

## Amendment No. 40 to the City of Vincent Town Planning Scheme No. 1 – Summary of Submissions

No	Name	Object or Support	Comments	Officer Comments
<b>SUPPORT</b>				
1	East Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	Mount Hawthorn should remain a quiet established residential area and should be protected against inappropriate Multiple Dwelling developments. Multiple Dwellings should be enabled along distributor roads.	Noted.
2	East Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	Support Amendment No. 40 and request the Minister to fast-track the approval of Amendment No. 39.	Noted.
3	Bondi Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>...support the proposed amendments to ban multiple dwellings in Mount Hawthorn.</i>	Noted.
4	The Boulevard, Mount Hawthorn	Support	<i>My preference is that multiple dwelling rules are not relaxed at all. Given the proximity to the City, relaxed rules would inspire Joondanna Style developing and cheapen the feel of the area. Would also decrease the more family oriented look and feel of the area. We are definitely anti-development having moved from Joondanna because of the significantly relaxed codes.</i>	Noted.
5	Buxton Street, Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	Developers build to the full potential that is allowed on any site. Large developments are not conducive to the single storey residential character of the established area of Mount Hawthorn.  Residents in Mount Hawthorn have restored character homes contributing to the popularity of the area, these residents should be able to enjoy the amenity of privacy and the surrounding character homes in the area.	Noted.  Noted. The residential design codes contains requirements relating to privacy as per Clause 5.4.1 and 6.4.1.
6	Fairfield Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>...We moved to Mount Hawthorn from Joondanna 3 years ago because we did not like the feel of Joondanna with all its multiple dwellings on blocks. Like many other Mount Hawthorn residents we love the character of our suburb.</i>	Noted.
7	Shakespeare Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	The current infrastructure of the area is at capacity. Accessing entertainment and parking is an issue. Scarborough Beach Road traffic makes it difficult for pedestrians to use local shops and the sense of care for senior citizens is eroding.	Noted.
8	Dunedin Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	Prefer low density in Mount Hawthorn. For some areas this amendment is too late, such as Hobart street, however less development of this type would be good.	Noted.
9	Blackford Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	Single and grouped dwellings provide the opportunity, to families, for children to play in a safe and secure adequate outdoor space. With reduced outdoor space the neighborhood children cannot interact in imaginative play and activity.	Noted, passive and active recreation can also occur in public open space.

## Amendment No. 40 to the City of Vincent Town Planning Scheme No. 1 – Summary of Submissions

No	Name	Object or Support	Comments	Officer Comments
<b>SUPPORT</b>				
			<p>Multiple dwellings add to existing issues such as traffic congestion which is a concern for the area particularly at Mt Hawthorn primary school. There is also insufficient parking at Glendalough station, making it inconvenient to use this rapid transit to the City.</p> <p>It is acknowledge that this amendment will not affect ancillary accommodation.</p>	<p>Noted, parking in new developments is provided in accordance with State Planning Policy 3.1.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
10	Dunedin Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support this Scheme Amendment.</i>	Noted
11	Fairfield Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<p>Multiple Dwellings allow more density and population in the area exacerbating social issues of living in close proximity.</p> <p>If we have multiple buildings then because I have a big block it will mean higher rates.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted, however land value is not identified as a planning consideration.</p>
12	Matlock Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<p>Matlock street should be excluded from Multiple Dwelling developments due to its existing nature, being a low density residential area. The increase in dwellings creates excessive use of street car bays and subsequent traffic hazards.</p> <p>Two-storey homes would be acceptable provided that garage space was included in the development.</p> <p>Rubbish removal trucks cannot use Coogee street therefore blocking access to the rear lane between Matlock and Coogee streets.</p> <p>Mount Hawthorn should be maintained as it is. A residential area central to all amenities. The apartment development in East Perth and North Perth is adequate for inner city living.</p> <p>Apartment developments will increase the rates of established residents.</p> <p>The development of Leederville should be restricted so it does not end up like Northbridge as the Perth City Council cannot control it.</p>	<p>Noted, parking in new developments is provided in accordance with State Planning Policy 3.1.</p> <p>Parking for grouped and single dwellings is to be provided in accordance with Clause 5.3.3 of the R Codes.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted, however land value is not identified as a planning consideration.</p> <p>Noted.</p>

## Amendment No. 40 to the City of Vincent Town Planning Scheme No. 1 – Summary of Submissions

No	Name	Object or Support	Comments	Officer Comments
<b>SUPPORT</b>				
13	Kalgoorlie Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	I agree with the suggestions, being a long time resident.  Is the area around Harrow Street and Wilberforce Street as yet undecided?	Noted.  Administration has recommended Council write to the Western Australian Planning Commission requesting this area be included in the proposed prohibition.
14	Tasman Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	I am a long term resident and purchased in the area to avoid the consequences of Multiple Dwelling developments. Mount Hawthorn is desirable due to its current layout.	Noted.
15	Coogee Street Mount Hawthorn	Support	<i>I am for the proposed ban on multiple dwellings in Mount Hawthorn.</i>	Noted.
16	Coogee Street Mount Hawthorn	Support	I would like more controls on the development of Multiple Dwellings in Mount Hawthorn, even on Oxford Street and Scarborough Beach Road.	Noted, the City is currently undertaking a Planning framework Policy review to refine the provisions for developing Multiple Dwellings.
17	Matlock Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	Mt Hawthorn contains high density along Brady street. There is sufficient evidence to suggest that anti-social behaviour and lack of property maintenance is associated with government owned housing. If the government cannot get it right how is the private sector going to replicate this model.	Not supported, the private sector does not provide government owned housing, and the comments regarding property maintenance and anti-social behaviour are not substantiated.
18	Dunedin Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	The destruction of dwellings and other historic buildings is already occurring and without planning requirements many more would have been demolished.  Allowing Multiple Dwellings in medium density suburbs will erode the reasons why people choose to live in these areas such as the lifestyle.  Government should not pander to the wishes of developers who overlook the impact of Multiple Dwellings on the Mount Hawthorn community in order to receive quick profits.	Noted.  Noted.  Not supported, Government establish and enforce planning requirements to reduce the impact of Multiple Dwellings; and retain the amenity of existing residence.
19	Edinboro Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	If more multiple dwellings are developed we will lose the character streetscape that makes Mount Hawthorn unique and appealing.  It also affects the value of property, are property developers offering compensation?  Developers do not take into account the community or its future and simply develop land and move on to the next job.	Noted.  Noted, however land value is not identified as a planning consideration.  Noted.

## Amendment No. 40 to the City of Vincent Town Planning Scheme No. 1 – Summary of Submissions

No	Name	Object or Support	Comments	Officer Comments
<b>SUPPORT</b>				
20	Federation Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<p>Mount Hawthorn is not suitable for apartments as the blocks are too small and dwellings are close to one another.</p> <p>There is currently no room for parking if multiple dwellings were constructed where would their visitors park?</p> <p>Rubbish bins would need to be lined up two deep, there is existing traffic congestion evident in Anderson, Milton and Brady Streets.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted, visitor parking is required to be provided on-site as per Clause 6.3.3 of the Residential Design Codes.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
21	Matlock Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<p>Multiple dwellings are only appropriate along major transport routes such as Scarborough Beach Road, Oxford Street and London Street.</p> <p>Multiple dwellings affect the tranquility of this inner-city suburb and destroy the aesthetic beauty because of excessive height, parking of vehicles, removal of street trees, limitation of solar access and added noise.</p> <p><i>I currently live next door to a two storey home that was built for the sole purpose of rental. It has 5 bedrooms, so consequently there are at least 5 cars parked in the drive and on the street (sometimes in excess of 5 cars). The neighbors are not noisy, or unruly in anyway but parking is an issue!</i></p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
22	Edinboro Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I have lived in Mount Hawthorn for over 44 years and do not wish the suburbs to be populated with multiple dwellings and suffer the associated problems. Eg. Extra vehicle traffic and congestion, unique character eroded, increase to street parking, social issues with increase from owner occupier to rentals etc.</i>	Noted.
23	Coogee Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	Mount Hawthorn has beautiful character homes and a great sense of community. Prohibiting multiple dwellings will maintain this amenity.	Noted.
24	Egina Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<p>Character and amenity of Mount Hawthorn would be eroded if Multiple Dwellings were allowed.</p> <p>Suggest that Council encourage ratepayers to lobby the Minister and Local M.P on their views.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
25	The Boulevarde Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>...We value the character and heritage of the homes in our local area. We were particularly concerned that the ability to build multiple dwellings would increase the risk of more character homes being demolished.</i>	Noted.

## Amendment No. 40 to the City of Vincent Town Planning Scheme No. 1 – Summary of Submissions

No	Name	Object or Support	Comments	Officer Comments
<b>SUPPORT</b>				
26	Edinboro Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	Multiple dwellings on main roads are appropriate, as these may be serviced by light rail in the future. Other areas should remain single dwellings which enhance living conditions for families. Retention of trees is important and traffic congestion should be considered.	Noted.
27	Fairfield Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	The area is already dense in population. Multiple Dwellings should be allowed on major transport routes and prohibited in the streets behind those roads. This will preserve the current demographic of the area. Multiple dwellings should be planned on a large scale basis and not allowed piecemeal on lots as part of infilling.	Noted.
28	Coogee Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>Support the ban of Multiple Dwellings on land zoned R30 and below in Mount Hawthorn. I am 86 and not in a position to purchase another property and move into it.</i>	Noted.
29	Dunedin Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>The suburb and its appeal is built on the small community &amp; character feel it holds. Multiple dwellings will shift the existing character of this suburb, it will gradually deconstruct the intimacy the suburb currently holds and the existing sense of community will be affected.</i>	Noted.
30	Buxton St Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	Parking and traffic is already an issue in my street with single dwellings.	Noted.
31	Tasman Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support the proposed actions as I would like to see the character and community 'feel' of Mount Hawthorn maintained. This I believe, would be compromised if blocks of flats/apartments were to be erected on all but main thoroughfares.</i>	Noted.
32	Flinders Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>... the unique character identity of Mount Hawthorn will be ruined if multiple dwellings are allowed across the entire suburb. This will affect the value of our home and the reputation of Mount Hawthorn which has recently been named Perth's number one suburb. We moved here because of the heritage feel and would soon move if that were to change because of ugly flats and apartments. There is a place for that type of development but that is not our residential streets. As stated in a previous submission, we also support amendment No. 39 for the same reasons.</i>	Noted, however land value is not identified as a planning consideration.

## Amendment No. 40 to the City of Vincent Town Planning Scheme No. 1 – Summary of Submissions

No	Name	Object or Support	Comments	Officer Comments
<b>SUPPORT</b>				
33	Egina Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>... There is an expectation in Mount Hawthorn that a dwelling be of a certain size. The sheer size, bulk and height will indefinitely negatively affect surrounding properties.</i>	Noted.
34	Eucla Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I agree with Scheme Amendment No. 39 &amp; 40. Multiple Dwellings will affect the unique character of Mount Hawthorn. Multiple Dwellings will be of detriment to the existing streetscape of the area.</i>	Noted.
35	Flinders Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I believe the character of Mount Hawthorn is best preserved by maintaining single residential development for blocks designated R30 or below – with the obvious exception of multiple dwelling being permitted on Scarborough Beach Road and Oxford Street. Mount Hawthorn already has relatively high density living as block sizes are typically small (&lt;500 m2) in comparison to other parts of Perth (or Western Australia). In addition other parts of the City of Vincent have high density living (eg. Leederville) and can be utilised for multiple dwelling development while still preserving the character of those areas.</i>	Noted.
36	Tasman Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>Permitting multi-dwelling development along major routes such as Oxford Street and Scarborough Beach Road while banning multiple dwelling in all areas zoned R30 or below is an appropriate balance between permitting development and expansion within the suburb while protecting the residential character and environment of the majority of the suburb, which is at the heart of making Mount Hawthorn the desirable suburb that it is.</i>	Noted.
37	Egina Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>We chose to buy a home and raise our family in Mount Hawthorn due to its unique close knit, family friendly feel. We believe that the development of multiple dwellings will remove this family vibe making it feel like the more impersonal high density areas of North Perth.</i>	Noted.
38	Ellesmere Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>The unique character of the area will be abolished if apartments &amp; multiple dwellings are approved.</i>  <i>It will lose the community appeal that residents have developed &amp; in essence moved to the area for.</i>	Noted.  Noted.
39	Ellesmere Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I do not wish Mount Hawthorn's unique identity and character to be permanently changed by unit/apartment developments.</i>	Noted.

## Amendment No. 40 to the City of Vincent Town Planning Scheme No. 1 – Summary of Submissions

No	Name	Object or Support	Comments	Officer Comments
<b>SUPPORT</b>				
40	Anzac Road Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>City of Vincent should go ahead with a ban for multiple dwellings in Mount Hawthorn on land zoned R30.</i>	Noted.
41	Coogee Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>The Cityscape of a quiet urban neighbourhood would forever be changed with Multiple Dwelling apartment buildings as it has in some parts of North Perth, Coolbinia, and Mount Lawley already these (39+40) measures give greater control to individual property owners who need a voice to resist greedy developers.</i>	Noted.
42	Shakespeare Street Leederville	Support	<i>I am not affected by proposed development in Mount Hawthorn but live in the vicinity and enjoy the general character of the area. I would like to support the residents wanting to preserve the character of their street so I wish the City of Vincent the best of luck with Amendment 40.</i>	Noted.
43	Coogee Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>Primarily the introduction of multiple dwellings into Mt Hawthorn would alter the whole character of the suburb which is one of families and homes. There is already a significant problem with parking. Coogee Street and most other road ways in the area are narrow, built to service houses built in the 1930's era. Few houses have garages and, most houses have more than one car. The streets and verges are used for parking multiple dwellings would lead to even more parking problems.</i>	Noted.
44	Edinboro Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>We agree with Scheme Amendment No. 40 and hope it will be agreed to by the Minister. There are so many reasons not to allow multiple dwellings in the areas designated. E.g. traffic control, better living conditions for families, area coverage and gardens with the possibility of space to be more sustainable.</i>	Noted.
45	Coogee Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>Totally against multiple dwellings for the following reasons:</i>  <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>1. Reduces existing privacy</i></li> <li><i>2. Increases parking problems (Already existing)</i></li> <li><i>3. Increases heat gradient</i></li> <li><i>4. Changes wind access (I.e. sea breeze)</i></li> <li><i>5. Changes character of the area. I bought 18 years ago because of the identity the area has</i></li> <li><i>6. Will change demographic from family area which is one of the appeals of the area</i></li> <li><i>7. Mt Hawthorn has a "Village" atmosphere which will be destroyed with multiple dwellings.</i></li> </ol>	Noted.

## Amendment No. 40 to the City of Vincent Town Planning Scheme No. 1 – Summary of Submissions

No	Name	Object or Support	Comments	Officer Comments
<b>SUPPORT</b>				
			8. <i>There are enough multiple dwelling residences already available. E.g. Perth City, East Perth, Burswood, Rivervale and so on.</i>	
46	Berryman Street Mount hawthorn 6016	Support	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>Higher density will generate larger heat profile</i></li> <li>2. <i>Impacts on sea breeze</i></li> <li>3. <i>Impacts available parking (Which is already a problem)</i></li> <li>4. <i>Not in keeping with character of area</i></li> <li>5. <i>I purchase in Mt Hawthorn as the area I purchased is not high density</i></li> <li>6. <i>Substantial existing high density exists in Perth, East Perth, Highgate etc.</i></li> </ol>	Noted.
47	The Boulevard Mount hawthorn 6016	Support	<p><i>Why is necessary for you to mess up Mt Hawthorn. After being a resident for 53 years it's very sad that it has come to this. You are spoiling Mt Hawthorn for what it is, its heritage and lovely community.</i></p> <p><i>Don't ruin Mt Hawthorn, leave it as it is. Stop being greedy!! Don't ruin Mt Hawthorn. The grass is already green on this side. Leave it as it is. Don't want our property to be devalued stop being greedy.</i></p>	Noted, however land value is not identified as a planning consideration.
48	The Boulevard Mount hawthorn 6016	Support	<p>Heritage character is of high value in Mount Hawthorn and should be maintained.</p> <p><i>The way I see it I think the Government and Councils being greedy for more rate payers. Would there be a substantial discount on rates if the zoning goes through and devalues our properties.</i></p> <p>Parking is also an issue in this area and is already limited. There is also limits on internet usage for the area.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Should this amendment be adopted it would reduce potential resident numbers and ratepayers. Further to this land value is not identified as a planning consideration.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
49	Matlock Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support this submission. Plenty of opportunity for multiple dwellings in higher density areas.</i>	Noted.
50	Shakespeare Street Mount hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support the changes to have no multiple dwellings in the area. We are about to see the effects of the Shakespeare/Hobart Street development we need to protect the feel/culture and demographic of the suburb.</i>	Noted.
51	The Boulevard Mount hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>We are fully supportive of a ban on multiple dwellings in Mt Hawthorn.</i>	Noted.



## Amendment No. 40 to the City of Vincent Town Planning Scheme No. 1 – Summary of Submissions

No	Name	Object or Support	Comments	Officer Comments
<b>SUPPORT</b>				
52	Federation Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	Restoration of Federation homes is expensive. Privacy may be effected if Multiple Dwellings are constructed and property value will diminish.	Noted, however land value is not identified as a planning consideration.
53	Shakespeare Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>Try driving through this section of the street during the week. Cars parked on both sides of the Street and cars parked on neighbours lawns (damaging sprinklers). These parked cars are from people catching buses to work into the City, workers not the shopping centre and businesses on Scarborough Beach RD. The parking problem is soon to get worse near and at our house as the Council have approved 16 apartments to be built on the corner of Hobart and Shakespeare Street. Have a guess where these tenants will be parking their cars!! Proposed ban on multiple dwellings is a bit late for us. We need "No Parking on Road or Verge" signs.</i>	Noted, the comment has been referred to the City's Technical Services.
54	Fairfield Street Mont Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>We do not approve of multiple dwellings in our street. 1. Street parking is already a problem with shoppers, workers and hotel patrons parking in front of our house. 2. Traffic is already a hazard with trucks from the shopping centre waiting on the street or using the street to access the shopping centre loading bays. 3. Hotel patrons noisy and a problem to householders 4. We do not want extra traffic/cars parked in street from multiple unit accommodation because we are already disadvantaged by the above. 5. There is also a risk of transient renters that could pose problems for us older owner/occupiers.</i>	Noted.
55	Buxton Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I am concerned that what is now a low density single housing area with many young families will turn into a packed multiple dwellings and apartments metropolis.</i>	Noted
56	Buxton Street Mount hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>We have seen many suburbs in Perth lose their character due to subdivision and construction of apartments which, not only increases the density of housing but also changes the character of the streetscape. We have recently invested a significant amount of money in a major renovation of the above address which enhances the character of the area and we'd like this to be supported by the neighbourhood and Council.</i>	Noted

## Amendment No. 40 to the City of Vincent Town Planning Scheme No. 1 – Summary of Submissions

No	Name	Object or Support	Comments	Officer Comments
<b>SUPPORT</b>				
57	Matlock Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<p>I am disappointed at the delay in getting to this point when there has been such persistent and vocal hostility toward multiple dwellings on R30 zoned streets, and toward those who contributed to this outcome for our suburb. The delay has significantly benefited developers and contributed to the irreversible destruction of Mt Hawthorn's unique streetscapes. The community will have to bear the brunt of cheap buildings, overshadowing, traffic chaos and lost privacy and identity.</p> <p>Scheme Amendment No. 39 is not effective.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Both Amendments are with the Minister for consideration.</p>
58	Matlock Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>Ban on multiple dwellings. Excellent idea.</i>	Noted.
59	The Boulevard Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>It will help maintain the unique character and identity of the area.</i>	Noted.
60	Matlock Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>The character of the area is being compromised by modern apartments being built.</i>	Noted.
61	The Boulevard Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<p>Area is already congested with traffic.</p> <p>The architectural and social heritage of the suburb is distinctive and highly prized by residents.</p>	Noted.
62	Shakespeare Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<p>The history of the area would be discredited by allowing multiple dwellings.</p> <p>Multiple dwellings can be occupied by boarders, lodgers and used as holiday accommodation especially with the close proximity to the Perth CBD.</p> <p>It is not always easy to distinguish whether a person is a tenant, boarder or lodger. While boarders and lodgers pay for the right to occupy residential premises they are not covered by the Residential Tenancies Act 1987.</p> <p>Multiple dwellings exacerbate existing traffic issues.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Separate provisions exist for each type of accommodation as per the City's Policy No. 7.4.5 – Temporary Accommodation. Further to this lodging houses are subject to the provisions of the Health Act 1911.</p> <p>As above.</p> <p>Noted</p>

## Amendment No. 40 to the City of Vincent Town Planning Scheme No. 1 – Summary of Submissions

No	Name	Object or Support	Comments	Officer Comments
<b>SUPPORT</b>				
			Graffiti and anti-social behaviour may increase in the area due to the increased population. Development of Multiple Dwellings will devalue property.	Noted  Noted, however land value is not identified as a planning consideration.
63	Flinders Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	Do not agree to any apartments proposed in the residential area.	Noted.
64	Egina Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>Oppose apartments in the area. Leads to overcrowding. Cheaper styles of apartments will in time degrade to slums. Privacy is also concerning where development overlooks adjoining properties.</i>	Noted.
65	Federation Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>Multiple Dwellings increase traffic. The local primary school is already full, any increase in population could not be supported. Multiple dwellings will change the composition of the community, which is currently pleasant. Character dwellings would be lost.</i>	Noted.
66	Matlock Street Mount Hawthorn	Support	<i>Amendment No. 40 will retain the value of our clean and well cared for and desirable suburb.</i>	Noted.
67	Buxton Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	Increased traffic is dangerous to young and old. Noise may increase from new multiple dwelling tenants.  Multiple Dwellings are appropriate on main roads where they do not dominate the streetscape.	Noted.  Supported.
68	Edinboro Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>Multiple dwellings are not in keeping with the suburb.</i>	Noted.
69	Buxton Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>Past experiences has shown that with Multiple Dwellings comes noise and trouble.</i>	Noted.
70	Shakespeare Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>Loss of character. Population leads to congestion.</i>	Noted.
71	Bondi Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>Negatively impact views and erodes the unique character. It is expensive to live here and likeminded people have bought and live here, multiple dwellings would allow people who are not prepared to pay the premium to live here.</i>	Noted.

## Amendment No. 40 to the City of Vincent Town Planning Scheme No. 1 – Summary of Submissions

No	Name	Object or Support	Comments	Officer Comments
<b>SUPPORT</b>				
72	Coogee Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>Devalue people's investment in this unique family area. Multiple dwelling are appropriate on major transport routes. Traffic congestion would be exacerbated.</i>	Noted.
73	Kalgoorlie Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>Further dilution of the unique history represented by Mount Hawthorn. The homes designed to house our returned servicemen should be valued and cherished rather than demolished for apartments or modern homes.  Resources, water pressure, schooling services already stretched to capacity and unable to support further growth.  Apartment living can introduce an entirely new demographic into the area, which will likely impact on the family friendly suburb which makes the area so desirable.  Impact negatively on property value.</i>	Noted.  Noted.  Noted.  Noted, however land value is not identified as a planning consideration.
74	Flinders Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>Reduce character. Introduce social problems that do not currently exist. Lose appeal as a family-oriented place. Overload infrastructure.</i>	Noted.
75	Matlock Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>Loss of the general character Exacerbate traffic issues.</i>	Noted.
76	Dunedin Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>The character is single dwellings. Mt Hawthorn has an amazing environment and allowing Multiple Dwellings would completely ruin the character.</i>	Noted.
77	East Street, Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support Amendment 40.</i>	Noted.
78	Kalgoorlie Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I definitely do support a ban on multiple dwellings.</i>	Noted.
79	London Street Mount Hawthorn	Support	<i>I do support a ban on multiple dwellings.</i>	Noted.
80	East Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support a ban on multiple dwelling.</i>	Noted.

## Amendment No. 40 to the City of Vincent Town Planning Scheme No. 1 – Summary of Submissions

No	Name	Object or Support	Comments	Officer Comments
<b>SUPPORT</b>				
81	Buxton Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support the ban.</i>	Noted.
82	Buxton Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support a ban on multiple dwellings in Mt Hawthorn as stated in the Amendment.</i>	Noted.
83	Anzac Road Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support ban of multiple dwellings.</i>	Noted.
84	Shakespeare Street Mount Hawthorn	Support	<i>R Codes allow ample development opportunity. Mount Hawthorn should be protected from excessive density.</i>	Noted.
85	Sasse Avenue Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>Banned to maintain character and heritage in the area.</i>	Noted.
86	Federation Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	Multiple dwellings are only appropriate on major transport routes as they: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add to the bulk and scale and are out of character when proposed within Mount Hawthorn.</li> <li>• Exacerbate traffic issues and stretch current infrastructure.</li> <li>• Do not promote social harmony in the community</li> <li>• Affect accessibility particularly on bin days</li> <li>• Add pollution and noise</li> <li>• Affect the safety of pedestrians and cyclists</li> <li>• Do not allow for space and privacy</li> <li>• Do not maintain the heritage of our homes</li> </ul>	Noted.
87	Buxton Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>Mount Hawthorn is an area whose character is defined by quaint cottages and family values, as well as community spirit. Multiple Dwelling buildings typically do not offer the character of single family dwellings, and their presence will erode the appeal of the streets on which they are erected.</i>  <i>They will also tend to attract renters rather than owner/occupiers, whose temporary occupancy will mean less community allegiance and participation, thus eroding the community spirit that is so special here in Mount Hawthorn.</i>  <i>Exacerbate existing traffic issues.</i>	Noted.  Noted.  Noted.

## Amendment No. 40 to the City of Vincent Town Planning Scheme No. 1 – Summary of Submissions

No	Name	Object or Support	Comments	Officer Comments
<b>SUPPORT</b>				
			<i>I can say that if we learned that a multiple dwelling was proposed for our street, we would move away, either to another street or even another suburb where there was no risk of the same thing happening.</i>	Noted.
88	Matlock Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>Multiple Dwellings should only be constructed on major transport routes. If they are developed in established suburbs they exacerbate traffic problems and erode character of the area.</i>	Noted.
89	Shakespeare Street Mount Hawthorn 6016.	Support	<i>The ban will maintain the unique character and identity of Mount Hawthorn.</i>	Noted.
90	Flinders Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>Completely support Scheme Amendment 39 and particularly Scheme Amendment 40.</i>	Noted.
91	Flinders Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>It would be a great pity if the residential area of Mount Hawthorn was blighted with multiple dwellings.</i>	Noted.
92	Buxton Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>Multiple dwellings will increase traffic and affect privacy, the current infrastructure could not cope.</i>	Noted.
93	Egina Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support Amendment No. 40.</i>	Noted.
94	Buxton Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>Property values will decrease and the community feel will disappear.</i>	Noted, however land value is not identified as a planning consideration.
95	Fairfield Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>We support Amendment No. 40 to ban all multiple dwellings on land zoned R30 or below in Mount Hawthorn as we would be directly affected with several blocks of land directly opposite our home originally single plans were submitted to allow demolition and now rezoning was requested to enable multiple dwellings where parking issues are already stressed and a problem issue in our street and it would ruin the streetscape of single housing properties also devaluing local residents property.</i>	Noted, however land value is not identified as a planning consideration.
96	Matlock Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I Support the proposal however would like a review of the zoning to allow development of units on Green Title of 230m2 with rear access lane. My block 464/2 = 232 etc. This is inner city and the density needs to increase over time to save the environment.</i>	Minimum lot sizes are contained in the R-Codes and are the responsibility of the Western Australian Planning Commission.

**Amendment No. 40 to the City of Vincent Town Planning Scheme No. 1 – Summary of Submissions**

No	Name	Object or Support	Comments	Officer Comments
<b>SUPPORT</b>				
97	Dunedin Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<p><i>Supports with respect to a number of issues:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>1. Parking. Further multiple dwellings will compound parking issues.</i></li> <li><i>2. Noise. Increased number of people and confined space created by multiple dwellings will increase noise levels.</i></li> <li><i>3. Privacy. Multiple dwellings will result in a loss of privacy.</i></li> <li><i>4. Drainage. Multiple dwellings overload existing drainage infrastructure.</i></li> <li><i>5. Aesthetics. Mt Hawthorn has enjoyed a resurgence of character homes which would be marginalised.</i></li> </ol>	Noted.
98	East Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<p><i>Oppose multiple dwellings in quiet residential Mount Hawthorn. Over development destroys amenity of neighbours. Possible increase in noise, traffic and parking with less visibility and more chance of accidents. Social and community benefits are reduced with these types of developments in these locations.</i></p>	Noted.
99	Egina Mt Hawthorn 6016	Support	<p><i>Preserving the single dwelling nature of the area serves various purposes, including:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>• Maintaining the streetscapes,</i></li> <li><i>• Maintaining social amenity,</i></li> <li><i>• Encouraging the retention renovation of existing historical architecture (worker cottages etc).</i></li> </ul> <p><i>The small lot sizes, restricted street widths, lack of rear access and narrow verges in many areas of Mt Hawthorn mean that many streets are simply not suitable for multiple dwelling developments.</i></p> <p><i>Multiple Dwellings should promote best practise design. By restricting multiple dwellings to designated areas the community benefits from more sustainable and better planned development. This will result in less conflict, and fewer problems due to poor planning and should, in turn, allow for even more infill/multiple dwellings in appropriate areas.</i></p> <p><i>Developers who are motivated purely by profit and what land they happen to own are not best placed to be making decisions that affect the whole community.</i></p> <p><i>Proposed amendment 40 will simply close a loophole created by changes to the RDC in 2010 and which is now being exploited in the Mt Hawthorn area.</i></p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>

## Amendment No. 40 to the City of Vincent Town Planning Scheme No. 1 – Summary of Submissions

No	Name	Object or Support	Comments	Officer Comments
<b>SUPPORT</b>				
100	Gloster Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	Infill is destroying character and amenity. Developers are seeking to enrich themselves to the longer term detriment of these suburbs.	Noted.
101	Egina St Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>...proposed ban is imperative to maintain the integrity and streetscape that Mount Hawthorn has become known for. In today's society it is too easy to ruin beautiful things, to make a developer or multi-national company rich. Only to their personal gain, whilst so many others lose out. Keep Mount Hawthorn a suburb to be proud of.</i>	Noted.
102	Fairfield Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	Believe allowing multiple dwellings on land zoned R30 would change the vital character of Mount Hawthorn and destroy much of what has made it such a great place to live.	Noted.
103	Lynton Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I am strongly in favour of the Amendment with a view to protecting the character of the suburb, as well as maintaining the amenity of already busy and congested streets.</i>  <i>In line with 'Vincent Vision 2024' the adoption of the Amendment will ensure the core area of Mount Hawthorn retains its current level of density, streetscape and family-friendly feel, whilst allowing higher density living along main corridors such as Scarborough Beach Road and Oxford Street.</i>	Noted.  Supported.
104	Fairfield Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I believe the allowance of multiple dwellings will bring unwanted traffic, parking problems, noise and crime. Agree multiple dwellings should be allowed along Scarborough Beach Road and Oxford Street.</i>	Noted.
105	Lynton Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>Strongly in favour of the Amendment with a view to protecting the character of the suburb, as well as maintaining the amenity of already busy and congested streets.</i>  <i>In line with 'Vincent Vision 2024' the adoption of the Amendment will ensure the core area of Mount Hawthorn retains its current level of density, streetscape and family-friendly feel, whilst allowing higher density living along main corridors such as Scarborough Beach Road and Oxford Street.</i>	Noted.  Supported.
106	Kalgoorlie Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	I do not believe that multiple high rise dwellings have any place on residential suburban streets and should be restricted to the higher density areas on major roads that can then incorporate mixed uses.	Noted.



## Amendment No. 40 to the City of Vincent Town Planning Scheme No. 1 – Summary of Submissions

No	Name	Object or Support	Comments	Officer Comments
<b>SUPPORT</b>				
			Car parking and traffic issues will be exacerbated with further developments.	Noted.
			The local school could not accommodate the increased population.	Noted.
107	Kalgoorlie Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	Without this amendment the character of Mt Hawthorn will continue to be eroded through increased multiple dwellings. Allowing multiple dwellings on Main roads is more appropriate.	Noted. Noted.
108	Dunedin Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>Concerned about the amount of traffic that more dwellings are going to create. My street already has a lot of cars (travelling through and parked on the road) more development will mean more cars and traffic in the area. I am also concerned about a larger population in the area and the potential increase in crime.</i>	Noted.
109	Dunedin Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	We do not support multiple dwellings due to the following reasons: 1. Privacy. Multiple dwellings could invade our privacy and cause us to lose our private living areas. 2. Traffic/congestion. Very few residents have provision for parking their own cars within their property and are currently parking on the street. This is causing congestion and with more development this is bound to cause more congestion. 3. Loss of character. With multiple dwellings the attraction to live in Mount Hawthorn will be lost.	Noted Requirements relating to Privacy are contained in Clause 6.4.1 of the Residential Design Codes.
110	Dunedin Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	Concerned about the impact that multiple dwellings would have on this charming suburb. I would much prefer it if these developments could be restricted to designated areas for two main reasons: 1. Traffic. There has been a steady increase in the number of cars parked on the street and an increase in the number of children in the street. I am fearful of the potential for an accident with more developments. 2. Loss of character. Concerned that the charm and village atmosphere will be lost.	Noted.
111	East Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support the proposed prohibition of multiple dwellings in the quiet residential character streets of Mount Hawthorn.</i>	Noted.
112	East Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support the proposed prohibition of multiple dwellings in the quiet residential character streets of Mount Hawthorn.</i>	Noted.

## Amendment No. 40 to the City of Vincent Town Planning Scheme No. 1 – Summary of Submissions

No	Name	Object or Support	Comments	Officer Comments
<b>SUPPORT</b>				
113	Britania Road Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>Agree with amendment 40 to keep/preserve the appeal of Mount Hawthorn. High density will eventually ruin the identity and history of one of Perth's most sought after suburbs.</i>	Noted.
114	The Boulevarde Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<p><i>Residents/owners have purchased properties with knowledge of the prevailing coding and the modification of the R-Codes has subverted the Scheme intent without the due process a Scheme review would afford.</i></p> <p><i>The T.O.V TPS makes adequate provision for higher density development in appropriate locations without having to compromise the residential amenity of all areas coded R30.</i></p> <p><i>It is clear that the review of the R-Codes did not fully anticipate unintended outcomes the modification would cause where higher densities are possible in locations where the Local Government and Community never intended.</i></p> <p><i>Traffic and parking issues would be exacerbated.</i></p> <p><i>Consider that the R-Codes should not prevail over the LPS given the LPS's are prepared after extensive Analysis and engagement with affected owners where the R-Codes is a policy of the WAPC that has not had some level of due process applied to its implementation.</i></p>	<p>Whilst a scheme review and a review of State Planning Policy differ, these processes both involve research and community consultation, the changes made allowed a variety of housing types.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>A review of State Planning Policy requires research, justification and community consultation, similar to that required in a Scheme Amendment process.</p>
115	Flinders Street Mt Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support Scheme Amendment No. 40.</i>	Noted.
116	Edinboro Street Mount Hawthorn	Support	<p><i>I prefer no apartments. Should be only on main thoroughfares. Multiple Dwellings increase the population exponentially affecting traffic also. In the 26 years I've been living in Mount Hawthorn this has been happening in steady way allowing for infrastructure changes to happen along with it.</i></p> <p><i>With multiple dwellings are schools, roads, traffic increase, parking etc being considered?</i></p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>In proposing Multiple Dwellings a Neighbourhood Context Report is required as per the City's Policy No. 7.4.8 – Development Guidelines for Multiple Dwellings.</p>

## Amendment No. 40 to the City of Vincent Town Planning Scheme No. 1 – Summary of Submissions

No	Name	Object or Support	Comments	Officer Comments
<b>SUPPORT</b>				
			<p><i>Eg as it is on workdays cars move to park closer to Scarborough Beach Road, making it a game of chicken for me getting in and out of my driveway. Will this get worse? With increased population.</i></p> <p><i>Can the local high school and primary school handle more students.</i></p> <p><i>How are road movement and access going to be improved to improve traffic flow.</i></p> <p><i>What parking facilities will be available for commuters as well as shoppers/cafes.</i></p>	<p>Car parking is required on-site for Multiple Dwellings in accordance with Clause 6.3.3 of the Residential Design Codes. Providing the required car parking or an excess of what is required for all new dwellings would not affect the current situation, a behavioural shift of transport mode is required to reduce motor vehicle traffic and congestion.</p> <p>Population statistics explored in the Local Planning Strategy suggest that the number of high school and primary school students will increase requiring expansion of current schools.</p> <p>Road movement and access can be improved by education, appropriate line markings and signage. The City's Technical Services implement measures in residential areas which are experiencing traffic and access issues.</p> <p>If a development proposes commercial uses, these uses are required to provide on-site parking in accordance with Policy No. 7.7.1 – Parking and Access.</p>
117	Flinders Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<p><i>If multiple dwellings are allowed, the character of "the mount" will be lost and it will just be another suburb. – Perth in general is running out of nice suburbs for families to be raised in – let this lovely suburb not be lost.</i></p> <p><i>Land sizes of approximately 400m2 good balance for home and garden, Typical of "the Mount".</i></p>	Noted.
118	London Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<p><i>Bought this property as an investment and it to stay as is.</i></p>	Noted.
119	Matlock Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<p><i>These development are most welcomed on the principle roads. Not on small residential streets it only serves to diminish not only the value of properties but the fabric of the street and area!</i></p> <p><i>Mount Hawthorn streets should not become developers "inner-city development site for pure greed but rather the wonderful suburb that combines inner city living (&amp; what that entails) but will maintain a tradition suburban feel.</i></p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>

## Amendment No. 40 to the City of Vincent Town Planning Scheme No. 1 – Summary of Submissions

No	Name	Object or Support	Comments	Officer Comments
<b>SUPPORT</b>				
120	Ellesmere Street Mount Hawthorn 6016		<p><i>I am disappointed that it has taken the council so long to act and am now concerned about how many more developments will pass through council before the amendment can be enacted. Not only that, it also concerns me that developers will be able to appeal to the TPA or other government body and have the decision overturned if development is denied by council. Already there has been occasions when any concerns about size of development by council has ended up with a larger number of units after appeal, as in the case of the development on the corner of Shakespeare and Hobart St.</i></p> <p><i>My other concern is the increasing volume of group dwelling developments which will also put similar pressures on Mt Hawthorn.</i></p> <p><i>My specific objections in relation to my properties are :- 1) Loss of value due to loss of feeling of space, increased noise, parking problems, loss of privacy, loss of community feel, loss of trees, gardens and grass.</i></p> <p><i>Are these apartment dwellings or group dwelling developments required to have at least 2 car bays? If not, this will only increase street problems, made worse by visitors and service vehicles in the area needing to park in the street.</i></p> <p><i>Increased development will lead to a loss of local flora. Heat radiation increases off roads and buildings in higher density housing.</i></p> <p><i>The area should be predominately single storey to allow aging residents to remain in the area, and for the area to remain enticing to new families.</i></p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Car parking is required on-site for Multiple Dwellings in accordance with Clause 6.3.3 of the Residential Design Codes. Providing the required car parking or an excess of what is required for all new dwellings would not affect the current situation, a behavioural shift of transport mode is required to reduce motor vehicle traffic and congestion.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
121	Kalgoorlie Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<p><i>Without this Amendment the character and amenity of Mount Hawthorn will continue to be eroded through increased multiple dwellings. Allowing Multiple Dwellings on main roads (Loftus, Oxford, Green and Scarborough Beach Road) is the more appropriate location of such developments.</i></p>	Noted.

## Amendment No. 40 to the City of Vincent Town Planning Scheme No. 1 – Summary of Submissions

No	Name	Object or Support	Comments	Officer Comments
<b>SUPPORT</b>				
122	Dunedin Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<p><i>Traffic – over the years I have seen a steady increase in the number of cars parked in my street. I have also noticed a steady increase in the number of children in my street. I'm fearful of the potential for an accident would increase with more developments.</i></p> <p><i>Loss of character – I originally came to this area because of the charm and village atmosphere and I'm concerned that will be lost. Presently it is an ideal mix and I can understand the attraction it would hold for developers but I am fearful about the cost to the residents what we stand to lose.</i></p>	Noted.  Noted.
123	Flinders Street Mt Hawthorn 6016	Support	Maintaining the dwellings in Mount Hawthorn as they are is supported.	Noted.
124	Shakespeare Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I would like the R20 provision to continue as I have chosen to live where the dwellings are not "built up".</i>	Noted.
125	Buxton Street, Mount Hawthorn	Support	<i>...Believe there should be a consultative process to determine those areas where higher density/multiple dwellings could be allowed, rather than applying to all R30 coded areas.</i>	Noted, the consultation process relating to Town Planning Scheme No. 2 resulted in the majority of submissions stating that established residential areas should be maintained and high densities should be proposed along major transport routes.
126	Harrow Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>Pleased to support opposing higher density housing in Mount Hawthorn, primarily as it would ruin the character of the suburb.</i>	Noted.
127	Hobart Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	Not opposed to Multiple Dwellings on main roads but multiple dwellings on suburban streets as there is already traffic issues.	Noted.
128	Egina Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>We support the ban on multiple dwellings as we believe it may lead to an increase in traffic, anti-social behaviour, invasion of our privacy and does not fit in with our family oriented community.</i>	Noted.
129	Johnson Street Wembley 6014	Support	The ban is supported as Multiple Dwellings would destroy the unique character of the "family residential area" and would increase, traffic, noise and parking problems.	Noted.
130	East Street, Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>The amendment will maintain the quiet, family friendly street character which was the main reason I have bought a house in Mount Hawthorn. It will also help prevent the problems seen with the development at 46 East Street. This development is not in line with the character of our streets.</i>	Noted.

## Amendment No. 40 to the City of Vincent Town Planning Scheme No. 1 – Summary of Submissions

No	Name	Object or Support	Comments	Officer Comments
<b>SUPPORT</b>				
131	Matlock Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>Multiple dwellings detract from the character of the area and should be restricted to higher density zones, they also devalue the surrounding properties and the suburb as a whole.</i>	Noted, however the comment regarding value is not identified as a planning consideration.
132	Dunedin St Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	It is understood that urban sprawl cannot continue and Mount Hawthorn must increase its housing density. However, Multiple Dwelling developments should be appropriately located and compliant to ensure the impact on the amenity of surrounding residents is protected. It is important that high density living is proposed adjacent to public transport and main roads, with low density leafy suburbs and parks nearby which would raise population density but not at the expense of quality of life.	Noted.
133	Dunedin St Mt Hawthorn WA 6016	Support	<i>We object to the proposed amendment on the basis of the following points:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Street Parking congestion due to residents and visitors, this problem would be exacerbated due to increased development.</li> <li>• Devaluation of property.</li> <li>• Additional Noise.</li> </ul>	Noted.
134	Kalgoorlie St. Mt Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>The planning rules for Mt Hawthorn are already far too lax, allowing developers and/or property owners to build inappropriate houses to the detriment of their neighbours and the streetscape. The character of the suburb is being destroyed one house at a time. We sincerely hope that Scheme Amendment No.40 is approved, and the council can then turn their attention to the inappropriate single house developments which are currently being approved in Mt Hawthorn. It is not a museum, but nor is it appropriate to allow people to build massive two storey houses which occupy the entire block, and completely destroy the streetscape of adjacent California bungalows or similar.</i>	Noted, the City is currently completing a review of its Policy framework to ensure development is appropriately planned.
135	Kalgoorlie St Mt Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>Developers currently construct large scale dwellings to the detriment of the area.</i>	Noted.
136	Flinders Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	Multiple and Grouped Dwellings should be prohibited in Mount Hawthorn but allowed on major transport routes.  The area has unique amenity and character that would be destroyed if Multiple Dwellings (MD) were allowed. Traffic issues will also be exacerbated.  Values will diminish MD if development is allowed.	The Scheme Amendment proposes the prohibition of Multiple Dwellings however Grouped Dwellings would still be allowed.  Noted.  Land value is not identified as a planning consideration.

## Amendment No. 40 to the City of Vincent Town Planning Scheme No. 1 – Summary of Submissions

No	Name	Object or Support	Comments	Officer Comments
<b>SUPPORT</b>				
137	Fairfield Street, Mount Hawthorn	Support	Multiple Dwellings should be prohibited in Mount Hawthorn but allowed in high density areas as they will: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Decrease the value of properties.</li> <li>• Increase traffic issues</li> <li>• Loss of community and social interaction</li> <li>• Loss of vegetation</li> </ul>	Noted however land value is not identified as a planning consideration.
138	Coogee Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	Multiple Dwelling (MD) development should be restricted to major transport corridors.  Development of MD's in Mount Hawthorn will erode the unique character and identity of the area and will devalue existing dwellings due to overcrowding.  Privacy, traffic, solar access and noise problems may also increase.	Noted.  Noted.  Noted.
139	Anzac Road Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	Mount Hawthorn contains visually appealing streets. These are becoming tasteless, a profit driven mess. Laws should be brought in to stop demolition as the new constructions are not appropriate.	Noted.
140	The Boulevard Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I believe that the proposed amendment will ensure that the amenity of the Mount Hawthorn area is maintained for current and future residents. Mount Hawthorn is a unique character suburb of predominantly single dwellings. It has a village style lay out and a great community. Ensuring that multiple dwellings (apartments) are zoned for the main corridors of our suburb (and not the quiet residential streets) will ensure that these much loved characteristics are maintained. My final point is that multi storey developments result in parking issues and congested streets and lane ways.</i>	Noted.
141	Lynton Street Mt Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>The amendment will assist in protecting the character of the suburb, as well as maintaining the amenity of already busy and congested streets.</i>  <i>In line with 'Vincent Vision 2024' the adoption of the Amendment will ensure the core area of Mount Hawthorn retains its current level of density, streetscape and family-friendly feel, whilst allowing higher density living along main corridors such as Scarborough Beach Road and Oxford Street.</i>	Noted.  Noted.

## Amendment No. 40 to the City of Vincent Town Planning Scheme No. 1 – Summary of Submissions

No	Name	Object or Support	Comments	Officer Comments
<b>SUPPORT</b>				
142	Fairfield Street, Mount Hawthorn	Support	Mount Hawthorn is particularly popular with young families and those seeking to raise children in this area. Among the main reasons for Mount Hawthorn's growing popularity, are its very desirable mix of near city location, excellent amenity, safety for residents including young children and very importantly its well preserved, unique character streetscapes.  Multiple dwellings are only appropriate on major transport routes.	Noted.  Noted.
143	Tasman Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	Fully support Amendment No. 40 in order to preserve the ambiance of this old inner city suburb.	Noted.
144	Dunedin Street Mount Hawthorn 6016  Blair Road Yokine	Support	<i>It's too late for those of us that own property surrounding the abomination that is 86 Hobart Street. However, I and other residents who took the time to go to council meetings to protest the above development can feel some sense of satisfaction that it highlighted what potentially can happen in any street of the ratepayers of Mount Hawthorn.</i>	Noted.
145	London Street, Mount Hawthorn, WA 6016	Support	<i>As an owner of property in the affected area, I do not wish the existing character and identity of the area to be adversely affected by multiple dwellings. Mt Hawthorn has many character homes, of which my property is one with a unique aspect to them. It has an atmosphere of warmth and family friendly nature. If multiple dwellings were permitted, I feel that that character would impacted. I also feel that property values in the area would be decreased if large numbers of multiple dwellings were permitted.</i>	Noted however land value is not identified as a planning consideration.
146	Dunedin Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>If multiple dwellings are allowed along London Street (Which is parallel to our right of way) this will have a significantly negative impact on our privacy, light (Natural) and potentially drainage (increased run off from higher land to lower land).</i>	Noted however the impacts would be minimised by compliance with the Residential Design Codes.
147	Sasse Avenue Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support Amendment 40.</i>	Noted.
148	Sasse Avenue Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support the proposed prohibition of Multiple Dwellings in the quiet residential character streets of Mt Hawthorn.</i>	Noted.
149	Egina Street Mt Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support the proposed prohibition of Multiple Dwellings in the quiet residential character streets of Mt Hawthorn.</i>	Noted.



## Amendment No. 40 to the City of Vincent Town Planning Scheme No. 1 – Summary of Submissions

No	Name	Object or Support	Comments	Officer Comments
<b>SUPPORT</b>				
150	Milton Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support the proposed prohibition of Multiple Dwellings in the quiet residential character streets of Mt Hawthorn.</i>	Noted.
151	Sasse Avenue Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support the proposed prohibition of Multiple Dwellings in the quiet residential character streets of Mt Hawthorn.</i>	Noted.
152	Sasse Avenue Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support the proposed prohibition of Multiple Dwellings in the quiet residential character streets of Mt Hawthorn.</i>	Noted.
153	East Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support the proposed prohibition of Multiple Dwellings in the quiet residential character streets of Mt Hawthorn.</i>	Noted.
154	Sasse Avenue Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support the proposed prohibition of Multiple Dwellings in the quiet residential character streets of Mt Hawthorn.</i>	Noted.
155	Sasse Avenue Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support the proposed prohibition of Multiple Dwellings in the quiet residential streets of Mt Hawthorn.</i>	Noted.
156	Sasse Avenue Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support the proposed prohibition of Multiple Dwellings in the quiet streets of Mt Hawthorn.</i>	Noted.
157	Sasse Avenue Mount Hawthorn	Support	<i>I support the proposed prohibition of Multiple Dwellings in the quiet streets of Mt Hawthorn.</i>	Noted.
158	Sasse Avenue Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support the proposed prohibition of Multiple Dwellings in the quiet residential streets of Mt Hawthorn.</i>	Noted.
159	Sasse Avenue Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support the proposed prohibition of Multiple Dwellings in the quiet residential streets of Mt Hawthorn.</i>	Noted.
160	Sasse Avenue Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support the proposed prohibition of Multiple Dwellings in the quiet residential streets of Mt Hawthorn.</i>	Noted.
161	Sasse Avenue Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support the proposed prohibition of Multiple Dwellings in the quiet residential streets of Mt Hawthorn.</i>	Noted.
162	Sasse Avenue Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support the prohibition of Multiple Dwellings in the quiet residential streets of Mt Hawthorn.</i>	Noted.

## Amendment No. 40 to the City of Vincent Town Planning Scheme No. 1 – Summary of Submissions

No	Name	Object or Support	Comments	Officer Comments
<b>SUPPORT</b>				
163	Sasse Avenue Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support the prohibition of Multiple Dwellings in the quiet residential streets of Mt Hawthorn.</i>	Noted.
164	Sasse Avenue Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support the proposed prohibition of Multiple Dwellings in the quiet residential character streets of Mt Hawthorn.</i>	Noted.
165	Sasse Avenue Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support the proposed prohibition of Multiple Dwellings in the quiet residential character streets of Mt Hawthorn.</i>	Noted.
166	Sasse Avenue Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support the proposed prohibition of Multiple Dwellings in the quiet residential character streets of Mt Hawthorn.</i>	Noted.
167	Sasse Avenue Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support the proposed prohibition of Multiple Dwellings in the quiet residential character streets of Mt Hawthorn.</i>	Noted.
168	Sasse Avenue Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support the proposed prohibition of Multiple Dwellings in the quiet residential character streets of Mt Hawthorn.</i>	Noted.
169	Sasse Avenue Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support the proposed prohibition of Multiple Dwellings in the quiet residential character streets of Mt Hawthorn.</i>	Noted.
170	Sasse Avenue Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support the proposed prohibition of Multiple Dwellings in the quiet residential character streets of Mt Hawthorn.</i>	Noted.
171	Sasse Avenue Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support the proposed prohibition of Multiple Dwellings in the quiet residential character streets of Mt Hawthorn.</i>	Noted.
172	Sasse Avenue Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support the proposed prohibition of Multiple Dwellings in the quiet residential character streets of Mt Hawthorn.</i>	Noted.
173	Sasse Avenue Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	I support the proposed prohibition of Multiple Dwellings (MD) in the quiet residential character streets of Mt Hawthorn. MD's add to noise pollution traffic congestion and are not conducive to the character of the area.	Noted.
174	Sasse Avenue Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support the proposed prohibition of Multiple Dwellings in the quiet residential character streets of Mt Hawthorn.</i>	Noted.

## Amendment No. 40 to the City of Vincent Town Planning Scheme No. 1 – Summary of Submissions

No	Name	Object or Support	Comments	Officer Comments
<b>SUPPORT</b>				
175	East Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support the proposed prohibition of Multiple Dwellings in the quiet residential character streets of Mt Hawthorn.</i>	Noted.
176	Sasse Avenue Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support the proposed prohibition of Multiple Dwellings in the quiet residential character streets of Mt Hawthorn.</i>	Noted.
177	Sasse Avenue Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support the proposed prohibition of Multiple Dwellings in the quiet residential character streets of Mt Hawthorn.</i>	Noted.
178	Sasse Avenue Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support the proposed prohibition of Multiple Dwellings in the quiet residential character streets of Mt Hawthorn.</i>	Noted.
179	Sasse Avenue Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support the proposed prohibition of Multiple Dwellings in the quiet residential character streets of Mt Hawthorn.</i>	Noted.
180	Sasse Avenue Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support the proposed prohibition of Multiple Dwellings in the quiet residential character streets of Mt Hawthorn.</i>	Noted.
181	Sasse Avenue Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support the proposed prohibition of Multiple Dwellings in the quiet residential character streets of Mt Hawthorn.</i>	Noted.
182	Sasse Avenue Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support the proposed prohibition of Multiple Dwellings in the quiet residential character streets of Mt Hawthorn.</i>	Noted.
183	Sasse Avenue Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support Amendment 40.</i>	Noted.
184	East Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support the proposed prohibition of Multiple Dwellings in the quiet residential character streets of Mt Hawthorn.</i>	Noted.
185	East Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support the proposed prohibition of Multiple Dwellings in the quiet residential character streets of Mt Hawthorn.</i>	Noted.
186	Sasse Avenue Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support the proposed prohibition of Multiple Dwellings in the quiet residential character streets of Mt Hawthorn.</i>	Noted.
187	East Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support the proposed prohibition of Multiple Dwellings in the quiet residential character streets of Mt Hawthorn.</i>	Noted.

## Amendment No. 40 to the City of Vincent Town Planning Scheme No. 1 – Summary of Submissions

No	Name	Object or Support	Comments	Officer Comments
<b>SUPPORT</b>				
188	The Boulevarde Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support Amendment 40.</i>	Noted.
189	Coogee Street Mt Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support Amendment 40.</i>	Noted.
190	Federation Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support Amendment 40.</i>	Noted.
191	Dunedin Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support Amendment 40.</i>	Noted.
192	London Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support Amendment 40.</i>	Noted.
193	Faraday Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support Amendment 40.</i>	Noted.
194	Federation Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support Amendment 40.</i>	Noted.
195	Matlock Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support Amendment 40.</i>	Noted.
196	Federation Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support Amendment 40.</i>	Noted.
197	The Boulevarde Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support Amendment 40.</i>	Noted.
198	Sasse Avenue Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support the proposed prohibition of Multiple Dwellings in the quiet residential character streets of Mt Hawthorn.</i>	Noted.
199	Sasse Avenue Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support the proposed prohibition of Multiple Dwellings in the quiet residential character streets of Mt Hawthorn.</i>	Noted.
200	Sasse Avenue Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support the proposed prohibition of Multiple Dwellings in the quiet residential character streets of Mt Hawthorn.</i>	Noted.

### Amendment No. 40 to the City of Vincent Town Planning Scheme No. 1 – Summary of Submissions

No	Name	Object or Support	Comments	Officer Comments
<b>SUPPORT</b>				
201	Sasse Avenue Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support the proposed prohibition of Multiple Dwellings in the quiet residential character streets of Mt Hawthorn.</i>	Noted.
202	Buxton Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>Support the proposed ban on high density residential development within "core" Mount Hawthorn.</i>	Noted.
203	Buxton Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support Amendment 40.</i>	Noted.
204	Salisbury Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support Amendment 40.</i>	Noted.
205	Kalgoorlie Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support Amendment 40.</i>	Noted.
206	Buxton Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support Amendment 40.</i>	Noted.
207	Buxton Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support Amendment 40.</i>	Noted.
208	Purslowe Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support Amendment 40.</i>	Noted.
209	Birrell Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support Amendment 40.</i>	Noted.
210	Buxton Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support Amendment 40.</i>	Noted.
211	Egina Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support Amendment 40.</i>	Noted.
212	Buxton Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support Amendment 40.</i>	Noted.

## Amendment No. 40 to the City of Vincent Town Planning Scheme No. 1 – Summary of Submissions

No	Name	Object or Support	Comments	Officer Comments
<b>SUPPORT</b>				
213	Sasse Avenue Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support Amendment 40.</i>	Noted.
214	Buxton Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support Amendment 40.</i>	Noted.
215	Buxton Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support Amendment 40.</i>	Noted.
216	Salisbury Street Leederville 6007	Support	<i>I support Amendment 40.</i>	Noted.
217	Edinboro Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support Amendment 40.</i>	Noted.
218	Hobart Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support Amendment 40.</i>	Noted.
219	East Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support the proposed prohibition of Multiple Dwellings in the quiet residential character streets of Mt Hawthorn.</i>	Noted.
220	Lynton Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support the proposed prohibition of Multiple Dwellings in the quiet residential character streets of Mt Hawthorn.</i>	Noted.
221	East Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support the proposed prohibition of Multiple Dwellings in the quiet residential character streets of Mt Hawthorn.</i>	Noted.
222	East Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support the proposed prohibition of Multiple Dwellings in the quiet residential character streets of Mt Hawthorn.</i>	Noted.
223	East Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support the proposed prohibition of Multiple Dwellings in the quiet residential character streets of Mt Hawthorn.</i>	Noted.
224	East Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support the proposed prohibition of Multiple Dwellings in the quiet residential character streets of Mt Hawthorn.</i>	Noted.
225	East Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support the proposed prohibition of Multiple Dwellings in the quiet residential character streets of Mt Hawthorn.</i>	Noted.

## Amendment No. 40 to the City of Vincent Town Planning Scheme No. 1 – Summary of Submissions

No	Name	Object or Support	Comments	Officer Comments
<b>SUPPORT</b>				
226	East Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support the proposed prohibition of Multiple Dwellings in the quiet residential character streets of Mt Hawthorn.</i>	Noted.
227	East Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support the proposed prohibition of Multiple Dwellings in the quiet residential character streets of Mt Hawthorn.</i>	Noted.
228	East Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support the proposed prohibition of Multiple Dwellings in the quiet residential character streets of Mt Hawthorn.</i>	Noted.
229	East Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support the proposed prohibition of Multiple Dwellings in the quiet residential character streets of Mt Hawthorn.</i>	Noted.
230	East Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support the proposed prohibition of Multiple Dwellings in the quiet residential character streets of Mt Hawthorn.</i>	Noted.
231	East Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support the proposed prohibition of Multiple Dwellings in the quiet residential character streets of Mt Hawthorn.</i>	Noted.
232	Anzac Road Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support the proposed prohibition of Multiple Dwellings in the quiet residential character streets of Mt Hawthorn.</i>	Noted.
233	East Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support the proposed prohibition of Multiple Dwellings in the quiet residential character streets of Mt Hawthorn.</i>	Noted.
234	East Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support the proposed prohibition of Multiple Dwellings in the quiet residential character streets of Mt Hawthorn.</i>	Noted.
235	East Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support the proposed prohibition of Multiple Dwellings in the quiet residential character streets of Mt Hawthorn.</i>	Noted.
236	East Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support the proposed prohibition of Multiple Dwellings in the quiet residential character streets of Mt Hawthorn.</i>	Noted.
237	East Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support the proposed prohibition of Multiple Dwellings in the quiet residential character streets of Mt Hawthorn.</i>	Noted.

## Amendment No. 40 to the City of Vincent Town Planning Scheme No. 1 – Summary of Submissions

No	Name	Object or Support	Comments	Officer Comments
<b>SUPPORT</b>				
238	East Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support the proposed prohibition of Multiple Dwellings in the quiet residential character streets of Mt Hawthorn.</i>	Noted.
239	East Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support the proposed prohibition of Multiple Dwellings in the quiet residential character streets of Mt Hawthorn.</i>	Noted.
240	East Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support the proposed prohibition of Multiple Dwellings in the quiet residential character streets of Mt Hawthorn.</i>	Noted.
241	East Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support the proposed prohibition of Multiple Dwellings in the quiet residential character streets of Mt Hawthorn.</i>	Noted.
242	East Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support the proposed prohibition of Multiple Dwellings in the quiet residential character streets of Mt Hawthorn.</i>	Noted.
243	East Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support the proposed prohibition of Multiple Dwellings in the quiet residential character streets of Mt Hawthorn.</i>	Noted.
244	East Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support the proposed prohibition of Multiple Dwellings in the quiet residential character streets of Mt Hawthorn.</i>	Noted.
245	East Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support the proposed prohibition of Multiple Dwellings in the quiet residential character streets of Mt Hawthorn.</i>	Noted.
246	East Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support the proposed prohibition of Multiple Dwellings in the quiet residential character streets of Mt Hawthorn.</i>	Noted.
247	East Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support the proposed prohibition of Multiple Dwellings in the quiet residential character streets of Mt Hawthorn.</i>	Noted.
248	East Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support the proposed prohibition of Multiple Dwellings in the quiet residential character streets of Mt Hawthorn.</i>	Noted.
249	East Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support the proposed prohibition of Multiple Dwellings in the quiet residential character streets of Mt Hawthorn.</i>	Noted.



## Amendment No. 40 to the City of Vincent Town Planning Scheme No. 1 – Summary of Submissions

No	Name	Object or Support	Comments	Officer Comments
<b>SUPPORT</b>				
250	Sasse Avenue Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support the proposed prohibition of Multiple Dwellings in the quiet residential character streets of Mt Hawthorn.</i>	Noted.
251	Sasse Avenue Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support the proposed prohibition of Multiple Dwellings in the quiet residential character streets of Mt Hawthorn.</i>	Noted.
252	Sasse Avenue Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support the proposed prohibition of Multiple Dwellings in the quiet residential character streets of Mt Hawthorn.</i>	Noted.
253	Sasse Avenue Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support the proposed prohibition of Multiple Dwellings in the quiet residential character streets of Mt Hawthorn.</i>	Noted.
254	Sasse Avenue Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support the proposed prohibition of Multiple Dwellings in the quiet residential character streets of Mt Hawthorn.</i>	Noted.
255	Sasse Avenue Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support the proposed prohibition of Multiple Dwellings in the quiet residential character streets of Mt Hawthorn.</i>	Noted.
256	Sasse Avenue Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support the proposed prohibition of Multiple Dwellings in the quiet residential character streets of Mt Hawthorn.</i>	Noted.
257	Sasse Avenue Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>I support the proposed prohibition of Multiple Dwellings in the quiet residential character streets of Mt Hawthorn.</i>	Noted.
258	Buxton Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Support	Concerned with car parking provision in Multiple Dwellings.  Development of Multiple Dwellings will also spoil the ambiance of the area.	Noted parking is provided in accordance with Clause 6.3.3 of the R-Codes.

## Amendment No. 40 to the City of Vincent Town Planning Scheme No. 1 – Summary of Submissions

No	Name	Object or Support	Comments	Officer Comments
<b>NO OBJECTION</b>				
1	Fairfield Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	-	<p>My concerns are around the future ability to develop our property – what work has the council put into assessing the impact of the amendment on the ability of homeowners to develop their properties and maximize the value of their assets?</p> <p>It seems to me that council is making arbitrary decisions which may have a serious impact on the future financial outcomes for many residents. We purchased our property several years ago with the view to its development potential under regulations existing at the time under which we may have been able to develop when it came time to downsize, a time which is approaching rapidly.</p>	Individual asset value is not identified as a planning consideration.
2	MRA		The MRA supports housing diversity and flexible planning systems, particularly within inner urban areas such as the City of Vincent. However, the proposed Scheme Amendment No. 40 relates to areas in Mount Hawthorn and has no specific implications for the MRA.	Noted.
3	Green Street Mount Hawthorn 6016		Our business has been on the corner of Green Street and Dunedin Street for 10 years and as such we are a long standing retail outlet. We believe that because of the Commercial area we are in and the surrounding businesses our corner should be exempt from this ban.	The lot occupied by Liquor Barons is zoned as residential R30. Because of this any ban on multiple dwellings arising from the endorsement of Amendment 40 will apply to this lot.
4	Water Corporation	No Objection	<p><i>The Corporation does not object to the amendment.</i></p> <p><i>The Corporation's position on the Multiple Dwelling policy is that it is not transparent and therefore can create un-clarity when planning for infrastructure.</i></p> <p><i>The Corporation prefers and R coding to mean what it says e.g. for R30 to mean 30 dwellings per hectare, not a density to ultimately mean more density than indicated.</i></p> <p><i>It is considered this would create unorderly infrastructure planning, and may in places create infrastructure constraints, unless a more transparent method were to be employed.</i></p>	Noted, the Western Australian Planning Commission establish whether residential zoned land may be assessed by minimum site area per dwelling or plot ratio. A plot ratio calculation or assessment may allow more dwellings on a site than the assigned minimum site area per dwellings resulting in an increased amount of dwellings which does not resemble the Residential Code.

## Amendment No. 40 to the City of Vincent Town Planning Scheme No. 1 – Summary of Submissions

No	Name	Object or Support	Comments	Officer Comments
<b>NO OBJECTION</b>				
5	City of Stirling	No Objection	<p>As you may be aware, the City of Stirling's Local Planning Scheme No.3 prohibits the development of multiple dwellings in areas coded R35 and below. The City is also concerned that the 2010 changes to the Residential Design Codes (R Codes) to permit multiple dwellings have resulted in unintended consequences, by encouraging unsustainable growth in the suburbs, rather than in town and activity centres.</p> <p>To protect the amenity of residential areas and the future growth of the City's activity centres, the City of Stirling has proposed Amendment No. 32 to its Local Planning Scheme to exclude further multiple dwelling developments on land coded R40 and below, and to focus multiple dwelling developments to our existing activity and town centres where residents have better access to appropriate services, infrastructure and facilities. Amendment No. 32 is currently with the Minister of Planning for approval. In light of the above, the City of Stirling has no objections to the City of Vincent's proposed Amendment No. 40.</p>	<p>Noted, the intention of the Amendment is to encourage multiple dwelling growth on major transport corridors whilst restricting them in established residential areas.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
6	Dunedin St and Green Street		<p><i>Consider their properties as commercial despite being zoned as R30 and because of this they should be exempt from this ban.</i></p> <p><i>Received assurances in 2010 that the City of Vincent would consider re-zoning their properties to Mixed-Use in TPS2.</i></p>	<p>The lot occupied by Liquor Barons is zoned as residential R30. Because of this any ban on multiple dwellings arising from the endorsement of Amendment 40 will apply to this lot.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
7	Main Roads	No Objection	<i>Main Roads has no objections to proposed Amendment No. 40 of Town Planning Scheme No. 1.</i>	Noted.
8	State Heritage Office	No Objection	<i>The proposed Scheme Amendment has been considered for its potential impact on heritage places within the Scheme area. There is no objection to the proposal.</i>	Noted.
9	City of Subiaco	No objection	<i>The City of Subiaco does not object to the proposed amendment and supports the initiative to develop appropriate locally responsive development requirements.</i>	Noted.
10	Coogee Street Mt Hawthorn 6016	Support	<i>Property is located adjacent the commercial area on Scarborough Beach Road. Multiple Dwellings would be appropriate on this site due to its proximity to the commercial area.</i>	Noted.

## Amendment No. 40 to the City of Vincent Town Planning Scheme No. 1 – Summary of Submissions

No	Name	Object or Support	Comments	Officer Comments
<b>NO OBJECTION</b>				
			<p><i>My property is on the side of the business area. Directly behind the shops and restaurants/cafes. I have always been part of the business area – trucks, customers and residents walk up and drive through the road separating shops from my property. Therefore, only having residential where I am does not make sense. Yes okay from 74 Coogee onwards. Leave for residential, but 72A&amp;B is part of the business area. I would have a hard time trying to sell my property to anyone other than business because of its location. I prefer the choice for my property Multi Dwellings is okay if there are laws ensuring height, of property eg. Allowing only 3 to 4 levels and ensuring buildings surrounding areas gardens and pathways are made for residents and surrounding residents/customers.</i></p> <p><i>Leave 72A&amp;B to have the choice of business so if it means apartments ensure the proprietor or builder meets all the requirements.</i></p>	<p>Noted, Council at its Ordinary Meeting held 18 November 2014 endorsed the City's Town Planning Scheme No. 2 and forwarded it to the WAPC for final determination. These properties are proposed to be residential R60 under TPS2 and therefore suitable for multiple dwellings.</p> <p>Noted.</p>

No	Name	Object or Support	Comments	Officer Comments
<b>OBJECTIONS</b>				
1	Leederville	Object	<p><i>...vehemently oppose this proposed amendment.</i></p> <p><i>I purchased my property in the knowledge that one day they would become an investment, all other areas are allowed to have Multiple dwellings even in Leederville and Joondanna etc.</i></p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Land value is not identified as a planning consideration.</p>
2	Fairfield Street, Mount Hawthorn 6016	Object	<p>The negative impacts of Urban Sprawl are well known and increased housing density is part of the answer.</p> <p>Multiple dwelling developments which are appropriately designed and spaced should be encouraged.</p> <p>The City of Vincent is trying to protect the interests of its residents but those interests are too selfish and not in the greater interest of a better city.</p>	<p>Increased density needs to be appropriately placed to not have a detrimental impact on established character and heritage.</p> <p>Supported.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
3	Edinboro Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Object	<p>It may become necessary for me to sell my house. To sell to a developer would increase the value so it in in my best interests for Amendment No. 40 to be disallowed.</p>	<p>Land value is not identified as a planning consideration.</p>

## Amendment No. 40 to the City of Vincent Town Planning Scheme No. 1 – Summary of Submissions

No	Name	Object or Support	Comments	Officer Comments
<b>OBJECTIONS</b>				
4	The Boulevard Mount Hawthorn 6016	Object	<p>Oppose local councils introducing policy or scheme requirements that vary the Residential Design Codes.</p> <p>The R-Codes provide sufficient assessment criteria for the development of multiple dwellings. This criteria ensures the protection of amenity of neighbouring properties. The issue with development of any kind is when the Council does not adequately address variations to the R-Codes, these variations concern neighbours.</p> <p>The City of Vincent is an inner city municipality it is ridiculous to contemplate restricting more intense development.</p> <p>As multiple dwellings in R30 or below are based on 410m<sup>2</sup> per dwelling and not linked to plot ratio no additional dwellings can be achieved as compared to developments of grouped dwellings, it is simply a matter of the dwellings being side-by-side or stacked (apartments). The site area requirements therefore also restrict the height thereby also ensuring any multiple dwelling is not out of context with the area, taking into account that very few super lots exist in this municipality.</p>	<p>All Amendments to Town Planning Schemes are required to be lodged with the Western Australian Planning Commission and subsequently determined by the Minister for Planning.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Currently the minimum site area per dwelling for R30 is 260m<sup>2</sup> with the average being 300m<sup>2</sup>. Plot ratio is also available to sites zoned R30, the plot ratio being 0.5. Plot ratio currently allows landowners to construct Multiple Dwellings in Mount Hawthorn with the incentive of increased density compared to a minimum site area per dwelling assessment.</p>
5	Harrow Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Object	<p>I am not in favour of any council intervention to restrict the development of multiple dwelling in Mount Hawthorn as this infringes on the rights of owners to develop their properties in line with modern town planning practice set out by the WAPC.</p> <p>These proposals are a threat to the future value of our properties and reduces our flexibility and choice, should the owners decide to redevelop in the future.</p>	<p>Noted, grouped dwelling redevelopment is allowed in accordance with table 1 of the Residential Design Codes.</p> <p>Property value is not identified as a planning consideration.</p>
6	Deague Court North Perth 6006	Object	<p>The Development Assessment Panel supported and approved a large scale development of multiple dwellings on Charles Street. The proposal was an overdevelopment of the lot and would exacerbate car parking issues. This objection was raised and subsequently dismissed by the Panel as they have an obligation to support Multiple Dwellings along high frequency transport corridors.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

## Amendment No. 40 to the City of Vincent Town Planning Scheme No. 1 – Summary of Submissions

No	Name	Object or Support	Comments	Officer Comments
<b>OBJECTIONS</b>				
			<p>Why would Mount Hawthorn be exempt? The high frequency route of Scarborough Beach Road is appropriate for multiple dwellings.</p> <p>The exemption is hypocrisy and cannot be supported.</p>	<p>Scheme Amendment No. 40 is proposed in order to prohibit Multiple Dwellings on land zoned Residential R30 and below in Mount Hawthorn. Lots which front Scarborough Beach Road, in Mount Hawthorn, are predominately Residential R60 and therefore development of Multiple Dwellings would not be prohibited should Scheme Amendment No. 40 be adopted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
7	Fairfield Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Object	<p>It is my belief that the Mt Hawthorn area can support the increase in development caused by traditional single-house blocks being subdivided into duplexes, triplexes and possibly grouped or multiple dwellings. Duplexes and triplexes have minimal impact on the surrounding properties. Grouped and multiple dwellings may have greater impact however I am comfortable with the controls currently imposed by the R-codes (however I do believe in council oversight in special cases).</p> <p>The streets and roads on Mt Hawthorn are not busy or congested, so I don't believe the increased population will be an issue. Also, Mt Hawthorn is close to the city so people have the option of riding bikes or catching public transport to their destination. This is one of the main reasons people are attracted to this area. Other infrastructure such as water, sewerage, power and telecommunications will be relatively inexpensive to upgrade, if required, due to the suburban nature of the area.</p> <p>I am unsure of the reasons for Amendment 40 being put forward, I can only suspect it is "NIMBYism" from Mt Hawthorn residents. I think the City of Vincent should not bow to pressure from these residents, even though they are voters and rate payers. The City of Vincent should consider its other residents, who perhaps live in smaller apartments or in more built-up areas of Vincent and would be attracted to a duplex/triplex or small group of larger apartments in Mt Hawthorn.</p>	<p>There is no restriction on sub-division or grouped dwellings proposed under Amendment 40. The amendment only applies to multiple dwellings as defined by the R-Codes. Amendment 39 requires Council to advertise and to "exercise its discretion" when approving multiple dwellings. Amendment 39 has been submitted to the Minster for endorsement.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>

## Amendment No. 40 to the City of Vincent Town Planning Scheme No. 1 – Summary of Submissions

No	Name	Object or Support	Comments	Officer Comments
<b>OBJECTIONS</b>				
			As for the "character" nature of Mount Hawthorn streets, I think this is misplaced. Mount Hawthorn was never a historically significant area of Perth and just because it is perhaps older than some other suburbs, there is no need to try to freeze the suburb in time. There is a good chance that many old houses will be retained anyway. It seems that, by the number of tastefully renovated older homes, there is already a demand for and high value placed on these older homes by homebuyers.	Noted
8	Fairfield Street, Mount Hawthorn	Object	<p>We purchased our property in Mt Hawthorn due to its location, proximity to the City, restaurants, train stations, school, parks and all the lifestyle advantages Mt Hawthorn offers.</p> <p>It was important for us to be able to future develop to maximise our investment – being able to subdivide. I think restricting the potential to develop in Mount Hawthorn will have a direct effect on the value of our property and in the future and will affect future options for our family to develop for our needs financially and emotionally.</p> <p>We purchased to cater for the life style we want for our future and I feel the proposed changes being suggested will directly hurt us. If people don't want to share this unique part of Perth with a diverse array of housing and peoples – the aged, young, single, young couples, retirees, new families etc. I think they will be poorer for it.</p> <p>In summary I think this change will devalue my investment both financially and in lifestyle quality. Our population is increasing we need to continue to grow and be creative not restrictive and selfish.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Effects on property prices are not identified as a consideration for planning.</p> <p>Noted, and support the comment that diverse housing and people are what makes communities rich.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
9	Coogee Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Object	Redevelopment of dilapidated houses is positive as it creates jobs and revitalises the area. It would also increase affordable housing for younger generations.	Noted.
10	Brittania Road Mount Hawthorn 6016	Object	<p>If the administration is of the opinion that multiple dwellings are unacceptable in Mount Hawthorn based on a small section of the community I would ask you to answer the following questions:</p> <p>– Do you know what you are objecting to? Is it the style of development you assume will occur, the people that you believe it will attract, or the affect that it will have on your suburb in terms of change or traffic impacts?</p>	Noted.

## Amendment No. 40 to the City of Vincent Town Planning Scheme No. 1 – Summary of Submissions

No	Name	Object or Support	Comments	Officer Comments
<b>OBJECTIONS</b>				
			<p>– If it is the development that you object to, what exactly is the objection? Is it multi-storey flats and apartments? Is it the appearance of the development type? Is it the front and side setbacks? Is it the lack of trees? I'm afraid that my observation of single house and grouped dwelling development is that all of these impacts could be identical – see the attached pages</p> <p>– If it is the people – to start with that's really inappropriate to assume all apartment dwellers are somehow the 'others', but forgetting that, how do you know these variations in community members would not contribute to a more desirable place to live, where lots of different people get to mingle and enjoy a more colourful life?</p> <p>– If it is the change to the suburb visually or for traffic; the following pages suggest that is already happening with or without multiple dwellings. Our streets are already a mish-mash of styles. My opinion of some of the more recent single house developments is pretty scathing; I'm not sure the fear is well placed. With regard to traffic, I'm afraid to say that you are likely to have just as many vehicles at a 4 bedroom house these days as you would at 4 single bedroom dwellings. I just think this argument is for today, when you should be planning for tomorrow.</p> <p>I am not sure which community you are listening to. Is it the 10% that call you, and bug you, and complain? Or the 90% who are generally satisfied (or like me cannot stand the mcmansions which now proliferate that 'quiet leafy suburban streets')?</p> <p>I implore you to consider, rather than a blanket 'no' to diversity, what character you are actually seeking for the area. Is this is not achieved by the current R-Codes, establish variations that can manage the <i>built form character</i>, not the type of dwelling. Fear of multiple dwellings and this change to the scheme will not stop ugly development, it will just ensure it is all ugly in the same way.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted and support the comment that a diverse population adds to a rich community.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
11	The Boulevarde Mount Hawthorn 6016	Object	Multiple Dwelling Developments in Mount Hawthorn are contentious particularly in areas dominated by single residential dwellings.	Noted



## Amendment No. 40 to the City of Vincent Town Planning Scheme No. 1 – Summary of Submissions

No	Name	Object or Support	Comments	Officer Comments
<b>OBJECTIONS</b>				
			<p>The amendments to the R-Codes in 2010 introduced the assessment of plot ratio for lower density codes making multiple dwellings an option however these were practically unfeasible due to block size.</p> <p>Corner sites with rear lane access are viable site for multiple dwellings and should be allowed subject to the provisions of State and Local Planning Policies.</p> <p>Multiple dwelling development is in some cases less intrusive than large scale grouped dwelling development.</p> <p>Multi dwelling development provides an affordable option.</p> <p>Future generations should have the option of living in Mount Hawthorn rather than adding to urban sprawl.</p> <p>The objectives stated in the City of Vincent's Planning Policies - <i>"To maximise the opportunities afforded by the City of Vincent's proximity to the central business district, major public transport routes, and road networks to provide a range of housing types consistent with the principles of 'Directions 2031 Spatial Framework for Perth and Peel' and the City of Vincent Economic Development Strategy"</i></p> <p><i>"To encourage the provision of affordable housing within the City of Vincent including a wide variety of dwelling types for a range of household types"</i>.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted, this is supported through increased zoning along major transport routes in the City's proposed Town Planning Scheme No. 2.</p>
12	Anzac Road Mount Hawthorn 6016	Object	It is understood the introduction of Amendment 40 is the City's response to some local residents that have raised concerns about maintaining local character. We believe the City needs to consider all forms of residential development on a case by case basis, in accordance with state and local government planning objectives and policy.	Noted.

## Amendment No. 40 to the City of Vincent Town Planning Scheme No. 1 – Summary of Submissions

No	Name	Object or Support	Comments	Officer Comments
<b>OBJECTIONS</b>				
			<p>Introducing a generalised ban is an unreasonable approach to policy and development as it hinders growth, housing diversity and housing choice within the inner metropolitan region. It is requested that the City take a more pragmatic approach to the issue of local character and instead seek to implement alternative development provisions that modify current standards, to help guide more appropriate forms of multiple dwelling products being developed. For example, the City could develop a local planning policy for Mount Hawthorn to establish and implement appropriate planning requirements and standards in respect to residential subdivision and future forms of residential development. Provisions the City could consider include: • Restrict multiple dwellings to lots of a minimum size and/or with a minimum frontage; • Impose additional built form/design provisions such as maintaining traditional front setbacks and the provision of courtyards within front setback areas; • Modify plot ratios and/or introduce a maximum number of dwelling units per square metre of land; Introduce locational criteria for multiple dwellings, such as sites adjacent to areas of POS, within 200m of Scarborough Beach Road and other activity centres and along key distributor roads (such as Anzac Road).</p> <p>As the key issue is local character the City should introduce provisions for all types of development in order to retain the character. The City should look at restricting development to one style on streets with particular character or heritage.</p>	<p>Noted, the City currently guides development through provisions of Policy No. 7.2.1 Residential Design Elements, this Policy is currently being reviewed and incorporated into a Policy which will guide all development within the City.</p> <p>The City is currently advertising the introduction of character areas within the City, this will ensure development is conducive to the particular character identified in the street.</p>
13	Woodstock Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Object	<p><i>I agree with the proposal to allow multiple dwellings in medium density areas and would support a change in the land zoning to R40, or higher density, in the Mount Hawthorn area.</i></p> <p><i>To avoid continued urban spread of the Perth Metropolitan Area, WAPC and local Council need to support higher density development such as apartments.</i></p> <p><i>The long-term needs of the community should outweigh the narrow minded and short-term outlook of existing householders.</i></p>	<p>This is not supported, Council has proposed the majority of Mount Hawthorn to maintain an R30 coding in the proposed Town Planning Scheme No. 2.</p> <p>Noted, Council has supported higher densities along major transport routes in the proposed Town Planning Scheme No. 2.</p> <p>Noted.</p>

## Amendment No. 40 to the City of Vincent Town Planning Scheme No. 1 – Summary of Submissions

No	Name	Object or Support	Comments	Officer Comments
<b>OBJECTIONS</b>				
14	Green Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Object	Our property should be included in the areas designated to allow for higher-density dwellings, which, according to the Mt Hawthorn Precinct map, are most of Scarborough Beach Road, Oxford Street and Brady Street. These streets are busy main roads, as is Green Street. The property directly next door, at 27 Green Street, has been used in a commercial capacity since 1959, as have those close by (see images 1 and 2). Given that my property sits next to an area with commercial notes of activity (London Street and Green Street), and does not sit amongst a streetscape of classic Mt Hawthorn residences, I submit that it should be incorporated into the areas which allows for higher density. Whilst I appreciate the need and desire to keep the Mount Hawthorn precinct mainly single residences, I also appreciate the need to provide inner city housing that also encourages a sense of community which is walking distance from local shops and incorporates environmentally-friendly planning.	Supported, the area is adjacent a local centre, contains appropriate access and should facilitate the growth of the local centre node. As such Administration has included a recommendation to exempt these lots from the Amendment area.
15	Egina Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Object	I object as this is my nest egg and if it is passed I will lose value/money as developers will not be interested and people with 2 storey houses will get more money for their homes.	Land value is not identified as a planning consideration.
16	Anzac Road, Mount Hawthorn 6016	Object	No. 70 Anzac Road is a prime location to have multiple dwellings as it has appropriate access to public transport, employment, community facilities. Many amenities and conveniences are located in close proximity. The site also has laneway access.	Noted.
17	Public Transport Authority	Object	<i>The PTA does not support Amendment No. 40 to the Town Planning Scheme No. 1.</i>  <i>The density restricted areas currently proposed are seen as too vast to support an attractive and high level of public transport service. The PTA strongly supports an increase in residential and commercial density across the subject area, in particular to a greater extent along bus route corridors and around train stations.</i>	Noted.  Increased densities along transport corridors have been proposed in the City's Town Planning Scheme No. 2.

## Amendment No. 40 to the City of Vincent Town Planning Scheme No. 1 – Summary of Submissions

No	Name	Object or Support	Comments	Officer Comments
<b>OBJECTIONS</b>				
			<p><i>Multiple dwellings should be allowed within a walkable catchment (400 metres) of the Scarborough Beach Road corridor, which is serviced by the Route 990 high frequency bus service. The current proposed higher residential density ribbon adjacent to Scarborough Beach Road is restrictively narrow and not conducive to supporting a high level of public transport service.</i></p> <p><i>Further, 800 metres is considered the walkable catchment for train stations. Using this measure, the land adjacent to Glendalough Train Station and not subject to this restrictive amendment should be extended.</i></p>	<p>The City has appropriately proposed increased density on Scarborough Beach Road, whilst maintaining density within the suburb of Mount Hawthorn to retain the built form and perceived character.</p> <p>The land within 800 metres of Glendalough train station is predominately zoned Residential R60 and above. As the Amendment only affects lots zoned R30 and below, the higher zoned areas will not be subject to the Amendment.</p>
18	Hobart Street Mount Hawthorn 6016	Object	<p><i>The area is close to public transport &amp; infrastructure that will support a higher population density.</i></p> <p><i>The future availability of lower cost units will be a benefit to younger people &amp; will result in a more vibrant population mix in the area.</i></p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
19	Dowel Court Ocean Reef 6027	Object	<p><i>This proposal is almost a “blanket ban” on Multiple Dwellings in Mount Hawthorn. Scheme amendments are in direct contravention of highlighted elements of Vincent Vision 2024 in Clause 4.2.</i></p> <p><i>Specific massing requirements and interface diagrams (as per Policy 7.4.8) extra over Parking requirements. (as per (East of Joel Terrace – 2 parking bays) requirements) and a lowered plot ratio allowance could have allowed a mixed development provision to continue and addressed the concerns of Councillors and residents.</i></p> <p><i>Scheme Amendment 40 is also premature considering the WAPC are in the final stages of SPP3.1 revision – which could make this amendment redundant.</i></p>	<p>The proposed amendment supports many elements of Clause 4.2 by maintaining the character and heritage of established residential areas whilst focusing density in town centres and along transport corridors.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>The amendments to SPP3.1 do not prohibit the construction of Multiple Dwellings.</p>

## Amendment No. 40 to the City of Vincent Town Planning Scheme No. 1 – Summary of Submissions

No	Name	Object or Support	Comments	Officer Comments
<b>OBJECTIONS</b>				
20	Department of Housing	Object	<p><i>The Department does not support the proposed amendment to the Scheme that would result in the prohibition of multiple dwellings from R30 coded lots in the Mount Hawthorn area. The amendment unduly restricts residential development currently supported by State Planning Policy 3.1 Residential Design Codes.</i></p> <p><i>While the Department acknowledges that multiple dwellings would still be allowed in designated areas, coded higher than R30, the proposal will substantially reduce the opportunities to broaden housing diversity on lower-coded lots and limit the opportunity to provide a range of affordable housing options.</i></p> <p><i>The Department recognises the concerns voiced by the community in relation to built form, character and parking. However, we consider that the local policy and scheme provisions effectively minimise these impacts without the need to remove the multiple dwelling potential from a significant number of residential lots within the City.</i></p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>