

Canning City Centre (CCC) Activity Centre Plan (ACP) Schedule of Submissions (August 2016)

No.	Name and Address	Description of Affected Property	Date and Content of Submission	Council's Recommendation
1	Environmental Protection Authority (EPA) Environmental Protection Authority Locked Bag 10 EAST PERTH WA 6892	N/A	15/07/16 <u>No Comment</u> Based on the information that you provided the Office of the EPA will not provide a comment on the proposed Activity Centre Plan (ACP) for the Canning City Centre (CCC).	Noted.
2	Atco Gas (Asset Management for Alinta Energy) Atco Gas Australia PO Box 3006 SUCCESS WA 6964	N/A	30/06/16 <u>Comment 1</u> ATCO Gas doesn't have any objections to the proposed Activity Plan being approved to facilitate future redevelopment. ATCO Gas request contact by any development proponent during their preliminary design stage, prior to any designs being finalised.	Noted.

No.	Name and Address	Description of Affected Property	Date and Content of Submission	Council's Recommendation
3	Department of Health PO Box 8172 Perth Business Centre PERTH WA 6849	N/A	<p>28/07/16: <u>Comment 1</u> All developments are required to connect to scheme water and reticulated sewerage as required by the Government Sewerage Policy - Perth Metropolitan Region. Water supply, water management plan including the utilisation of recreational water and any waste water recycling is to comply with Department of Health guidelines and requirements.</p> <p><u>Comment 2</u> Public health impact should be addressed. The aim of the CCC ACP should include a direct reference to 'enhancing the public health and community'. The ACP should include a risk assessment, addressing each of the potential non-positive aspects (see attached document). The ACP should also address the potential negative impacts of mixed use (e.g. odour, noise, light...).</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted, no modification. Clause 6.4.22 of the Activity Centre Plan (ACP) requires a noise attenuation report in mixed use developments to be provided at the development application stage. In addition, the ACP requires residential dwellings to be designed to minimise noise impacts and plant equipment and air conditioning units are to be positioned to reduce noise and odour emissions. It is considered that the existing requirements within the ACP will address noise, odour and light emissions and therefore no change to the ACP is suggested to address this comment.</p>
4	<p>Main Roads WA Manager Road Planning Main Roads Western Australia PO Box 6202 EAST PERTH WA 6892</p> <p>Assunta.dinardo@mainroads.wa.gov.au</p>	N/A	<p>29/07/16: <u>Comment 1</u> <u>Section 6.4.15. Awning and Verandas:</u> For properties fronting Albany Highway, Main Roads WA require a minimum setback of 2.5m from the kerb face to allow for street furniture, which must be taken into account on properties where there is a NIL setback. The owner is responsible for all present and future costs associated with any awning, including its maintenance and any possible alteration that may be required due to future changes such as modification to Albany Highway.</p>	<p>Modification proposed: Comment Supported. Changes to be made to Table 6 to note that a minimum 2.5m street setback will be required on Albany Highway in the following precincts: Cecil Avenue Other, Pattie Street, Civic and Recreational and Retail.</p>

No.	Name and Address	Description of Affected Property	Date and Content of Submission	Council's Recommendation
			<p><u>Comment 2</u> <u>Local Development Plan (LDP) 7 and 8:</u> Main Roads WA will require a robust traffic impact assessment to be undertaken in accordance with WAPC's Transport Assessment Guidelines. This assessment should be based on the year of full opening of the development and 10 years after full opening.</p> <p>In the event that modifications to existing intersection treatments are required as a result of the redevelopment/intensification of Areas 7 and 8, the developer shall be responsible for all costs involved in the land acquisition, design and construction of the intersection and access. This includes signing, road markings, relocation of services, street lighting and Main Roads WA costs involved in checking of the design and construction drawing and any site inspections.</p> <p><u>Comment 3</u> <u>Section 11.4.7 Riverside Residential Precinct:</u> Proposal for formal pedestrian crossing must be fully investigated by Council to determine the most appropriate type of pedestrian crossing and demonstrate how it impacts the existing surrounding network. All new and upgraded crossing facilities proposed must follow the Main Roads WA warrant system as outlined in the DOT Publications: Planning and Designing for Pedestrians Guidelines.</p> <p><u>Comment 4</u> The proposed Bus Rapid Transit/Light Rail Transit route along Albany Highway North of Cecil Avenue will require widening to provide 8 lanes. Main Roads has previously advised that this is not likely to be viable.</p> <p><u>Comment 5</u> Any reduction in the speed limit outside of the legal speed limit (including Cecil Avenue) will require approval from Main Roads - networks operations.</p> <p><u>Comment 6</u> <u>Modify the following clauses to add wording in bold below:</u></p>	<p>Modification proposed: Comment Supported. The following statement is to be added as a new (h) under Section 6.8 of the ACP: "A Traffic Impact Assessment undertaken in accordance with WAPC's Transport Assessment Guidelines, is to be included in the LDP for LDP Areas 7 and 8".</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Modification proposed: Comment Supported. Update Clause 6.4.17(b)</p>

No.	Name and Address	Description of Affected Property	Date and Content of Submission	Council's Recommendation
			<p><u>6.4.17. Signage:</u> "Lots with frontage to Albany Highway and/or located within the Riverside Commercial, Retail, and Civic and Recreational precincts are to follow Main Roads WA advertising policy and the City's current policy on advertising and signs.</p> <p><u>6.4.22. Noise Attenuation:</u> "(a) Developments near the railway line, Primary Regional Road (Albany Highway) or affected by the Perth Airport buffer have to meet the requirements of the policies below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SPP5.1 (Land Use Planning in the Vicinity of Perth Airport) in relation to aircraft noise. • SPP5.4 (Road and Rail Transport Noise and Freight Considerations in Land Use Planning) in relation to railway and highway noise. <p>(b) These developments are to be designed to address highway, railway and aircraft noise wherever practical.</p> <p>d) All mixed use developments (if they comprise a noise sensitive land use) fronting Albany Highway are to provide a noise attenuation report to Main Roads for assessment and must pay special consideration in addressing noise amelioration measures for multi storey dwellings with the plans at the development application stage.</p> <p><u>Comment 7</u> Insert the Following Clauses: <u>6.4.22. Noise Attenuation:</u> (g) (i) "Lots facing Albany Highway are required to have a notification, pursuant to section 70A of the Transfer of Land Act 1983 and is to be placed on the certificate(s) of title of the proposed lot(s). Notice of this notification is to be included on the diagram or plan of survey (deposited plan)."</p>	<p>to add "...Main Roads WA advertising policy and...".</p> <p>Modification proposed: Comment Supported. Update Clause 6.4.22(a) to add "...Primary Regional Road (Albany Highway)...". Update Clause 6.4.22(b) to add "...highway...".</p> <p>Noted, no modification. State Planning Policy 5.4 Road and Rail Transport Noise and Freight Considerations in Land Use Planning (SPP 5.4) provides noise attenuation guidance for noise-sensitive land uses in the vicinity of Albany Highway. SPP 5.4 does not require noise attenuation reports submitted for developments comprising noise-sensitive land uses to be referred to Main Roads WA for assessment.</p> <p>Noted, no modification. Part 5.7 of SPP5.4 appropriately details the requirements for Section 70A Notifications on titles for affected lots. It is not considered necessary to replicate the requirements in the ACP given that the latter refers to SPP5.4 in Clause 6.4.22(a).</p>

No.	Name and Address	Description of Affected Property	Date and Content of Submission	Council's Recommendation
			<p>(ii) "The notification is to state as follows: "The lot/s are situated in the vicinity of a transport corridor and is currently affected by transport noise. Further information about transport noise, including development restrictions and noise insulation requirements for noise affected property are available on request from the relevant Government Office."</p> <p>(h) "In the event that an acoustic noise wall needs to be constructed to address noise amelioration issues, anti-graffiti coating is to be applied to the fence wall adjoining Albany Highway reserve to Main Roads WA Specification 908. Specification 908 can be found on Main Roads website >"Building Roads">"Tender Preparation>Specifications>900 Series – Miscellaneous".</p> <p><u>Development adjacent to Albany Highway</u> (i) "For development adjacent to Albany Highway, all structures including any footings shall be placed within the applicant's private property".</p>	<p>Noted, no modification. All structures and footings are as a matter of course only allowed inside the property boundary. However; Awnings over footpaths may be considered on its merit.</p>
5	Telstra Forecasting & Area Planning – South Western Access Network & Technology Locked Bag 2525 PERTH WA 6001	N/A	<u>No comment received.</u>	N/A.
6	Water Corporation Development Services PO Box 100 LEEDERVILLE WA 6902 Ian.Kininmonth@watercorporation.com.au	N/A	<p>27/07/16: <u>Comment 1</u> <u>Rewording and Change of title for clause 6.3.2:</u> Change the title of 6.3.2 to read "Wastewater Pump Station" Reword the first paragraph as follows: "An odour buffer to the Richmond Street (Cannington No. 3) Wastewater Pump Station is identified in Figure 3. The odour buffer extends into the Riverside Commercial Area. In accordance with EPA Guidance Statement No. 3 Separation Distances between Industrial and Sensitive Land Uses, odour sensitive land uses will be avoided in this area".</p>	<p>Modification proposed: Refer to Submission No. 20 whereby concerns have been raised about the application of buffers on the Activity Centre Plan Map. It is noted that based on the existing volume/capacity of the Waste Water Pump Station a 75m buffer is identified under the EPA Guidance Statement No. 3 (Separation Distances between Industrial and Sensitive Land Uses) and it is appropriate this buffer, which has a minimal impact on adjoining private land</p>

No.	Name and Address	Description of Affected Property	Date and Content of Submission	Council's Recommendation
				<p>should be designated on the ACP Map.</p> <p>The 150m buffer however is based on a future expansion of the facility years into the future and if best practice environmental practices were to be used the buffer could be reduced significantly. It is considered that the City has already addressed the Water Corporation's concerns over land use conflict by identifying the affected private land within the Riverside Commercial Precinct which does not identify residential development as a preferred use.</p> <p>It is recommended that any reference to the 150m buffer be removed from the ACP Map and clause 6.3.2 be modified as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support change of title of 6.3.2 to read "Wastewater Pump Station". • Reword Clause 6.3.2 as follows: "An odour buffer to the Richmond Street (Cannington No. 3) Wastewater Pump Station is identified in Figure 3 at 75m for the current pump station, whereby sensitive land uses should be avoided in this area. The Water Corporation has advised that an expansion of the Waste Water Pump Station is likely to occur in the future. The Riverside Commercial Precinct does not identify residential development as a preferred use, thereby reducing the incidence for land use conflict between this infrastructure and redevelopment of adjacent land parcels in the future.
7	Department of Water PO Box K822	N/A	20/07/16: <u>Comment 1</u>	Noted.

No.	Name and Address	Description of Affected Property	Date and Content of Submission	Council's Recommendation
	PERTH WA 6842		DOW is reviewing the Local Water Management Strategy (LWMS) in parallel with the ACP. Once the DoW has assessed and supported the finalised LWMS, the DoW will notify the City of Canning of its support.	The LWMS (Appendix 2 within Part of the ACP) propose modifications which are outside of the ACP area. Any changes required to these plans will not have a structural impact on the ACP and would not require further modification in this area.
8	Public Transport Authority PO Box 8125 Perth Business Centre PERTH WA 6849	N/A	26/07/16: <u>Comment 1</u> Supportive of the proposal; thankful for the collaboration.	Noted.
9	Department of Environment Regulation Locked Bag 33 Cloisters Square PERTH WA 6850	N/A	<u>No comment received</u>	N/A.
10	Department of Parks and Wildlife Locked Bag 104 BENTLEY DC WA 6983 chantal.wilson@dpaw.wa.gov.au (request and recommendation 1) lyndon.mutter@dpaw.wa.gov.au		29/07/16: <u>Comment 1</u> Review of the LWMS (Essential Environmental, 2012) as part of the Centre Plan by the City of Canning. The LWMS should consider the impact the proposed reduction of Riverside Residential Precinct and increase of the Riverside Commercial Precinct will have on local storm and groundwater, and water resource use, consistent with the requirements of <i>Better Urban Water Management</i> . <u>Comment 2</u> The Department strongly supports the proposal to undertake a comprehensive investigation of the existing hydrology of the wetland and Threatened Ecological Community (TEC) and develop, in collaboration with Parks and Wildlife, a strategy to maintain the ecological water requirements. <u>Comment 3</u> Department of Parks and Wildlife requests the opportunity to comment on the draft LPP, as provided to Western Australian Planning	Noted, no modification. The consultant was asked to consider the Department of Parks and Wildlife's comments and according to Essential Environmental the changes in the ACP relating to the change in residential / commercial precinct boundaries would not have a significant impact on storm water, ground water and water recourse use. This commentary has been included with the LWMS (Appendix 2). Noted, no modification. The City supports the development of a strategy to maintain the ecological water requirements in the wetland and TEC. Noted, no modification. The Local Planning Policy is not required to be forwarded to the WAPC for approval. However;

No.	Name and Address	Description of Affected Property	Date and Content of Submission	Council's Recommendation
			<p>Commission for endorsement.</p> <p><u>Comment 4</u> Adequate separation between new development and adjoining bushland should be regulated by the planning system.</p> <p>The proposed Activity Centre adjoins the Canning River Regional Park. Most of the area adjoining the regional park has been developed. Any future development should be separated from adjoining bushland by a hard road edge for reasons of public safety, protection of bushland and fire safety for residents</p> <p>An appropriate fence or other suitable access control measures should be constructed on the boundary between the development and the regional park to the satisfaction of Parks and Wildlife and the City.</p>	<p>the ACP will be forwarded to the WAPC for approval with the required modifications. There is no further opportunity to comment; however, the Minister for Planning may require the City to re-advertise. A full set of all the unabbreviated comments will be provided to the WAPC for consideration. All submitters will be given an opportunity to read the report and this Schedule prior to Council consideration.</p> <p>Modification proposed: Comment Supported. A Bushfire Hazard Level Assessment and BAL Contour were developed for the ACP area. The following modifications are required:</p> <p>Add a new Clause under Section 6.3 Hazard and Separation Areas, namely "6.3.3 Bushfire Hazard Level".</p> <p>Paragraph to read as follows: "The Canning City Centre contains area of Low, Moderate and Extreme Bushfire Hazard Levels. The hazard level is not prohibitive of any proposed re-development as long as the objectives of State Planning Policy 3.7 and associated Guidelines are considered for future development in bushfire prone areas. Developers which development falls inside an area identified as bushfire prone on Figure 3 must submit an assessment of their property against the Bushfire Protection Criteria as part of the Development Application. The assessment must be done by an accredited assessor. A list of professionals is available on the City's website. Refer to Bushfire Hazard Level and</p>

No.	Name and Address	Description of Affected Property	Date and Content of Submission	Council's Recommendation
			<p>Comment 5 <u>Section 11.4.10 Regional Reserve and Conservation Precinct:</u> City to seek comments from Parks and Wildlife for any planning/design proposal within the Regional Park.</p> <p>City to seek comments from Parks and Wildlife for any planning /design proposal within the TEC: there may be a requirement for State and Commonwealth environmental approvals depending on the proposals.</p> <p>Comment 6 The areas to the North and East of the Carousel wetlands on Lake St are marked as 6-9 storeys developments. Being on the North side of the TEC wetlands this implies potential for high level overshadowing of the wetlands in winter/spring – their peak growth and flowering periods. Detailed consideration of impacts on the TEC from shading will be necessary for high rise developments adjoining the TEC.</p>	<p>Bushfire Attack Level Contour Map at Appendix 7 of Part 2 for more information.</p> <p>The following being undertaken:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Figure 3 to be amended to show areas that are bushfire prone as per fire assessment. • Add Appendix 7: Bushfire Hazard Level Assessment - CCC ACP for reference. <p>Noted, no modification. The regional park does not fall within the ACP area.</p> <p>Modification proposed: Comment Supported. Whilst this will occur anyway, a new (c) has been added to Section 6.5.10 (Conservation Precinct) as follows:</p> <p>"(c) All development proposals within this precinct are to be referred to the Department of Parks and Wildlife, and where appropriate state and federal environmental authorities."</p> <p>Noted, no modification. Clause 6.5.7(b) already refers to consideration being provided for the overshadowing of the TEC.</p>

No.	Name and Address	Description of Affected Property	Date and Content of Submission	Council's Recommendation
			<u>Comment 7</u> The area immediately adjacent to the South side of the wetlands is marked as Civic and Recreational Precinct. Impacts to the TEC wetlands including hydrological changes, shading, fire risks, rubbish, and recreational impacts are some of the major issues that will need to be considered for any developments that occur close to the wetlands.	Noted, no modification. The impact of high rise development on the TEC wetland within the Civic and Recreation Precinct is not likely to be an issue, as the interface area has already been built out with the construction of the Greyhounds Facility.
11	Department of Fire & Emergency Services GPO Box P1174 PERTH WA 6844	N/A	06/07/16 <u>Comment 1</u> BHL or BAL rating and Management Plan required.	Modification proposed: Comment Supported. A Bushfire Hazard Level Assessment and BAL Contour were developed for the ACP area. The following modifications are required: Add a new Clause under Section 6.3 Hazard and Separation Areas, namely "6.3.3 Bushfire Hazard Level". Paragraph to read as follows: "The Canning City Centre contains area of Low, Moderate and Extreme Bushfire Hazard Levels. The hazard level is not prohibitive of any proposed re-development as long as the objectives of State Planning Policy 3.7 and associated Guidelines are considered for future development in bushfire prone areas. Developers which development falls inside an area identified as bushfire prone on Figure 3 must submit an assessment of their property against the Bushfire Protection Criteria as part of the Development Application. The assessment must be done by an accredited assessor. A list of professionals is available on the City's website. Refer to Bushfire Hazard Level and Bushfire Attack Level Contour Map at Appendix 7 of Part 2 for more information.

No.	Name and Address	Description of Affected Property	Date and Content of Submission	Council's Recommendation
				<p>The following being undertaken:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Figure 3 to be amended to show areas that are bushfire prone as per fire assessment. • Add Appendix 7: Bushfire Hazard Level Assessment - CCC ACP for reference.
12	Perth Airport Pty Ltd PO Box 6 CLOVERDALE WA 6985	N/A	<p>03/08/16 <u>Comment 1</u></p> <p>Perth Airport does not support the further intensification of residential development within the CCC as it will continue to be affected by aircraft noise. Moreover the new runway project will not assist with alleviating aircraft noise in the area.</p> <p>Lots of residents have already been complaining.</p> <p>If the City decides to support the proposal, it is recommended that the ACP includes details of the Australian Noise Exposure Forecast (ANEF) and N65 and provides provisions relating to the amelioration of aircraft noise impacts, such as requirements for insulation to meet the indoor noise levels in AS 2021 (including a requirement for testing post construction). In addition, it is recommended that notifications be placed on future titles advising of the impact of aircraft noise.</p>	<p>Noted, no modification.</p> <p>State Planning Policy 5.1 Land Use Planning in the Vicinity of Perth Airport prescribes noise attenuation measures for noise-sensitive land uses that fall within the 20 ANEF and above noise contours. Within the 20 ANEF and 25 ANEF areas, Part 5.3.2 supports residential density greater than an R20 equivalent density code where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land is identified as appropriate for a greater density under a regional or sub-regional structure plan (SP); • A higher development potential is desirable to facilitate redevelopment of existing residential areas; and • The benefits of increased density can be demonstrated to outweigh the impacts of a higher number of residents being exposed to aircraft noise. <p>The ACP accords with all three of these requirements.</p> <p>Further, the opportunity exists for new development to be designed to include appropriate noise attenuation devices.</p> <p>State Planning Policy (SPP) 5.2 states that</p>

No.	Name and Address	Description of Affected Property	Date and Content of Submission	Council's Recommendation
				<p>developments within the 20 ANEF and 25 ANEF noise contours should accord with the same requirements described above and potentially also where a higher density would facilitate the concurrent provision of noise attenuation devices.</p> <p>The ACP accords with this additional matter. It is noted that SPP 5.2 requires a Section 70A Notification on the titles of lots that fall within the 20 ANEF and above noise contours. The City considers that SPP 5.2 provides sufficient statutory guidance to new development in the ACP area in this regard and there is no requirement to modify the ACP on the basis of comments provided from this agency.</p>
13	Department of Aboriginal Affairs PO Box 3153 East Perth WA 6892	N/A	<p>05/07/16 <u>Comment 1</u></p> <p>The plan area is not within the boundary of any sites under the Aboriginal Heritage Act 1972 as currently mapped. However, there may be sites that are yet to be identified. LG to encourage developers to familiarize with the State's Cultural Heritage Due Diligence Guidelines.</p>	Noted.
14	Heritage Council PO Box 7479 Cloisters Square PERTH WA 6850	N/A	<p>19/07/16 <u>No comment on the proposal.</u></p>	Noted.
15	Department of Transport GPO Box C102, PERTH WA 6839	N/A	<p>26/07/16 <u>Comment 1</u></p> <p>Supportive of the proposal; thankful for the collaboration.</p>	Noted.
16	Department of Housing 99 Plain Street EAST PERTH WA 6004 Amanda.shipton@housing.wa.gov.au		<p>27/07/16 <u>Comment 1</u></p> <p>Highly supportive of the infrastructure initiatives that contribute to the regeneration of the CCC. Department of Housing (DoH) is also committed to ensuring that development of its 4.5 hectares Cecil landholdings aligns with the delivery of a vibrant strategic centre.</p>	Noted.

No.	Name and Address	Description of Affected Property	Date and Content of Submission	Council's Recommendation
			<p><u>Comment 2</u> Would like further discussions / review time prior to WAPC consideration.</p> <p><u>Comment 3</u> Cecil Avenue cannot be successful as a main street and may be better identified as an activity or transport corridor based on the following arguments: Cecil Avenue is too wide and too long to provide intimate human scale making main streets successful.</p> <p>This is reinforced by the number of car bays located along the street from the Carousel Shopping Centre.</p> <p>Identifying Cecil Avenue as an Activity or Transport Corridor does not need to be at the expense of providing an excellent pedestrian environment; it will however involve reconsidering the land uses and current unreasonable level of "activated land uses".</p> <p><u>Comment 4</u> DoH does not support Cecil Avenue widening for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Absence of justification for the proposed alignment. • Absence of compensation plan. • Lack of communication between DoH and the City of Canning despite DoH's requests. 	<p>Noted, no modification. The ACP has gone through a number of consultations and review processes since its initiation in 2012. A number of agencies, including the DoH have been involved since the beginning of the process with varying DoH officers from different levels. Further consultation is not considered necessary at this point in time. However; the City will work closely with the DoH at the time when they consider development of their sites and will assist the DoH in achieving their objectives.</p> <p>Noted, no modification. The approach to the Cecil Avenue corridor has already been changed to the present two high intensity nodes in the "Cecil Avenue Main" precinct along approximately 300m of Cecil Avenue. This precinct will promote almost exclusive activated uses on the ground floor. The remainder of Cecil Avenue, approximately 700m in length, falls within the "Cecil Avenue Other" precinct and promotes a large number of non-activated uses together with the option for activated uses. The high level of pedestrian environment remains and Cecil Avenue will maintain its important transport function.</p> <p>Noted, no modification. Considerable expertise, time and effort were used in determining the width required for Cecil Avenue. This was done via consultants and in cooperation with the DoT, PTA and MRWA who have provided considerable technical input into</p>

No.	Name and Address	Description of Affected Property	Date and Content of Submission	Council's Recommendation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DoH is not opposed to contributing to services and infrastructure upgrades but believe that any such contribution must be justified and implemented in a fair and equitable manner. 	<p>the design. The best solution has been arrived at in light of the competing requirements for public transport, pedestrians and traffic flows within the ACP area.</p> <p>The alignment of the widening requirements has largely been associated with larger landholdings to reduce the complexity and negotiations required in the process of acquiring the necessary land.</p> <p>Where land is required for the widening of Cecil Avenue it will be negotiated during the development application stage or when required for road widening. The principle of the negotiation will be to not negatively affect the owners' development potential in the process and compensation to be provided accordingly.</p> <p>The ACP has gone through a number of consultations and review processes since its initiation in 2012. A number of agencies, including the DoH have been involved since the beginning of the process with varying DoH officers from different levels. Further consultation is not considered necessary at this point in time.</p> <p>In cases where contributions in land and/or service provision are negotiated, the City will ensure via legal agreement/development conditions or other means that the affected land owners are not required to make further contribution to these services, should a Developer Contribution Plan be put in place in the future.</p>

No.	Name and Address	Description of Affected Property	Date and Content of Submission	Council's Recommendation
			<p><u>Comment 5</u> Increase the list of activated land uses on Cecil Avenue: DoH believes that given the surface to activate and the necessity to plan over time, the City of Canning should be more flexible in terms of activated land uses on Cecil Avenue.</p> <p><u>Comment 6</u> Remove all laneways and access lane from the ACP map: DoH believes such details at this stage cannot be determined so early in the planning process. Moreover, the ACP establishes a network of laneways traversing DOS's land with little consideration for the optimum sizing and dimensions of resultant sites.</p> <p><u>Comment 7</u> Clarify the Public Open Space provision and difference between public and private open space.</p> <p><u>Comment 8</u> The ACP states that Public Open Space will be transferred to the Council free of cost and these will be calculated as part of the required Public Open Space requirements. However, the ACP then indicates that urban streams will be delivered by the City of Canning and/or developers via negotiation with the City of Canning.</p>	<p>Noted, no modification. Activated uses proposed for the ground floor level in the "Cecil Avenue Main" precinct has purposely been kept to the provided list of activated uses apart from "Car Park". This is specifically proposed to create higher intensity use in the two focal points along Cecil Avenue. The "Cecil Avenue Other" precinct is extremely flexible with a large number of activated and non-activated uses.</p> <p>Noted, no modification. Laneways in "Figure 3: Activity Centre Plan Map" are only indicative (as noted on the map) if they do not already exist. They indicate potential locations and will only be fixed should an LDP be developed or during the development application process.</p> <p>Modification proposed: Comment Supported. Use of the term "Private Open Space" was confusing and its actual intention was to describe communal open space. The term to be changed throughout the document where applicable.</p> <p>Modification proposed: Comment Supported. Subclause (c) of Clause 6.4.5 is ambiguous and a change is proposed for clarity purposes. The intention is for Council to deliver the urban streams where the open space is transferred free of cost. However, the option exists to negotiate with the City for the developer of a site to deliver the urban stream and water sensitive urban design as part of its</p>

No.	Name and Address	Description of Affected Property	Date and Content of Submission	Council's Recommendation
			<p><u>Comment 9</u> DoH also believes that more information should be provided regarding the contribution towards Public Open space for landowners which no part of the property is shown as such.</p> <p>Moreover, DoH believes that this is inequitable, given that the provision of private open space is a critical component to the success of any residential development and will be a requirement of all landowners, regardless of whether they have provided land for open space or not.</p> <p>According to DoH, the ACP should state that all landowners are responsible for the provision of public open space whether from the ceding of land or via subsequent contributions.</p> <p><u>Comment 10</u> The ACP does not adequately address the coordination and funding of essential services and infrastructure, a requirement under the Local Planning Scheme 2015 for an ACP. The ACP lacks of information on mechanism that will deliver all essential services and infrastructure in a fair and coordinated manner. This should include all necessary improvements (see Cardno Servicing report) and allocating costs across land owners proportionally.</p> <p><u>Comment 11</u> Align sustainability targets with existing rating system and potentially set less ambitious target.</p>	<p>development in coordination with the City.</p> <p>Noted, no modification. The ACP has been written to require 20% of the site area as communal open space for all sites. In order to encourage developers to give up identified portions of land for public open space, the ACP provides certain lots to provide land for public open space instead of communal open space. In the absence of a developer contribution plan, this incentive approach was seen as the most likely to provide for the public open space identified in the ACP. Should a developer contribution plan be made, this requirement in the ACP can be reviewed if required.</p> <p>Noted, no modification. The City is exploring the implementation of a Developer Contribution Plan. However, the ACP provides for developer contributions to be sought via negotiation during the development application process.</p> <p>Noted, no modification. Developers are free to use any rating system as long as it demonstrates the minimum performance criteria required and the density bonus requirements if applicable.</p> <p>The minimum criteria have been reviewed and are not considered over-ambitious. The higher sustainability targets, above the mandatory criteria, are only relevant if a developer wishes</p>

No.	Name and Address	Description of Affected Property	Date and Content of Submission	Council's Recommendation
			<p><u>Comment 12</u> Believes that given the cost of construction to deliver development above 4 storeys, these sustainability targets may deter builders instead of encouraging them, creating a loss of opportunity to maximise dwelling yield which in itself is a "sustainable" goal (and one of the prime) given the proximity with the train station.</p>	<p>to seek a height bonus as identified under the Activity Centre Plan.</p> <p>Noted, no modification. The City has been implementing a similar system of sustainability requirements in the Bentley Redevelopment Project and it is currently being tested. However; the City understands that this is a new approach and will work with developers to determine the appropriate level of sustainability that can be delivered.</p>
17	Canning District RSL Club	Canning District RSL Club	<p>21/07/16 <u>No comment</u></p>	Noted.
18	Canning Business Advisory Group	N/A	<p>25/07/16 The proposed plan, in our opinion, is very good and has a clear direction which will enhance the Cannington area.</p> <p><u>Comment 1</u> Shortcomings are clearly highlighted; Improving sense of community facilitated by the 3 notable gathering points, wider street scape, walking and bike activity between the station and the river.</p> <p><u>Comment 2</u> The increase of residential density and mixed use development dominates the plan, and will succeed assuming considerate development. Subiaco, Maylands and East Perth have fine examples of this that has been successful, whereas the new Burswood Springs precinct at this stage appears to be less successful beyond high density and commercial development.</p> <p><u>Comment 3</u> No proposal to enhance the experience of the gathering points such as skate park and kids' playground in Fremantle or large screen in</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. Only one public square in the revised ACP now provided for at Cecil Square see "Figure 3: Activity Centre Map".</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted, no modification. It is anticipated that Cecil Square will fulfil this function in the centre of the area. The overall</p>

No.	Name and Address	Description of Affected Property	Date and Content of Submission	Council's Recommendation
			<p>Northbridge.</p> <p><u>Comment 4</u> Entertainment has not been addressed well in the SP; will the zoning table and approved uses address this?</p> <p>In addition, the connection between the Agricultural Society/Greyhound Track is clearly hindered by the electrical sub-station. Is there an opportunity where recreation and activity could be utilised to create another destination similar to the Fremantle Esplanade including the incorporation of a permanent stage, climbing, skate park, playground and social sporting activity?</p>	<p>experience of the City Centre will also be enhanced by the improved quality public domain provision in the footpaths as the centre develops.</p> <p>Noted, no modification. "Table 4: Preferred Land Uses per Precinct" provide for a broad number of entertainment type uses e.g. Club premises, Community Purpose, Hotel, Market, Occasional Uses, Open Air Display, Public Amusement, Public Exhibition, etc. The preferred land use in this precinct will allow for stages, climbing walls, skate parks, playgrounds etc. It would be up to the land owners in this area to decide if they want to pursue these activities via the development application process.</p>
19	URBIS on behalf of Scentre Group	Lot 102 Carousel Road	<p>26/07/2016 <u>Comment 1</u> Lot 102 Carousel road, Cannington to be included in the Retail Precinct in lieu of City Residential Precinct based on the following arguments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proximity of this site from Carousel Shopping Centre provides excellent opportunity for expansion. • The site presents unique opportunity within the City Centre to accommodate retail and larger format uses. This expansion is in line with the status of the CCC as a Strategic Centre and will allow considerable economic benefits. • The City Residential Precinct should be contained within a 400m radius from the train station. 	<p>Modification proposed: In place of request; extend Cecil Main Precinct to align with precinct South-West of Carousel Road acknowledging the importance of this area (Figure 4 to be amended).</p> <p>In relation to points made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proximity alone is not the only reason considered in the determination of this precinct boundary. • "City Residential" still provides for a number of commercial uses e.g. Restaurant/Café, Shop, and offices. However; the precinct purposely limits larger format uses to blend the commercial use into a mixed and higher density residential environment. • Using and 800m radius as was done in this

No.	Name and Address	Description of Affected Property	Date and Content of Submission	Council's Recommendation
			<p><u>Comment 2</u> Amend Table 6, Retail Precinct to reflect same R-Codes (n/a in lieu of R-AC0) and minimum density (n/a in lieu of 80) as Figure 4.</p>	<p>instance is an acceptable practice in Transit Oriented Development (TOD) area development. It allows for higher numbers of residential units to be achieved taking into consideration the combination of market and other challenges and assists in focusing the activity towards Cecil Avenue.</p> <p>Modification proposed: Comment Supported. Amend Table 6, Retail Precinct to reflect the same R-Codes (n/a in lieu of R-AC0) and minimum density (n/a in lieu of 80) as per Figure 4.</p>
20	Hames Sharley on behalf of Coxon Group m.somers@hamesharley.com.au	Lots 42,43 and 803 Albany Highway and Lot 802 Richmond Street Cannington	<p>27/07/16 Overall supportive of proposal.</p> <p><u>Comment 1</u> Remove Water Corporation sewer pump station buffer and clause 6.3.2 based on the following arguments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is unclear what the nature of the buffer is. • The buffer area has limited the ability for residential development by including the area in the Riverside Commercial Precinct and has therefore served its main purpose. • The "preferred uses" within this precinct would be able to function within the pump station buffer. The precinct already accommodates a range of commercial that are able to operate in the area, unaffected by the existence of the pump station. • If the buffer ought to remain in place because of potential expansion of Station, it should be noted that technology will improve over time and reduce the impact of the station. • SPs are only required to be shown "due regard" and proponents are not compelled to liaise with Water Corporation. • Buffer and Clause 6.3.2 are therefore creating confusion with regards to impact of buffer on site and requirements. 	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Modification proposed: Comment Supported. Refer modification identified under Submission No. 6.</p>

No.	Name and Address	Description of Affected Property	Date and Content of Submission	Council's Recommendation
			<p><u>Comment 2</u> Increase maximum height allowed to be built up to boundary from 13 to 18m in riverside commercial precinct based on the following arguments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 13m height limit reflected the previous designation of the precinct for residential land uses but is impractical as it discourages any form of flexibility in commercial land uses. • Any option of providing basement parking onsite can be disregarded given the presence of high water table which makes that type of work difficult and cost prohibitive. <p><u>Comment 3</u> Clarify developers' requirements with regards to new indicative POS and water sensitive urban design treatment measures along Richmond Street. On Figure 3, the dotted pink points representing urban water sensitive design are overlaid upon indicative new POS. It is unclear if the City will require developers to provide a strip of their land when proposing a new subdivision or development. But if it is the case, it is assumed that the Water Sensitive Urban Design measures will be undertaken by the City.</p> <p><u>Comment 4</u> Provide maximum heights of building in storeys or meters but not both to avoid confusion.</p>	<p>Modification proposed: Comment Supported. Modification to the ACP is proposed to accommodate this request. Given the commercial only land uses within the Riverside Commercial precinct and associated higher ceiling heights, an increase to the 'built up to boundary height' is considered appropriate.</p> <p>Modification proposed: Comment Supported.</p> <p>Comment Supported. Subclause (c) of Clause 6.4.5 is ambiguous and a change is proposed for clarity purposes. The intention is for Council to deliver the urban streams where the open space is transferred free of cost. However, the option exists to negotiate with the City for the developer of a site to deliver the urban stream as part of its development in coordination with the City.</p> <p>Noted, no modification. The ACP has been drafted with both storeys and metres to ensure that the required development intensity is achieved. If metres are used as the only measurement, it is possible for a development to have a 2 storey building that is 13 metres in height as opposed to the preferred 4 storeys. The use of storeys only could also result in significant variation in building height due to a lack of constraints on the height of each storey.</p>

No.	Name and Address	Description of Affected Property	Date and Content of Submission	Council's Recommendation
			<p><u>Comment 5</u> The City of Canning should request a signage strategy at development stage (as part of LDP or development application). It will allow a better control for the City (specific to each proposed development) and better flexibility for the applicant (in case of simple change of tenancy, for instance, which may just necessitate a change of signage but no change in terms of location or size of sign).</p>	<p>Modification proposed: Comment Supported. Section 6.4.17 to be updated with new sub-clause (b) stating "Lots that are subject to a Local Development Plan are required to provide a signage strategy". Existing sub-clause (b) is renumbered (c) and following clauses also renumbered.</p>
21	Georgiou Development	Lot 37, 38, 39 and 40 Lake Street, Cannington & Lot 41 and 1 Cecil Ave, Cannington	<p>26/07/16 <i>A number of comments and questions from Georgiou Development were in relation to the contract arrangements between them and the City with regards to the TOD Site development. These comments and questions do not relate directly to the ACP and I will be addressed separately. However; the separation between the contract arrangements and the assessment of the development application remains as a matter of principle and no modification will be made to the ACP in this regard.</i></p> <p><u>Comment 1</u> <u>6.4.1. Variations to the R-Codes:</u> What is the statutory process to vary the ACP?</p> <p><u>Comment 2</u> <u>6.4.2. Activated Ground Floor Uses</u> Preference to have all upper floor uses allowable onto the ground floor provided that activation is demonstrated – more flexibility, mitigate risk of lengthy vacancies.</p> <p><u>Comment 3</u> <u>6.4.7. Landscape Consideration</u> Tree removal should be approved if an arborist finds that the tree in question is in poor health and is unlikely to survive construction.</p>	<p>Noted. Variation to the R-Codes is catered for under Part 7 of the R-Codes.</p> <p>Noted, no modification. Both Cecil Main and Other Precinct are critically important precincts in the ACP. The identification of predominantly active uses in the Cecil Avenue Main Precinct was done with a purpose to activate and enliven these smaller areas. The "Cecil Avenue Other" precinct, ground floor uses are actually wider than the upper floor uses. No changes to land use table proposed.</p> <p>Noted, no modification. Tree removal will be considered during the DA process. The City of Canning is currently preparing a "Tree Canopy Policy" which will provide further information on developers' requirements with regards to tree removal/replacement.</p>

No.	Name and Address	Description of Affected Property	Date and Content of Submission	Council's Recommendation
			<p><u>Comment 4</u> <u>6.4.8. Public Realm Materials</u> The City's website did not have the City of Canning Public Realm Style Guide for review at the time of reviewing the SP.</p> <p><u>Comment 5</u> <u>6.4.9. Building Response to Public Realm</u> Building materials, articulation etc. should not form the only basis to create visual interest and character. The ACP will need to allow for buildings that achieve the same outcome without the prescriptive need to adhere to various materials etc.</p> <p><u>Comment 6</u> <u>6.4.12. Landmark Buildings</u> Flexibility for the definition of landmark needs to be maintained enabling us to maximise the outcome. Landmark buildings are often defined by the residents or visitors; it should not be limited to built form as many places have landmark locations or spaces.</p> <p><u>Comment 7</u> <u>6.4.14. Roof Design</u> Rooftop accessibility for commercial and residential uses will be considered as part of the design in which case balustrades will be introduced.</p>	<p>Noted, no modification. The City is currently working on new and more detailed Public Realm Style Guide which will guide mainly open space, paving on footpaths and street furniture. This document is not critical to development and the City will negotiate with developers during the development application process in this regard if required.</p> <p>Modification proposed: Comment Supported. Remove the words "...three colours..." from sub-clause (c) under Clause 6.4.9.</p> <p>Noted, no modification. Flexibility of design is allowed for and will be negotiated in the DA process. Landmark buildings are not limited to built form only. However; built form is a predominant factor for it in the ACP area.</p> <p>Noted. Rooftop accessibility and treatment will be considered during the DA process.</p>

No.	Name and Address	Description of Affected Property	Date and Content of Submission	Council's Recommendation
			<p><u>Comment 8</u> <u>6.4.15. Awnings and Verandas</u> Colonnades will be considered as suitable options to allow for alfresco dining. This will encourage all year round street activation especially in the winter months of the year. These opportunities will future proof the area. An efficient and attractive outcome can be achieved.</p> <p><u>Comment 9</u> <u>6.4.16. Fencing</u> Fencing will be in keeping with the design and materiality of the building it fences.</p> <p><u>Comment 10</u> <u>6.4.19 Diversity through Dwelling Types</u> Habitable bedroom sizes must allow for design discretion. Dwelling sizes will be driven by market demand. We wish to avoid developments which are difficult to sell due to prescriptive requirements of the ACP.</p> <p>Minimum 40m² dwellings and smaller should be allowed where twin-key apartment layouts are considered.</p> <p><u>Comment 11</u> <u>6.4.20 Dual-Key Developments</u> Consideration of the impact on parking requirements and local rates and taxes require that it must be considered as one apartment. The potential for future subdivision is the key attractor for this product.</p> <p><u>Comment 12</u> <u>6.4.21 Flexible and Universal Design/Accessible Housing</u> What are the definitions of "essential facilities and rooms"?</p>	<p>Noted, no modification. Colonnades are not supported in the ACP as they often obscure views of frontages and separate street frontage activity from the street. However, each development application will be assessed on its own merit.</p> <p>Modification proposed: Comment Supported. Add a new (b) to Clause 6.4.16 stating "Fencing will be in keeping with the design and materiality of the building it fences".</p> <p>Modification proposed: Comment Supported. Modify final dot point under Clause 6.4.19 to read "minimum dimension of 3m".</p> <p>Add another dot point after the last to read: "Flexibility in dwelling size to be considered in dual-key developments".</p> <p>Noted, no modification. The City has strengthened its description of dual key developments to clarify that dual-key apartments which are separate but on the same title are regarded as two sole occupancy units for the purposes of the Building Code of Australia and for development requirements.</p> <p>Modification proposed: Comment Supported. Remove reference to "...essential facilities and rooms..." from sub-clause (b) of Clause 6.4.21.</p>

No.	Name and Address	Description of Affected Property	Date and Content of Submission	Council's Recommendation
			<p>This cannot be referenced to an Australian Standard as it will impact on land value.</p> <p><u>Comment 13</u> <u>6.4.24 Storage Units for Residential Development</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Passive surveillance in lieu of monitored surveillance. • Storage should be flexible on apartment sizes and also be compliant through performance measured in volume. The location can be either within the apartment or outside the apartment. Up to 100% of required storage can be within apartments excluding kitchens, bathrooms, laundries and bedrooms. <p><u>Comment 14</u> <u>6.4.26 Air Conditioners and Water Heaters</u> Space taken from A/C and water heaters on balconies is to be taken as private open space. Screening treatments will counter any adverse impact on the buyer.</p> <p><u>Comment 15</u> <u>6.4.27 Drainage</u> Landowners abutting the urban stream will need to work with the City to determine the interface, width and depth of the urban stream. Costs associated with undermining and surcharging will need to</p>	<p>This section does not refer to the Australian Standard.</p> <p>Modification proposed: Comment Supported in Part.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modify sub-clause (a) of Clause 6.4.24 to make it clear passive surveillance might not always be possible and monitored surveillance may be required, and accessibility from the outside is to remain. • Modify sub-clause (c) of Clause 6.4.24 to add additional sentence stating "Size of storage for 1 bedroom apartments may be varied by up to 50% maintaining a minimum dimension of 1.5m". • Add new sub-clause (e) of Clause 6.4.24 stating "Storage provided on balconies to be in addition to the minimum balcony size". • Add to Clause 6.4.1 Variations to R-Codes, after last dot point: "Utilities and facilities (sub-clauses 6.4.6). <p>Modification proposed: Comment Supported. This requirement purposely set to ensure level of useable private open space e.g. a useable balcony. Change "as private open space" to "in the minimum balcony size" in 6.4.26 (b).</p> <p>Noted. These issues will be considered during the design phase of the urban streams.</p>

No.	Name and Address	Description of Affected Property	Date and Content of Submission	Council's Recommendation
			<p>be the responsibility of the City. The City will determine the final design.</p> <p><u>Comment 16</u> <u>6.4.28 Waste Management</u> Service vehicles need to be able to access off Cecil Avenue through the above mentioned lots for waste, fire, ambulances etc.</p> <p>The waste management plan will detail the access and collection. Access into the development with access easements is not considered appropriate.</p> <p><u>Comment 17</u> <u>6.6.1 Sustainability</u> (c) Direct sunlight for 4 hours would be very difficult to achieve for principal useable part of the private open space between 9am-3pm in the middle of winter. Given the need to address all streets with units, the East, West and South facing apartments would be non-compliant. Other projects around Perth require 2 hours as a rough guide and even then the East, West and South facing are still challenging.</p> <p>(d) Natural cross ventilation can become increasingly problematic as the height of buildings increase. The feasibility of having tall buildings can be adversely affected which may obstruct the intent with regards to height targets.</p>	<p>Noted. Access for waste, fire, ambulances services etc. will be negotiated and determined during the DA process.</p> <p>Modification proposed: Comment Supported. Section 6.6.1 refers to communal open space and not private open space. Subclause (c) of Clause 6.6.1 is to be amended to read "developments are to achieve a minimum 50% direct sunlight to the principal usable part of the communal open space for a minimum of 4 hours between 9am and 3pm on 21 June.</p> <p>Modification proposed: Comment Supported in Part. The 60% of dwellings with cross ventilation is an acceptable and current standard e.g. NSW Apartment Design Guide. However the height issue is acknowledged and sub-clause (d) of Clause 6.6.1 is to be amended to state the following: "Developments are to have at least 60% of the apartments naturally cross ventilated in the first nine storeys of the building".</p>

No.	Name and Address	Description of Affected Property	Date and Content of Submission	Council's Recommendation
			<p><u>Comment 18</u> <u>6.8 Local Development Plan</u> Landowners should be given the ability to nominate if they want to adopt an LDP. For the above lots GP3 and CoC may want to have the flexibility to increase yields and or densities if the market changes significantly. A LDP is easier and quicker to amend than a SP.</p> <p><u>Comment 19</u> <u>7.3 Reciprocal Parking Arrangements</u> Reciprocal parking should be allowable to maximise city centre land for highest and best use. The consideration for reciprocal parking should take into account the peak use of parking for business or multiunit residential buildings to share with other private landowners outside of business hours.</p> <p>The requirement to enter into legal agreements should be a last resort to promote reciprocity as various legal agreements for each individual business owner will become impractical.</p> <p><u>Comment 20</u> <u>7.4 Bicycle End of Trip Facilities</u> End of trip facilities should be exempt for sole residential developments as tenants and owners will have access to their own residence.</p> <p><u>Comment 21</u> <u>7.5 Car Parking Rates</u> The number of visitor car bays required should be reduced given the city centre location, proximity to reciprocal parking and public transport.</p>	<p>Noted, no modification. Landowners do not have the ability to directly nominate if they want to develop an LDP in accordance with regulation 47 of the deemed provision of the <i>Planning and Development Regulations 2015</i>.</p> <p>Modification proposed: Comment Supported in Part. Section 7.3 provides the opportunity for reciprocal parking arrangements, however Clause (b) is to be amended to clarify the affected property owners constitute separate owners of parent lots.</p> <p>Section 7.5 is also proposed to be amended to reference that variations to car parking provision within the Scheme will be supported where variations are consistent with the parking provisions contained within Appendix 6 of the Activity Centre Plan – The City Centre Movement, Access and Parking Strategy.</p> <p>Modification proposed: The document will be updated to remove the need for end of trip facilities in residential developments.</p> <p>Noted, no modification. The ACP provides for reduced residential visitor parking and reciprocation of parking under Section 7.5.</p>

No.	Name and Address	Description of Affected Property	Date and Content of Submission	Council's Recommendation
			<p>Residential and commercial visitors should be allowed to park in reciprocal car parking within the area and within the building.</p> <p>On street parking should be allowed to be constructed along Neighbourhood connectors to maximise the building envelope and land values and encourage walking on footpaths.</p> <p>No trees between car bays on podium car parks.</p> <p><u>Comment 22</u> <u>7.6 Parking Design Principles</u> Street parking should be encouraged along neighbourhood connectors to provide a City feel and ease parking requirements on site at the developers cost to offset their requirements</p> <p><u>Comment 23</u> <u>7.7 Parking in Lieu</u> The contribution of cost to parking in lieu is to be reasonable and agreed between the PCG and the PSC. The parking requirements for visitors to the multi-unit residential building should be reduced to promote the use of reciprocal parking and maximise land within the city centre to be its highest and best use.</p> <p><u>Comment 24</u> <u>8.1 Funding Arrangements</u> For the Provision of Standard and Community Infrastructure, if an existing commercial agreement is in place between the City and the proponent/developer, the commercial agreement should prevail.</p> <p><u>Comment 25</u> Verbal comment from Georgiou's Planning Consultant: Should we have rear setbacks in table 6?</p>	<p>The ACP provides for on street parking in Section 7.7.</p> <p>The ACP requires 1 tree for every 3 car parking bays in open lot car parks. This would not be applicable to under croft or decked parking areas. Instead, such developments would provide trees in other areas of the site.</p> <p>Noted, no modification. Section 7.7 Parking In Lieu, provides for the opportunity to off-set developers requirements to on street parking with the City's approval.</p> <p>Noted, no modification. In cases where contributions in land and/or service provision are negotiated, the City will ensure via legal agreement/development conditions or other means that the affected land owners are not required to make further contribution to these services, should a Developer Contribution Plan be put in place.</p> <p>Noted. Same as above.</p> <p>Noted, no modification. Plan silent on rear setback. To be determined on merit in light of guidance to provide parking at rear.</p>

No.	Name and Address	Description of Affected Property	Date and Content of Submission	Council's Recommendation
22	Sugiarto Sutedja jyse1918@yahoo.com.au	168 Wharf Street, Cannington	<p>26/07/16 <u>Comment 1</u> Include 168 Wharf street in the CCC ACP based on the following argument:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supportive of vision but it is inconsistent to leave a strip of land between ACP and Queens Park SP. • It is evident that Wharf Street is so close to many facilities/activities that meets the housing, employment and social requirements of all members of the community. • The location is within less than 400-500 metres to the Queens Park and Cannington Train Stations, walking distant to Cannington Leisureplex (across the road), Coker parks, Westfield Carousel Shopping Centre, schools and busy commercial area along Albany Highway. • Wharf Street high quality and high density residential area in established areas could play a crucial role in ensuring affordability for young 1st home single or couple new buyers and providing options for older people to stay in Vibrant neighbourhoods. It re-energises city centre with a community heart that is connected, accessible, vital and resilient. 	<p>Noted; no modification. This area was excluded in updated ACP because the original CCC SP Local Planning Policy (LPP) did not show any specific requirements to this area. It was "Residential" only.</p> <p>Agrees with the reasoning provided and the City will investigate and consider integrating this area within the Queens Park Structure Plan.</p>
23	David Dufall davedufall1939@hotmail.com	N/A	<p>29/06/16 <u>Comment 1</u> A very impressive & detailed submission.</p> <p><u>Comment 2</u> The development should not be allowed to ignore other Precincts within Cannington.</p> <p><u>Comment 3</u> There should be no encroachment on existing park & recreational facilities.</p> <p><u>Comment 4</u> Early planning should take into account any future possibility of the</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. All development in the City of Canning will be thoroughly considered on its merit.</p> <p>Noted. Agreed-the ACP protects existing POS and natural areas. No rezoning of any POS is foreshadowed in the ACP.</p> <p>Noted. The ACP's aim is to establish high standards of</p>

No.	Name and Address	Description of Affected Property	Date and Content of Submission	Council's Recommendation
			<p>establishment of an "urban slum".</p> <p><u>Comment 5</u> Early consideration & plantings of image improvement at the Cannington Rail Station i.e. the "major transit oriented location" or 'window on Cannington'.</p>	<p>development that would prevent the formation of an urban slum with a large number of development requirements demanding higher quality development. (Landmark, minimum size, quality of building, sustainable principle).</p> <p>Noted. With the extension of the Thornlie Line to Cockburn, the City understands there will be 4 tracks at the Cannington Railway Station. This station will be upgraded significantly at the time.</p>
24	<p>APP on behalf of Harwin Holdings Pty Alan.Stewart@app.com.au</p>	<p>Lot 27, 28, 29 and 201 Lake street, Cannington</p>	<p>26/07/16 Their current design is for the most part consistent with the objectives and requirements of the ACP.</p> <p>Supportive of overall proposal and performance based approach.</p> <p><u>Comment 1</u> Be less prescriptive with regards to maximum height of building. As proposed, the CCC (CCC) will be under-utilised and heavily reliant on private cars. The height limit will severely limit the City of Canning to transform itself from a low density car based suburban shopping centre to a vibrant mixed use transit oriented destination. Little amenity currently presents in core precincts (including the City Residential Precinct) which mean great opportunity to encourage much taller buildings without having concerned about any potential adverse impact (overshadowing, overlooking) on established amenity.</p>	<p>Noted, no modification. Already a range of heights provided (see Figure 4 and Table 6), with further opportunity to increase height through achieving improved sustainability criteria.</p>
	<p>Steve Walker stevewalker12@live.com.au</p>	N/A	<p><i>A number of comments and questions from Mr Steve Walker were not directly related to the ACP. These comments and questions will be addressed separately in correspondence to Mr Walker.</i></p> <p><u>Comment 1</u> Why have the residents who submitted comments regarding the 2013 SP not been notified of the CCC advertising? Lack of transparency?</p>	<p>Noted. Letters were sent to all residents within the vicinity of the CCC and 150m around it. An advertisement was published in the Canning Times. The ACP and supporting documents were also available online and at the City of Canning Administration Centre during all of the</p>

No.	Name and Address	Description of Affected Property	Date and Content of Submission	Council's Recommendation
			<p><u>Comment 2</u> Did the mayor and the councillors read the 2013 SP prior to the council meeting? Have they been given a hard copy of the booklet?</p> <p><u>Comment 3</u> Why did the City choose to have a more basic consultation approach for a project of such importance?</p> <p><u>Comment 4</u> The consultation period should have been at least 6 to 7 weeks.</p> <p><u>Comment 5</u> Why was a hard copy of the ACP not available in libraries (more flexibility in terms of opening hours)?</p> <p><u>Comment 6</u> The sustainability argument (less printing) is just an excuse as the lack of incentives to seek public comments is as unsustainable as printing the documents. Where is the cost of supplying these reports to the</p>	<p>advertising period.</p> <p>Noted. A hard copy of Part 1 the current draft ACP was distributed to each councillor at a presentation and as part of the agenda. Two presentations were also provided on the topic. Part 2 was available for them to review at the administration centre and online. The current ACP refers to the 2013 SP which has been available online since its approval along with the current ACP since the beginning of the advertising period.</p> <p>Noted. While the name of the document has changed, refinements have been done and further technical studies added, the CCC ACP's vision and intent remain the same as the 213 SP, LPP SRS237. Therefore, the consultation approach is considered to be appropriate.</p> <p>Noted. The ACP was advertised for a maximum of 28 days as prescribed in the 2015 planning and development regulations.</p> <p>Noted. A hard copy of the ACP and supporting documents was available at the City of Canning Administration Centre. These documents were also available online.</p> <p>Noted. As mentioned above the City considered the consultation approach as appropriate in this instance.</p>

No.	Name and Address	Description of Affected Property	Date and Content of Submission	Council's Recommendation
			<p>public? Mayor, councillors should have a specific advertising breakdown of cost which should then be supplied to residents.</p> <p><u>Comment 7</u> Why is the schedule of submissions not attached to the 2016 documents and not available anymore online? Lack of transparency?</p> <p><u>Comment 8</u> Why haven't the residents who submitted comments on the 2013 SP seen the modified version prior to endorsement by council as a LPP?</p> <p>Why the City did not advise them that they could attend the ASB and OCM on the matter?</p> <p><u>Comment 9</u> Are you planning to organise a relaunch event?</p> <p><u>Comment 10</u> What are the reasons for such slow progress on improving Albany Highway intersections? What are the City's efforts regarding the bus jumper lanes, future road flyovers, Albany Highway median space, and landing points for pedestrian overpasses at several places?</p> <p>The mention of MRWA in 1992 informing the Albany Highway local governments they expected planning & designs for all Albany Highway intersections to be widened to include bus jumper lanes. Well, two decades ago MRWA mapped out the future requirements. I must ask,</p>	<p>Noted. LPP SRS 237 has already been adopted with modifications. It is therefore unnecessary to attach the old schedule of submissions to the ACP.</p> <p>Noted: Council meetings' agenda and minutes are available online to the public.</p> <p>We will definitely inform the 2016 submitters specifically prior to the next agenda briefing.</p> <p>Noted. We are not planning to organise a relaunch event. While the name of the document has changed, refinements have been done and further technical studies added, the CCC ACP's vision and intent remain the same as LPP SRS237. Therefore, a relaunch event is considered unnecessary.</p> <p>Noted. MRWA is responsible for Albany Highway and the City works diligently with them to improve its road network within our jurisdiction and budget. Bus lanes (Southbound) on Albany Highway from Cecil Avenue to Station Street will be developed as part of the Carousel and new Bunnings developments. A new pedestrian overpass at Cockram Street will also be constructed as part of the Carousel</p>

No.	Name and Address	Description of Affected Property	Date and Content of Submission	Council's Recommendation
			<p>where are the bus jumper lane designs at Leige Street, Cecil Avenue, Wharf Street, etc. in City of Canning by 2016?</p> <p><u>Comment 11</u> What are the funding instalments and years to progress the CCC project?</p> <p><u>Comment 13</u> How many staff have been working on the project (year per year breakdown of numbers and cost)</p> <p><u>Comment 14</u> Could you provide more information on the Wharf Street improvements/upgrades to support the increased use of Wharf Street by road vehicle traffic instead of Cecil Avenue?</p> <p><u>Comment 15</u> What are the solutions with regards to the Southbound Wharf Street at the approach to the Albany Highway traffic signal?</p> <p><u>Comment 16</u> What is the City's plan if developers do not want to redevelop?</p> <p><u>Comment 17</u> How are big stakeholders (e.g. Scentre Group, Aldi) contributing to improvements with regards to public transport, cycle lane, and road infrastructures?</p>	<p>development.</p> <p>Noted. The City's Economic Development unit is currently working on a business case and program plan for the CCC regeneration project and should present it to Council in the near future.</p> <p>Noted. The staff involved in this project on a full time basis during the life of the project varied from between 2 to 5 at a time.</p> <p>Noted. Signage will be installed to direct traffic to the Carousel development via Albany Highway, Wharf and Pattie Street.</p> <p>Noted. No modifications are currently proposed. However; these intersections will be monitored and upgraded when required.</p> <p>Noted. The CCC ACP is offering significant uplift in development intensity. These incentives should encourage landowners to redevelop over a period of time.</p> <p>Noted. At this stage contributions from developers will be sought via negotiation at development approval stage. Contributions would be a condition of the Development Approval.</p>

No.	Name and Address	Description of Affected Property	Date and Content of Submission	Council's Recommendation
			<p><u>Comment 18</u> Why aren't any cycling link provided to the South-East of the CCC (e.g. to Ferndale, Lynwood) - are these areas being deprioritised?</p> <p><u>Comment 19</u> Figure 3 and 4 of the ACP do not show the athletic track. Where is the track relocated to?</p> <p><u>Comment 20</u> Why aren't the following mentioned in the section "management structure" of the preface (p56): name of Mayor, name of the two Councillors referred to, name of the project director? And CCC SP advertising in June 2013 and outstanding matters raised by the public during the advertising?</p> <p><u>Comment 21</u> On what ground did the City decide to go from 3 to 1 public square? Was the public consulted?</p>	<p>Noted. A separate cycling and pedestrian plan is being prepared. Once a draft version is ready, the latter will be available for public comments.</p> <p>Noted, no modification. The athletic track will remain at this stage. Upgrades have recently been done to the track. No reconsideration of the athletics track is planned for the next few years.</p> <p>Noted, no modification. The preface is only a summarized version of the process followed by the City of Canning for the development of the ACP.</p> <p>Noted, no modification. The civic square locations have been reduced to one and relocated to a more central and accessible position based on the Carousel Shopping Centre Redevelopment LDP. The latter was advertised to the public from 15 July 2014 to 5 August 2014 and adopted as a LPP by Council at the ordinary meeting held on 21 October 2014.</p> <p>The central location of the new square has diminished the need for market square furthermore, in the process of developing the City's land near the train station, the opportunity of providing a public space near the station and the future urban stream has arisen. Users that will get to the area by train could easily walk</p>

No.	Name and Address	Description of Affected Property	Date and Content of Submission	Council's Recommendation
			<p><u>Comment 22</u> Why doesn't the ACP include more cycling / pedestrian facilities?</p> <p><u>Comment 23</u> The advertising period was too short given the amount of documents to review.</p> <p><u>Comment 24</u> The consultation page on the website and the advertisement banner were not available on the day the ACP was published in the Canning Times.</p> <p><u>Comment 25</u> Contradiction between the work that was done in the City of Canning the last years and the strategic vision for the CCC (e.g. Investment in upgrading roads and streetscapes that improve street parking while the City wants to reduce car dependency) -influence powerful stakeholders?</p> <p><u>Comment 26</u> Worried that the amount of feeder streets into the CCC will encourage</p>	<p>through the public space and the urban stream to get to the centre of Cecil Main precinct.</p> <p>Noted, no modification. A separate Cycling and Walking Plan is being prepared. Once a draft version is ready, the latter will be available for public comment. The Cycling and Walking Plan examines opportunities for improvements to the cycling and walking infrastructure throughout the City and also examines behaviour change programmes.</p> <p>Noted. The ACP was advertised for a maximum of 28 days as prescribed in the 2015 Planning and Development Regulations.</p> <p>Noted. All documentation was available at the time of the newspaper advertisement at the front counter and electronically on the website under the City's "Consultation" link on our web page's first page. However; due to administrative issues, the banner only was online the day after the Canning Times' advertisement.</p> <p>Noted, no modification. Reduction in terms of car dependency is a long term goal the City is working towards. However, it is the City of Canning's role to provide appropriate infrastructure in the interim.</p> <p>Noted. A comprehensive MAPS was developed by the</p>

No.	Name and Address	Description of Affected Property	Date and Content of Submission	Council's Recommendation
			<p>short cuts by private and commercial vehicle. He prefers vehicle to use Albany Highway, Sevenoaks and Liege Street to access carousel shopping centre.</p> <p>Also worried about the impact that extending Lake Street, Pattie Street and Carousel Road to Wharf Street will have on the traffic.</p> <p><u>Comment 27</u> Lack of transparency of ACP in terms of content (e.g. Schedule of submissions not included) and advertising approach. For e.g. The ACP should have been distributed to main decision makers in WA and Australia; key information should have been advertised in the media.</p> <p><u>Comment 28</u> The ACP preface is too simplistic and false – it diminishes the domination by state government buildings and local government administration centres and the impact these can have on the CCC.</p>	<p>professional private consultant Jacobs. All access and movements of vehicles have been tested and also supported by the department of transport, the public transport authority and main roads.</p> <p>Noted. While the name of the document has changed, refinements have been done and further technical studies added, the CCC ACP's vision and intent remain the same as the SP LPP SRS237. Therefore, the City believes the consultation approach was appropriate.</p> <p>Letters were sent to residents within the vicinity of the CCC and 150m around. An advertisement was published in the Canning Times. The ACP and supporting documents were also available online and at the City of Canning Administration Centre during all the advertising period.</p> <p>Moreover, the ACP has been advertised for a maximum of 28 days, in accordance with the 2015 Regulations.</p> <p>Noted, no modification. The preface is just a summary. The administration buildings are not part of the CCC. However, the MAPS and some earlier studies took all facilities surrounding the CCC into consideration when developing their recommendations.</p>

No.	Name and Address	Description of Affected Property	Date and Content of Submission	Council's Recommendation
			<p><u>Comment 29</u> The below statement in the ACP's preface may be too private vehicle focused: "in order to be successful, the creation of a central focal point and main street environment for the city centre requires: direct and immediate access to the significant volumes of existing traffic generated into and out of Carousel" (ref: preface section 3 p 2).</p> <p><u>Comment 30</u> Contradiction between keeping McDonald's and Caltex service station at the current location and the vision of Cecil Avenue as a pedestrian friendly street (ref 2. Interpretation and scheme relationship, p19).</p> <p><u>Comment 31</u> Lack of consideration of previous comments from residents – the ACP only refers to "submissions by agencies and authorities" (ref 3. Operation, p19)</p> <p><u>Comment 32</u> The City should start planning now for bus rapid transit and light rail transit. This information should be included in the ACP. Believes the Canning Bridge via Manning road link will not happen and the City should focus on the link to Bentley technology park and advocate for that only.</p>	<p>Modification proposed: Traffic in this regards should refer to customer. The paragraph will be amended accordingly.</p> <p>Noted. The ACP is a long term plan. Although the current petrol station and takeaway outlets do not contribute to a pedestrian friendly environment, future development would be guided towards this goal.</p> <p>Noted, no modification. The submissions mentioned in the "operation" section of the ACP refers to technical submissions provided during the development of technical studies which the draft versions are now advertised to the community along with the ACP.</p> <p>Noted, no modification. The City of Canning is currently working on a study supporting bus rapid transit and light rail transit between Curtin university and the CCC.</p> <p>However, it is a long term project that will lead to the creation of a separate plan which will have to be considered by council at a later stage. The City will also comment on the current Perth Transport Plan to raise this issue.</p>

No.	Name and Address	Description of Affected Property	Date and Content of Submission	Council's Recommendation
			<p>Comment 33 Preferred land use: (a) The City should ensure that Cecil Main, City Residential, and Railway precinct can include a lodge, community building, plus an 'occasional uses' or 'special facilities' use.</p> <p>(b) Cecil Avenue Main and others: We should rule out drive-thru takeaway food outlets; particularly their standalone structures.</p> <p>(c) Pattie Street precinct: Against service station, showroom, and take away food outlet – if it is the drive-thru fast food stand-alone variety.</p> <p>Also against any service stations being built on Albany Highway near the exhibition centre (currently mixed commercial/service), or from manning road south-east ward along Albany Highway both sides.</p> <p>Why allowing warehouse style in that precinct? Worried that will end up as stuff opposite on Albany Highway (Liege street northward) and</p>	<p>Noted, no modification. The City Residential and Railway precincts include "community building" and "reception lodge" as preferred land uses. The Cecil Main and Railway precincts include "special facilities" as a preferred land use. The Cecil Main precinct includes "occasional uses" as a preferred land use. These use classes are also classified as AA or SA under the current scheme. Each development applicant will, therefore, be considered on its own merit.</p> <p>Noted, no modification. Take away food outlet means "land and building used for the preparation, sale and serving of food to customers in a form ready to be eaten without further preparation primarily off the premises". As such, it does not always imply drive thru facilities. Being a discretionary use under the scheme, a development approval is required. Each development application will be addressed on its own merit.</p> <p>Noted, no modification. Same as above.</p> <p>Showroom and Service Station are both included in the Pattie Precinct as preferred uses as this precinct includes properties along Albany Highway where such land uses could be expected.</p> <p>All these usages are already allowed in these areas and consistent with the objectives of a</p>

No.	Name and Address	Description of Affected Property	Date and Content of Submission	Council's Recommendation
			<p>currently on Cecil Avenue.</p> <p>(d) Riverside Commercial precinct: No to service station and new warehouse. Residential needed.</p> <p>(e) Civic and Recreation precinct: Query on warehouse, why here?</p> <p><u>Comment 34</u> One concern about Ern Clark LDP.</p> <p><u>Comment 35</u> Was expecting to see a streetscape map of Liege Street extension, would like it to be four lanes, painted median, zero on-street parking,</p>	<p>primary regional road such as Albany Highway. Once again, each development application will be addressed on its own merit.</p> <p>Noted, no modification. Residential is not a preferred use in the Riverside Commercial precinct due to the Water Corporation Buffer and noise/traffic impacts associated with Albany Highway. Service Station and Warehouse are preferred uses in this precinct due to the frontage to Albany Highway. In addition, it should be noted that the CCC is proposed to be zoned "Centre" via Scheme Amendment No. 196. This zone provides for Warehouse to be an "I" use, which means that it is incidental to another use on the site. This is important to provide for a storage function for larger bulky good showrooms and trade supply businesses.</p> <p>Noted, no modification. As detailed above, Warehouse will be an incidental use in the Centre zone which will serve a storage function for other land uses such as bulky good showrooms and trade supply businesses. On this basis, Warehouse will not be the predominant use in this precinct.</p> <p>Noted, no modification. Should a LDP be submitted, it will be assessed and advertised to the public as per the planning regulations in place in Western Australia.</p> <p>Noted, no modification. Details of road design are not required in the ACP. However, cross section of Cecil Avenue</p>

No.	Name and Address	Description of Affected Property	Date and Content of Submission	Council's Recommendation
			<p>safe median refuge space for pedestrians. Is it the plan? (Ref section 7. Movement, access and requirements, p 49).</p> <p><u>Comment 36</u> Disagree with grid rationale if it means removing the athletic track from the CCC (ref 9.1 introduction and purpose, p64) – if moved from its current location, the track should be relocated between the green space on wharf street and Sevenoaks Senior College (ref fig.11.5).</p> <p><u>Comment 37</u> Believes point 3 of section 9.1 of the ACP should be reworded as follow “along Cecil Avenue or near the train station” in lieu of “along Cecil Avenue and near the train station”.</p> <p><u>Comment 38</u> Office and residential land uses should be encouraged along Albany Highway (ref section 9.1. Introduction and purpose, point 4).</p> <p>Development to the South-East of the Aldi site is awful. Development between Mason Street and Carden Street (on Albany Hwy), and between Wharf Street and Cecil Ave (on Albany Hwy), is ready for residential type multi storey re-development.</p> <p><u>Comment 39</u> The ACP should provide a breakdown of the improvements so far in the CCC including the money spent for each upgrade/construction (ref information on p 80 regarding road links... not comprehensive enough).</p>	<p>and indicative cross-sections of Lake Street, Carousel Road, Pattie Street and Leila Street are available in section 12.5 of the ACP (figure 12.5 and 12.6).</p> <p>Noted, no modification. The athletic track will remain at this stage. Upgrades have recently been done to the track. No reconsideration of the athletics track is planned for the next few years.</p> <p>Noted, no modification. It is the intention of the ACP to have the highest density concentrated at the train station and close from it.</p> <p>Noted, no modification. Office is part of the preferred land uses in all the precincts along Albany Highway.</p> <p>Residential was considered in the riverside commercial precinct. However, it was considered more strategic to place the focus on residential closer to the train station.</p> <p>Noted, no modification. The progress of developments within the area is not a prescribed element to include in the ACP. However, the City is looking at ways to supply information on the progress of the project.</p>

No.	Name and Address	Description of Affected Property	Date and Content of Submission	Council's Recommendation
			<p><u>Comment 40</u> Question regarding the extension of Carousel Road around the Athletics Track, or moving the Athletics Track East, out of the Carousel Road extension.</p> <p><u>Comment 41</u> Ground water should not be used for irrigation purposes: "leave the watering to the clouds" (ref 10.3, p 87).</p> <p><u>Comment 42</u> Figure 10.4 (p 91) and 11.1 (p 95) of ACP and figure 3.3 (p 52) of the servicing report show the athletic track while the activity centre is looking at moving it.</p> <p><u>Comment 43</u> Believes the City should improve the sense of arrival in the CCC.</p> <p><u>Comment 44</u> Figure 11.1 is showing 2 public squares while the ACP only includes one.</p> <p><u>Comment 45</u> Why no measure was introduced to reduce the open space deficit</p>	<p>Noted, no modification. Minor changes will still be made to the Carousel Road extension at design stage and solutions found for the athletics track. As mentioned earlier, the athletic track will remain at this stage.</p> <p>Noted, no modification. As mentioned in the referred section, "water efficient landscape design and irrigation practices will be used to limit future POS irrigation demand to current licensed volumes".</p> <p>Noted, no modification. The athletic track will remain at this stage. Upgrades have recently been done to the track. No reconsideration of the athletics track is planned for the next few years.</p> <p>Noted, no modification. The City of Canning is exploring ways to enhance the sense of arrival by working with developers on specific high quality architectural built form, land mark buildings and other measures.</p> <p>Modification proposed: As mentioned above the configuration has changed and a larger, more central square will be provided. This information and the rationale behind it are clearly mentioned in the ACP. Figure 11.1, as reflected in its title is only indicative. However, the City will remove these indicative public squares from figure 11.1.</p> <p>Noted, no modification. The deficit shown in figure 11.3 falls within</p>

No.	Name and Address	Description of Affected Property	Date and Content of Submission	Council's Recommendation
			<p>shown in figure 11.3?</p> <p><u>Comment 46</u> Disagree with the implied proposed route to Cockburn central via Jandakot.</p>	<p>private property. As stated in their LDP, in addition to Cecil Square, Scentre Group will provide "two other smaller spaces that will play important roles in way-finding and connectivity throughout the centre, as well as providing informal meeting spaces for visitors. These places will be located along Cecil Avenue, adjacent the food court and along the Albany Highway frontage adjacent the entry to the cinemas. Whilst subject to further detailed design, these spaces will be highly articulated and landscaped, providing some relief to what will be a highly urbanised space. It is anticipated that these areas will contain sculpture, seating and potentially provide spaces for pop-up uses/ events".</p> <p><u>Noted, no modification.</u> The extension of the passenger rail line from the Thornlie spur to Cockburn Central (following the existing freight rail line running through Canning Vale and Jandakot) is detailed in the draft Perth Transport Plan for 3.5 Million People and Beyond currently released for consultation by the Department of Transport. It is noted that this proposal was also featured in the Department of Transport's draft Public Transport Plan for Perth in 2031 (released in 2011), and has been discussed publicly by various government Ministers since that time.</p> <p>The City has no control over the route of future passenger rail lines, however is strongly supportive of the proposed passenger rail extension through Canning Vale as detailed in the draft Perth Transport Plan for 3.5 Million</p>

No.	Name and Address	Description of Affected Property	Date and Content of Submission	Council's Recommendation
			<p><u>Comment 47</u> Believes all residential areas should allow for higher density.</p> <p><u>Comment 48</u> Data from the CCC movement, access and parking strategy are from 2014 – readers should be aware; assumptions are made based on old data and projects that are not on the agenda anymore.</p> <p><u>Comment 49</u> Figure 4.6 (public transport master plan) of the Movement, Access And Parking Strategy is not accurate and should not be relied on.</p> <p><u>Comment 50</u> Disagree with Scentre Group on the idea of providing access to the shopping centre from Albany Highway (Cockram Street intersection) He is also questioning their second point: Mr Walker believes Scentre Group and Urbis do not want to advocate, consult or negotiate fairly (ref table 4.3 maps p 28).</p>	<p>People and Beyond. Council resolved to support this position in comments provided to the Department of Planning at its Ordinary Meeting on 14 July 2015.</p> <p>Noted, no modification. The minimum density in the City residential precinct is of 80 dwellings per hectare or a plot ratio of 1:1.</p> <p>The building height ranges from 4 to 6 storeys which is considered appropriate for such a precinct. Moreover, developers can be granted additional height providing that they meet certain sustainable criteria.</p> <p>Noted, no modification. Data is clearly referenced. The data used is the latest available and projected increases were considered in the development of this strategy.</p> <p>Noted, no modification. The referred figure is part of the current Public Transport Plan 2031 which is the latest source of data available on the matter.</p> <p>Noted, no modification. A comprehensive MAPS was developed by the professional private consultant Jacobs. All access and movements of vehicles have been tested and supported by the Department of Transport, the Public Transport Authority and MRWA. Moreover, a development application has been approved by the JDAP on 22 July 2016.</p>

No.	Name and Address	Description of Affected Property	Date and Content of Submission	Council's Recommendation
			<p><u>Comment 51</u> Disagree with a number of strategic actions and directions mentioned in section 5.3 of the maps (ref p34 of the maps).</p> <p><u>Comment 52</u> Upgrade of the Wharf Street/Albany Highway intersection: the movement, access and parking strategy rev a report casts doubt on the Wharf Street/Albany Highway intersection. Therefore, the City of Canning councillors and citizens need to expect an upgrade of this signalized intersection to improve performance. Expect the Wharf Street lanes to be widened Eastward (to/from Albany Hwy). Would like to see the design and estimated costs, and have a clear understanding on who will pay for it?</p> <p><u>Comment 53</u> Believes the calibration report should be updated as per the last row of the table in Rev A, Appendix D: model audit of the MAPS.</p> <p><u>Comment 54</u> Questions the influence of Scentre Group on the City's decision: although Jacobs (MAPS, Appendix E, 2014 microsimulation, 2nd key findings) has identified that "a grade separated right hand turn structure over liege street from Albany Highway can improve the 2014 scenario to levels better than the 2014 base values.", this is not happening.</p> <p>Is it because Scentre Group the 'retail experts' have said no, as they do not want to pay for it?</p> <p><u>Comment 55</u> Some comments made on the 2013 SP have not been well summarized.</p>	<p>Noted, no modification. The MAPS was developed by the professional private consultant Jacobs in collaboration with the Department of Transport, the Public Transport Authority and MRWA.</p> <p>Noted. No modifications are currently proposed. However; these intersections will be monitored and upgraded when required.</p> <p>Noted, no modification. The table states that the calibration report has been updated in sections 4.5 and 4.6 and Appendices B and C of the report.</p> <p>Noted, no modification. That flyover was considered. However, the negative impact on the streetscape and pedestrian activity was too high and alternative solutions had to be considered.</p> <p>Noted, no modification. The 2013 SP is already approved. With regards to the ACP, we will summarize all comments as accurately as possible and address them</p>

No.	Name and Address	Description of Affected Property	Date and Content of Submission	Council's Recommendation
			<p>Some of these comments have also been ignored in the preparation of the ACP.</p> <p><u>Comment 56</u> Public transit (including the proposed bus link to Wilcock Street Ferndale); Bike associated infrastructure (including cycling links over the river); Pedestrian improvements; And less car dealer along Albany Highway in Cannington.</p> <p><u>Comment 57</u> More activation – measures to make the city centre a 24h destination.</p> <p><u>Comment 58</u> Amend figure 1 map to show "to Fremantle" on right bottom of row highway as if the current state/federal government project continue, vehicular traffic will be redirected to Roe Highway. Amend figure 1 map to show "to Perth Airport" on the top right of Roe Highway.</p> <p><u>Comment 59</u> Would like more information on lake street, Sevenoaks and southern link LDP.</p>	<p>appropriately. Mr Walker's comments which are not relevant to the ACP will be addressed in further correspondence following the publication of the schedule of submissions.</p> <p>Noted, no modification. The ACP provides information on bicycle end trip facilities (7.4) and bicycle parking rates (7.8). A separate cycling and pedestrian plan is being prepared. This plan will allow for more end trip facilities. Once a draft version is ready, the latter will be available for public comments. With regards to Albany Highway and the predominance of car dealers, land uses will change over time as the city centre develop and more activated uses will be integrated.</p> <p>Noted, no modification. It is the intent of the ACP to create a more dynamic city centre. The preferred land uses will contribute to working towards this vision.</p> <p>Noted, no modification. Figure 1 shows the current CCC context. As such, the information stated by Mr Walker are already shown on the map next to Leach Highway.</p> <p>Noted, no modification. Should a LDP be submitted for any of these areas, it will be advertised to the public as per the 2015 Planning and Development Regulations.</p>

No.	Name and Address	Description of Affected Property	Date and Content of Submission	Council's Recommendation
			<p><u>Comment 60</u> Wants changes to laneways generated from planned Northern extensions of Lake Street and Carousel Road. An athletic track must be relocated in that specific area (ref section 7. Movement, access and parking requirements, p 49).</p> <p><u>Comment 61</u> Would like better cyclist end point infrastructures at various locations in the City; Additional cyclist bridge over Albany Highway; More details on new bike crossing over the Canning River And more information on shared parking locations.</p> <p><u>Comment 62</u> Provide a more detailed staging of the project including \$ amount.</p> <p><u>Comment 63</u> Provide more information on the signage policy – also why not discussed with citizens?</p> <p><u>Comment 64</u> Provide more details on the key decision makers (ref section 17 p 139 and 140).</p>	<p>Noted, no modification. The laneways shown on Figure 3 are indicative only. As previously mentioned, the City has no intention to relocate the athletic track at this stage.</p> <p>Noted, no modification. The ACP provides information on bicycle end trip facilities (7.4), bicycle parking rates (7.8) and reciprocal parking arrangement (7.3).</p> <p>A separate cycling and pedestrian plan is being prepared. This plan should cover all the points Mr Walker is requesting information on. Once a draft version is ready, the latter will be available for public comments.</p> <p>Noted. The City's Economic Development unit is currently working on a business case and program plan for the CCC regeneration project and should present it to Council in the near future.</p> <p>Noted, no modification. The proposed new LPP - LP.07 Advertising Signs has been presented at the Ordinary Council meeting on 16 August 2016 for the purpose of initiating public advertisement.</p> <p>Noted, no modification. The list of key decision makers include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Western Australian Planning Commission • Water Corporation • Main Roads WA

No.	Name and Address	Description of Affected Property	Date and Content of Submission	Council's Recommendation
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department of Water • Department of Transport • Public Transport Authority • Department of Health • Department of Housing • Environmental Protection Authority • ATCO Gas • Telstra • Western Power • Department of Environment and Regulation • Department of Parks and Wildlife • Department of Fire and Emergency Services • Perth Airport • Department of Aboriginal Affairs • Heritage Council.