

SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED ON AMENDMENT 14 TO LPS6			
No.	Status	Submission	City of Melville Response
1	Object	I am concerned the proposal will set precedence and give rise to further potential rezoning requests outside of current approved areas. If approval for such rezoning occurred, I am concerned that license for further amendments to original amenities will not be controlled sufficiently	<p>Noted.</p> <p>It is recommended that the scheme amendment not be supported and that the proposal be flagged for consideration as part of a wider review of the area.</p> <p>LPS6 is currently under review and can facilitate this approach.</p>
2	Support	R30 suits this location being on the foreshore and the higher density in the surroundings. I support this scheme amendment.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Whilst the proposal is considered to have some merit, it is recommended that individual requests for changes to zonings or R-Codes be noted and considered comprehensively through the current LPS6 review program. The commencement of the review process has and will continue to prompt proposals for changes. These proposals are best steered into the review program.</p>
3	Object	Higher density is already allowed for within the CBAC. Allowing increased density at 45 & 47 Canning Beach Road would not be consistent with the desired character of the locality. If approved, the development would cause a further increase in traffic. We and other residents choose this area to live in because we have a preference for the larger block sizes and hence the lower density and this should not be taken away from us.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>It is recommended that the scheme amendment not be supported and that the proposal be flagged for consideration as part of a wider review of the area.</p> <p>Issues such as traffic will be considered comprehensively as part of the LPS6 review.</p>
4	Support	The amendments as outlined are in line with the development throughout other parts of the City of Melville. The proposal is upmarket and stylish and should be supported by the CoM.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Whilst the proposal is considered to have some merit, it is recommended that individual requests for changes to zonings or R-Codes be noted and considered comprehensively through the current LPS6 review program.</p>

5	Support	The amendments as outlined are in line with the development throughout other parts of the City of Melville. The proposal is upmarket and stylish and should be supported by the CoM.	Noted. Whilst the proposal is considered to have some merit, it is recommended that individual requests for changes to zonings or R-Codes be noted and considered comprehensively through the current LPS6 review program.
6	Support	Full support of the proposed amendment	Noted.
7	Support	This is a sensible amendment considering the development directly the rear of the applicant properties.	Noted. Whilst the proposal is considered to have some merit and the aged care facility has been considered as part of this process, it is recommended that individual requests for changes to zonings or R-Codes be noted and considered comprehensively through the current LPS6 review program.
8	Support	This is a good concept for the area transitioning from the high rise nearer Raffles and the nursing home to single dwellings down our end of Canning Beach Road but I would not want to see the zoning changed any further along Canning Beach Road at this point.	Noted. Whilst the proposal is considered to have some merit and the aged care facility has been considered as part of this process, it is recommended that individual requests for changes to zonings or R-Codes be noted and considered comprehensively through the current LPS6 review program.
9	Support	The existing house is an eyesores, it's deteriorating and needs to be demolished. It will be lovely to see a new development in place.	Noted. Whilst the proposal is considered to have some merit and the aged care facility has been considered as part of this process, it is recommended that individual requests for changes to zonings or R-Codes be noted and considered comprehensively through the current LPS6 review program.

10	Support	I will not be impacted at all by the amendments it will be aesthetically pleasing to the eye due to the current house (dwelling) being more than 40 years old I cannot see any impact but a positive one. What is more worrisome is the 6 story apartments close by with more than 30 apartments in them. This is a lot more of an impact to our streets than the proposal being put forward.	Noted. Whilst the proposal is considered to have some merit and the aged care facility has been considered as part of this process, it is recommended that individual requests for changes to zonings or R-Codes be noted and considered comprehensively through the current LPS6 review program.
11	Support	We support the proposed amendment on the basis that it will result in a more appropriate and better utilisation of the property site.	Noted.
12	Support	We would not be impacted by these amendments and feel it should be approved.	Noted.
13	Support	I have no objection to the proposed development of 45-47 Canning Beach Road.	Noted.
14	Object	The amendments will further increase higher density living in an area that will have traffic congestion due to increase in high rise buildings.	It is recommended that the scheme amendment not be supported and that the proposal be flagged for consideration as part of a wider review of the area. Issues such as traffic will be considered comprehensively as part of the LPS6 review.
15	Object	The amendments equate to further high density living in an area where traffic congestion has already become a major issue for residents exiting onto Canning Highway via Canning Beach Road and Kintail Road due to the recent increase in high rise buildings immediately to the north-west of Canning Bridge which is a point of congestion in its own right without having to accommodate further traffic movements.	It is recommended that the scheme amendment not be supported and that the proposal be flagged for consideration as part of a wider review of the area. Issues such as traffic will be considered comprehensively as part of the LPS6 review

16	Object	<p>We fully oppose any further extension to the current area that allows a higher density in residential and commercial properties. While there is a suggestion that there is infrastructure to support increased density, what is more important to consider, is the impact of this on the local residents and their way of life – increased traffic, congestion, lack of parking, loss of river views to properties that currently have them and whose designs were set on zoning at the time.</p> <p>You have set the precinct, please stick with your original decision. To not, will see the destruction of Applecross as a residential area. If this change is made, a precedent will be set. A suggestion – focus your attention and efforts to find occupants for the plethora of apartments that are still empty or have not been sold to date.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>It is recommended that the scheme amendment not be supported and that the proposal be flagged for consideration as part of a wider review of the area.</p> <p>Issues such as traffic and parking will be considered comprehensively as part of the LPS6 review</p>
17	Object	<p>I support the initial council decision in 2021 and oppose the application for rezoning at this point in time for the following reasons.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is no demonstrated need or public benefit from the expansion of the R30 zone at this stage and 2. No planning urgency has been demonstrated and 3. Matters of local zoning would be best considered along with other current planning issues in the immediate locality and 4. Much of what the applicants have submitted in order to overturn the Council's decision of 2021 and in support of this reapplication is irrelevant from a planning perspective and; 5. Despite the apparent efforts in the application to suggest that a particular supposedly desirable development would eventuate there can be no certainty about the post rezoning outcomes and 6. The application is in conflict with the intent of the Local Planning Strategy section 3.8 regarding the river foreshore areas <p>(Further consideration of these matters is discussed in more detail in submission)</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>It is recommended that the scheme amendment not be supported and that the proposal be flagged for consideration as part of a wider review of the area for similar reasons to the March 2021 decision.</p>

18	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Our beautiful Swan River fore shore should be protected from multi story buildings along the river. The RIVIERE multi story is setting a presedant that shouldn't be allowed to continue. 2. Should lot 45 and 47 blocks be giving the re zoning go ahead ,then perhaps lot 30 Opal nursing home will apply for a rezoning to R 30 too. 3. Our Riverway is a very small road and it will be overloaded from the new Nursing Home traffic we don't want this to escalate with more traffic from future multi story planning. 	<p>It is recommended that the scheme amendment not be supported and that the proposal be flagged for consideration as part of a wider review of the area.</p> <p>Issues such as traffic and parking will be considered comprehensively as part of the LPS6 review</p>
19	Support	I support the Zoning to be changed to meet the owner's request which helps developing the area for better.	Noted.
20	Support	We need some of these old homes rebuilt	Noted.
21	Object	We support all of the points stated in: OFFICER RECOMMENDATION (3964) REFUSAL. Submitted at the ordinary Council Meeting dated 15 February 2022 We are saying no to the rezoning proposal.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>It is recommended that the scheme amendment not be supported and that the proposal be flagged for consideration as part of a wider review of the area for similar reasons to the 15 February 2022 report.</p>
22	Neutral	<p>With regard to the proposed change in the coding for the above properties, I would like to submit a request that the entrance to Canning Beach Road on the corner of Kintail Road be re-opened.</p> <p>At the time, I opposed the closure due to the extra traffic load on Kintail and down my road at Carron Road and because it rewarded the bad driver behaviour who ignored the Give Way sign on the corner of Kintail and Canning Beach Road.</p> <p>Carron Road is a downhill slope to the South of Perth Yacht Club and Heathcote and vehicles thunder down there at all times – day and night. I am even woken by the City of Melville rubbish truck going down at 3:30 AM to wait until 6:45 to come back in the other direction to empty the bins. The type of vehicles coming down are early morning delivery vans to the aged community centre across</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>If the proposal is approved, the suggestions will be forwarded to the City's Technical Services Department.</p>

		<p>the road as well as skip bin trucks, food deliveries, builders, motor bikes, service vehicles etc. This street is not very wide and nowadays there is a lot of road rage. Anyway I have written to the council about this before and nothing has changed.</p> <p>What I suggest is that the lights be moved from the corner of Canning Beach Road/Canning Highway and placed back to the corner of Kintail/Canning Beach Road and that a Stop sign replace the lights on the entrance to Canning Highway. This would force the Kintail Road traffic to stop for vehicles entering Canning Beach Road from Canning Highway.</p> <p>By allowing traffic back onto Canning Beach Road it would give access to all the extra infill occurring on that one-sided street (as the river is on the other side).</p> <p>I also request that a three-way round-about be put in place at the entrance to Carron Road at the crossing to Tweeddale. This is a really sharp bend and a blind corner and it would prevent the hoons speeding down the hill.</p> <p>Please consider these suggestions as the traffic congestion and parking in this area is becoming unbearable.</p>	
23	Support	<p>I support a modest increase in density on Canning Beach Rd An architecturally designed 3 storey development will enhance the aesthetic in the locality which is still populated with too many old residences on large blocks. I will not be affected overly by the development other than enjoying an improved street scape when I'm in the area.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Whilst the proposal is considered to have some merit, it is recommended that individual requests for changes to zonings or R-Codes be noted and considered comprehensively through the current LPS6 review program.</p>
24	Support	<p>The owners of properties adjacent to 45-47 Canning Beach Rd, support Scheme Amendment No.14 and request it is expanded to include: 39, 41, 43 & 43A Canning Beach Rd (a signed document from all owners was submitted).</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Whilst the proposal is considered to have some merit, it is recommended that individual requests for changes to zonings or R-Codes be noted and considered comprehensively through the current LPS6 review program.</p>

			The wider area, including the properties listed in the submission will be considered as part of the LPS6 review.
25	Support.	No Impact	Noted.
26	Support	Happy with this, no impact	Noted.
27	Support	Has minimal impact on the amenity of the local surrounds and is in keeping with canning bridge re development	Noted.
28	Object	<p>This submission provides our objection to the proposed scheme amendment on the basis of the direct impact to the Applecross Shore Care Community and the proposed ad hoc approach to increasing density that has not been strategically considered more holistically for the location. The key considerations of our objection to the amendment are summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased residential density resulting in the potential increased usage of the freehold 30 Carron Road access leg abutting the northern boundary of 45 Canning Beach Road. Any potential for increased usage or increased access of Applecross Shore Care Community land for private benefit is not supported. • The likely amenity impacts the residents in the Care Community as a result of more intense development scenarios that are implied by an increased density coding of R30 including, but are not limited to, building size (site cover), building bulk, scale, setbacks, parking, privacy, acoustic, access and traffic implications, could negatively impact the amenity to the residents within the Care Community and on a wider view, the character of the locality. • The removal of 6m rear setback requirements under R12.5 would have significant building bulk impact to the Applecross Shore Care Community. • The fundamental inability of the spot rezoning amendment to satisfy the objective of orderly and proper planning of the locality. Rezoning of a residential area should only be considered as part of a wider strategic exercise under review of a local planning scheme and / or the Canning Bridge 	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Whilst the proposal is considered to have some merit, it is recommended that individual requests for changes to zonings or R-Codes be noted and considered comprehensively through the current LPS6 review program. The commencement of the review process has and will continue to prompt proposals for changes. These proposals are best steered into the review program.</p>

	<p>Activity Centre. Consideration of this amendment would provide precedent and basis for further zoning creep which would further impact the character of the locality and Applecross Shore Care Community as a result of associated built form and density considerations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The uncertainty of the Medium Density Code and suggestion that this could imply an additional yield of two dwellings across the site, as well as modified development control imposing potentially more significant built form requirements. <p>(Further consideration of these matters is discussed in more detail in submission)</p>	
--	---	--