

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
PROPOSAL: DA14/0528 Telecommunications Facility
OFFICER: Sturt McDonald
SUBMISSIONS CLOSE: 30 January 2015

#	Name	Summary of submission	Comment
1.	BSN Holdings Pty Ltd	Objection 1. Impact on amenity/landscape 2. Does it have to be that high? 3. Property devaluation	1. Noted 2. Query passed to applicant. Response is 'yes' 3. Not a planning consideration
2.	Ken Owen	1. Strongly objects as it will diminish views. 2. Concerned the tower is only 180metres from property and considers it unacceptable. It will affect resale value. 3. Why should he pay for diminished resale value to benefit Dunsborough residents.	1. Noted 2. Noted 3. Not a planning consideration
3.	Ernest George Nominees Pty Ltd	1. Support proposal to provide improved telecommunications to the area. 2. Environmental impacts to be mitigated.	1. Noted 2. Noted
4.	North Native Hardwoods	1. Support proposal to provide improved telecommunications to the area. 2. Environmental impacts to be mitigated.	1. Noted 2. Noted
5.	Western Power - Perth	1. No specific comments at this time, 2. Would appreciate being kept informed. There are overhead power lines and/or underground cables, near the property & should be considered prior to works commencing.	1. - 2. Noted
6.	Carolyn Jane Robinson	Objection 1. Visual Amenity 2. Can it be disguised as a tree?	1. Noted 2. Briefly investigated- Considered to have greater visual impact when 'disguised'
7.	Elizabeth Irene O'Brien	Objection 1. EMR Health concerns. 2. Better tower location required 3. Visual Amenity 4. Too close to residents	1. The proposal is consistent with applicable standards and regulations 2. Noted 3. Noted 4. Noted
8.	Barbara Jane Green	Strongly objects - health concerns, misleading site plan did not mention of existing homes, it's in a landscape value area, visual amenity, devaluation of property, do standard setbacks apply?, residents won't benefit from this, community sensitive site.	The proposal is consistent with applicable standards and regulations. Homes, landscape value and visual amenity have been noted. Impact on property values is not a planning consideration. Other objections are noted.
9.	Johannes Versluis	Objection 1. Misleading Plans	1. Noted

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
PROPOSAL: DA14/0528 Telecommunications Facility
OFFICER: Sturt McDonald
SUBMISSIONS CLOSE: 30 January 2015

		2. Distance from dwellings 3. Visual amenity 4. Property Devaluation	2. Noted 3. Noted 4. Not a planning consideration
10	Ilona Versluis	Objection 1. Misleading Plans 2. Distance from dwellings 3. Visual amenity 4. Property Devaluation	1. Noted 2. Noted 3. Noted 4. Not a planning consideration
11	Joanne Maree Lawrence	Objection 1. Misleading plans 2. Visual amenity – estate entrance	1. Noted 2. Noted
12	Thomas Peter Black	Objection 1. Misleading plans 2. Requests a tower location closer to the centre of Lot 201, further away from neighbours	1. Noted 2. Noted
13	Nathan Stewart Whitney	Objection 1. Health concerns - EME 2. Concerned over devaluation of properties 3. Visual amenity. 4. There are 3 existing houses across the road from the proposed tower (one within 75 metres).	1. The proposal is consistent with applicable standards and regulations 2. Not a planning consideration 3. Noted 4. Noted
14	Penelope Candace Rosamund Marjorie De Cuyper	Support. 1. Benefit to mobile and internet services 2. Improved connection for families, businesses and emergency services	1. Noted 2. Noted
15	Peter Frederick De Cuyper	Support 1. Benefit to mobile and internet services 2. Improved connection for families, businesses and emergency services	1. Noted 2. Noted
16	Gregory Keith Woolley	Objection 1. Impact on surrounding residences 2. Inconsistent with 15m rural residential setback. 3. Inaccurate plans (missing nearby dwellings) 4. No details regarding removal of vegetation 5. No provision for firebreak around facility or other risk management 6. "Site coverage issues" highly questionable. 200m away, 0.8m difference in height. Why doesn't site O work?	1. Noted 2. Noted 3. Noted 4. Noted 5. Noted 6. Investigated. 'Site coverage issues' not substantiated by applicant. Owner of lot 201 objects to this site

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
PROPOSAL: DA14/0528 Telecommunications Facility
OFFICER: Sturt McDonald
SUBMISSIONS CLOSE: 30 January 2015

17	Lesley Ann Woolley	<p>Objection</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Impact on surrounding residences 2. Inconsistent with 15m rural residential setback. 3. Inaccurate plans (missing nearby dwellings) 4. No details regarding removal of vegetation 5. No provision for firebreak around facility or other risk management 6. "Site coverage issues" highly questionable. 200m away, 0.8m difference in height. Why doesn't site O work? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted 2. Noted 3. Noted 4. Noted 5. Noted 6. Investigated. 'Site coverage issues' not substantiated by applicant. Owner of lot 201 objects to this site
18	Benjamin Paul Overton	<p>Objection</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Plans misleading 2. Too close to dwellings 3. Visual amenity 4. EMR Health concerns 5. Property devaluation 6. Not compatible with rural residential area 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted 2. Noted 3. Noted 4. The proposal is consistent with applicable standards and regulations 5. Not a planning consideration 6. Noted
19	Philip Norman Burgess	<p>Objection.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 The proposal is inconsistent with SPP 5.2, in that it is not sited to minimise any potential impact on the surrounding area 2. Impact on rural landscape and visual amenity 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted 2. Noted
20	Simon Bernard Fleming	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Object to tower due to health concerns as it's located close to residences. Would expect an independent professional report on the tower's transmissions. 2. Unsightly impact on the rural/residential area. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposal is consistent with applicable standards and regulations 2. Noted
21	Pamela Ann Fleming	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Object to tower due to health concerns as it's located close to residences. Would expect an independent professional report on the tower's transmissions. 2. Unsightly impact on the rural/residential area 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposal is consistent with applicable standards and regulations 2. Noted
22	John Virgil Ricciardo	<p>Objection</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Too close to a residential area 2. EMR health concerns 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted 2. The proposal is consistent with applicable standards and regulations
23	Lee Pettengell	<p>Objection.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Too close to dwellings 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
PROPOSAL: DA14/0528 Telecommunications Facility
OFFICER: Sturt McDonald
SUBMISSIONS CLOSE: 30 January 2015

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Visual amenity 3. Property Devaluation 4. Misleading plans 5. EMR Health concerns 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Noted 3. Not a planning consideration 4. Noted 5. The proposal is consistent with applicable standards and regulations
24	Shannon Pettengell	<p>Objection.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Too close to dwellings 2. Visual amenity 3. Property Devaluation 4. Misleading plans 5. EMR Health concerns 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted 2. Noted 3. Not a planning consideration 4. Noted 5. The proposal is consistent with applicable standards and regulations
25	Michelle Lee Wood	<p>Objection.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) EMR Health concerns 2) Visual Amenity 3) Property Devaluation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposal is consistent with applicable standards and regulations 2. Noted 3. Not a planning consideration
26	Sean Troy David Wood	<p>Objection.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) EMR Health concerns 2) Visual Amenity 3) Property Devaluation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposal is consistent with applicable standards and regulations 2. Noted 3. Not a planning consideration
27	Jillian Fae Loveday	<p>Objection.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Visual amenity 2. Property devaluation 3. Impact on people and lifestyles 4. The proposal should be built on crown land 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted 2. Not a planning consideration 3. Noted 4. Unlikely to be feasible, given the immediate surrounding area has no crown land save for road reserve
28	John Ernest Loveday	<p>Objection.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Visual amenity 2. Property devaluation 3. Impact on people and lifestyles 4. The proposal should be built on crown land 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted 2. Not a planning consideration 3. Noted 4.
29	Lydia Evelyn Smith	<p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Too close to dwellings 2. Visual amenity/outlook of estate entrance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted 2. Noted

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
PROPOSAL: DA14/0528 Telecommunications Facility
OFFICER: Sturt McDonald
SUBMISSIONS CLOSE: 30 January 2015

		3. Property devaluation	3. Not a planning consideration
30	Ross Ian Smith	Objection 1. Too close to dwellings 2. Visual amenity/outlook of estate entrance 3. Property devaluation	1. Noted 2. Noted 3. Not a planning consideration
31	Richard Melville Clark	1. Objects due to property devaluation. 2. Visual impact. 3. Noise pollution from air-conditioning of facility. 4. Health concerns.	1. Not a planning consideration 2. Noted 3. Noted. Noise levels not considered to be significant. Will still be required to be consistent with noise level legislation. 4. The proposal is consistent with applicable standards and regulations
32	Julie Gail Kneale	1. Potential benefits of a tower in the area, but opposed its location so close to existing homes. 2. Visual pollution & unpleasant entry to estate. 3. One home has just been built and will be 75 metres from tower, without any prior knowledge of it.	1. Noted 2. Noted 3. Noted
33	David Michael Lewis	1. Objects to location of tower so close to existing homes/businesses. 2. Unpleasant visual impact. 3. Dishonest not to show existing residences on plans provided. 4. Could be located elsewhere.	1. Noted 2. Noted 3. Noted 4. Noted
34	Susan Mary Lewis	1. Objects to location of tower so close to existing homes/businesses. 2. Unpleasant visual impact. 3. Dishonest not to show existing residences on plans provided. 4. Could be located elsewhere.	1. Noted 2. Noted 3. Noted 4. Noted
35	Birgit Mason	1. Objects to this site as existing houses are not represented on plans. 2. Does not believe structure will be within the Building Envelope. 3. What trees will be removed? 4. Visually unappealing. 5. Could be located elsewhere.	1. Noted 2. Noted 3. Tree removal (if any) considered to be relatively minor. 4. Noted 5. Noted
36	Gilda Claire Mason	1. Objects to this site as existing houses are not represented on plans. 2. Does not believe structure will be within the Building Envelope. 3. What trees will be removed? 4. Visually unappealing. 5. Could be located elsewhere.	1. Noted 2. Noted 3. Tree removal (if any) considered to be relatively minor. 4. Noted 5. Noted
37	Dennis Johnson	1. Opposes the proposal as submitted and would oppose any future	1. Noted

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
PROPOSAL: DA14/0528 Telecommunications Facility
OFFICER: Sturt McDonald
SUBMISSIONS CLOSE: 30 January 2015

		similar development.	
38	Elisa Jane Johnson	1. Opposes the proposal as submitted and would oppose any future similar development.	1. Noted
39	Suzanne Maree Hillier	1. Objects - visual amenity impact 2. Property devaluation. 3. Will a light beacon be installed? 4. Property owners in area have strict building restrictions, how can a tower comply?	1. Noted 2. Not a planning consideration 3. Small, fixed (non-flashing) red beacon light likely 4. Telecommunications towers exempt from height restrictions.
40	Sherylee Anne Tutt	1. Objects due to visual amenity in the area. 2. Health concerns for residents and school bus children. 3. Alternative site would be preferred.	1. Noted 2. The proposal is consistent with applicable standards and regulations 3. Noted
41	Michael Leslie Tutt	1. Objects due to visual amenity in the area. 2. Health concerns for residents and school bus children. 3. Alternative site would be preferred.	1. Noted 2. The proposal is consistent with applicable standards and regulations 3. Noted
42	Trenton Sydney Eaves	Strongly objects - health concerns, misleading site plan did not mention of existing homes, it's in a landscape value area, visual amenity, devaluation of property, do standard setbacks apply?, residents won't benefit from this, community sensitive site.	The proposal is consistent with applicable standards and regulations. Homes, landscape value and visual amenity have been noted. Impact on property values is not a planning consideration. Other objections are noted.
43	Terence Michael O'Brien	1. Objects due to health concerns 2. Property devaluation. 3. Why can't Big Rock Reserve tower be updated? 4. Doesn't want Yallingup disfigured with towers. 5. Concerned for residents living near tower.	1. The proposal is consistent with applicable standards and regulations 2. Not a planning consideration 3. It is being upgraded. This does not negate the need for other towers such as this proposal to achieve network coverage 4. Noted 5. Noted
44	Elia Mazzoleni	1. Objects to tower. Plans provided don't show existing residences and finds this questionable. 2. Not against a tower for the area, but in a better location away from existing homes and businesses.	1. Noted 2. Noted
45	Martin Kane	1. Satisfied with current service. 2. An existing tower - similar height - already in the area. Can the existing tower be used by all providers? Can the height be changed for better reach?	1. Noted 2. Existing infrastructure not sufficient to achieve coverage. 3. Noted

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
PROPOSAL: DA14/0528 Telecommunications Facility
OFFICER: Sturt McDonald
SUBMISSIONS CLOSE: 30 January 2015

		3. Concerned about having 2 towers in the area.	
46	Janice Mary Irvine	1. Objects as the tower is too close to existing homes. 2. Tower to be located on the entry/exit to the estate, causing potential health risks to all in the area. 3. Bakery in the area already and a proposed cafe, all patrons could be exposed.	1. Noted 2 and 3. The proposal is consistent with applicable standards and regulations
47	Kendall Jane Smith	1. Objects due to radiation concerns with young children. 2. 3 local families live within 150m of the proposed tower. 3. Concerned about devaluation of property. 4. Visually undesirable.	1. The proposal is consistent with applicable standards and regulations 2. Noted 3. Not a planning consideration 4. Noted
48	Kevin Brian Smith	1. Objects due to radiation concerns with young children. 2. 3 local families live within 150m of the proposed tower. 3. Concerned about devaluation of property. 4. Visually undesirable.	1. The proposal is consistent with applicable standards and regulations 2. Noted 3. Not a planning consideration 4. Noted
49	Karlene Marzec	1. Strongly objects to tower due to health concerns related to tower emissions. 2. It will have an undesirable visual impact on the area. 3. Wants to raise her children in a more natural environment.	1. The proposal is consistent with applicable standards and regulations 2. Noted 3. Noted
50	Pamela Ann Fleming	1. Object to tower due to health concerns as it's located close to residences. Would expect an independent professional report on the tower's transmissions. 2. Unsightly impact on the rural/residential area.	1. The proposal is consistent with applicable standards and regulations 2. Noted
51	Rennae Louise Whitney	1. Objects due to health concerns over radiation from tower. 2. Concerned over devaluation of properties 3. Impact on visual amenity of the area. 4. There are 3 existing houses across the road from the proposed tower (one within 75 metres).	1. The proposal is consistent with applicable standards and regulations 2. Not a planning consideration 3. Noted 4. Noted

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

PROPOSAL: DA14/0528 Telecommunications Facility

OFFICER: Sturt McDonald

SUBMISSIONS CLOSE: 30 January 2015