

Schedule of Submissions

Amendment 88 to Town of Victoria Park Town Planning Scheme No. 1

Local Planning Policy 32 – Exemptions from Development Approval

Local Planning Policy – Character Retention Guidelines

Table 1: Community Consultation - Schedule of Submissions:

No.	Owner and/or Occupier	Submission Position	Submission Comments	Officer's Comments/ Recommendation
1.	Owner Only	Objection	Provisions will impede property owner's right to redevelop.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>It is noted that the majority (62 per cent) of community responses objected to the proposed changes to the local planning framework. In addition, following the outcome of the consultation process, the Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage advised that Amendment 88 is unlikely to be supported by the Western Australian Planning Commission.</p> <p>Due to these reasons the Officer Recommendation in the Council report recommends that Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resolves not to support Amendment 88 to Town Planning Scheme No. 1 for the reasons above and further discussed in the Council report. • Resolves not to proceed with draft amended Local Planning 32 – Exemptions from Development Approval.

No.	Owner and/or Occupier	Submission Position	Submission Comments	Officer's Comments/ Recommendation
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requests the Chief Executive Officer to present future reports to Council for further consideration in relation to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ modifying the draft new Character Exemption Guidelines to retain relevant contemporary development provisions and encourage the retention and maintenance of character dwellings. ○ Investigate the designation of heritage areas. ○ Investigate the development of incentives and development bonuses to encourage the retention and maintenance of character dwellings. <p>Further commentary regarding Officer Recommendation is contained in the Council report.</p>
2.	Owner and Occupier	Objection	<p>Amendment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provisions will impede property owner's right to redevelop. • Will create a two-class system, where homeowners inside the special control area will be affected by additional requirements. • If Council determines to continue with some character control system, then Burswood should be excluded, as it is clearly a distinct entity from the rest of 	Refer to the Officer comments provided in relation to Submission 1 above.

No.	Owner and/or Occupier	Submission Position	Submission Comments	Officer's Comments/ Recommendation
			<p>Victoria Park owing to its connection to the Peninsular.</p> <p>Character Retention Guidelines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The guidelines are subjective and demeans and devalues suburbs. • Guidelines do not enable contemporary imaginative design and freedom of architectural form, over bureaucratic policy. 	
3.	Owner Only	Support		Refer to the Officer comments provided in relation to Submission 1 above.
4.	Owner Only	Support		Refer to the Officer comments provided in relation to Submission 1 above.
5.	Owner and Occupier	Support		Refer to the Officer comments provided in relation to Submission 1 above.
6.	Owner Only	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provisions will impede property owner's right to redevelop. • Provisions are contrary to the intent of the changes introduced through the Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015 ('Regulations 2015') to reduce red tape. • Provisions will negatively impact on property value. • Town should limit building height in this area to two-storeys. • Town should increase ability to subdivide land. 	Refer to the Officer comments provided in relation to Submission 1 above.
7.	Owner and Occupier	Objection	No comments provided	Refer to the Officer comments provided in relation to Submission 1 above.
8.	Owner Only	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provisions are contrary to the intent of 	Refer to the Officer comments provided

No.	Owner and/or Occupier	Submission Position	Submission Comments	Officer's Comments/ Recommendation
			<p>the changes introduced through the Regulations 2015 to reduce red tape.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provisions should encourage but not mandate retention of character dwelling. 	in relation to Submission 1 above.
9.	Owner and Occupier	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> House is not of a suitable structural standard to be retained. Town should not mandate retention of character dwellings. 	Refer to the Officer comments provided in relation to Submission 1 above.
10.	Owner Only	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Town should not mandate retention of character dwellings. Provisions will impede property owner's right to redevelop. 	Refer to the Officer comments provided in relation to Submission 1 above.
11.	Owner Only	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Previous consultation showed that 74% of respondents objected to the proposal. The Town's comments regarding the character of dwellings being eroded appears to be based on opinions rather than facts, as they are unable to provide statistics on the number of character dwellings that have been demolished as a direct result of Government planning legislation changes. The Town is not able to guarantee what incentives will be provided to support the retention and maintenance of dwellings. Submissions should be provided to the Elected Members verbatim rather than summarised. 	Refer to the Officer comments provided in relation to Submission 1 above.

No.	Owner and/or Occupier	Submission Position	Submission Comments	Officer's Comments/ Recommendation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Town does not have the resources to implement this scheme. The streetscape has already been eroded. Provisions will impede property owner's right to redevelop. 	
12.	Owner and Occupier	Objection	Contains a copy of the Town of Victoria Park Ratepayers Association submission, which is summarised in Submission 19.	Refer to the Officer comments provided in relation to Submission 1 above.
13.	Owner and Occupier	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opposed to funding additional resource to administer the provisions. Provisions are contrary to the intent of the changes introduced through the Regulations 2015 to reduce red tape. Provisions will impede property owner's right to redevelop. 	Refer to the Officer comments provided in relation to Submission 1 above.
14.	Owner and Occupier	Objection	Contains a copy of the Town of Victoria Park Ratepayers Association submission, which is summarised in Submission 19.	Refer to the Officer comments provided in relation to Submission 1 above.
15.	Owner and Occupier	Objection	<p>Amendment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supportive of the intent to protect residential character, however: Property owners should not incur maintenance/development costs in addition to normal costs. The provisions will result in owner's incurring additional costs to maintain or redevelop, such as the costs of engaging consultants to prepare specialist reports. The Town should pay those additional costs. The Town should encourage and incentives the maintenance and 	Refer to the Officer comments provided in relation to Submission 1 above.

No.	Owner and/or Occupier	Submission Position	Submission Comments	Officer's Comments/ Recommendation
			<p>retention of dwellings, rather than mandate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provisions are contrary to the intent of the changes introduced through the Regulations 2015 to reduce red tape. Provisions will impede property owner's right to redevelop and may impact on development potential. The Town should compensate owners for reduced development potential. <p>Character Retention Guidelines and Local Planning Policy 32:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development that complies with the guidelines should be expect from the requirement to obtain development approval. Development approval should only be required where variations are proposed. 	
16.	Owner and Occupier	Objection	<p>Amendment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provisions are contrary to the intent of the changes introduced through the Regulations 2015 to reduce red tape. Conservation provisions will increase the cost of maintenance and development. Provisions will impede property owner's right to redevelop. <p>Character Retention Guidelines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Open garden on a street corner lot does not enable privacy. 	Refer to the Officer comments provided in relation to Submission 1 above.

No.	Owner and/or Occupier	Submission Position	Submission Comments	Officer's Comments/ Recommendation
17.	Owner and Occupier	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Town should encourage and incentives the maintenance and retention of dwellings, rather than mandate. • The Town's comments regarding the character of dwellings being eroded appears to be based on opinions rather than facts, as they are unable to provide statistics on the number of character dwellings that have been demolished as a direct result of Government planning legislation changes. • Provisions are contrary to the intent of the changes introduced through the Regulations 2015 to reduce red tape. • Provisions will impede property owner's right to redevelop. • Will create a two-class system, where homeowners inside the special control area will be affected by additional requirements, which will have implications for any development proposal. For example, repainting a dwelling will require development approval. • Designates every house built prior to 1 January 1946 as an 'original dwelling' regardless of condition or retention value. • No definition of the percentage of the dwelling that had to be retained in order for it to be designated as an 	Refer to the Officer comments provided in relation to Submission 1 above.

No.	Owner and/or Occupier	Submission Position	Submission Comments	Officer's Comments/ Recommendation
			<p>'original dwelling'.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Higher order preservation can be accommodated through the Sate Heritage List and lower order preservation can be protected through the Town's Heritage List. • Majority of community members objected to the previous community survey and Scheme Amendment 73. • Community members are unlikely to understand the provisions due to the consultation process methods. Consultation does not provide immediate clarification of the ramifications of the proposed changes. Survey questions were simplistic and lacked sufficient detail to enable respondents to provide an informed view. • Town proposes to use ratepayers' funds to subsidise repairs and maintenance, which is a risk to all ratepayers. <p>Character Retention Guidelines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy dictates special provisions for window types, roof, fences and colour of paint, however, there are not definitions of materials and design is at the discretion of staff. • Policy could be further amended by the Town at any time to introduce more restrictions. 	

No.	Owner and/or Occupier	Submission Position	Submission Comments	Officer's Comments/ Recommendation
18.	Owner and Occupier	Objection	Contains a copy of the Town of Victoria Park Ratepayers Association submission, which is summarised in Submission 19.	Refer to the Officer comments provided in relation to Submission 1 above.
19.	Town of Victoria Park Ratepayers Association	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creates a two-class system, where homeowners inside the special control area will be affected by additional requirements, which will have implications for any development proposal. For example, repainting a dwelling will require development approval. • Provisions are contrary to the intent of the changes introduced through the Regulations 2015 to reduce red tape. • Higher order preservation can be accommodated through the State Heritage List and lower order preservation can be protected through the Town's Heritage List. • Amendment 88 will provide planning staff with subjective powers that could be abused and could provide a breeding ground for corruption. • The Town's comments regarding the character of dwellings being eroded appears to be based on opinions rather than facts, as they are unable to provide statistics on the number of character dwellings that have been demolished as a direct result of Government planning legislation changes. • Provisions will impede property 	Refer to the Officer comments provided in relation to Submission 1 above.

No.	Owner and/or Occupier	Submission Position	Submission Comments	Officer's Comments/ Recommendation
			<p>owner's right to redevelop.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designates every house built prior to 1 January 1946 as an 'original dwelling' regardless of condition or retention value. • No definition of the percentage of the dwelling that had to be retained in order for it to be designated as an 'original dwelling'. • Majority of community members objected to the previous community survey and Scheme Amendment 73. • Community members are unlikely to understand the provisions due to the consultation process methods. Consultation does not provide immediate clarification of the ramifications of the proposed changes. Survey questions were simplistic and lacked sufficient detail to enable respondents to provide an informed view. • Town proposes to use ratepayers' funds to subsidise repairs and maintenance, which is a risk to all ratepayers. <p>Character Retention Guidelines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy dictates special provisions for window types, roof, fences and colour of paint, however, there are not definitions of materials and design is at the discretion of staff. 	

No.	Owner and/or Occupier	Submission Position	Submission Comments	Officer's Comments/ Recommendation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy could be further amended by the Town at any time to introduce more restrictions. 	
20.	Owner and Occupier	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development should be assessed against building regulations only. Provisions provide for style over substance. 	Refer to the Officer comments provided in relation to Submission 1 above.
21.	Occupier Only	Objection	Contains a copy of the Town of Victoria Park Ratepayers Association submission, which is summarised in Submission 19.	Refer to the Officer comments provided in relation to Submission 1 above.
22.	Owner and Occupier	Objection	Contains a copy of the Town of Victoria Park Ratepayers Association submission, which is summarised in Submission 19.	Refer to the Officer comments provided in relation to Submission 1 above.
23.	Owner and Occupier	Support	Demolition of neighbouring character homes directly impinges on residential amenity.	Refer to the Officer comments provided in relation to Submission 1 above.
24.	Owner and Occupier	Objection	Contains a copy of the Town of Victoria Park Ratepayers Association submission, which is summarised in Submission 19.	Refer to the Officer comments provided in relation to Submission 1 above.
25.	Owner Only <i>(Note: Duplicate submissions from the two owners have been entered as a single submission)</i>	Objection	Provisions provide for blanket approach and do not take into account dwellings which been modified over the years and are not worthy of retention.	Refer to the Officer comments provided in relation to Submission 1 above.
26.	Owner and Occupier <i>(Note: Duplicate submissions from the two owners have been entered as a single submission)</i>	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development approvals to demolish, undertake building works, or compliance with the provisions of local planning adopted for the Residential Character Control Areas should only apply to a single house constructed prior to 1945 that is of historical and 	Refer to the Officer comments provided in relation to Submission 1 above.

No.	Owner and/or Occupier	Submission Position	Submission Comments	Officer's Comments/ Recommendation
			<p>cultural significance - as demonstrated by ToVP, and not the applicant.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The amendment should not automatically apply to all single houses constructed prior to 1945 solely based on age of house. 	
27.	Owner and Occupier	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provisions will impede property owner's right to redevelop. Many dwellings do not have architectural merit and are not energy efficient. 	Refer to the Officer comments provided in relation to Submission 1 above.
28.	a) Owner and Occupier (Number 1) <i>(Note part 'b' submission below from the other owner/occupier)</i>	I'm unsure	Broadly support the amendment, however I'd like more clarity on what is deemed 'visible from the street' in regards to original corner blocks.	<p>Refer to the Officer comments provided in relation to Submission 1 above.</p> <p>The submitters comments will be taken into consideration during the further review of the Character Retention Guidelines.</p>
	b) Owner and Occupier (Number 2) <i>(Note part 'a' submission above from the other owner/occupier)</i>	Objection	Restrictions are too tight for houses on corner blocks.	Refer to the Officer comments provided in relation to Submission 1 above.
29.	Owner only	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retention of original dwellings should not be mandatory. Provisions will impede property owner's right to redevelop. Many dwellings do not have architectural merit and are not energy efficient. 	Refer to the Officer comments provided in relation to Submission 1 above.
30.	Owner and Occupier	Support		Refer to the Officer comments provided

No.	Owner and/or Occupier	Submission Position	Submission Comments	Officer's Comments/ Recommendation
				in relation to Submission 1 above.
31.	Owner and Occupier	Support	Concerned about the number of character homes that have been demolished over the last five years.	Refer to the Officer comments provided in relation to Submission 1 above.
32.	Owner only	Support	Protection of heritage should be a priority.	Refer to the Officer comments provided in relation to Submission 1 above.
33.	Owner and Occupier	Support		Refer to the Officer comments provided in relation to Submission 1 above.
34.	Owner only	Support	Incentives should be offered by the Town for residents to maintain/renovate character homes.	Refer to the Officer comments provided in relation to Submission 1 above.
35.	Occupier	Support		Refer to the Officer comments provided in relation to Submission 1 above.
36.	Owner and Occupier	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provisions are contrary to the intent of the changes introduced through the Regulations to reduce red tape. • Many dwellings do not have architectural merit, are in poor condition and are not energy efficient. • Many dwellings do not have architectural merit, are in poor condition and are not energy efficient. • Impedes property owner's rights to redevelop. • Character can be maintained through quality new builds. 	Refer to the Officer comments provided in relation to Submission 1 above.
37.	Owner and Occupier	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protection of heritage should be a priority. • Character should be maintained through quality new builds. 	Refer to the Officer comments provided in relation to Submission 1 above.
38.	Occupier	Support	Concerned about the number of character	Refer to the Officer comments provided

No.	Owner and/or Occupier	Submission Position	Submission Comments	Officer's Comments/ Recommendation
			homes that have been demolished and the quality of new houses.	in relation to Submission 1 above.
39.	Occupier and Owner	Objection	Provisions are contrary to the intent of the changes introduced through the Regulations 2015 to reduce red tape.	Refer to the Officer comments provided in relation to Submission 1 above.
40.	Owner only	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protection of heritage should be a priority. • Property owners need to maintain their houses. 	Refer to the Officer comments provided in relation to Submission 1 above.
41.	Owner and Occupier	Support		Refer to the Officer comments provided in relation to Submission 1 above.
42.	Owner and Occupier	Objection		Refer to the Officer comments provided in relation to Submission 1 above.
43.	Owner and Occupier within the Town	I'm unsure		Refer to the Officer comments provided in relation to Submission 1 above.
44.	Owner and Occupier within the Town	Support		Refer to the Officer comments provided in relation to Submission 1 above.
45.	Owner and Occupier	Support	Protection of heritage should be a priority.	Refer to the Officer comments provided in relation to Submission 1 above.
46.	Occupier	Support		Refer to the Officer comments provided in relation to Submission 1 above.
47.	Occupier	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protection of heritage should be a priority. • Character of Victoria Park is unique. • Concerned about the number of character homes that have been demolished and the lack of character in new houses. 	Refer to the Officer comments provided in relation to Submission 1 above.
48.	Owner and Occupier	Support		Refer to the Officer comments provided in relation to Submission 1 above.

No.	Owner and/or Occupier	Submission Position	Submission Comments	Officer's Comments/ Recommendation
49.	Owner and Occupier	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • My dwelling does not have architectural merit, is in poor condition and is not energy efficient. • Provisions will impede property owner's right to redevelop. 	Refer to the Officer comments provided in relation to Submission 1 above.
50.	Owner and Occupier	Objection	Houses built after the 1920s do not need to be retained and protected.	Refer to the Officer comments provided in relation to Submission 1 above.
51.	Owner and Occupier	Support		Refer to the Officer comments provided in relation to Submission 1 above.
52.	Owner and Occupier	Support		Refer to the Officer comments provided in relation to Submission 1 above.
53.	Owner and Occupier	Support	The Town should also encourage residents to maintain the Council verge / nature strips.	Refer to the Officer comments provided in relation to Submission 1 above.
54.	Owner and Occupier	I'm unsure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retention of dwellings should be encouraged rather than mandated. • Provisions are contrary to the intent of the changes introduced through the Regulations 2015 to reduce red tape. • Character can be maintained through quality new builds. 	Refer to the Officer comments provided in relation to Submission 1 above.
55.	Occupier	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provisions will impede property owner's right to redevelop. • The proposed Special Control Area is too large. • Character Retention Guidelines should be refined to allow for development in keeping with the character of the local streetscape. 	Note: owner submitted comments twice, which have been merged into this single submission.
56.	Unknown - details not provided	Objection		Refer to the Officer comments provided in relation to Submission 1 above.
57.	Occupier	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed Special Control Area is 	Refer to the Officer comments provided

No.	Owner and/or Occupier	Submission Position	Submission Comments	Officer's Comments/ Recommendation
			<p>too large. If the area was smaller and the provisions further refined to clarify when a dwelling could be removed I would support the proposal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provisions are contrary to the intent of the changes introduced through the Regulations 2015 to reduce red tape. 	in relation to Submission 1 above.
58.	Owner and Occupier	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protection of character and heritage should be a priority. Character of Victoria Park is unique. 	Refer to the Officer comments provided in relation to Submission 1 above.
59.	Occupier	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed Special Control Area is too large. The Town should protect key places with justifiable heritage value. 	Refer to the Officer comments provided in relation to Submission 1 above.
60.	Owner and Occupier	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provisions will impede property owner's right to redevelop. Provisions are contrary to the intent of the changes introduced through the Regulations 2015 to reduce red tape. There is a significant financial cost to maintain older dwellings. 	Refer to the Officer comments provided in relation to Submission 1 above.
61.	Owner and Occupier	Support	Protection of character and heritage should be a priority.	Refer to the Officer comments provided in relation to Submission 1 above.
62.	Owner and Occupier	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provisions will impede property owner's right to redevelop. The residential density of this property should be increased to allow for apartment development. 	<p>Refer to the Officer comments provided in relation to Submission 1 above.</p> <p>In relation to increasing residential density, Council at its August 2022 Ordinary Council Meeting resolved to initiate Local Planning Scheme No. 2 for advertising. Comments regarding residential density may be submitted to</p>

No.	Owner and/or Occupier	Submission Position	Submission Comments	Officer's Comments/ Recommendation
				the Town at the time of the future community consultation.
63.	Unknown. Submitted until the title of Owner, however, the name supplied does not match the Town's records.	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed provisions are too late as the character of the area has been reduced through demolition and redevelopment. • There is a significant financial cost to maintain older dwellings. • Many dwellings do not have architectural merit, are in poor condition and are not energy efficient. • Provisions will impede property owner's right to redevelop. • Garages should be permitted as open carports create a negative impact on the streetscape. 	Refer to the Officer comments provided in relation to Submission 1 above.
64.	Owner	I'm unsure	Clarification is required as to when a house can be demolished.	Refer to the Officer comments provided in relation to Submission 1 above.
65.	Owner and Occupier	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed provisions are too late as the character of the area has been reduced through demolition and redevelopment. • Provisions are contrary to the intent of the changes introduced through the Regulations 2015 to reduce red tape. 	Refer to the Officer comments provided in relation to Submission 1 above.
66.	Owner and Occupier	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed provisions are too late as the character of the area has been reduced through demolition and redevelopment. • Provisions will impede property owner's right to redevelop. • Existing residential character policy provisions appear to be inconsistently imposed by the Town which has 	Refer to the Officer comments provided in relation to Submission 1 above.

No.	Owner and/or Occupier	Submission Position	Submission Comments	Officer's Comments/ Recommendation
			<p>resulted in uncertainty for owners.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provisions are contrary to the intent of the changes introduced through the Regulations 2015 to reduce red tape. 	
67.	Owner and Occupier	Support	Incentives to retain older dwellings should be provided by the Town.	Refer to the Officer comments provided in relation to Submission 1 above.
68.	Occupier	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The previous Scheme Amendment 73 was not supported by the community. Provisions will impede property owner's right to redevelop. Provisions are contrary to the intent of the changes introduced through the Regulations 2015 to reduce red tape. The proposed Special Control Area is too large. 	Refer to the Officer comments provided in relation to Submission 1 above.
69.	Owner and Occupier	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provisions will impede property owner's right to redevelop. Provisions are contrary to the intent of the changes introduced through the Regulations 2015 to reduce red tape. Consultation was misleading as it indicated that many of community members were supportive of character retention, however, only 7% of people responded to the previous community survey. There is a significant financial cost to maintain older dwellings. 	Refer to the Officer comments provided in relation to Submission 1 above.
70.	Owner and Occupier	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provisions will impede property owner's right to redevelop. The policy does not provide sufficient 	Refer to the Officer comments provided in relation to Submission 1 above.

No.	Owner and/or Occupier	Submission Position	Submission Comments	Officer's Comments/ Recommendation
			<p>clarification regarding the criteria for allowing demolition of a dwelling built prior to 1946.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provisions are contrary to the intent of the changes introduced through the Regulations 2015 to reduce red tape. • If the proposal proceeds Council must provide an exemption to those people who have brought property following the changes to the Regulations 2015. In addition, prospective purchasers should be informed about the provisions. • Many dwellings do not have architectural merit, are in poor condition and are not energy efficient. • The proposed provisions are too late as the character of the area has been reduced through demolition and redevelopment since the deemed provisions were implemented in 2015. • The low response rate to the previous community consultation survey that there is very little interest in maintaining a particular streetscape within the Town of Vic Park. The Town should establish a minimum response rate. 	
71.	Owner only	Objection		Refer to the Officer comments provided in relation to Submission 1 above.
72.	Unknown. Submitted until the title of Owner,	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protection of heritage and character dwellings should be based on a heritage assessment. 	Refer to the Officer comments provided in relation to Submission 1 above.

No.	Owner and/or Occupier	Submission Position	Submission Comments	Officer's Comments/ Recommendation
	however, confirmation of ownership and property details were not provided.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provisions are contrary to the intent of the changes introduced through the Regulations 2015 to reduce red tape. 	
73.	Owner only	Support	The definition of 'visible from the street' should be modified to include a wider viewing area as viewed from the whole street.	Refer to the Officer comments provided in relation to Submission 1 above.
74.	Owner and Occupier	Objection	Provisions will impede property owner's right to redevelop.	Refer to the Officer comments provided in relation to Submission 1 above.
75.	Owner and Occupier	Objection	Provisions will impede property owner's right to redevelop.	Refer to the Officer comments provided in relation to Submission 1 above.
76.	Owner and Occupier	Objection	Provisions will impede property owner's right to redevelop.	Refer to the Officer comments provided in relation to Submission 1 above.
77.	Occupier	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Character of Victoria Park is unique. Protection of character and heritage should be a priority. 	Refer to the Officer comments provided in relation to Submission 1 above.
78.	Owner and Occupier	Support	Recommends including homes that are even newer than those built prior to 1946.	Refer to the Officer comments provided in relation to Submission 1 above.
79.	Occupier	I'm unsure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Did not fully understand the proposed provisions. Protection of character and heritage should be a priority. Incentives to retain older dwellings should be provided by the Town. 	Refer to the Officer comments provided in relation to Submission 1 above.

Table 2: Public Authorities - Schedule of Submissions:

No.	Public Authority	Submission Position	Submission Comments	Officer Comment
1	Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage - Heritage and Property Services <i>(CM9 D21/97028)</i>	No objection	The draft documents have been considered for their potential impact on State Heritage Places within the affected area. As there are no State Heritage Places within the affected area, there is no objection to the proposed amendment and Local Planning Policies.	Noted
2	Main Roads WA <i>(CM9 D22/3706)</i>	No objection	Nil.	As above
3	Department of Biodiversity, Conservation and Attractions <i>(CM9 D21/91290)</i>	No comments	Nil.	As above
4	Western Power <i>(CM9 D21/90003)</i>	No comments	Nil.	As above