

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

Modified Amendment No. 56 to Town of Victoria Park Town Planning Scheme No. 1

(Modified in accordance with Minister's decision dated 2 August 2021)

61 submissions total – 6 supporting; 1 partial support; 1 no position; 53 objections

Submissions Date	Street Address	Stated Interest	Position	Submission Comments	LG Officer Comments
Nov 25 21 10:30:52 am	Gresham Street, Victoria Park	I live in the Town of Victoria Park	Support	I support the amendment as modified by the Minister. The rezoning of the remainder of John Bissett Park to Parks and Recreation reflects what exists on the land at present. The vestigial land on the Carlisle side of the railway provides impracticable, unusable, low quality open space that would be better used for housing. The modification required by the Minister will enable to the Town to re-focus its efforts and resources in improving John Bissett Park (as well as other existing parks), instead of spending time and money attempting to purchase and retain very low quality open areas like Miller's Crossing. The R60 coding is appropriate for allowing for medium density, low rise housing in the inner city.	Support for modified amendment noted.
Nov 25 21 10:49:09 am	Canterbury Terrace, Lathlain	I live in the Town of Victoria Park	Do not support	The proposal for high density development on Miller's Crossing will remove a valuable piece of public open space, increase the heat island effect without any tree canopy mitigation, and increase traffic congestion in an already busy area. Miller's Crossing should be retained as public open space and planted with cockatoo food trees to replace those that were removed from Lathlain Oval five years ago.	Concerns noted. The local area contains a number of high quality public open spaces and local accessibility to such is not lacking as identified in the POSS. The development of the lots is not expected to generate additional traffic volumes that can not be accommodated by the existing local road network and the recommendation for a Local Development Plan (LDP) will seek to ensure the number and location of vehicular

Submissions Date	Street Address	Stated Interest	Position	Submission Comments	LG Officer Comments
					access points is appropriate. Vehicular traffic and parking are relevant factors to be assessed and considered in detail as part of any future development application for the land.
Nov 26 21 09:51:34 am	Custance St, Lathlain	I live in the Town of Victoria Park	Do not support	I am totally against rezoning of these lots to R60. There is absolutely no precedence for this. Carlisle is zoned R30 throughout, and R60 zoning here will be completely out of place. This is nothing short of a money making exercise by the government. It is a complete conflict of interest that the owner of the land is dictating the density zoning.	Objection noted.
Nov 26 21 09:52:38 am	O'Dea St, Carlisle	I live in the Town of Victoria Park	Do not support	I am totally against rezoning of these lots to R60. There is absolutely no precedence for this. Carlisle is zoned R30 throughout, and R60 zoning here will be completely out of place. This is nothing short of a money making exercise by the government. It is a complete conflict of interest that the owner of the land is dictating the density zoning.	Objection noted.
Nov 26 21 10:18 am	-	-	-	<p>1.) In relation to the roads at Raleigh St and Rutland Ave; I would like these to remain cul-de-sacs / no-through roads so that Miller Street does not become congested with further traffic. This is with either them being as they are (open space), or as proposed residential property. Additionally, I would like the round-about at Miller St and Bishopsgate St to remain, and no traffic lights added. I do not want vehicles slowing to stop on Miller St, Roberts Rd of these other two streets.</p> <p>2.) I do not want another train station at Miller St, as there is already sufficient access at Vic Park or Carlisle stations. I also do not want any additional walk-bridges over roads around that area.</p> <p>3.) I do not want the side-road section of Roberts Road modified in any way (i.e. 7 Roberts Road), and would like the traffic flow to remain as is whereby entering Miller St one way and mandatory left turn towards the round-about.</p> <p>4.) If Lots 6 & 7 (1003 & 1004) and 45 (1005) become residential, what does R60 mean in regards to the number of dwellings, the height of the buildings, the type of the buildings (i.e. house, unit, apartment, multi-storey). I do not want</p>	<p>Concerns and queries noted. The officer report provides an outline of potential dwelling yields and built form typologies that could potentially be developed on the Miller's Crossing lots in future.</p> <p>Future development in and of itself is not expected to generate traffic or other impacts that would influence the referenced road or rail infrastructure in/near the locality.</p> <p>Lot 1002 Beatty Avenue is proposed to be reserved 'Parks and Recreation' as part of John Bissett Reserve, and has remained</p>

Submissions Date	Street Address	Stated Interest	Position	Submission Comments	LG Officer Comments
				<p>multistorey buildings above 2 levels, however will consider undercroft parking in a basement as an additional level.</p> <p>5.) If Lots 6 & 7 (1003 & 1004) and 45 (1005) become residential, would you consider factoring in a publicly accessible small cafe in the dwelling complex? If not, what about one at Lot 1002 Beatty Avenue where the parks and recreation open space is proposed to remain.</p> <p>6.) I do not want this to set precedence to enable further parks and open spaces to be turned into residential dwellings around that area. Enough is enough, and that Lathlain and Vic Park area is best known for its parks and open spaces, I do not want this compromised.</p> <p>7.) I want Lot 1002 Beatty Avenue to remain parks and recreation open space. Alternatively, keep Miller's Crossing Lot 1003.</p> <p>My details are below, please call with any questions.</p>	consistently so as part of the originally initiated and further modified versions of Amendment 56 required by the Minister for Planning.
Nov 27 21 02:34:27 pm	Raleigh St, Carlisle	I live in the Town of Victoria Park, I live adjacent to the boundary of Amendment 56, I own a property adjacent to Amendment 56	Do not support	This is one of the few green spaces on Raleigh St in an area that is already increasingly becoming more dense due to subdivision of land. Please preserve our few green spaces.	Concerns noted. Refer to officer comments above regarding local public open space accessibility.
Nov 27 21 07:20:58 pm	Paltridge Avenue, Carlisle	I live in the Town of Victoria Park	Do not support	The green space is a space to reflect and sit, enjoy, look at the clouds and trees - it is for everyone to enjoy. I do not support the development of a space that already contributes green shared spaces in the TOVP.	Concerns noted. Refer to officer comments above regarding local public open space accessibility.
Nov 27 21 07:37:53 pm	Star St, Carlisle	I live in the Town of Victoria Park	Support	Density increase is appropriate for location	Support noted.
Nov 28 21 08:30:04 am	Mars St, Carlisle	I live in the Town of Victoria Park	Do not support	<p>I first came to live in Victoria Park in 2007. I have seen a lot of changes during this time, the largest of which is the removal of trees and green areas for residential or other building developments. My love for this town slips a little further away each time I see this.</p> <p>I love ToVP area immensely and I want the best for its future and its residents. I go running every day and my path takes me through Miller's Crossing. Amongst a pocket of townhouses, train lines and roads, Miller's Crossing is a welcome respite. A</p>	Concerns noted. The local area contains a number of high quality public open spaces and local accessibility to such is not lacking as identified in the POSS. The requirement for a LDP has been recommended to maximise

Submissions Date	Street Address	Stated Interest	Position	Submission Comments	LG Officer Comments
				<p>elongated area of cleared lawn through the middle, trees surrounding, mostly at each short end. Stop for a little while in the middle of the lawn and you can notice the bird life that call these trees home. Many residents from the surrounding streets in every direction would also target Miller's Crossing for the same mid-point of their neighborhood stroll or jog, or walk back home from getting the train after work. It's a reference point for many of ToVP's residents that is integral of their perception of where they live. Take it away, and their experience changes. You allow the dialogue to start of "this place was different when I was young" " it was so much greener here back in the day" all negative comments that the youth of today are tormented with by their parents and grandparents. A trend that I for one would like to stop so the future generations don't feel so doom and gloomy about their own future. - they will have enough to worry about lets give them a nice area to live at least. Remind them that respite pockets still exist. That we don't have to develop absolutely everything. That some things are - and should be - allowed to be left as they are. Reminders of where we've come from, of history, and a long established community. There are many other options to consider to increase the residential density of Vic Park that don't involve developing Miller's Crossing. Miller's Crossing development is a quick-fix boasting opportunity that will do very little in the long term to make a difference. ToVP needs to switch its focus to redeveloping existing areas and derelict industrial zones. I know a lot of folk who would love to live on repurposed industrial land! And a great deal more who would be very sad to live on a developed nature reserve. For the greater good, and long term future of this town, please reconsider the development of Miller's Crossing. Your kid's kids will thank you for it.</p> <p>Sincerely, a proud resident of Carlisle and the ToVP.</p>	<p>opportunities to retain mature trees as part of any future development of the Miller's Crossing land.</p>
Nov 28 21 11:04 am	Teague St, Victoria Park	Long term resident/ratepayer	Do not support	I do not support the proposed increase in density of the three lots comprising the Miller's Crossing open space from Residential R30 to Residential R60. We do not need any increase in density in this area. Miller's Crossing has already experienced a significant increase in traffic congestion in recent years. This is due mainly to the excessively high and	Concerns noted. The local area contains a number of high quality public open spaces and local accessibility to such is not lacking as identified in the

Submissions Date	Street Address	Stated Interest	Position	Submission Comments	LG Officer Comments
				unnecessary density of the Vic Quarter Boston Brewery development. Furthermore, I am sure this has led to an increase in traffic accidents and reduced safety for all residents, particularly school students who attend East Victoria Primary School. Therefore, as a long term rate payer I would like to see all of these blocks remain as green, public space which the Town of Victoria Park has alledegly prided itself on in recent times. I suspect that the motive for this unnecessary development is the potential increase in rates with virtually no increase in infrastructure or facilities.	POSS. The requirement for a LDP has been recommended to maximise opportunities to retain mature trees as part of any future development of the Miller's Crossing land. Traffic and parking would be relevant factors to be considered and assessed as part of any future development of the land.
Nov 29 21 05:34:05 pm	Raleigh St, Carlisle	I live in the Town of Victoria Park, I live adjacent to the boundary of Amendment 56, I own a property adjacent to Amendment 56	Do not support	Firstly Raleigh street can not handle any more traffic or cars. Secondly Lack of green space will also significantly affect residents' quality of life. There are also already significant disruptive behaviour and crime committed by housing department tenants and their associates at Cul de Sac of Raleigh street. High density housing will just make the area a crime central and affects surrounding suburbs.	Concerns noted. The local area contains a number of high quality public open spaces and local accessibility to such is not lacking as identified in the POSS. The requirement for a LDP has been recommended to maximise opportunities to retain mature trees and ensure the number and location of vehicular access points is appropriate, with vehicular traffic and parking being relevant factors to be assessed as part of any development application for the land.
Nov 29 21 7:10 pm	Teague St, Victoria Park	Affected local resident	Do not support	I do not support the proposed increase in density of the three lots comprising the Miller's Crossing open space from Residential R30 to Residential R60. Miller's Crossing has already experienced a significant increase in traffic congestion and I am sure this has led to an increase in traffic accidents and reduced safety for all residents. Why is this being done?, it's a is it just for more rates with no increase in infrastructure or facilities. Is the town	Objection noted. Potential future rate income has not informed the recommendation of Council officers in respect to this matter.

Submissions Date	Street Address	Stated Interest	Position	Submission Comments	LG Officer Comments
				that poor that it needs to sell its few open areas? I would like to see all of these blocks remain as open public space in the Town of Victoria Park, surely if you keep covering the few open spaces we have the town will be just an concrete jungle. Its then too late. So lets not increase density and what little green spaces remain.	
Nov 29 21 07:20:24 pm	Raleigh Street, Carlisle	I live in the Town of Victoria Park, I own a property adjacent to Amendment 56	Do not support	The suggested amendments will negatively impact on our family lifestyle. We currently use Lot 1002, 1003 and 1004 daily for our young children to play and run around. When we purchased our property, we were comfortable with the smaller backyard because we knew we could utilise the parks at the end of our street. A 1 minute walk from home. It has been our hope that as the children grow, we will be able to send them down by themselves to run around in nature. Removing access to nature and expansive running space will greatly impact on us. Please reconsider. May I also add that we are not alone in using these spaces. The streets that branch off of this space are full of houses with minimal backyards. We all rely on this space for our easter egg hunts/ dog walks and footy games.	Concerns noted. Refer to officer comments above regarding local public open space accessibility.
Nov 29 21 07:53:45 pm	Bishopsgate Street, Carlisle	I live in the Town of Victoria Park	Do not support	Better use of the area could be to enhance the user experience with more amenities / more trees / community gardens / small public events - markets, music in the park ...	Objection noted.
Nov 29 21 08:08:30 pm	O'Dea St, Carlisle	I live in the Town of Victoria Park	Do not support	Less Green Area... Why not plant trees ?	Objection noted.
Nov 29 21 08:10:11 pm	Raleigh St, Carlisle	I own a property adjacent to Amendment 56	Do not support	There is insufficient information to support the proposal given it is a highly constrained site. The nature and type of development could vary significantly and either be positive or negative overall. I am concerned about retention of trees on the site and traffic management to the site. Raleigh street is already congested with parked cars, and an R60 development could make this worse. This site needs very carefully planning if it is to be developed. The loss of open and green space is also a concern given the type of unit development that has already taken place in the area. The existing reserve helps reduce the heat island effect from the existing development.	Concerns noted. Refer to officer comments above regarding local public open space accessibility, the recommended requirement for a LDP, and traffic and parking matters.
Nov 29 21 08:45:35 pm	Bishopsgate Street, Carlisle	I live in the Town of Victoria Park, I live adjacent to	Do not support	We need more parks for growing community	Objection noted.

Submissions Date	Street Address	Stated Interest	Position	Submission Comments	LG Officer Comments
		the boundary of Amendment 56			
Nov 29 21 08:51:35 pm	Mars St, Carlisle	I live in the Town of Victoria Park	Do not support		Objection noted.
Nov 29 21 08:54:10 pm	Mars St, Carlisle	I live in the Town of Victoria Park	Do not support	Keep the parks, no more housing. You have the highest rates in WA you do not need to line your coffers any more!	Objection noted.
Nov 29 21 09:02:56 pm	Carlisle	I live in the Town of Victoria Park	Do not support	I would like to see Miller's Crossing remain as public open space (POS) for a number of reasons: 1) POS is needed in Carlisle - there aren't enough parks as it is 2) Traffic congestion is already terrible in that area, and adding R60 developments will make it significantly worse.	Concerns noted. Refer to officer comments above regarding local public open space accessibility and traffic and parking matters.
Nov 29 21 09:24:56 pm	Raleigh St, Carlisle	I live in the Town of Victoria Park	Do not support	Higher density housing will only add to the current crime that already exists in Carlisle. We bought our unit on Raleigh st for the quiet atmosphere not a high density neighbourhood.	Objection noted.
Nov 29 21 10:02:45 pm	O'Dea St, Carlisle	I live in the Town of Victoria Park	Do not support	We need to retain the nature area in this zone. We do not need future housing as it will impact the area.	Objection noted.
Nov 29 21 10:13 pm	Bishopsgate St, Carlisle	Carlisle resident approx. 20 years	Support	I just wanted to make a general comment that I wholeheartedly support this amendment as in the longer term we need to curb urban sprawl and encourage urban infill wherever we can. Having said that, it will be crucial to maintain the significant trees on these sites in keeping with the Town's Urban Forest Strategy to provide shade and absorb the ever increasing CO2 emissions. And any new build on there should be as sustainable as possible, utilising passive design, energy efficiency and renewable energy sources as much as possible to reduce carbon footprint.	Support noted.
Nov 30 21 01:02:41 am	Raleigh St, Carlisle	I live in the Town of Victoria Park	Do not support	We need more green spaces, not less, to combat climate change and retain the visual and communal amenity of our suburbs. The area would be of more benefit to ratepayers and wildlife if it was planted with a forest of native trees and plants instead of just being a source of rate income for the Council.	Concerns noted. Refer to officer comments above regarding local public open space accessibility and recommended requirement for a LDP to maximise tree retention opportunities.
Nov 30 21 05:42:33 am	Solar Way, Carlisle	I live in the Town of Victoria Park	Do not support	The presence of parks and nature reserves is one of the things that makes the Town of Victoria Park appealing. Far too many of these areas are being amended to residential causing crowding and increased traffic. The Town of Victoria Park has become far too crowded in the last 10 years; I believe we need	Concerns noted. Refer to officer comments above regarding local public open space accessibility and recommended requirement

Submissions Date	Street Address	Stated Interest	Position	Submission Comments	LG Officer Comments
				to moderate the urban infill and keep these green areas for community enjoyment.	for a LDP to maximise tree retention opportunities.
Nov 30 21 06:09:17 am	Raleigh St, Carlisle	I live in the Town of Victoria Park	Do not support	I always walk my dog there and love the green spaces for the many bird life that is there.	Objection noted.
Nov 30 21 08:02:01 am	Paltridge Avenue, Carlisle	I live in the Town of Victoria Park	Do not support	Carlisle is very low in the amount of public open space and any building on this area will further reduce this. If there has to be building on this space I believe there needs to be a Local Development Plan that would ensure any development would be done sensitively and of a high quality.	Objection noted.
Nov 30 21 08:08:44 am	Jupiter St, Carlisle	I live in the Town of Victoria Park	Do not support	Concerned about the increase in density. I never supported the use of this land for housing, instead it should have been retained as public open space as part of the Urban Forest Strategy. The increase just increases the burden on the surrounding areas in terms of amenity, car usage and traffic conflict. Will also increase non permeable space and concrete, increasing the urban heat effect.	Objection noted.
Nov 30 21 08:46:50 am	Bishopsgate Street, Carlisle	I live in the Town of Victoria Park	Support	I think it's a fantastic idea to bring more people into the area. The small grassed areas are very under-utilised in my opinion, I travel past them almost daily and rarely see people using them as they are too small for anything useful. The only time I see them being used is by dog owners that are letting their dogs play there off lead which is illegal, I have been chased more than once as I've walked through the grassed areas. Developing the small grassed areas will encourage those dog owners to walk the additional 100m to the actual dog exercise area.	Support noted.
Nov 30 21 09:07:58 am	Beatty Ave, East Victoria Park	I live in the Town of Victoria Park	Do not support	Very disappointing and extremely frustrating that the wishes of the community are always repeatedly ignored. Amazed that the council planned to get rid of half John Bisset reserve. Honestly, you have a tree as a council logo, why not change that to a house as well.	Objection noted.
Nov 30 21 09:41:58 am	Rutland Ave, Lathlain	I live in the Town of Victoria Park	Do not support	The ToVP Need as much green and park for future generations and wild life. Most of the older houses I are being pulled down for multi development. Leave the parks to cater for the numerous apartments and units being built and population growth.	Objection noted.
Nov 30 21 10:22:22 am	Forster Ave, Lathlain	I live in the Town of Victoria Park, I live adjacent to	Do not support	I personally use these spaces everyday for recreation, they provide an invaluable green space to safely walk the dog without having to cross at the busy roberts road/bishops gate	Concerns noted. The local area contains a number of high quality public open

Submissions Date	Street Address	Stated Interest	Position	Submission Comments	LG Officer Comments
		the boundary of Amendment 56, I own a property adjacent to Amendment 56		intersection. They are an extra space to exercise a dog safely without being on top of the children, families and others who are playing, exercising and enjoying a meal/celebrations in koolbardi park. We also use the dog park there, but this space is important for a walking space when koolbardi is often pretty packed. Further the traffic situation there is already busy so adding more vehicles to the space and removing a safe walking area will only compound the issue.	spaces and local accessibility to such is not lacking as identified in the POSS.
Nov 30 21 10:31:42 am	Raleigh St, Carlisle	I live in the Town of Victoria Park	Support	More interested to know if there will be a Local Development Plan created for the 3 Lots or some other planning instrument that allows the community more involvement in what uses can be established here and how it will look.	Support noted. The requirement for a LDP has been recommended as a further modification to Amendment 56 to facilitate high quality design and optimal streetscape outcomes.
Nov 30 21 10:35:44 am	Paltridge Avenue, Carlisle	I live adjacent to the boundary of Amendment 56	Do not support	I would prefer to keep the green space in an already densely populated Carlisle. If Co-vid has shown us anything it is how much as someone living in a rear duplex needs and appreciates some greenery to access.	Concerns noted. The local area contains a number of high quality public open spaces and local accessibility to such is not lacking as identified in the POSS.
Nov 30 21 11:08:19 am	Harris St, Carlisle	I live in the Town of Victoria Park	Do not support	Should be left as green space	Objection noted.
Nov 30 21 03:33:47 pm	Lion St, Carlisle	I live in the Town of Victoria Park	Do not support	For heaven's sake, we need more green spaces. NOT more housing. Global warming is a reality and green spaces, especially those that include trees are one way of reducing heat. This plan seems to be way out of line with current thinking.	Concerns noted.
Nov 30 21 06:55:40 pm	Cohn St, Carlisle	I live in the Town of Victoria Park	Do not support	I would like to keep as much nature as possible in my beauty suburb.	Objection noted.
Nov 30 21 07:28:26 pm	O'Dea St, Carlisle	I live in the Town of Victoria Park	Do not support	Decreased green space which is important for enjoyment of area and well-being. I really enjoy walking through this area when going to the Vic Pk strip.	
Nov 30 21 07:56:43 pm	Apollo Way, Carlisle	I live in the Town of Victoria Park	Do not support		Objection noted.
Nov 30 21 10:20:22 pm	Lathlain	I live in the Town of Victoria Park	Do not support	It will increase unsocial behaviour in Carlisle and surrounding suburbs and, we have enough of that already. We need more	Concerns noted. Refer to officer comments above

Submissions Date	Street Address	Stated Interest	Position	Submission Comments	LG Officer Comments
				green areas in our suburbs than we do housing. Let people live somewhere else!	regarding local public open space accessibility.
Dec 01 21 05:31:50 pm	Cohn St, Carlisle	I live in the Town of Victoria Park	Do not support	It would be a shame. My son likes to play there with his cousins who live on Raleigh Street.	Objection noted.
Dec 1 21 7:29 pm	-	-	Do not support	I do not support the higher density rezoning of Miller's Crossing from R30 to R60.	Objection noted.
Dec 06 21 11:51:34 am	Bishopsgate Street, Carlisle	I live in the Town of Victoria Park, I own a property adjacent to Amendment 56	Do not support	This is a greedy proposal. It will not help overall with affordable housing and will instead just cram more people into an already tight space. I use this park to walk my dogs - in part because there are already too many people and dogs in Koolbardi Park - and the cool breeze and green space is much needed in the area. There are other ways for the State to fix up housing affordability and it's not by destroying green space in an already over-zoned area. Don't be pushed over by this - be strong. We elected some of you councillors on the basis of environmental record and helping the community achieve its community plans - remember that much of that relates to open spaces and tree cover. This proposal is not in line with that; it's just greed. Allow this park to be improved by the Urban Forresters or other community groups and see the community benefits for years to come.	Concerns noted. Refer to officer comments above regarding local public open space accessibility and recommended requirement for a LDP to maximise tree retention opportunities.
Dec 12 21 10:31 pm	-	-	Do not support	Having read the paper work supplied on this matter we feel that the Town of Victoria Park should tell the state to bugger off. There are very few areas that are dedicated to parks and recreation in this area of the Lathlain Pk and Carlisle. Should in years to come these lots would be reduced in size as Miller St and Roberts road need to be widened for increased traffic flow. Where are the trees on the railway land? Here is a chance for the Council to show its metal we don't need any more high rise in our area.	Objection noted.
Dec 14 21 10:22:29 am	Raleigh St, Carlisle	I live in the Town of Victoria Park, I live adjacent to the boundary of Amendment 56	Do not support	As Raleigh St is a cul de sac and already a high density area I would be against making it even more densely populated, the cars from dwellings and businesses in the street already make driving in the street a problem. As one of the highest density councils already I am against this proposal as there is no need to change the zoning and make the area for those who live in it worse off.	Concerns noted.

Submissions Date	Street Address	Stated Interest	Position	Submission Comments	LG Officer Comments
Dec 14 21 04:34:22 pm	Raleigh St, Carlisle	I live in the Town of Victoria Park	Do not support	Parking and Traffic at 2 cul-de-sacs. There is already congestion on Raleigh and Planet Streets all day every day and night. Open space joining the parks is the only sensible option.	Concerns noted. Refer to officer comments above regarding traffic and parking matters.
Dec 31 21 02:42:46 pm	Raleigh St, Carlisle	I live in the Town of Victoria Park	Do not support	The potential for increased density developments will be aesthetically inconsistent with the existing community around the lots, further increasing the loss of the visual amenity that will already result from the development of the park land. Higher density developments have a strong potential to intrude on the privacy of lower lying R30 developments, and further increase parking stress on Raleigh Street where there are already issues, and potential future issues on 'game days' at nearby football oval. In short, the increase in density will only have negative impacts to the local community.	Concerns noted. The requirement for a LDP has been recommended as a further modification to Amendment 56 to facilitate high quality design and optimal streetscape outcomes.
Dec 31 21 02:43:25 pm	Raleigh St, Carlisle	I live in the Town of Victoria Park, I live adjacent to the boundary of Amendment 56, I own a property adjacent to Amendment 56	Do not support	I have lived on raleigh st (the cul-de-sac end for over 15 years. I was very disappointed to hear of the plan to develop this land which has been a lovely corridor of green space and trees for many years. I had hoped the tovp might buy some or all of the land and maintain it as a reserve. Raleigh st has become much busier as the old houses have been replaced by villas (r30). There is a lot of traffic even though it is a cul-de-sac. A steady stream of cars, vans and trucks use this section of raleigh st to turn around and/or park in order to access the commercial properties on the corner of archer street. The intersection has become somewhat of a nightmare with traffic banking up along archer st waiting for vehicles to turn into raleigh. I was shocked to read that an application to change the zoning to r60 had been made. I totally oppose this amendment on the basis of the loss of green space (which is used and appreciated by many, including the bird life) and also because i envisage an unacceptable increase in traffic, congestion and parking in this section of raleigh st.	Concerns noted. The local area contains a number of high quality public open spaces and local accessibility to such is not lacking as identified in the POSS. The requirement for a LDP has been recommended to maximise opportunities to retain mature trees and ensure the number and location of vehicular access points is appropriate, with vehicular traffic and parking being relevant factors to be assessed as part of any development application for the land.
Jan 1 22 11:54 am	Bishopsgate St, Carlisle	Local Raleigh Street residents and property owners	Do not support	Please be advised that we STRONGLY OPPOSE Town Planning Scheme No1-Amendment No 56 being modified. The land being discussed is known as Miller's Crossing' and provides the last long corridor for our native bird life. In particular the Red Tailed Cockatoo (Calyptorhynchus banksii). As we all know when Mineral Resources Football Club was	Concerns noted. The local area contains a number of high quality public open spaces and local accessibility to such is not lacking as identified in the

Submissions Date	Street Address	Stated Interest	Position	Submission Comments	LG Officer Comments
				developed much of the Red Tailed Cockatoo food source, nesting trees and a place to rest between their feeding corridors were destroyed. Since this time we have noticed their dwindling presence in our area. If we are to learn anything from this development is that we must REDUCE impact on the native bird life habitat. Secondly, as your colored aerial photograph of Raleigh Street and its surrounding area show there is high density living in this area. Nearly every block in your aerial shot shows three houses or units developed on each site. As we have experienced in our street when there is disruptive behaviour it effects many residents and I believe this would only increase with more development at the end of our street. Lastly the open land provides many local residents with a quite area to walk and play with their dogs. Many families go to the parks to play casual cricket games and all the pathways are used by joggers, walkers and families biking. Please consider a QUICK cash grab against promoting an area that people would actually like to live in. When we chose Raleigh St we actually took into consideration the fact there were parks at the end of our street and that it was a quiet Cul de sac. We felt these were positive influences in purchasing our property. We were amazed at the variety of native bird life and the community feeling in our street. We would hate to see this beautiful area change due a short sighted plan for this area.	POSS. The requirement for a LDP has been recommended to maximise opportunities to retain mature trees as part of any future development of the Miller's Crossing land. The development of the land for medium density purposes is aligned with State and local planning framework objectives and has potential to result in high quality built form and streetscape outcomes, with appropriate planning controls (e.g. LDP) in place.
Jan 05 22 11:24:53 am	Rutland Ave, Lathlain	I own a property adjacent to Amendment 56	Do not support	In a suburb with such a lack of open green space, to turn what are currently well-used community parks into high density, high rise units, strikes me as a tremendous loss to the character and amenity of Carlisle.	Concerns noted. Refer to officer comments above.
Jan 08 22 04:10:48 pm	Raleigh St, Carlisle	I live in the Town of Victoria Park	Do not support	This rezoning would be a disaster to our community. Our one way street is already flat out with traffic and to push more people down it will only cause issues. Our green spaces are currently limited so it will be a disaster to take these away. We utilise the spaces at the end of our street on a regular basis and we always see young families doing the same thing.	Concerns noted. Refer to officer comments above.
Jan 09 22 11:37:02 am	Raleigh St, Carlisle	I live in the Town of Victoria Park	Do not support	We bought our property with only a patio for outside space, knowing we had the green space at the end of our street. We are also very worried about the road traffic that would increase ten fold if the proposal goes ahead.	Concerns noted. Refer to officer comments above.

Submissions Date	Street Address	Stated Interest	Position	Submission Comments	LG Officer Comments
Jan 9 22 8:24 pm	Raleigh St, Carlisle	Affected property owner/resident	Do not support	<p>We wish to voice our strong opposition to any development of the abovementioned lands.</p> <p>Our reasons are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Blocks once housing one house, have been redeveloped into multi units, reducing the open space of back yards. - Residents in Raleigh Street have only got Lots 1004, 1003 and 1005 to exercise, take the children for walks and play, walk the dogs and generally stroll for fresh air and a safe area to escape the closed in feeling of having buildings close around us. Any further development will greatly reduce and hinder ours and other residents in teh area the enjoyment of having the open space. - Another very important aspect to consider is the antisocial behaviour in the area. This has become a real problem in recent times. Again any further development will create more of this problem. - As this residential area is close to the Victoria Park cafe strip and Football Oval, any more congestion in the areas is detrimental to all residents, Parking for visitors and residents is at a premium now and further development exacerbates the problem even further. - The open space as it is now, creates a social lifeline of freedom, enjoyment and relaxation for the Ages Residents, young mothers, and those who suffer mental health issues. Walking and the feeling of having "space" is an area where they can take time out in the open space to gather their thoughts, get out of the house for a break and assist in the healing of health issues. <p>These are have been set aside as open spaces and should remain so. Creating further congestion and social issues does not fare well for the local residents, Local Council (whom we are sure would like contented rate payers) and visitors.</p>	<p>Concerns noted. The local area contains a number of high quality public open spaces and local accessibility to such is not lacking as identified in the POSS. The requirement for a LDP has been recommended to maximise opportunities to retain mature trees as part of any future development of the Miller's Crossing land and ensure high quality built form and streetscape outcomes. Traffic, parking and CPTED (crime prevention through environmental design) would be relevant factors to be considered and assessed as part of any future development of the land.</p>
Jan 14 22 03:37:06 pm	Rutland Ave, Lathlain	I own a property adjacent to Amendment 56	Do not support	<p>'I oppose the amended changes to increase density from R30 to R60 for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reduction in public open space which is ever reducing in Carlisle / Lathlain - For bikers, walkers, this space provides a green corridor link between the Carlisle Station, East Vic park to the Lathlain precinct. 	<p>Concerns noted. The local area contains a number of high quality public open spaces and local accessibility to such is not lacking as identified in the POSS.</p>

Submissions Date	Street Address	Stated Interest	Position	Submission Comments	LG Officer Comments
				<p>- Parks in particular the Lot 1003 (No. 7) Raleigh Street, get significant use and ensure the other parks aren't overcrowded.</p> <p>- As a member of the CRG for the Carlisle and Oats train station upgrades, removing this green corridor link between the new public space around the station and the Lathlain Precinct goes against the themes of trying to create an inclusive zone where people want to spend time and explore this zone.</p> <p>- Around 70% of previous submissions opposed development and supported purchase and continuation of the lots being used as public open space. Further increasing density from r30 to r60 goes even further against the wishes of the community and the TOVP public open space strategy.</p> <p>My main concern as a resident on Rutland Ave is for the development of Lot 1003 (No. 7) Raleigh Street. This is for a few reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is currently a cul-de-sac street with a bike path and when the railway upgrades are completed, foot traffic should increase in this area. If this site is developed I would be strongly opposed to access to this block from Rutland Avenue and would suggest access should be from Raleigh Street. The bike path has already narrowed this road considerably reducing ability to park on the street. If residents and there guests were to access housing from Rutland Avenue I anticipate safety issues with flow of cars and foot traffic increasing. The street already has an issue with parked cars being broken into and if we see an increase in parked cars on this street then its going to lead to increase in burglaries and the attention of undesirables hopping off the train 2. This lot is the only lot of the three which has manicured gardens and heavy development of this lot would go against the town of vic parks urban forest strategy. 3. Residents on this street have already been shafted by the decision to elevate rail as opposed to sinking the rail. Heavy development and future traffic flow if housing is accessed from Rutland Ave will increase noise levels and adversely affect house prices in the immediate vicinity to the developments. The development of both the rail and large scale development may affect integrity of houses in immediate vicinity and therefore pre-dilapidation reports should be completed on 	<p>The development of the lots is not expected to generate additional traffic volumes that can not be accommodated by the existing local road network and the recommendation for a LDP will seek to ensure the number and location of vehicular access points is appropriate. Vehicular traffic and parking are relevant factors to be assessed and considered in detail as part of any future development application for the land.</p>

Submissions Date	Street Address	Stated Interest	Position	Submission Comments	LG Officer Comments
				houses to monitor adverse effects from development. If the density does increase then stringent conditions should be put in place to minimize the adverse effects stated above and they should synergise with the Town of Vic Parks future strategies and other related organisations such as metronet rail upgrades.	
Jan 18 22 4:08 pm	Farnham St, Bentley	-	Support	<p>Are supportive of the WAPC modified amendment 2021. In May 2016 by letter, the WAPC clearly told Town of Victoria Park, that as the landowner they were to sell the land for infill development. That they would not donate the land, and would sell it at market value. They also were generous enough to allow a piece of road reserve land on the Victoria Park side of the rail line to be rezoned into parks & recreation. Town of Victoria Park needs to continue to move forward on this, and not backwards. Moving forward is accepting the 2021 modified amendment.</p> <p>The lands were previously residential, with homes on them, prior to their demolition for road reserve/bridge building. Residents in proximity to the road reserve lands should feel fortunate for years since 2004 that they have been able to access those lands as default open space on a temporary basis. Furthermore some residents should be pleased that the Miller Street overpass bridge does not need to be widened (because that could potentially generate more vehicle traffic and more vehicle noise).</p> <p>The recent State Member of Parliament for the Seat of Victoria Park, Mr Ben Wyatt was in support of those State-owned lands being returned into residential due to their proximity to the passenger rail network AND proximity to amenities. I agree with WAPC placing R60 across the site. Many properties in the vicinity have already been cut up into 3 pieces and turned into medium-density residential.</p> <p>I never believed any of the 2019, 2020 scaremongering that the Department of Housing/Communities would gain the site, towers to be built, and zero ratepayer-revenue from it. In 2021 the WAPC has told the Town of Victoria Park of their intention to deliver the lands as high-quality medium-density development. Plus how WAPC's process for the sale of the land can be used to ensure a high-quality development</p>	Support noted. The local area contains a number of high quality public open spaces and local accessibility to such is not lacking as identified in the POSS. The development of the land for medium density purposes is aligned with State and local planning framework objectives and has potential to result in a high quality built form and streetscape outcomes, with appropriate planning controls (e.g. LDP) in place.

Submissions Date	Street Address	Stated Interest	Position	Submission Comments	LG Officer Comments
				<p>outcome for the area is achieved.</p> <p>The WAPC knows that location of Lathlain/Carlisle is a premium residential location, and the luxury builds that are nearby (and increasing).</p> <p>There is nothing to fear, a quality residential outcome will occur in the future on the WAPC owned sites.</p> <p>Furthermore. I continue to believe and advocate for Town of Victoria Park to purchase properties the southern side of Carlisle to turn into new public open space. That would be more worthwhile than concentrating efforts on retrofitting drainage sumps to deal with the public open space deficient zones in the suburb.</p>	
Jan 19 22	Sunbury Road, Victoria Park	Affected local property owner/resident	Do no support	<p>I wish to strongly object to plans to change the Miller's Crossing land to residential. I know it seems it has already been gazetted residential R30 and now the Minister for Planning wants to lift the zoning to R60. It is a stupid idea, the land should remain Park and Recreation. There is so little green space that we can't afford to lose any. The Council has been recently planting trees on people's verges in Victoria Park and Carlisle and here is a lovely corridor of established trees and green lawns. Surely the Council is not going to let the Planning Minister force them the change it to residential and cut down the trees. Enough tree were sacrificed to the Eagles Oval. Every day coming and going to work I drive down Roberts Road and over the bridge. The patch of green along Raleigh Street and Bishopsgate Street gives my spirit a lift on the way to work and peace and rest at the end of the day.</p> <p>Everywhere you look development is taking place, which is not a bad thing but that little space has been developed [as park land] and should stay as it is. Tell the Minister to go and take away someone else's green park. Over time O have seen children playing in the space, mothers pushing prams, children on bikes. So many people use the space for different reasons. I know my letter won't achieve very much but if you don't stand up and try it's no good complaining when you get walked over.</p>	Concerns noted. The local area contains a number of high quality public open spaces and local accessibility to such is not lacking as identified in the POSS. The requirement for a LDP has been recommended to maximise opportunities to retain mature trees as part of any future development of the Miller's Crossing land.
Jan 20 22 4:45 pm	Raleigh St, Carlisle	Affected local property owner/resident	Support in Part	<p>I ask that Council and WAPC consider allocation of a portion of Lot 1004 for sale to me as an adjoining land owner; that I can access rear of my property for an appropriate medium density development. I have made such written submission to WAPC</p>	Submission dismissed. The Town is not the appropriate conduit to facilitate land acquisition discussions.

Submissions Date	Street Address	Stated Interest	Position	Submission Comments	LG Officer Comments
				<p>in 2007, 2012, 2016. To Town of Victoria park various plans sympathetic to this area in 2018 and 2020, and written to Mayor and Councillors for same.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Any re-zoning to consider Tree, Fauna and Flora preservation. - Serious consideration given to retaining Lot 1003 as Public [open] Space; this is an open space recreation park suited to the area, in constant high use by residents from all over; and provides to a different demographic than the Bishopsgate reserve. - Schematic attached. 	Private development interests of a neighbouring property owner are not relevant planning considerations and would be inappropriate for the Town to consider in the context of resolving its recommendation in relation to modified Amendment 56.
Jan 20 22 06:56:20 pm	O'Dea St, Carlisle	I live in the Town of Victoria Park	Do not support	<p>I think it's too early to develop the land. It should continue being retained as a road reserve for widening of the bridge at Miller's Crossing.</p> <p>When Orrong Rd is widened, access to Roberts Rd will be easier for cars.</p> <p>The Town of Vic Park also has a plan to narrow Archer St (to slow cars to improve access for bicycles), which will also divert traffic to Roberts Rd.</p> <p>Hence Roberts Rd Reserve needs to be wide enough to hold 4 lanes including across Miller's Crossing.</p> <p>I would not like to see what happened at 113 Orrong Rd Rivervale where the land was sold off and a 2 story building constructed but then traffic along Francesco St became busier than planned and the 2 storey building prevents widening of that intersection.</p> <p>Another example is the train line under Miller Crossing being sunk below grade 20yrs ago but soon the train line will be above grade at Archer St.</p> <p>I live close to Roberts Rd and would prefer not to see congestion, especially when it can be avoided.</p> <p>Long term, once Roberts Rd is widened, any remaining land could remain as vegetation as part of a green corridor for wildlife connecting John Bissett Reserve to Koolbardi Park. I am not opposed to Terraced housing, and other areas in Carlisle may be suited to density higher than R30.</p>	Concerns noted. The local area contains a number of high quality public open spaces and local accessibility to such is not lacking as identified in the POSS. The requirement for a LDP has been recommended to maximise opportunities to retain mature trees and ensure the number and location of vehicular access points is appropriate, with vehicular traffic and parking being relevant factors to be assessed as part of any development application for the land.
Jan 21 22 04:49:31 pm	Raleigh St, Carlisle	I live in the Town of Victoria Park, I live adjacent to	Do not support	<p>1. The Amendment No.56 proposal is counter to the Town of Victoria Park's Urban Forest program and the Green Basins program, which are intended to improve the function,</p>	Concerns noted. The development of the lots is not expected to generate

Submissions Date	Street Address	Stated Interest	Position	Submission Comments	LG Officer Comments
		the boundary of Amendment 56, I own a property adjacent to Amendment 56		<p>appearance and ecological contribution of these open spaces.</p> <p>2. The Miller's Crossing open spaces are essential for the amenity and mental health of local residents, due to small block sizes and increasing population density of the surrounding properties.</p> <p>3. Many of the properties in the surrounding area have little or no green canopy due to small block sizes and high residential density.</p> <p>4. Motor vehicle parking on Raleigh Street is already at a premium, causing frequent traffic congestion along the street. An increase in the residential zoning and subsequent population increase will further exacerbate this congestion.</p> <p>5. Currently, there are repeated occurrences of anti-social behaviour close to the Roberts Road end of Raleigh Street. The WA Police and Homes West personnel have not been able to correct this. An increase in residential density at this end of Raleigh Street will have a detrimental effect on all residents of Raleigh Street.</p> <p>6. All of the residents in Raleigh Street that I have spoken with are opposed to the proposed increase in density of the three lots comprising 'Miller's Crossing' open space from 'Residential R30' to 'Residential R60'.</p>	additional traffic volumes that can not be accommodated by the existing local road network. The recommendation for a LDP will seek to ensure the number and location of vehicular access points is appropriate, with vehicular traffic and parking being relevant factors to be assessed in detail as part of any development application for the land.
Jan 21 22 08:05:34 pm	Raleigh St, Carlisle	I live in the Town of Victoria Park, I live adjacent to the boundary of Amendment 56, I own a property adjacent to Amendment 56	Do not support	It will substantially increase traffic to a street that it already too busy and not big enough to handle the flow. The parks are utilized by a lot of people for a range of different activities	Concerns noted. The development of the lots is not expected to generate additional traffic volumes that can not be accommodated by the existing local road network. The recommendation for a LDP will seek to ensure the number and location of vehicular access points is appropriate, with vehicular traffic and parking being relevant factors to be assessed as part of any development application for the land.

Submissions Date	Street Address	Stated Interest	Position	Submission Comments	LG Officer Comments
Jan 21 22 08:07:34 pm	Raleigh St, Carlisle	I live in the Town of Victoria Park, I live adjacent to the boundary of Amendment 56, I own a property adjacent to Amendment 56	Do not support	We live culdesac end of Raleigh street right near lot 1003 and 1004. The street is always extremely busy with a significant number of cars parked on the street. The culdesac is quite tight and having a significant dense residential development will make the street impossible to navigate. Further, these green open spaces are regularly used by my family and plenty of others in the community for walking and exercising dogs, playing sports etc.	Concerns noted. Refer to officer comments above.