

Case Citation No.	Delivered/Published	Case Name	Determination
WASAT 31	24 May 2019	Optus Mobile and City of Stirling	<p>The City of Stirling refused an application for the installation of a 20 metre monopole with an overall height of 21.6 metres (including all equipment) and ancillary facilities at No. 366 Grand Promenade, Dianella. Following mediation, the infrastructure was modified to reduce the height to a 18.5 metre high monopole with a 3 metre high shroud covering panel antennas.</p> <p>The Tribunal determined that the proposed development was needed for effective telecommunications service provision of an effective telecommunications service and network as it would facilitate continuous network coverage and improve the telecommunications services to the community. The Tribunal was satisfied that the infrastructure had been sited and designed to minimise its visual impacts on the character and amenity of the locality and found that the visual impact of the proposed development was acceptable.</p> <p>The Tribunal determined that, in the exercise of direction, the proposed development warranted approval subject to appropriate conditions.</p>
WASAT 10	15 February 2018	NBN and City of Swan	<p>The City of Swan refused an application for the installation of a 30 metre high monopole; four panel antennas and eight remote radio units; one parabolic dish antenna; two outdoor cabinets at ground level; a 2.4 metre high chain link security compound fence; and ancillary equipment associated with the operation of the facility at No. 158 Hardwick Road, Millendon.</p> <p>The issue for determination in this matter was whether the visual impact of the monopole was such that the proposed development warranted refusal. The respondent accepted that the proposed development would produce a community benefit.</p> <p>The Tribunal was satisfied that the development was consistent with the principles embodied in <i>State Planning Policy 5.2 – Telecommunications Infrastructure</i> and was persuaded that the community benefits derived from the proposed facility outweighed the consequential visual impacts on the locality. Consequently development approval was granted.</p>
WASAT 4	19 January 2018	Vodafone Hutchinson Australia and Town of Claremont	<p>The City of Cockburn refused an application for the erection of a 35 metre high monopole with three panel antennas up to 36.8 metres high at the rear of a 2 hectare lot behind the house and sheds in a locality used for rural residential properties. The City considered the adverse visual</p>

			<p>impact on the locality and on the residents would outweigh any community benefit from improvements in service from the proposed telecommunication infrastructure.</p> <p>The Tribunal concluded that overall the community benefits derived from the proposed facility was balanced with any consequential impact there might be on the visual amenity of the locality and found that planning approval was warranted subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions.</p>
WASAT 130	6 October 2017	Vodafone Hutchinson Australia and City of Bayswater	<p>The City of Bayswater refused an application for a proposed telecommunication facility on Crimea Reserve. The proposed development involved the replacement of an existing 20 metre light pole in Crimea Reserve with a new monopole of approximately the same height and colour which would carry an antenna headframe to which mobile telephone network antennas would be mounted. The antenna headframe will extend approximately 1.5 metres above the monopole.</p> <p>The Tribunal was persuaded that the community benefits derived from the proposed facility outweighed the consequential negative impacts and found that planning approval was warranted subject to appropriate conditions.</p>
WASAT 61	25 May 2016	NBN Co and City of Albany	<p>The City of Albany refused an application for a proposed fixed wireless transmission facility on a site in the suburb of Albany. The proposed facility comprised a 40 metre monopole with various attachments and an equipment cabinet at ground level. The City considered the facility would have an unacceptable impact on the character and amenity of the local environment.</p> <p>The Tribunal determined that telecommunications infrastructure is not a prohibited use under the <i>City of Albany Town Planning Scheme No.1</i>. In relation to impact on visual amenity, the Tribunal determined that the mere fact that part of the proposed development would be visible from various locations, did not mean that the proposed development would have a negative impact on the visual amenity of the locality.</p> <p>The Tribunal was satisfied that the proposed development would not have an adverse impact on the visual amenity of the locality and it was determined that the proposed development should be approved.</p>

WASAT 28	12 March 2014	Telstra Corporation and Town of Cottesloe	<p>The Town of Cottesloe refused an application for the erection of six panel antennas on two mounting poles on the existing Telephone Exchange building located at No. 1 Congdon Street, Cottesloe.</p> <p>The Tribunal accepted that the removal of the current Telstra facility on the Sundowner Hostel site would put a strain on existing Telstra wireless network and its infrastructure, and that while the facility located at the Grove Shopping Centre could adequately service the southern portion of the area currently served by the Sundowner Hostel facility, an additional facility was required to service the northern portion of this area.</p> <p>The Tribunal found that while there would be a perceptible effect on visual amenity, the impacts of the proposed development were not substantive.</p> <p>The application for review was allowed and planning approval granted subject to agreed conditions.</p>
WASAT 135	27 August 2013	Telstra Corporation and City of Mandurah	<p>The City of Mandurah refused an application for a 25 metre high monopole telephone base station at the rear of an existing telephone exchange on Lakes Road, Greenfield because it considered that the visual impact of the monopole would outweigh the benefit to telecommunications in the locality.</p> <p>The Tribunal found that the proposed monopole facility could be supported because it was in a locality that would best serve existing and planned land uses in the locality and would not have an impact on visual amenity that would outweigh the benefit to local telecommunications.</p> <p>The Tribunal decided to grant development approval for the proposed telecommunications facility.</p>
WASAT 179	27 August 2012	Aurecon Australia and Shire of Waroona	<p>The Shire of Waroona refused an application for telecommunications infrastructure on a water tower site within the Preston Beach townsite.</p> <p>The Tribunal found that the overall impact on the tower on the visual amenity of the locality would not be significantly adverse to outweigh the increased reliability of the telecommunication services that would be provided, and that the possible availability of other sites was not determinative of the matter.</p>

