

ATTACHMENT D
AMENDMENT 50 TO LOCAL PLANNING SCHEME 21
SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

No	NAME & ADDRESS	NATURE OF SUBMISSION	COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
Agency Submissions				
1.	Department of Planning Lands and Heritage Aboriginal Heritage Operations 140 William Street Perth WA 6000	A review of the Register of Places and Objects as well as the Aboriginal Heritage Database indicates that Lot 81 (18), Strata Plan 17588 (20), and Lots 115 to 127 (26-50), Geographe Bay Road, Dunsborough are within the public boundary of Aboriginal site ID 20764 (Caves Road Campsite) but not within the boundary administered by the Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage (DPLH). As such, the DPLH Aboriginal Heritage Operations does not have any comment to make regarding the query.		That the submission be noted.
2.	Department of Fire and Emergency Services 20 Stockton Bend Cockburn Central WA 6164	Given the Amendment seeks to decrease the residential density code from R80 to R60 as per your correspondence, which may not be considered an intensification of land use, DFES agrees with the City of Busselton's assessment that the application of State of Planning Policy 3.7 Planning in Bushfire Prone Areas (SPP 3.7) may not be required, in this instance. Please note that the application of SPP 3.7 is ultimately at the discretion of the decision maker. Thank you for providing us with the opportunity to make a submission, DFES has no further comments.		That the submission be noted.
3.	Department of Planning Lands and Heritage Heritage Services 140 William Street Perth WA 6000	As there are no State Heritage Places within the proposed amendment area, there is no objection to the proposed amendment.		That the submission be noted.
4.	ATCO GAS C/- 81 Prinsep Road Jandakot WA 6164	ATCO is not impacted by this amendment.		That the submission be noted.

**ATTACHMENT D
AMENDMENT 50 TO LOCAL PLANNING SCHEME 21
SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS**

No	NAME & ADDRESS	NATURE OF SUBMISSION	COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
5.	Department of Education 151 Royal Street East Perth WA 6004	No in principle objections to the proposed down-coding		That the submission be noted.
Public Submissions				
1.	Anthony Sharp 170 Lagoon Drive Yallingup WA 6282	<u>Support</u> When R80 zoning was introduced in Dunsborough, the City of Busselton (COB) advised that building height would be controlled by provisions in the local planning scheme. The approval of a 4 storey building on the foreshore is contrary to this advice and will substantially change the character of the area. To ensure Dunsborough retains its unique character, the foreshore must not have more than 3 storey buildings.	Where reference is made to approval of a 4 storey building on the foreshore, this is in regard to development approval (DA20/0624) granted by the JDAP for a four storey development located at Lots 115 and 116 Geographe Bay Road (subject to this amendment) and Lots 139 and 140 Lorna Street.	That the submission be noted.
2.	Jacque Happ 749 Caves Road Anniebrook WA 6280	<u>Support</u> The Strategic Community Plan for Dunsborough emphasises the need to stimulate the vibrancy of the town without destroying its unique and boutique characteristics and village feel. The R80 zoning and its potential building height of more than 3 storeys will not achieve this important objective.	Noted.	That the submission be noted.
3.	Mike Foster 10 Naruo Court Dunsborough WA 6281	<u>Support</u> 4 storey development in Dunsborough does not represent the feel of the town and is unnecessary.	Noted.	That the submission be noted.
4.	Geoff Rocchi 16 Rocky Place Quedjinup WA 6281	<u>Support</u> Residential development above 2 levels on Geographe Bay road frontage will not maintain the present low density environment and increase parking requirements which cannot be accommodated in the area.	Noted.	That the submission be noted.
5.	Christine Emerson 30 Hakea Way Dunsborough WA 6281	<u>Support</u> 4 storey development in this locality will be overpowering, restricting the view of the sea along	Where reference is made to the '4 storey development', see comment for public submission no. 1.	That the submission be noted.

ATTACHMENT D
AMENDMENT 50 TO LOCAL PLANNING SCHEME 21
SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

No	NAME & ADDRESS	NATURE OF SUBMISSION	COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
		Dunn Bay Road and does not fit the character of the town. R80 is inappropriate within 150 metres of the shoreline.		
6.	Michelle Cameron-Brown 7 Lorna Street Dunsborough WA 6281	<u>Support</u> 4 storey development would block out a lot of the northern sun on surrounding properties and is not in keeping with the look of the rest of the area.	The R-Codes volumes 1 & 2 provide requirements for overshadowing of adjoining lots, between lots of the same and differing densities.	That the submission be noted.
7.	Bruce Cameron-Brown 7 Lorna Street Dunsborough WA 6281	<u>Support</u> A 4 storey building would block 75% of our northern sun which was a prime concern when we purchased the block and designed our home. Development at this height will create unacceptable increased traffic in this area.	See comment for public submission no. 6.	That the submission be noted.
8.	David Buckingham 140 Summerville Crescent Yallingup Siding WA 6282	<u>No not support</u> The JDAP approval conflicts with local planning regulation and advice to residents regarding building heights designed to protect the natural shoreline of Geographe Bay for Dunsborough. It sets an undesirable precedent for future development along this pristine foreshore.	As the comments appear to be in support of the proposal, the submitter was invited to clarify his position. A second submission, in support of the proposal, was later lodged (see 11 below). Where reference is made to the JDAP, see comment for public submission no. 1.	That the submission be noted collectively with submission 11 below.
9.	Marina Leith 12/700 Caves Road Marybrook WA 6280	<u>Support</u> Very nice diversity.	Noted.	That the submission be noted.
10.	Jenny Fletcher 7 Okapa Rise Dunsborough WA 6281	<u>Support</u> R80 zoning is not in keeping with the relaxed village feel and pristine, unpopulated beaches of Dunsborough, so attractive to residents and tourists. R60 zoning (3 storey) is a more appropriate height for a small town.	Noted.	That the submission be noted.
11.	David Buckingham 140 Summerville Crescent Yallingup Siding WA 6282 (Second submission)	<u>Support</u> The JDAP approval conflicts with local planning regulation regarding building heights designed to protect the natural shoreline of Geographe Bay for Dunsborough. It sets an undesirable precedent for future development along this pristine foreshore.	See also public submission no. 8.	That the submission be noted collectively with submission 8 above.

**ATTACHMENT D
AMENDMENT 50 TO LOCAL PLANNING SCHEME 21
SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS**

No	NAME & ADDRESS	NATURE OF SUBMISSION	COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
		Support reverting density to R60.		
12.	Maggie Anson 2 Muirfield Road Dunsborough WA 6281	<u>Support</u> Opposed to build up along coastal foreshore and support local regulation limiting building heights in this area.	Noted.	That the submission be noted.
13.	Alison Butler 3 Concord Brace Dunsborough WA 6281	<u>Support</u> When R80 zoning was introduced in Dunsborough, the COB advised that building height would be controlled by provisions in the local planning scheme. Approval of 4 storey buildings on the foreshore is contrary to this advice and will substantially change the character of the area.	Noted.	That the submission be noted.
14.	Nigel Smith 20 Howson Rise Yallingup WA 6282	<u>Support</u> An R60 zoning would enable a manageable population density, protect the open and natural character of the town and foreshore and manage this important transition zone between the town and the seafront.	Noted.	That the submission be noted.
15.	Philippa D'Arcy 6 Duffy Place Dunsborough WA 6281	<u>Support</u> R80 is not in keeping with the village atmosphere of Dunsborough. Support local regulation limiting building heights along the foreshore.	Noted.	That the submission be noted.
16.	Peter D'Arcy 6 Duffy Place Dunsborough WA 6281	<u>Support</u> R80 is not in keeping with the village atmosphere of Dunsborough. Support local regulation limiting building heights along the foreshore.	Noted.	That the submission be noted.
17.	Mark Webster Unit 4/9 Acorn Place Dunsborough WA 6281	<u>Support</u> 4 storeys along the foreshore is contrary to the intent of local regulations for height and will substantially change the character of the area. R60 and 3 storey height is a reasonable compromise allowing some room for increased development, but	Noted	That the submission be noted.

**ATTACHMENT D
AMENDMENT 50 TO LOCAL PLANNING SCHEME 21
SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS**

No	NAME & ADDRESS	NATURE OF SUBMISSION	COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
		also requires stricter setback controls to minimise impact on surrounding area.		
18.	Duncan Gardner 144 Glover Road Yallingup Siding 6282	<u>Support</u> 3 storey development should be the maximum for Dunsborough town centre and 2 storeys for residential areas.	Noted.	That the submission be noted.
19.	Lizzie Nunn 47 Kawana Boulevard Dunsborough WA 6281	<u>Support</u> At the time R80 zoning was introduced in Dunsborough, the COB advised that building height would be controlled by provisions in the local planning scheme. The approval of a 4 storey building by the JDAP on the foreshore is contrary to this advice and development at this scale will substantially change the character of the area.	Where reference is made to the JDAP, see comment for public submission no. 1.	That the submission be noted.
20.	Athol Blight 44 Queens Crescent Mount Lawley WA 6050 (Property owner: 17 Lorna Street, Dunsborough)	<u>Support</u> R60 allows plenty of scope for medium density developments along the iconic foreshore without it being unsightly or out of character with the area.	Noted.	That the submission be noted.
21.	Kristen Gadsdon 1 Norfolk Street Dunsborough WA 6281	<u>Support</u> Mass dwellings are too commercial for this country town and limiting height to less than 3 storeys will effectively maintain the beauty of the bay.	Noted.	That the submission be noted.
22.	Victoria Russell 29 Monclair Circuit Dunsborough WA 6281	<u>Support</u> The amenity of our coastal town needs to be protected by restricting large developments to reflect the existing height restriction of 2 to 3 storeys along Geographe Bay road.	Noted.	That the submission be noted.
23.	Moir Buckley 283 Quedjinup Drive Quedjinup WA 6281	<u>Support</u> High rise development along our foreshore is not wanted by the majority of the community. It does not fit with our coastal village personality and will not provide affordable housing for local families.	Noted.	That the submission be noted.
24.	Tim Greay	<u>Support</u>	Noted.	That the submission be noted.

ATTACHMENT D
AMENDMENT 50 TO LOCAL PLANNING SCHEME 21
SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

No	NAME & ADDRESS	NATURE OF SUBMISSION	COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
	51 Bina Place Quedjinup WA 6281	Rezoning to reduce building heights is supported to protect beach town vibe and avoid traffic and parking issues.		
25.	Patricia Roach 21 North Street Dunsborough WA 6281	<u>Support</u> 4 storey development will not maintain the seaside village atmosphere of Dunsborough and is contrary to the intent of local regulations for building heights along the foreshore.	Noted.	That the submission be noted.
26.	Marina Leith 12/700 Caves Road Marybrook WA (Second submission)	<u>Support</u> If designed properly can look fantastic and bring more life to the foreshore.	Noted.	That the submission be noted.
27.	Paul Dwyer P.O. Box 439 Yallingup WA 6282	<u>Support</u> Oppose built out urban development in Dunsborough and support retention of regional feel.	Noted.	That the submission be noted.
28.	Lincoln Trager 6/8 Nicholas Court Dunsborough WA 6281	<u>Do not support</u> Any developments over 3 storey will adversely impact the community and the feel of Dunsborough.	As the comments appear to be in support of the proposal, the submitter was invited to clarify his position. A second submission, in support of the proposal, was later lodged (see 36 below).	That the submission be noted collectively with submission 36 below.
29.	Holly Morrow 15 Windlemere Drive Dunsborough WA 6281	<u>Support</u> Opposed to high rise development along the foreshore.	Noted.	That the submission be noted.
30.	Tania Sommerville 29 Diamante Boulevard Dunsborough WA 6281	<u>Do not support</u> Support keeping building heights to 3 storeys or lower along the foreshore to blend in with current development, prevent additional traffic and parking problems and risk of damage and pollution to the flora and beachfront.	As the comments appear to be in support of the proposal, the submitter was invited to clarify her position. A second submission, in support of the proposal, was later lodged (see 40 below).	That the submission be noted collectively with submission 40 below.
31.	Ingrid Spelman 22 Spyglass Cove Dunsborough WA 6281	<u>Support</u> R60 will ensure appropriate low scale development for Dunsborough foreshore and retain our village and traditional seaside character.	Noted.	That the submission be noted.
32.	Luke Gerson 11 Curtis Street Dunsborough WA 6281	<u>Support</u> A 3 storey height limit on Dunsborough foreshore will prevent overdevelopment, ensure minimum visual impact and retain the charm of the town.	Noted.	That the submission be noted.

**ATTACHMENT D
AMENDMENT 50 TO LOCAL PLANNING SCHEME 21
SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS**

No	NAME & ADDRESS	NATURE OF SUBMISSION	COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
33.	Craig Beenham 182 Dunsborough Lakes Drive Dunsborough WA 6281	<u>Support</u> Buildings over 3 storeys are not needed in small country towns and ruin the aesthetics.	Noted.	That the submission be noted.
34.	Dan Bish 10 Killarney Road Dunsborough WA 6281	<u>Support</u> Building heights should be in keeping with the local aesthetic.	Noted.	That the submission be noted.
35.	Matthew Stewart 3 Kunzea Place Dunsborough WA 6281	<u>Support</u> This amendment will help keep development in check and protect the community of Dunsborough.	Noted.	That the submission be noted.
36.	Lincoln Trager 6/8 Nicholas Court Dunsborough WA 6281 (Second submission)	<u>Support</u> R60 density is supported.	See also public submission no. 28.	That the submission be noted collectively with submission 28 above.
37.	Kris Davis 11 Rivendell Court Dunsborough WA 6281	<u>Support</u> The bay and foreshore is an amazing spot and family space. Building height and traffic should be restricted to protect the coast and natural amenity of the location.	Noted.	That the submission be noted.
38.	Greg Milner 23 Gibson Drive Dunsborough WA 6281	<u>Support</u> This rezoning is required to prevent 4 storey buildings along the foreshore which would detract for coastal small town amenity. Apartment buildings allowed along the foreshore will be priced for millionaires and will not alleviate housing shortages for average people.	Where reference is made to '4 storey buildings', see comment for public submission no. 1.	That the submission be noted.
39.	Bradley Proctor 8 Pimelea Parade Dunsborough WA 6281	<u>Support</u> Dunsborough is a coastal town that benefits from a country feel and high rise buildings along the foreshore will detract from this vibe.	Noted.	That the submission be noted.
40.	Tania Sommerville 29 Diamante Boulevard Dunsborough WA 6281 (Second submission)	<u>Support</u> I do support the change.	See also public submission no. 30.	That the submission be noted collectively with submission 30 above.
41.	Penny De Cuyper 69 Ballyneal Loop	<u>Support</u>	Noted.	That the submission be noted.

**ATTACHMENT D
AMENDMENT 50 TO LOCAL PLANNING SCHEME 21
SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS**

No	NAME & ADDRESS	NATURE OF SUBMISSION	COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
	Dunsborough WA 6281	Buildings above R60 on the foreshore will change the coastal and visual aspect of Dunsborough.		
42.	Robert Anson 2 Muirfield Road Dunsborough WA 6281	<u>Support</u> Build up along the entire foreshore will overshadow the public open space and is contrary to local planning regulations.	Noted.	That the submission be noted.
43.	Bree Wiley 195 Quedjinup Drive Quedjinup WA 6281	<u>Support</u> Restriction to foreshore building height is imperative for protecting the beauty and integrity of our environment and community.	Noted.	That the submission be noted.
44.	Dale Wiley 195 Quedjinup Drive Quedjinup WA 6281	<u>Support</u> Will protect the integrity and beauty of our foreshore and environment.	Noted.	That the submission be noted.
45.	Georgina Marchesi 96 O'Byrne Road Quindalup WA 6281	<u>Support</u> R80 zoning was introduced in Dunsborough, to allow for multi- purpose uses and greater population density in the area along the foreshore, not to permit buildings greater than 3 storeys. Approval of 4 storey buildings on the foreshore is contrary to local regulation and will substantially change the character of the area and its coastal village charm.	Noted.	That the submission be noted.
46.	Lynn Sadler 13 Marron Rise Yallingup WA 6282	<u>Support</u> Dunsborough's village feel, particularly along the foreshore, should be retained by limiting building heights to no higher than 3 storeys.	Noted.	That the submission be noted.
47.	Sherylee Tutt 15 Lochinvar Place Quindalup WA 6281	<u>Support</u> The rezoning of the foreshore area from R60 to R80 in 2017 should never have occurred. The current amendment will retain the low-rise development, a special and slower characteristic of this holiday destination.	Noted.	That the submission be noted.
48.	Brett Pescod 18 Bay View Crescent Dunsborough WA 6281	<u>Support</u> 4 storey buildings along the whole beach front could end up like the Gold Coast.	Noted.	That the submission be noted.

ATTACHMENT D
AMENDMENT 50 TO LOCAL PLANNING SCHEME 21
SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

No	NAME & ADDRESS	NATURE OF SUBMISSION	COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
49.	Helen Jones 40 Bayfield Court Yallingup WA 6282	<u>Support</u> Refining from R80 to R60 will contribute to retention of the Dunsborough village feel.	Noted.	That the submission be noted.
50.	Alastair McMichael 3 Lorna Street Dunsborough WA 6281	<u>Support</u> Any significant increase in density of development along Geographe Bay Road between Dunn Bay Road and Chester Way would reduce the amenity and enjoyment of living in Lorna Street and be out of character for the area.	Noted.	That the submission be noted.
51.	Sarah Wright 10 Wentworth Loop Dunsborough WA 6281	<u>Support</u> 4+ storey developments will increase holiday rentals affecting the laid back and strong community lifestyle feel of this coastal country town.	Noted.	That the submission be noted.
52.	Kathryn Pollard 10 Cygnet Cove Dunsborough WA 6281	<u>Support</u> Dunsborough has a unique position in the West Australian landscape of an east facing bay with a delightful village atmosphere. High rise development would spoil the ambience.	Noted.	That the submission be noted.
53.	Kelly Lamp 1972 Caves Road Naturaliste WA 6281	<u>Support</u> This zoning change needs to happen to ensure that more 4 storey buildings are not approved as this will destroy the feel of the town.	Where reference is made to '4 storey buildings', see comment for public submission no. 1.	That the submission be noted.
54.	Ruth Thomas 14 Waterville Road Dunsborough WA 6281	<u>Support</u> The character and street scene of this part of Dunsborough needs to be safeguarded to minimise the visual impact of the urban area on the adjoining coastal scene and skyline.	Noted.	That the submission be noted.
55.	Victoria Viela 6 Glover Road Yallingup Siding WA 6282	<u>Support</u> R80 zoning was introduced in Dunsborough, to allow for multi-purpose uses and greater population density in the area along the foreshore, not to permit buildings greater than 3 storeys. Need to cap heights at R60. Approval of 4 storey buildings on the foreshore is contrary to local regulation and will substantially	Where reference is made to the approval of 'four storey buildings', see comment for public submission no. 1.	That the submission be noted.

ATTACHMENT D
AMENDMENT 50 TO LOCAL PLANNING SCHEME 21
SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

No	NAME & ADDRESS	NATURE OF SUBMISSION	COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
		change the character of the area and its coastal village charm.		
56.	Nita Pratt 43 Gibson Drive Dunsborough WA 6281	<u>Support</u> Opposed to multi story buildings above 3 storeys too close to changing foreshore lines, and unpredictable soil stability.	Noted.	That the submission be noted.
57.	Annie Mussell 60 Sloan Drive Dunsborough WA 6281	<u>Support</u> Support the reduction in permissible storeys along the foreshore to preserve the beach side feel of Dunsborough.	Noted.	That the submission be noted.
58.	Jane Huxley 102 St Michael's Parkway Dunsborough WA 6281	<u>Support</u> Any building higher than 3 storeys will detrimentally affect the vibe of the coastal village of Dunsborough.	Noted.	That the submission be noted.
59.	Colleen Shanhun 13 Lorna Street Dunsborough WA 6281	<u>Support</u> R80 development would increase loss of privacy and natural light and shading of backyards. It would have a negative effect on coastal character of the area and neighbourhood and create an excessive carbon footprint of tall buildings.	The R-Codes volumes 1 & 2 provide requirements for privacy and overshadowing of adjoining lots, between lots of the same and differing densities.	That the submission be noted.
60.	Therese Sayers 16 Chapman Street Dunsborough WA 6281	<u>Support</u> Tall buildings and big developments with additional traffic and parking needs will adversely impact on the coastal holiday feel of Dunsborough and the low key frontage to Geographe Bay which is unique and accessible to all.	Noted.	That the submission be noted.
61.	Richard Wain 138 Dunsborough Lakes Drive Dunsborough WA 6281	<u>Support</u> High density living in Dunsborough is not and cannot be supported by the infrastructure and services. Nothing over 3 storeys should be allowed adjacent to the beach as it is visually inappropriate.	Noted.	That the submission be noted.
62.	Sarah Trager Unit 6, 8 Nicholas Court Dunsborough WA 6281	<u>Support</u> R60 zoning is in keeping with the feel of the town, maximising the natural beauty of the Dunsborough coastline while keeping the low key country feel to the town.	Noted.	That the submission be noted.
63.	Stacey Mills	<u>Support</u>	Noted.	That the submission be noted.

**ATTACHMENT D
AMENDMENT 50 TO LOCAL PLANNING SCHEME 21
SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS**

No	NAME & ADDRESS	NATURE OF SUBMISSION	COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
	138 Gifford Road Dunsborough WA 6281	Large buildings and eyesores will negate the natural beauty of the area and maintaining this charm is essential to the community.		
64.	Andrew Saberton PO Box 1025 Dunsborough WA 6281	<u>Support</u> 4 storey development is too high for the foreshore area.	Noted.	That the submission be noted.
65.	Geoffrey Forman Unit 4/20 Lorna Street Dunsborough WA 6281	<u>Support</u> The position and height of the proposed property development is out of character with the rest of Dunsborough and sets an undesirable precedent for other 4 storey buildings on the coast. 3 storey development will be a little more acceptable on Geographe Bay Road and less of a car parking problem. Development should be restricted to 2 storeys where Chieftain Crescent and Lorna St meet to be in keeping with the area.	Where reference is made to the 'proposed property development', see comment for public submission no. 1.	That the submission be noted.
66.	Mel Kent PO Box 618 Dunsborough WA 6281	<u>Support</u> Support building height restrictions on Geographe Bay Road to protect our coastal, country town of Dunsborough, unique to residents and visiting tourists.	Noted.	That the submission be noted.
67.	Kimberley Sadler 13 Marron Rise Yallingup WA 6282	<u>Support</u> Limit the amount of dwellings to minimize ecological impact of developments and protect village atmosphere along the foreshore.	Noted.	That the submission be noted.
68.	Johannes Versluis 6 Hebrides Close Quindalup WA 6281	<u>Support</u> Reduction of building height will maintain the pleasant feel of Dunsborough town, especially near the beach front and improve the existing streetscape of low-level buildings.	Noted.	That the submission be noted.
69.	Andy Park 193 Yungarra Drive Quedjinup WA 6281	<u>Do not support</u> R80 zoning was introduced in Dunsborough, to allow for multi - purpose uses and greater population density in the area along the foreshore, not to permit buildings greater than 3 storeys.	As the comments appear to be in support of the proposal, the submitter was invited to clarify his position. A second submission, in support of the proposal, was later lodged (see 74 below).	That the submission be noted collectively with submission 74 below.

**ATTACHMENT D
AMENDMENT 50 TO LOCAL PLANNING SCHEME 21
SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS**

No	NAME & ADDRESS	NATURE OF SUBMISSION	COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
		Approval of 4 storey buildings on the foreshore is contrary to local regulation and will substantially change the character of the area and its coastal village charm. We need to cap heights at R60.		
70.	Tracey Plester 96 Kinross Loop Quindalup WA 6281	<u>Support</u> Coastal small country village vibe with beautiful, natural, unspoilt and not overdeveloped coastlines, needs to be retained.	Noted.	That the submission be noted.
71.	Bridget Haak 4 Newberry Road Dunsborough WA 6281	<u>Support</u> 4 storey buildings on the foreshore will hem in green play-space and do nothing to enhance our village atmosphere. Planning should reduce the built environment on our coastline and be sensitive to the landscape.	Noted.	That the submission be noted.
72.	Paul Jordan 20 Swinley Approach Dunsborough WA 6281	<u>Support</u> R80 zoning was introduced in Dunsborough, to allow for multi -purpose uses and greater population density in the area along the foreshore, not to permit buildings greater than 3 storeys. Approval of 4 storey buildings on the foreshore is contrary to local regulation and will substantially change the character of the area and its coastal village charm. Heights need to be capped at R60.	Noted.	That the submission be noted.
73.	Sally Garnett 25 Hammond Road Yallingup WA 6282	<u>Support</u> The amendment will help retain the relaxed seaside feel by preventing high rise buildings along the coastline which is out of character for our region.	Noted.	That the submission be noted.
74.	Andy Park 193 Yungarra Drive Quedjinup WA 6281 (Second submission)	<u>Support</u> I would like to amend my submission to "I do support."	See also public submission no. 69.	That the submission be noted collectively with submission 69 above.
75.	Kate Fysh	<u>Support</u>	Noted.	That the submission be noted.

ATTACHMENT D
AMENDMENT 50 TO LOCAL PLANNING SCHEME 21
SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

No	NAME & ADDRESS	NATURE OF SUBMISSION	COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
	12 Big Rock Place Quedjinup WA 6281	Dunsborough is a holiday destination with a small community vibe. High rise buildings are unsightly along the coastline and R60 is more than high enough.		
76.	Annie Winchcombe 13 Cape Way Dunsborough WA 6281	<u>Do not support</u> 4 storey development on the beach front infringes on views and the amenity of our beachfront.	As the comments appear to be in support of the proposal, the submitter was invited to clarify his position. A second submission, in support of the proposal, was later lodged (see 109 below).	That the submission be noted collectively with submission 109 below.
77.	Janine Gasbarri 193 Eagle Bay Road Naturaliste WA 6281	<u>Support</u> R60 will limit impact on foreshore and is in line with community wishes.	Noted.	That the submission be noted.
78.	David Mills 56 O'Byrne Road Quindalup WA 6281	<u>Support</u> R60 development will prevent 4 storey development on foreshore.	Noted.	That the submission be noted.
79.	Tony Jackson PO Box 226 Burswood WA 6100	<u>Do not support</u> Increase in density will detract from amenity of foreshore area and create traffic and parking problems.	As the comments appear to be in support of the proposal, the submitter was invited to clarify his position. A second submission, in support of the proposal, was later lodged (see 90 below).	That the submission be noted collectively with submission 90 below.
80.	Ian Smith 65 Peppermint Drive Dunsborough WA 6281	<u>Support</u> Reduction in coding is necessary to minimise onerous impacts of density development and increased traffic and parking in this sensitive coastal area.	Noted.	That the submission be noted.
81.	Kevin and Julie Stanley 53 Pine Valley Pass Connolly WA 6027	<u>Support</u> R60 will allow development but also protect space, peace and environment of foreshore. Traffic noise and parking already a problem over weekends and summer period.	Owner of affected property Lot 122 (40) Geographe Bay Road, Dunsborough.	That the submission be noted.
82.	Luke Pearce 5 Diamante Boulevard Dunsborough WA 6281	<u>Support</u> Reduction in height limit to 3 storeys is in keeping with general community feel of Dunsborough and will protect its unique attraction to residents and holidaymakers.	Noted.	That the submission be noted.
83.	Chris Harding 23 Campion Way Quindalup WA 6281	<u>Support</u> 4 storey development is not consistent with retaining coastal atmosphere of Dunsborough	Noted.	That the submission be noted.

ATTACHMENT D
AMENDMENT 50 TO LOCAL PLANNING SCHEME 21
SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

No	NAME & ADDRESS	NATURE OF SUBMISSION	COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
84.	Peter Chandler 85 Amberley Loop Dunsborough WA 6281	<u>Do not support</u> Opposed to big developments for tourists in this small family town.	As the comments appear to be in support of the proposal, the submitter was invited to clarify his position. A second submission, in support of the proposal, was later lodged (see 88 below).	That the submission be noted collectively with submission 88 below.
85.	Patricia Roach 21 North Street Dunsborough WA 6281	<u>See submission 25</u>	Noted.	That the submission be noted.
86.	Joy Watling 4 Peppermint Drive Dunsborough WA 6281	<u>Support</u> No precedent for 4 storey buildings along and R80 will not enhance the streetscape of Geographe Bay Road.	Noted.	That the submission be noted.
87.	Julia Carrico 21 Moriarty Place Yallingup WA 6282	<u>Support</u> Height of buildings in Dunsborough needs to be capped at 3 storeys to reflect ambience of coastal country town.	Noted.	That the submission be noted.
88.	Peter Chandler 85 Amberley Loop Dunsborough WA 6281 (Second submission)	<u>Support</u> I do support the change and don't want higher density and taller buildings in COB.	See also public submission no. 84.	That the submission be noted collectively with submission 84 above.
89.	Diane Alldis 5/85 Reserve Street Wembley WA 6014	<u>Do not support</u> Development should be limited to 2 storeys in close proximity to beach front to blend with the landscape, prevent overshadowing and retain the attractive charm of the town.	As the comments appear to be in support of the proposal, the submitter was invited to clarify his position. A second submission, in support of the proposal, was later lodged (see 91 below).	That the submission be noted collectively with submission 91 below.
90.	Tony Jackson PO Box 226 Burswood WA 6100 (Second submission)	<u>Support</u> Comments per previous submission.	See also public submission no. 79.	That the submission be noted collectively with submission 79 above.
91.	Diane Alldis 5/85 Reserve Street Wembley WA 6014 (Second submission)	<u>Support</u> Comments per previous submission.	See also public submission no. 89.	That the submission be noted collectively with submission 89 above.
92.	Lavan 1 William Street Perth WA 6000	<u>Do not support</u> Acting on behalf of A & R Holdings, owner of affected properties Lots 115 & 116 (26 & 28) Geographe Bay	The alternative courses of action by the Council regarding the progress of the Amendment in terms of the <i>Planning and Development (Local Planning</i>	It is recommended that the amendment be modified to include Lots 139 and 140 (23-25) Lorna Street so that all four lots would be subject of the R60 coding.

ATTACHMENT D
AMENDMENT 50 TO LOCAL PLANNING SCHEME 21
SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

No	NAME & ADDRESS	NATURE OF SUBMISSION	COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
	Acting on behalf of: A & R Holdings	<p>Road, Dunsborough and non-affected properties Lot 139 & 140 (23 and 25) Lorna Street, Dunsborough.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amendment 50 should be modified, so as to exclude the land owned by my client and to retain that land as coded R80 for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • there is already a development approval in place for this land, the proposed design is broadly consistent with an R80 coding and this development approval is currently being implemented. • The land has unique characteristics (as compared to the other lots along Geographe Bay Road) in that it abuts a public reserve, has two street frontages, constitutes a large development site and is in very close proximity to the R-AC3 coded parts of the Dunsborough town centre. • If such a modification is to occur, no objection is raised to the down-coding of the other lots along Geographe Bay Road. • Amendment 1 approved in 2017 was informed by a significant amount of strategic planning and R80 was considered to be the appropriate coding. The current proposal to down-code to R60 is not justified by further strategic planning and is not supported by built form modelling or similar to demonstrate the practical benefits and potential impact in this locality. It appears to be almost entirely motivated by opposition to the recent approval of development of the four storey building. • There would be no utility in down-coding this land to R60 if there is already a building on the land that has been constructed in accordance with an R80 coding. 	<p><i>Schemes) Regulations 2015</i>, are to support the Amendment without modification, to support the Amendment with proposed modifications or not to support the Amendment.</p> <p>The R60 coding if approved in this locality would reduce the prospect of development above three storeys on the remaining foreshore lots. This coding is not in conflict with the broad urban consolidation objective for the Dunsborough Townsite and continues to reflect the strategic direction for mixed use and higher residential development in this locality. This would reflect the majority of views in submissions and signal the concern about the potential impact of the current R80 coding in this sensitive locality within the current planning framework. Given the constraints associated with developing the remaining lots and the progression of the PSP process this is unlikely to create any negative impact for landowners in the short term. It is recommended therefore that the Council resolve to seek final adoption of the Amendment.</p> <p>The shortcomings of a blanket density code in this sensitive foreshore locality without supporting design guidance have been outlined above and it is recommended that the issue of more detailed analysis of potential development outcomes on the remaining lots be given priority as part of the PSP process or its recommendations for further action.</p> <p>The proposed designation of the R60 coding on Lots 115 and 116 (26-28) Geographe Bay Road, whilst retaining the R80 coding on Lots 139 and 140 (23-25) Lorna Street, is potentially confusing given that the lots are being amalgamated to form one</p>	

**ATTACHMENT D
AMENDMENT 50 TO LOCAL PLANNING SCHEME 21
SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS**

No	NAME & ADDRESS	NATURE OF SUBMISSION	COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is my understanding that the existing R80 coding in this area was only quite recently put in place, via Amendment 1 being gazetted in 2017. • It is accordingly unclear what practical benefits (if any) the City expects to achieve in down-coding this area to R60, as proposed in Amendment 50. 	<p>development site, with development approval for one building. In order to reflect a uniform coding over this development site, a modification to the Amendment to R80 or R60 should be required.</p> <p>An R80 coding over the site would indicate the density approved for the apartment development. It would also represent an exception for this significant lot on the Dunsborough foreshore as Lots 81 and Strata Lots 1-9 across Dunn Bay Road and Lots 117-127 Geographe Bay Road would remain coded R60. It is acknowledged that the site has some unique advantages for the design of a landmark commercial and residential development but a similar case could be argued for redevelopment of the site on the opposite corner of Dunn Bay Road.</p> <p>If the R60 coding proceeds within this amendment, it will not affect the validity of the approval already issued. The development approval remains valid (notwithstanding any down-coding) unless the approval lapses and the development has not been substantially commenced. However, the development approval is the subject of an application for judicial review in the Supreme Court (unrelated to the proposed down-coding) and, depending on the outcome, this may impact on the validity of the approval.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the concerns raised by the owner, it is recommended that the Amendment be modified to include Lots 139 and 140 in the R60 coding to reflect the overarching intention to down-code lots on the Dunsborough foreshore. It is envisaged that the PSP process will provide specific provisions and clearer guidance aimed at protecting the future of</p>	

**ATTACHMENT D
AMENDMENT 50 TO LOCAL PLANNING SCHEME 21
SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS**

No	NAME & ADDRESS	NATURE OF SUBMISSION	COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
			<p>this unique foreshore location and this may prompt future amendments to the local planning scheme.</p> <p>This recommendation for final approval and modification is made on the grounds that the proposed down-coding is not contrary to current strategic planning direction, reflects community concern about future development of this coastal locality, and will not cause a negative impact on future development of the area.</p>	
93.	Kevina Stewart 49 Peppermint Drive Dunsborough WA 6281	<p><u>Do not support</u> Leave zoning as is to protect the low rise amenity of the area reduce the likelihood of additional traffic volume and noise.</p>	As the comments appear to be in support of the proposal, the submitter was invited to clarify her position. A second submission, in support of the proposal, was later lodged (see 94 below).	That the submission be noted collectively with submission 94 below.
94.	Kevina Stewart 49 Peppermint Drive Dunsborough WA 6281 (Second submission)	<p><u>Support</u> The minimum number of additional dwellings should be permitted with a maximum height restriction of 3 storeys and ideally only 2 storeys.</p>	See also public submission no. 93.	That the submission be noted collectively with submission 93 above.
95.	Richard Paterson 9 Koorabin Drive Yallingup WA 6282	<p><u>Do not support</u> High buildings are not in keeping with the Dunsborough "village" concept. If Fremantle can thrive with 3 storeys, so can Dunsborough.</p>	As the comments appear to be in support of the proposal, the submitter was invited to clarify his position. A second submission, in support of the proposal, was later lodged (see 97 below).	That the submission be noted collectively with submission 97 below.
96.	Frank Gaschk 18 Windmills Close Yallingup WA 6282	<p><u>Support</u> Building height on the coast should be staged and stepped back to control coastal erosion impacts and avoid the expense of 'protecting' coastal infrastructure burdened on future generations. Support the regulation of building heights as apartment buildings are high risk hotspots during a respiratory viral pandemic and concentrate noise and disruption in the local community. The social amenity, liveability and attraction for tourism of Dunsborough will be visually and spatially impacted by the development of high concentration and</p>	Noted.	That the submission be noted.

**ATTACHMENT D
AMENDMENT 50 TO LOCAL PLANNING SCHEME 21
SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS**

No	NAME & ADDRESS	NATURE OF SUBMISSION	COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
		potentially monolithic structures along the seaboard.		
97.	Richard Paterson 9 Koorabin Drive Yallingup WA 6282	<u>Support</u> Comments per previous submission.	See also public submission no. 95.	That the submission be noted collectively with submission 95 above.
98.	Douglas Kirsop 2 Smith Street Dunsborough WA 6281	<u>Support</u> Development should be limited to R60 and 3 storeys along the beachfront to maintain character of the area, protect future buildings from coastal erosion and avoid pressure on facilities and services.	Noted.	That the submission be noted.
99.	Warren Brown 53 Amberley Loop Dunsborough WA 6280	<u>Support</u> Inappropriate to have high rise development directly on the foreshore with potential overshadowing of surrounding areas and devaluation of properties behind the lots. Full consideration must be given to the community impact and long term effects of the decision.	Noted.	That the submission be noted.
100	Terry Carmichael 6 Galley Ramble Dunsborough WA 6281	<u>Support</u> High rise apartment development is not in keeping with the village atmosphere, will disregard the uniqueness of the fore shore and affects adjoining areas.	Noted.	That the submission be noted.
101	Allen Cooper 8 Patton Terrace Quindalup WA 6281	<u>Support</u> Reducing from R80 to R60 supports the current planning policy of restricting buildings to 3 storeys or less within 150 metres of the high water mark.	Noted.	That the submission be noted.
102	Alana Milton 8 Staley Street Quindalup WA 6281	<u>Support</u> We need to preserve this unique town and fragile development from over development.	Noted.	That the submission be noted.
103	Natasha Blefari 9 Buckingham Grove, Quedjinup WA 6281	<u>Support</u> The height of buildings along the foreshore should be limited to keep with the small town vibe of the area.	Noted.	That the submission be noted.

**ATTACHMENT D
AMENDMENT 50 TO LOCAL PLANNING SCHEME 21
SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS**

No	NAME & ADDRESS	NATURE OF SUBMISSION	COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
Late Submissions				
104	Wayne Duyvestein 8 Shearers Close Quedjinup WA 6281	<u>Support</u> No 4 storeys should be permitted in Dunsborough and only 2 storeys on the foreshore.	Noted.	That the submission be noted.
105	Fiona Duyvestein 8 Shearers Close Quedjinup WA 6281	<u>Support</u> Storeys to be limited as possible on foreshore and no high rise for Dunsborough or Busselton.	Noted.	That the submission be noted.
106	Caron Reynolds 26 St. Michaels Parkway Dunsborough WA 6281	<u>Support</u> R80 and 4 storey development should not be permitted because of the impacts on the look and feel of the Dunsborough foreshore.	Noted.	That the submission be noted.
107	Anthony David Sheard 26 Flora Terrace Watermans Bay WA 6020	<u>Support</u> Concern about the impact of 4 storeys building height and boundary wall heights and related shade issues on the locality and surrounding properties and the vista and views from the park and beachfront. The proposed change to an R60 coding will better mitigate these concerns, reflect the initial intent of all parties, and current intent of the community and councillors.	Affected owner - Lot 119 (34) Geographe Bay Road	That the submission be noted.
108	Danielle Phipps 48 Geographe Bay Road Dunsborough WA 6280	<u>Support</u> Do not wish to see four-storey buildings neighbouring my residential property. The amendment reflects the changes desired by the community and the need to preserve the existing coastal feel and integrity of the town.	Affected owner – Lot 124 (44) Geographe Bay Road.	That the submission be noted.
109	Annie Winchcombe 13 Cape Way Dunsborough WA 6281	<u>Support</u> Yes – I do not support R80 – but do support the change to R60.	See also public submission no. 76.	That the submission be noted collectively with submission 76 above.