) Good design is also needed and this project is good design. 	
9	Natalie Kendal No address provided	<ul style="list-style-type: none">) I am happy for the LDP to proceed;) In general I support increased density near community hubs and public transport stations when compliant with local planning requirements.) It provides the opportunity for more diverse living options and increases our community 	Noted
10	Meaghan White	<ul style="list-style-type: none">) Support the proposed LDP) The proposal is modest, sensibly located and environmentally responsive scheme to provide high quality housing for our ageing community; 	Noted
11	Andrew Aitken	<ul style="list-style-type: none">) Strongly in favour of the development proceeding being close to the station and having access to retail shops and café across the railway line 	Noted
12	Brett Barns	<ul style="list-style-type: none">) Confirmed that the revised LDP meets with approval 	Noted
13	Jaime Atkinson No address provided	<ul style="list-style-type: none">) Support for LDP <p>Objection to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">) Building Height being limited to 2 storeys in Station Precincts) The liability for pro-rata contributions to road reserve infrastructure by the developer / owner is unfair when this is in the public domain. A make good clause is 	<p>Noted</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">) Building height is limited by the Town of Cottesloe Local Planning Scheme;) Pro rata contributions is a Town of Cottesloe led initiative.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS - SUPPORTIVE SUBMISSIONS

Attachment 1

#	Submitter	Comments	Response
		fair and reasonable. J It is not reasonable for the landowner to provide a Landscape Plan when the area outside the property boundary in the public realms when this has been in poor condition whilst the Towns responsibility.	J Noted. Landscaping in the Verge is a Town of Cottesloe led initiative to encourage streetscape improvements.
14	Tim Roberts,	J LDP is appropriate and should be fully supported; J Such a large corner site, in close proximity to the train station should be rezoned with the capacity of being developed to a higher density with greater density being encouraged.	Noted
15	Allison Manners	J Full support and agreement of the revised LDP.	Noted
16	Jane King No address provided	J Support for LDP.	Noted
17	Chris King No address provided	J Support wholeheartedly the project.	Noted
18	Phillip King No address provided	J Support for LDP.	Noted
19	Alexander Jowett No address provided	J Support for LDP.	Noted
20	Denise Ricci	J Support for LDP.	Noted
21	Michael J Hulme	J Support the revised LDP.	Noted

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS - SUPPORTIVE SUBMISSIONS

Attachment 1

#	Submitter	Comments	Response
22	Brian Page) Support the revised LDP;) Well located site suitable for this type of development.	Noted
23	Angelo Scatena) Support the revised LDP;) Well located site suitable for this type of development.	Noted
24	Christine Scatena) Support the revised LDP;) Well located site suitable for this type of development.	Noted
25	Robert Sharpe) Support the revised LDP;) In favour of the setbacks and height restrictions;) Well located.	Noted
26	A.G Linde) Support the revised LDP;) Well considered plan;) Impact on neighbours probably less than building 2 individual two storey homes.	Noted
27	Timothy Strahan) Support the revised LDP;) Well located site suitable for this type of development	Noted
28	Peter Strahan) Support the revised LDP;) Well located site suitable for this type of development	Noted
29	Ron Dwyer) Support the revised LDP	Noted
30	Jo Dawkins) Support the revised LDP;	Noted

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS - SUPPORTIVE SUBMISSIONS

Attachment 1

#	Submitter	Comments	Response
) Well located site suitable for this type of development	
31	Lesley Shaw) Support the revised LDP;) Well located site suitable for this type of development	Noted
32	Campbell Ansell and Carol Day) Support the revised LDP;) Well located site suitable for this type of development.	Noted
33	Georgina Moore) Support the revised LDP.	Noted
34	Julie Kaminickas) Support the revised LDP;) Well located site suitable for this type of development.	Noted
35	Patrick Dawkins) Support the revised LDP;) Well located site suitable for this type of development;) Support reduced street setbacks.	Noted
36	Maxine Chapman) Support the revised LDP;	Noted
37	Maxine Mazzucchelli) Support the revised LDP;) Well located site suitable for this type of development.	Noted
38	Fiona Roger) Support the revised LDP;	Noted

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS - SUPPORTIVE SUBMISSIONS

Attachment 1

#	Submitter	Comments	Response
39	Greg Roger) Support the revised LDP;	Noted
40	John Hearne) Support the revised LDP;) Well located site suitable for this type of development.	Noted
41	Tony and Sue Hayes) Support the revised LDP;) Well located site suitable for this type of development.	Noted
42	W. F. Hazell) Support the revised LDP;	Noted
43	Coralie Willoughby) Support the revised LDP;	Noted
44	Malcom Jones) Support the revised LDP;	Noted
45	Rick Balston) Support the revised LDP;) Well located site suitable for this type of development.	Noted
46	Susan Tay) Support the revised LDP.	Noted
47	Don Mazzuccchelli) Support the revised LDP.	Noted

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS - SUPPORTIVE SUBMISSIONS

Attachment 1

#	Submitter	Comments	Response
48	Nicole Shaw) Support the revised LDP.	Noted
49	Richard Craddock) Support the revised LDP.	Noted
50	Simon Norrish) Support the revised LDP.	Noted
51	Bob Stevenson) Support the revised LDP.	Noted
52	Jessica Rucks No address provided) Support the revised LDP;) Well located site suitable for this type of development	Noted
53	Steven David) Support the revised LDP;) Well located site suitable for this type of development.	Noted
54	Chantal Hartstone) Support the revised LDP;) Well located site suitable for this type of development.	Noted
55	J. Willoughby) Support the revised LDP;) Well located site suitable for this type of development.	Noted

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS - SUPPORTIVE SUBMISSIONS

Attachment 1

#	Submitter	Comments	Response
56	Cameron Jenkinson	<ul style="list-style-type: none">) Support the revised LDP;) Well located site suitable for this type of development. 	Noted
57	Julia Hayes	<ul style="list-style-type: none">) Support the revised LDP;) Well located site suitable for this type of development. 	Noted
58	Ann Cook	<ul style="list-style-type: none">) Support the revised LDP;) Well located site suitable for this type of development. 	Noted
59	Arunas Kaminickas	<ul style="list-style-type: none">) Support the revised LDP;) Well located site suitable for this type of development. 	Noted
60	Tony Casella No address provided	<ul style="list-style-type: none">) Support the revised LDP <p>Further comments :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">) Outdoor Living Areas – should be added that size of OLA shall be in accordance with requirements or relevant R-Code;) Awnings – 2.0m not wide enough – consideration should be given to 3.0m;) Landscaping – encourage deciduous trees particularly to Railway Street to permit winter sun access to OLA's on this frontage. 	<p>Noted</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">) Outdoor living area requirements of the R-Codes are applicable.) Noted. Awnings could be updated to 3m.) Noted. It is the responsibility of the Town of Cottesloe to specify street tree species, which may be negotiated via the landscaping plan.
61	Simon Williams No address provided	<ul style="list-style-type: none">) Support the revised LDP;) Well located site suitable for this type of development. 	Noted
62	Nick Melidonis	<ul style="list-style-type: none">) Support the revised LDP;) Well located site suitable for this type of 	Noted

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS - SUPPORTIVE SUBMISSIONS

Attachment 1

#	Submitter	Comments	Response
		development.	
63	Brett Maclachlan	<p>) Support the revised LDP;</p> <p>) Well located site suitable for this type of development.</p>	Noted
64	James Shaw	<p>) Support the revised LDP.</p> <p>Further comments:</p> <p>) Would prefer "All other setbacks shall be provided in accordance with the R-codes" rather than "Deemed to comply" provisions of the R-Codes arguing that this provides opportunity to design a quality building whilst complying with the design intent of the R-codes.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>) Deemed to comply setback requirements to side and rear boundaries are appropriate to provide sufficient boundary separation and certainty for neighbours.</p>
65	Brian Sierakowski	<p>) Support the revised LDP.</p>	Noted
66	Henry Esbenshade	<p>) Support the revised LDP;</p> <p>) Well located site suitable for this type of development.</p>	Noted
67	Dr Colin Bennett	<p>) Support the revised LDP;</p> <p>) Well located site suitable for this type of development.</p>	Noted
68	David Ellery	<p>) Support the revised LDP;</p> <p>) Well located site suitable for this type of development.</p>	Noted
69	Carolyn Marshall	<p>) Support the revised LDP;</p> <p>) Well located site suitable for this type of development.</p>	Noted

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS - SUPPORTIVE SUBMISSIONS

Attachment 1

#	Submitter	Comments	Response
70	Max Ball No address provided) Support the revised LDP.	Noted
71	Rod Griffiths) Support the revised LDP;) Well located site suitable for this type of development;) Encourages cohesion between Town of Claremont and Town of Cottesloe to create a complete centre;) Encourages consideration of drop off point for Scotch College on south side of railway.	Noted
72	Jane Hope) Support the revised LDP.	Noted
73	Alan Wilson) Support the revised LDP;) Well located site suitable for this type of development.	Noted
74	Tony Hope) Support the revised LDP.	Noted
75	Jasmine Michelides and Rose Michelides) Support the revised LDP;) Well located site suitable for this type of development.	Noted
76	Sasha Ivanovich) Support the revised LDP.	Noted
77	Todd Paterson) Support the revised LDP;) Well located site suitable for this type of	Noted

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS - SUPPORTIVE SUBMISSIONS

Attachment 1

#	Submitter	Comments	Response
		development.	
78	Kenneth Paterson No address provided) Support the revised LDP;) Well located site suitable for this type of development.	Noted
79	Anne-Marie And Dom Mallon) Support the revised LDP.	Noted
80 (Petition 1)	Anthony King) Support the revised LDP.	Noted
81 (Petition 1)	Name unclear) Support the revised LDP;) Well located site suitable for this type of development.	Noted
82 (Petition 1)	Betty Rose) Support the revised LDP;) Well located site suitable for this type of development.	Noted
83 (Petition 1)	Maria Noakes) Support the revised LDP;) Well located site suitable for this type of development.	Noted
84 (Petition 1)	Helene Dobson) Support the revised LDP;) Well located site suitable for this type of development.	Noted
85 (Petition 2)	Name Unclear) Support the revised LDP;) Well located site suitable for this type of development.	Noted
86 (Petition 2)	Margaret Steadman) Support the revised LDP;) Well located site suitable for this type of development.	Noted

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS - SUPPORTIVE SUBMISSIONS

Attachment 1

#	Submitter	Comments	Response
87 (Petition 2)	Sheila Binns) Support the revised LDP;) Well located site suitable for this type of development.	Noted
88 (Petition 2)	Lorna Dick) Support the revised LDP;) Well located site suitable for this type of development.	Noted
89 (Petition 2)	L. Sadler) Support the revised LDP;) Well located site suitable for this type of development.	Noted
90 (Petition 2)	Kevin Sadler) Support the revised LDP;) Well located site suitable for this type of development.	Noted
91 (Petition 2)	Jenny Archibald) Support the revised LDP;) Well located site suitable for this type of development.	Noted
92 (Petition 2)	Name unclear) Support the revised LDP;) Well located site suitable for this type of development.	Noted
93 (Petition 2)	David Long) Support the revised LDP;) Well located site suitable for this type of development.	Noted
94 (Petition 2)	Betty Rose) Support the revised LDP;) Well located site suitable for this type of development.	Noted
95 (Petition 2)	Craig Sealry) Support the revised LDP;) Well located site suitable for this type of	Noted

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS - SUPPORTIVE SUBMISSIONS

Attachment 1

#	Submitter	Comments	Response
		development.	
96 (Petition 2)	Blanche D. Kailis) Support the revised LDP;) Well located site suitable for this type of development.	Noted
97 (Petition 2)	Ross Littlewood) Support the revised LDP;) Well located site suitable for this type of development.	Noted
98 (Petition 2)	Geoff Cook) Support the revised LDP;) Well located site suitable for this type of development.	Noted
99 (Petition 2)	Christine's Hairdressing) Support the revised LDP;) Well located site suitable for this type of development.	Noted
100 (Petition 2)	John R Angeloni) Support the revised LDP;) Well located site suitable for this type of development.	Noted
101 (Petition 2)	Gordon Smith and Miriam Vittigalia) Support the revised LDP;) Well located site suitable for this type of development.	Noted
102 (Petition 3)	Linden Heward No address provided) Support the revised LDP;) Well located site suitable for this type of development.	Noted
103 (Petition 3)	Marion Ling No address provided) Support the revised LDP;) Well located site suitable for this type of development.	Noted
104 (Petition 3)	Joel Blakely No address provided) Support the revised LDP;) Well located site suitable for this type of development.	Noted

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS - SUPPORTIVE SUBMISSIONS

Attachment 1

#	Submitter	Comments	Response
105 (Petition 3)	Maria Smith) Support the revised LDP;) Well located site suitable for this type of development.	Noted
106 (Petition 3)	Sophia Wehr No address provided) Support the revised LDP;) Well located site suitable for this type of development.	Noted
107 (Petition 3)	Kelly Kullander No address provided) Support the revised LDP;) Well located site suitable for this type of development.	Noted
108 (Petition 3)	Amber Lamb No address provided) Support the revised LDP;) Well located site suitable for this type of development.	Noted
109 (Petition 3)	Douglas Bourke and Gina Bourke No address provided) Support the revised LDP;) Well located site suitable for this type of development.	Noted
110 (Petition 3)	Shahid Iqbal No address provided) Support the revised LDP;) Well located site suitable for this type of development.	Noted
111 (Petition 3)	Davinder Singh No address provided) Support the revised LDP;) Well located site suitable for this type of development.	Noted
112 (Petition 4)	Jamie Harrington and Mark Anderson) Support the revised LDP;) Well located site suitable for this type of development.	Noted
113 (Petition 4)	Jonathan Holohan) Support the revised LDP;) Well located site suitable for this type of development.	Noted

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS - SUPPORTIVE SUBMISSIONS

Attachment 1

#	Submitter	Comments	Response
114 (Petition 4)	Karla Risetto) Support the revised LDP;) Well located site suitable for this type of development.	Noted
115 (Petition 4)	Dani Baker) Support the revised LDP;) Well located site suitable for this type of development.	Noted
116 (Petition 4)	Michael Williamson) Support the revised LDP;) Well located site suitable for this type of development.	Noted
117 (Petition 4)	Tony Clark) Support the revised LDP;) Well located site suitable for this type of development.	Noted
118 (Petition 4)	Kate Santog) Support the revised LDP;) Well located site suitable for this type of development.	Noted
119 (Petition 4)	John Christovitsis) Support the revised LDP;) Well located site suitable for this type of development.	Noted
120 (Petition 4)	P. Christovitsis) Support the revised LDP;) Well located site suitable for this type of development.	Noted
121 (Petition 4)	Alan Morgan,) Support the revised LDP;) Well located site suitable for this type of development.	Noted