



# AGENDA

## Special Council Meeting

---

### Wednesday, 7 August 2019 at 6.30pm

#### **Disclaimer**

The purpose of this Council meeting is to discuss and, where possible, make resolutions about items appearing on the agenda. Whilst Council has the power to resolve such items and may in fact, appear to have done so at the meeting, no person should rely on or act on the basis of such decision or on any advice or information provided by a member or officer, or on the content of any discussion occurring, during the course of the meeting.

Persons should be aware that the provisions of the Local Government Act 1995 (section 5.25 (e)) establish procedures for revocation or rescission of a Council decision. No person should rely on the decisions made by Council until formal advice of the Council decision is received by that person.

The Town of East Fremantle expressly disclaims liability for any loss or damage suffered by any person as a result of relying on or acting on the basis of any resolution of Council, or any advice or information provided by a member or officer, or the content of any discussion occurring, during the course of the Council meeting.

#### **Copyright**

The Town wishes to advise that any plans or documents contained within this Agenda may be subject to copyright law provisions (Copyright Act 1968, as amended) and that the express permission of the copyright owner(s) should be sought prior to their reproduction.

## Procedure for Deputations, Presentations and Public Question Time at Council Meetings

Council thanks you for your participation in Council Meetings and trusts that your input will be beneficial to all parties. Council has a high regard for community input where possible, in its decision making processes.

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Deputations</b></p> <p>A formal process where members of the community request permission to address Council or Committee on an issue.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Presentations</b></p> <p>An occasion where awards or gifts may be accepted by the Council on behalf of the community, when the Council makes a presentation to a worthy recipient or when agencies may present a proposal that will impact on the Local Government.</p>
--	---

### Procedures for Deputations

The Council allows for members of the public to make a deputation to Council on an issue related to Local Government business.

Notice of deputations need to be received by **5pm on the day before the meeting** and agreed to by the Presiding Member. Please contact Executive Support Services via telephone on 9339 9339 or email [admin@eastfremantle.wa.gov.au](mailto:admin@eastfremantle.wa.gov.au) to arrange your deputation.

Where a deputation has been agreed to, during the meeting the Presiding Member will call upon the relevant person(s) to come forward and address Council.

A Deputation invited to attend a Council meeting:

- (a) is not to exceed five (5) persons, only two (2) of whom may address the Council, although others may respond to specific questions from Members;
- (b) is not to address the Council for a period exceeding ten (10) minutes without the agreement of the Council; and
- (c) additional members of the deputation may be allowed to speak with the agreement of the Presiding Member.

Council is unlikely to take any action on the matter discussed during the deputation without first considering an officer's report on that subject in a later Council agenda.

### Procedure for Presentations

Notice of presentations being accepted by Council on behalf of the community, or agencies presenting a proposal, need to be received by **5pm on the day before the meeting** and agreed to by the Presiding Member. Please contact Executive Support Services via telephone on 9339 9339 or email [admin@eastfremantle.wa.gov.au](mailto:admin@eastfremantle.wa.gov.au) to arrange your presentation.

Where the Council is making a presentation to a worthy recipient, the recipient will be advised in advance and asked to attend the Council meeting to receive the award.

All presentations will be received/awarded by the Mayor or an appropriate Councillor.

---

### Procedure for Public Question Time

The Council extends a warm welcome to you in attending any meeting of the Council. Council is committed to involving the public in its decision making processes whenever possible, and the ability to ask questions during 'Public Question Time' is of critical importance in pursuing this public participation objective.

Council (as required by the *Local Government Act 1995*) sets aside a period of 'Public Question Time' to enable a member of the public to put up to two (2) questions to Council. Questions should only relate to the business of Council and should not be a statement or personal opinion. Upon receipt of a question from a member of the public, the Mayor may either answer the question or direct it to a Councillor or an Officer to answer, or it will be taken on notice.

Having regard for the requirements and principles of Council, the following procedures will be applied in accordance with the *Town of East Fremantle Local Government (Council Meetings) Local Law 2016*:

1. Public Questions Time will be limited to fifteen (15) minutes.
2. Public Question Time will be conducted at an Ordinary Meeting of Council immediately following "Responses to Previous Public Questions Taken on Notice".
3. Each member of the public asking a question will be limited to two (2) minutes to ask their question(s).
4. Questions will be limited to three (3) per person.
5. Please state your name and address, and then ask your question.
6. Questions should be submitted to the Chief Executive Officer in writing by **5pm on the day before the meeting and be signed by the author**. This allows for an informed response to be given at the meeting.
7. Questions that have not been submitted in writing by 5pm on the day before the meeting will be responded to if they are straightforward.
8. If any question requires further research prior to an answer being given, the Presiding Member will indicate that the "question will be taken on notice" and a response will be forwarded to the member of the public following the necessary research being undertaken.
9. Where a member of the public provided written questions then the Presiding Member may elect for the questions to be responded to as normal business correspondence.
10. A summary of the question and the answer will be recorded in the minutes of the Council meeting at which the question was asked.

**During the meeting, no member of the public may interrupt the meetings proceedings or enter into conversation.**

**Members of the public shall ensure that their mobile telephone and/or audible pager is not switched on or used during any meeting of the Council.**

**Members of the public are hereby advised that use of any electronic, visual or audio recording device or instrument to record proceedings of the Council is not permitted without the permission of the Presiding Member.**

---

## **CONTENTS**

1.	OFFICIAL OPENING	1
2.	ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF COUNTRY	1
3.	RECORD OF ATTENDANCE	1
3.1	Attendance	1
3.2	Apologies	1
3.3	Approved	1
4.	DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST	1
4.1	Financial	1
4.2	Proximity	1
4.3	Impartiality	1
5.	PUBLIC QUESTION TIME	1
5.1	Public Question Time	1
6.	PRESENTATIONS/DEPUTATIONS	1
6.1	Deputations	1
7.	REPORT	2
7.1	Complex Amendment No. 15 to Local Planning Scheme No. 3 to Supplement Special Zone - Royal George Hotel Provisions – Consideration of Schedule of Modifications (as directed by Minister for Planning) and Schedule of Submissions	2
8.	CLOSURE	32

---

---

**NOTICE OF MEETING**

Elected Members

A Special Meeting of the Council will be held on Wednesday, 7 August 2019 in the Council Chamber, 135 Canning Highway East Fremantle commencing at 6.30pm and your attendance is requested.



GARY TUFFIN  
Chief Executive Officer

---

**AGENDA**

**1. OFFICIAL OPENING**

**2. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF COUNTRY**

*“On behalf of the Council I would like to acknowledge the Whadjuk Nyoongar people as the traditional custodians of the land on which this meeting is taking place and pay my respects to Elders past and present.”*

**3. RECORD OF ATTENDANCE**

**3.1 Attendance**

**3.2 Apologies**

Cr J Harrington

**3.3 Approved**

**4. DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST**

**4.1 Financial**

**4.2 Proximity**

**4.3 Impartiality**

**5. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

**5.1 Public Question Time**

**6. PRESENTATIONS/DEPUTATIONS**

**6.1 Deputations**

## 7. REPORT

### 7.1 Complex Amendment No. 15 to Local Planning Scheme No. 3 to Supplement Special Zone - Royal George Hotel Provisions – Consideration of Schedule of Modifications (as directed by Minister for Planning) and Schedule of Submissions

<b>Owner</b>	34 Duke Street P/L (Saracen Properties)
<b>Applicant</b>	Town of East Fremantle
<b>File ref</b>	TPS3A15; P/DUK34
<b>Prepared by</b>	Christine Catchpole, Senior Planning Officer
<b>Supervised by</b>	Andrew Malone, Executive Manager Regulatory Services
<b>Meeting Date:</b>	7 August 2019
<b>Voting requirements:</b>	Simple Majority
<b>Documents tabled</b>	Nil
<b>Attachments</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Location Plan</li><li>2. Amendment No. 15 – Schedule of Modifications</li><li>3. Schedule of Submissions</li><li>4. Proposed Modifications to Schedule of Modifications (tracked changes)</li><li>5. Amendment No. 15 - Timeline of Events</li><li>6. Summary of Key Planning Issues resulting from the Schedule of Modifications</li></ol>

#### **Purpose**

The purpose of this report is for Council to consider and make a resolution in regard to the Schedule of Modifications (as directed by the Minister for Planning) and the Schedule of Submissions (outcome of readvertising) for complex Amendment No. 15 – Royal George Hotel site at No. 34 Duke Street, East Fremantle.

#### **Executive Summary**

In 2017 the State Government, subject to a Heritage Agreement, sold the Royal George Hotel site to a private land owner, Saracen Properties Pty Ltd (Saracens). At the time the Town was advised that the *Conservation Management Strategy* (Annexure to the Heritage Agreement) and the contract of sale would not contain development controls for the vacant rear portion of the site.

In June 2017, Council initiated Amendment No. 15 to Local Planning Scheme No. 3 (LPS 3) to include additional development standards for this important site. In June 2018 the Council resolved to support the Amendment with modifications. The Amendment considered the site's location and physical development constraints, its heritage value and context, and the character and amenity of the surrounding area. In summary, it limited redevelopment to a non-variable maximum height which equated to 6 storeys (including basement car parking), applied non-variable setbacks, ensured restoration of the Hotel, considered traffic and parking implications, residential development standards and protected residential amenity.

The Amendment was subsequently forwarded to the WA Planning Commission (WAPC) for its consideration. The Department of Planning made substantial changes to the Amendment most notably to the Special Zone objectives, building height and setbacks, plot ratio, residential development requirements, parking requirements and heritage controls. These changes were then endorsed by the WAPC and forwarded to the Minister for Planning who directed that the Amendment be further modified and advertised for public comment. The Schedule of

Modifications was advertised for a period of 28 days from 29 January to 25 February 2019. The modifications were advertised through various print and electronic means and copies of the document were available at the Town. Signs were erected on the site and a number of newspaper advertisements were placed in local papers. This satisfied the statutory advertising requirements and additional advertising measures the Town thought appropriate were also undertaken. This included letters inviting comment on the modifications being sent to all land owners. A total of 233 submissions were received of which 216 submitters overwhelmingly rejected the Schedule of Modifications (as modified by the Minister) and were in support of the Council's Amendment (6 storey height limit). Sixteen (16) submissions supported the Minister's modifications. The majority of submissions expressed concern that no Hotel restoration work had been commenced and the Legal Agreement to date had not been honoured.

Although there are concerns with a number of the modifications, the Town is predominantly concerned with the seven storey building height provision. The Town understood the Minister's modifications to be in response to the Council's and community's concerns with the proposed 21 storey apartment tower and its negative impact on heritage, amenity and orderly and proper planning. However, on closer examination of the drafting of the clause, in conjunction with the application of the new State Planning Policy 7.3 - R-Codes – Volume 2 - Apartments, it is clear that the clause specifying height (and referring to natural ground level) can be varied by a decision-maker, thereby enabling building height to exceed what the community would reasonably expect to be aligned with seven storeys but also, and more significantly, for the 7 storey limit to be exceeded. If the Minister were to support the modifications in their current form the potential impact of a building height exceeding seven storeys would not become apparent until a development approval application was lodged. Given the current wording of the building height and other clauses, the Town has reached the conclusion that it cannot support the modified Amendment in its current form. The aim of Council's Amendment was to incorporate built form development standards that would define a building envelope which would provide certainty and clarity to all stakeholders. In the Town's opinion this cannot be balanced with the flexibility of the wording of the current provisions.

It is therefore recommended the Council supports the Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) subject to the further modifications outlined in the Officer's Report and in Attachment 4. The Minister's modifications are considered supportable on the basis that further amendments are made to the building height clause that will ensure the scale and height of the development is not open to variation and addresses the heritage and planning considerations. It is recommended that a maximum height control be introduced which reflects the Minister's wish to cap the height at seven storeys but still allows for generous four metre floor to ceiling heights (i.e. 43.0m AHD). This allows for a building of seven levels, including parking level(s) which will be approximately 1.0m higher than the top of the spire of the Hotel (~AHD 42.04m).

It is also recommended that the significant concerns Council has with the specific provisions as discussed in the body of the Report be forwarded to the Department of Planning, the WAPC and the Minister so they are fully informed of the Council's concerns prior to the Amendment being finalised. In particular, and of foremost concern, is that consideration be given to a specific maximum non-variable building height limit, so that the height of a building is fixed in relation to the Hotel and cannot be changed by any provision of the Planning Scheme or any other mechanism. Other provisions relating to plot ratio, building setbacks, vehicle parking, residential development, Special Zone objectives and heritage are also recommended to be amended or reintroduced. It is also recommended that the Council resolves that the submissions made in regard to the advertised Schedule of Modifications be received and that the recommendation in

respect to each submission be noted and those who made a submission be notified of the Council's decision.

### **Background**

The following is a summary of the background in relation to Amendment No. 15. Full background details are available in the Council Minutes dated 7 June 2017 (SPCM Minutes 070617) and 6 June 2018 (SPCM Minutes 06072018).

The Royal George Hotel site is a 1,499m<sup>2</sup> triangular shaped lot located within the Town's historic Plympton Precinct (refer to Attachment 1). The Hotel site is on the State Heritage Register and was sold by the State of WA in June 2017 to 34 Duke Street P/L (Saracen Properties P/L). The sale of the land was subject to a *Heritage Agreement* and a *Conservation Management Strategy* which are part of the contract of sale. The *Heritage Agreement* is available for public viewing on the *inHerit* website. The Agreement is a binding legal document between the Heritage Council of WA and the owner. It specifies that restoration works undertaken on the Hotel are to be completed within three years of the effective date (i.e. June 2020) with some of the more urgent works requiring completion before then. The Hotel is to be restored before any development at the rear of the site can be subdivided. A caveat on the title prevents strata titling and subsequent selling of any apartments until the State lifts the caveat.

A detailed timeline of events can be read in Attachment 5.

### **Details**

#### Schedule of Modifications

Following Council adoption of Amendment No. 15 in June 2018 and the Town receiving advice from the Department of Planning that modifications to the Amendment were intended, Elected Members and the Town's Officers met with the following people:

- Minister for Planning;
- Members of State and Federal Parliament;
- Chair of the Heritage Council;
- CEO of the State Heritage Office and heritage officers;
- Director General of the Department of Planning; Lands and Heritage;
- Senior State Planning staff ;
- Chair of the Western Australian Planning Commission;
- Senior advisors to the Minister for Planning; and
- Chief Planning Advisor to the Director General of Planning.

The aim of the meetings was to outline the basis and importance of the Scheme Amendment in relation to orderly and proper planning for the site and to seek support for the Amendment in the form adopted by Council. The Town has also liaised with community members and organisations who expressed an interest in voicing their support for the Council's Amendment.

Amendment No. 15 was then considered by the Statutory Planning Committee (SPC - a sub-committee of the Western Australian Planning Commission WAPC) on 23 October 2018. At the meeting the SPC considered a report by Officers of the Department of Planning which did not support the Council's Amendment. The SPC reports are confidential so the recommendation by State Planning Department Officers to the SPC was not available to the Town.

The Mayor, Deputy Mayor and Officers from the Town, as well as many community members, the land owners/developers and their representatives made deputations to the SPC to speak both in



support of and against the Town's Amendments. Notwithstanding the Town's arguments in support of the Council endorsed Amendment, the Minister accepted the Schedule of Modifications (as proposed by the Department of Planning) and then directed further modifications be made in consultation with Department of Planning Officers and her advisors.

The Town believes that the Minister's modifications significantly increased the redevelopment potential of the site which is contrary to the objective of the Council endorsed Amendment. The Minister's modifications provide the leeway for the built form outcome of the site to be greater than the Council endorsed development controls. This is primarily because the building height and plot ratio clauses, as adopted by Council, have been significantly changed. It was for this reason and because many of the Council's provisions were deleted that the Amendment was readvertised. The principal reason being that the Minister had made a public announcement that *'the maximum height of development within the zone is not permitted to exceed seven storeys above natural ground level measured at the lowest point of the Lot 303 boundary fronting Duke Street'*. In particular, the Minister and the Department of Planning staff wanted to seek community feedback on the changes to the building height clause.

Since initially advised of the modifications, the Town has expressed its dissatisfaction with the manner in which the Department of Planning has assessed and responded to the Council's Amendment and remains significantly concerned with the changes. These concerns are twofold. Firstly, in the Town's assessment of the modifications, the new provisions are considered to allow for development potential beyond what Council and the community considered appropriate for the site. The development capacity of the site is extremely constrained and overdevelopment of the site will have implications for the orderly and proper planning of the Hotel and wider heritage area. Any increase in building height and scale and the consequent increase in traffic and parking will have immediate negative heritage, visual and amenity impacts that cannot be mitigated. Secondly, the Town is of the view that changes to the clauses allowing greater discretionary powers and scope to vary provisions will give rise to concerns because the community has no certainty in regard to the development potential of the site and because they are misleading; the intent being to provide the decision maker with the power to approve a building of greater than seven storeys. The end result being the potential for the site to be developed for more dwellings and to a greater height and bulk than the Council had advocated on behalf of the community and that which was committed to by the Minister in her press release.

#### State Planning Policy 7.3 (SPP 7.3): R-Codes – Volume 2 - Apartments

Toward the end of the advertising period SPP 7.3 was launched (18 February 2019) which replaced Part 6 of the R-Codes (multiple dwellings) and was gazetted on 24 May 2019. This new set of rules for apartment developments has direct application to the development controls which would be applied to apartments being developed at the rear of the Hotel.

The application of the new R-Codes for apartments allows for 'natural ground level' to be altered. This combined with no definitive height in metres being assigned to a seven storey building (as per the Minister's modifications) means there is no absolute way of determining the overall maximum height of a building in and of itself, or in relation to the Hotel. The overriding concern, however is that the modified building height clause does not dis-apply the 'variations to site and development standards and requirements' clause (i.e. cl. 5.6.1) in the Town's Planning Scheme, as is the case with cl. 5.9.7.3 in regard to plot ratio. Therefore, all design elements (e.g. basements, height of a storey, roof structures, lofts and mezzanines) and controls in relation to determining building height under the Scheme and the R-Codes are discretionary and open to variation by a decision maker. The point that natural ground level can be altered is contrary to

correspondence from Department of Planning staff (email dated 30 November 2018) that confirmed that natural ground level was to be taken from the lowest point on the Duke Street boundary.

In addition, a number of words which are not defined in the current R-Codes are now defined under the new apartment R-Codes. The following words and expressions: basement; mezzanine; loft; mansard roof and natural ground level have relevance in respect to the provisions in the modifications. As mentioned previously because the new R-Codes were not available until near the close of advertising the Town did not have time to undertake a full analysis and provide the information to the community. The consequence of this will be discussed later in this Report when clauses related to height and additional height are discussed.

### **Consultation**

In December 2018 the WAPC advised that it had considered Amendment No. 15 and submitted its recommendation to the Minister for Planning. The Minister directed that the Amendment be modified in accordance with the Schedule of Modifications and also determined that the recommended modifications were significant. The Town was directed to advertise the modifications for 28 days and follow the procedures required for advertising under the *Local Planning Schemes Regulations 2015*. The advertising was undertaken from 29 January to 25 February 2019. A comprehensive advertising program was undertaken involving the required statutory advertising notices, a number of conventional and social media forums, the Town's website and eNews, signs on the site, as well as individual correspondence being sent to all landowners in the Town which included a submission form and reply paid envelope.

All relevant public authorities including the Heritage Council and EPA were notified in writing of the requirement for the Town to advertise the modifications to the Amendment and they were provided with the modifications for comment.

The advertising process followed formal statutory processes in accordance with the requirements of the WAPC and the *Local Planning Schemes Regulations 2015* as outlined in the WAPC letter received in December 2018.

### Community submissions

A total of 233 submissions have been received in response to advertising the Schedule of Modifications. Overall 216 objections to the modifications were received, with 16 in support (4 conditional support and 1 unrelated submission). Twenty one (21) submissions were joint submissions, listing two names but made on the one submission form. This accounts for a further 17 people objecting and 4 supporting the modifications.

The submissions objecting can be classified as follows:

- 129 objecting to modifications and supporting Council's Amendment without qualification.
- 87 conditional objection to modifications. The conditions covering a variety of factors related to maximum building height, amenity and parking.
- 76 of the conditional objection submissions supported Council's Amendment and were categorised as conditional because they did not object to the 7 storeys building height cap (Minister's modification). However, in all other respects the submissions supported the remainder of the Council's planning controls and noted they should be reinstated. The submissions also stated that:
  - building height to be capped and specified in metres above AHD;

- the Royal George Hotel to be restored without further delay; and
- the Heritage Agreement conservation requirements to be enforced.

**Note:** the submitters who supported the Minister’s modification to seven storeys were not aware of the new SPP 7.3 - R-Codes – Apartments document and the interpretation of seven storeys, in terms of overall height, under the provisions of the new R-Codes. It is fair to say that their likely interpretation of seven storeys was 3.5 metres/storey (i.e. ~1 storey higher than the 6 storeys capped height measured in metres above AHD (sea level), as proposed by Council. The Town did not have the information to hand before the commencement of the advertising period and therefore could not provide the information to the community so the broader implications of the new R-Codes could be understood. This will be discussed in more detail in the ‘Comment’ section of this Report but suffice to say that it is likely there would have been less support for the Minister’s proposal of seven storeys if the full impact of the new R-Codes was understood.

It must also be noted that a small number of the submissions did not support the Council’s endorsed Amendment as a lower height building was considered more appropriate. These submissions have been included in the overall total of submissions not in support of the Minister’s modifications. The following comments were made:

- Only a lower scale building of less than 6 storeys should be developed; and/or
- No development should occur at the rear of the Hotel. This area of land should remain vacant.

The 16 submissions in support of the modifications were primarily based on:

- achieving urban infill which will contribute to the Town’s dwelling targets and decreases the rate of urban sprawl;
- additional development on the site will address sustainability and environmental issues;
- a taller building is a more acceptable design/architectural outcome;
- redevelopment as proposed provides economic incentive for Hotel restoration work; and
- satisfaction with the Minister’s decision.

#### Heritage Council

The Heritage Council of WA made the following comments:

*“The Heritage Council resolved to advise the Town of East Fremantle that the proposed scheme amendment has been considered in the context of the Royal George Hotel and the following advice is given:*

#### **Findings**

1. *The Royal George Hotel is a notable landmark and an important townscape element, particularly in the George Street historic precinct.*
2. *The proposed revised amendment responds well to the recommendations contained in the Heritage Council’s previous advice of July 2017.*

#### **Advice**

*The revised proposed Scheme Amendment No. 15 for the Royal George Hotel site is supported; however, the Heritage Council would like to advise that while there is no specific objection to stating a building height limit of seven storeys, it will consider any development proposal for its overall impact on heritage values of the Royal George Hotel, with building height being just one of the factors that will be assessed.”*

#### Service Authority comments

Most service authorities requested for their comments have responded. Generally there are no objections to the modifications, however Fremantle Ports and Main Roads WA have specified that development must be in compliance with relevant State Planning Policies.

#### Submission – Themes

The submissions received overwhelmingly reject the Minister's modifications. A large majority of submissions (93%) clearly support the Town's Amendment as adopted in June 2018. Even those submissions that favoured the Minister's seven storey proposal did so on the basis that the six storeys proposed by Council was to be replaced by a seven storey height control with the height cap remaining in place and the height of the storey being that of a conventional 3.5 metres.

The community also noted that restoration of the Hotel should not come at any cost and certainly not at the cost of significant loss of amenity to the area resulting from over development of the site with intensified activity and more so a detrimental impact on the heritage elements of the precinct. Development controls for the rear of the site have to be determined with the outcome being fair and equitable for the surrounding residents.

Hand in hand with these concerns is the degree to which the unique heritage value and intactness of the precinct is held in very high regard. By far the majority of residents do not want the encroachment of a multi-storey apartment building in the precinct or the Town. They have very clearly expressed the concern that the physical scale of any building above the height of the Hotel is not compatible with the Precinct or the Town Centre and will not enhance or protect the elements that contribute to its historic and architectural significance. These sentiments are very clear in the majority of the submissions.

The other overwhelming concern expressed in the submissions is the lack of progress in relation to restoration of the Hotel. The submissions make it very clear the community is aware that the terms of the Heritage Agreement required works to be completed by June 2020 and that priority restoration items and building works noted in the *Conservation Management Plan* which were required to be completed within certain timeframes have not been commenced.

#### Response to Submissions

Each submission (Form 4) has been reviewed and entered in the Schedule of Submissions (below). The Recommendation in response to each submission is classified as either supported in part, supported, not supported or noted. A response number which corresponds with the Recommendation has also been entered in the Recommendation column. This number then corresponds with a general response which is provided below.

Four basic responses to the submissions have been provided. Three responses provide a general response to the issues and comments noted in the submissions and one other notes or acknowledges submissions that are not relevant to the planning considerations of the Amendment. Further detail regarding submission responses is contained in the Officer's Report where the Town's response to the Schedule of Modifications is discussed in more detail than can be provided in the Schedule of Submissions. Reference should also be made to the Officer's Report and Recommendation for the detailed Council Resolution in respect to the Schedule of Modifications to Amendment No. 15.

This broad approach in addressing the major issues is required due to the high number of submissions. Whilst this approach may not address every individual issue, it is considered a

---

reasonable method of responding given the overriding community concerns relate to building height controls and heritage conservation. Reference should be made to the Officer's Report and Recommendation for the detailed response to the planning issues and recommended modifications to the Schedule of Modifications.

The outcome of the consideration of submissions is that there be further modifications to the Schedule of Modifications in response to the majority of the submissions not supporting the modified development controls. The height of seven storeys (variable and no maximum upper height limit) and plot ratio of 2.0:1 was not supported, neither was the deletion of other planning controls. The support for the Council's Amendment indicates community support for a capped building height with no power to vary the height control. In response the proposed modifications focus on introducing a capped building height control, reducing plot ratio and reinstating provisions relating to vehicle parking, residential development and heritage conservation with some minor wording changes to the Special Zone objectives. This is discussed in detail in the 'Comment' section of the Report.

#### **Statutory Environment**

*Planning and Development Act 2005*

*Heritage Act 2018*

*Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015*

*Local Planning Scheme No. 3 (LPS No. 3)*

*State Heritage List – Permanent Entry (30.10.1998)*

*Classified by the National Trust (5.12.2005)*

*LPS No. 3 – Heritage List – Category A*

*MRS - the site abuts a Primary and Other Regional Road reservation under the MRS.*

#### **Policy Implications**

*Draft Local Planning Strategy 2016*

*Municipal Inventory 2015 – Category A*

#### **Financial Implications**

Nil

#### **Strategic Implications**

The Council's adopted Amendment (Council meeting resolution 6 June 2018) is considered to be in line with the recommendations of the State strategic planning policies such as *Directions 2031 and Beyond* and *Perth and Peel @3.5Million* and would ultimately facilitate the development of this important heritage site with additional dwellings and commercial floor space commensurate with a mixed use area. This will contribute to the economic development of the George Street mixed use area and the Town's dwelling target under State urban infill strategies.

The Town of East Fremantle Strategic Community Plan 2017 – 2027 states as follows:

Built Environment

Accessible, well planned built landscapes which are in balance with the Town’s unique heritage and open spaces.

- 3.1 Facilitate sustainable growth with housing options to meet future community needs.
  - 3.1.1 Advocate for a desirable planning and community outcome for all major strategic development sites.
  - 3.1.2 Plan for a mix of inclusive diversified housing options.
- 3.2 Maintaining and enhancing the Town’s character.
  - 3.2.1 Ensure appropriate planning policies to protect the Town’s existing built form.
- 3.3 Plan and maintain the Town’s assets to ensure they are accessible, inviting and well connected.
  - 3.3.1 Continue to improve asset management practices.
  - 3.3.2 Optimal management of assets within resource capabilities.
  - 3.3.3 Plan and advocate for improved access and connectivity.

Natural Environment

Maintaining and enhancing our River foreshore and other green, open spaces with a focus on environmental sustainability and community amenity.

- 4.1 Conserve, maintain and enhance the Town’s open spaces.
  - 4.1.1 Partner with Stakeholders to actively protect, conserve and maintain the Swan River foreshore.
  - 4.1.2 Plan for improved streetscapes parks and reserves.
- 4.2 Enhance environmental values and sustainable natural resource use.
  - 4.2.1 Reduce waste through sustainable waste management practices.
- 4.3 Acknowledge the change in our climate and understand the impact of those changes.
  - 4.3.1 Improve systems and infrastructure standards to assist with mitigating climate change impacts.

**Risk Implications**

Risk	Risk Likelihood (based on history & with existing controls)	Risk Impact / Consequence	Risk Rating (Prior to Treatment or Control)	Principal Risk Theme	Risk Action Plan (Controls or Treatment proposed)
That Council does not endorse the Report Recommendation	Unlikely (2)	Moderate (3)	Moderate (5-9)	COMPLIANCE Non-compliance results in litigation, criminal charges or significant damages or penalties	Accept Officer Recommendation

**Risk Matrix**

Consequence		Insignificant	Minor	Moderate	Major	Extreme
		1	2	3	4	5
Likelihood	5	Moderate (5)	High (10)	High (15)	Extreme (20)	Extreme (25)
	Almost Certain	5	Moderate (5)	High (10)	High (15)	Extreme (20)
Likely	4	Low (4)	Moderate (8)	High (12)	High (16)	Extreme (20)
Possible	3	Low (3)	Moderate (6)	Moderate (9)	High (12)	High (15)
Unlikely	2	Low (2)	Low (4)	Moderate (6)	Moderate (8)	High (10)
Rare	1	Low (1)	Low (2)	Low (3)	Low (4)	Moderate (5)

A risk is often specified in terms of an event or circumstance and the consequences that may flow from it. An effect may be positive, negative or a deviation from the expected and may be related to the following objectives; occupational health and safety, financial, service interruption, compliance, reputation and environment. A risk matrix has been prepared and a risk rating is provided below. Any items with a risk rating over 16 will be added to the Risk Register, and any item with a risk rating over 16 will require a specific risk treatment plan to be developed.

Risk Rating	6
Does this item need to be added to the Town's Risk Register	No
Is a Risk Treatment Plan Required	No

### Site Inspection

Various - 2017/18.

### Environmental Implications

There are no known significant environmental implications associated with this proposal. The Schedule of Modifications was referred to the EPA in February 2019. No further comments from the EPA were received.

### Comments

A summary of the key planning issues resulting from the Schedule of Modifications is provided in Attachment 6.

Amendment No. 15 has progressed to completion of advertising the Schedule of Modifications as directed by the Minister. The advertising was deemed necessary after substantial changes were made to the Town's Amendment by the Department of Planning, subsequently endorsed by the WAPC and then further modified by the Minister for Planning. When the Town initially indicated to the Department of Planning that the modifications were not supported in September 2018 there were no further discussions with the Town about the modifications before the Department of Planning Officer's report was progressed to consideration by the Statutory Planning Committee (a sub-committee of the WAPC) or before the WAPC recommendation was forwarded to the Minister, which was only one month later.

In respect to the Minister's modifications it was the Town's understanding that the changes to the Amendment were a direct response to the Council's and community's concerns with the proposed 21 storey apartment tower which was publicly advertised by Saracen throughout the Amendment process. However, on closer examination of the drafting of the modified Amendment provisions, in conjunction with the application of the new SPP 7.3 - R-Codes, it was clear that the clause specifying height (and referring to natural ground level) can be varied by a decision maker, thereby enabling building height to exceed what the community would

---

reasonably expect to be aligned with seven storeys but also, and more significantly, for the seven storey limit to be exceeded because a plot ratio of 2.0:1 is capable of being approved.

During and after the advertising phase discussions regarding the drafting of the modified provisions and planning issues were undertaken with the Chairman of the WAPC, the Chief Planning Advisor, Minister's staff and State planning officers to underline the Town's significant concerns with the drafting of the new clauses and the likely implications and development outcomes. At these meetings State Planning Officers advised the Town that if it believed the issues to be of such significance then it should undertake its own detailed review and redraft exercise of the Amendment.

The Town wrote to Minister Saffioti on 3 May 2019 requesting she clarify her position as to why a non-variable maximum height limit was not applied and why a decision-maker would have wide-ranging scope in terms of ability to vary building height beyond seven storeys. The Town then met with Minister Saffioti on 11 June 2019. The outcome of the meeting was not clear and the Minister has not provided a formal written response to the Town's concerns. However, the Minister indicated she is considering the issues and will take into account the submissions and the advice of the Town and the WAPC in respect to building height in her final considerations.

The Town's view is that the Minister's standpoint is fundamental to informing the Council's decision making process and recommendations in respect to the modifications and on that point it requested the Minister provide a formal response to matters raised in the correspondence of 3 May 2019 as the modifications directed by the Minister seemingly do not reflect her public announcement about capping the building height at seven storeys. At the time of writing the Report no response has been received.

The Town is also of the opinion that if the Minister were to support the modifications in their current form the potential impact of a building height exceeding seven storeys would not become apparent until a development approval application was lodged. This does not give the community a legitimate informed understanding of the potential outcomes and in turn limits their ability to make informed deputations and further comments on the Amendment if they so wish.

More recently the Town has been granted an extension of time in which the Council has to make a resolution regarding the Schedule of Modifications and the submissions. Due to the complexities in the technical drafting of the Amendment provisions and the issues that have emerged regarding the Minister's response to height control the amended deadline was extended until 9 August 2019.

#### Schedule of Modifications

The Town's primary concerns with the Minister's modifications relate to the ambiguous and open-ended nature of the building height clause and related clauses. The clause, as it is currently drafted, simply does not provide any certainty that a building will be capped at seven storeys. There are also a number of other clauses relating to plot ratio, vehicle parking and residential development which would perhaps leave the Amendment open to misinterpretation or misuse in respect to those planning controls for the vacant land and the site as a whole. It is the Town's view that the Amendment in this form will lead to a development outcome that is not aligned with the community's expectations or understanding of the redevelopment outcome for the site. Neither is it aligned with the Minister's statement that she has responded to the community's concern regarding the owner's plans for development of the site. The Town believes that the



Schedule of Modifications will not result in orderly and proper planning and will have undesirable heritage, amenity and streetscape outcomes.

The specific concerns regarding the modifications are supported by the large majority of submissions which demonstrate collective support for the Council endorsed Amendment. However, it is important to acknowledge the context that has led the Town to arrive at the point at which it cannot support the Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) and is recommending further modifications. This is based primarily on the degree of discretion that has been applied to the building height clause and is further complicated by the gazettal of the new R-Codes which apply a modified set of development controls in respect to apartments and an increased degree of flexibility regarding building height and other development controls.

The building height and plot ratio clauses are the primary focus of concern because the modified plot ratio, albeit controlled with a non-variable upper limit, is considered too substantial given building height as it currently stands is not capped. Based on the owner's detailed plans (multi-storey tower on car park podium), with height unimpeded and a plot ratio of 2.0:1 development of the site has the potential to reach a height of ~16 storeys. At a plot ratio of 1.5:1 a building has the potential to reach a height of ~9 storeys. There is one other modified clause and two deleted clauses which also give rise to concerns; these are the vehicle parking, residential development and heritage clauses. The Town is also concerned with the wording of some of the general development control clauses and the Special Zone objectives. This involves minor changes to the text in respect to the language used but will result in a different interpretation and application of the clause, providing more clarity and strength in terms of the intent. These matters are discussed in detail in the 'Comment' section of the Report.

The majority of the submissions received in respect to the advertised modifications have not altered from the views expressed in the original advertising period. These views align with the Town's concerns regarding controlling height and scale for the purpose of preserving the significant heritage values of the Hotel and its status as a landmark building in this historic precinct. The two issues go hand in hand on this very constrained site and this point is further elaborated in the discussion on heritage and orderly and proper planning considerations to follow.

The modifications to the Amendment as directed by the Minister do not address these issues satisfactorily and the 217 submissions which have objected to the modifications have reinforced the Town's concerns. Therefore, it is not recommended the Council support the Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) by the Minister but that the Council endorse further modifications as outlined in Schedule 4 and discussed in the 'Comment' section of the Report.

#### Heritage Considerations

The heritage elements of the Plympton Precinct have been fundamental in the formulation of development controls for the Royal George Hotel site. An overview of the important elements and characteristics which define the precinct and the Hotel site is provided below. It forms the basis of the reasoning underpinning the Town's argument for requiring further modifications to reintroduce a non-variable capped building height and respecting the heritage streetscape.

George Street is central to the Plympton Precinct area and effectively reflects the surrounding streets in both character and scale. It also provides an attractive streetscape with good public amenity. Both the workers' cottages which surround George Street and the small scale and modest commercial buildings are features which contribute towards creating a very intimate

---

relationship with this street. The corner buildings are particularly important to George Street. They act as mediation between the commercial strip and the historic residential streets and provide a connectivity for residents and visitors to the area and a link to a past way of life.

The eastern end of the George Street is well defined by the Stirling Highway reservation and two prominent buildings on the north and south corners of Duke Street, these being the Royal George Hotel and the newly restored and developed Brush Factory site. The Royal George Hotel is a notable landmark in the Town and Fremantle region and a very important townscape element in the heritage precinct. It is a significant and representative example of a Western Australian gold boom hotel with much of its original form and fabric intact. The tower and cupola structure is an increasingly rare example of a landmark element still in its original form and in itself forms an important landmark element visible from many parts of the Town and on approach to the Town Centre.

The now completed refurbishment of the four level Brush Factory is an integral part of the George Street heritage area with exceptional aesthetic value as a good restrained example of the Federation Free Classical style commercial building. It was part of the suburban residential development associated with the expansion of East Fremantle during the Goldrush period of the 1880s and 1890s and of the Town Centre, so its importance in reflecting the past and in representing a period in WA's history and development cannot be overstated.

Buildings and places between the west and east end landmarks of the George Street heritage area predominantly comprise of a mix of one and two storey commercial, residential and mixed use buildings together with a small local park and the odd three storey development. Overall the George Street streetscape possesses a high level of visual coherence as do the residential streets running perpendicular to George Street.

The most significant part of George Street extends from Hubble Street to Duke Street. This location is, in effect, the beginning and main arrival point, of that part of the street and, therefore, is the first point at which the character of the George Street precinct is fully apparent. The view shed from this point is particularly important in experiencing the perception and identity of the area as a remnant example of a previous era.

For over 100 years the perception of the Town and the locality as a historic suburb within a well-vegetated suburban backdrop has been maintained. Views and vistas from many vantage points are very important to the overall heritage character of the locality and should not be diminished, neither should the Royal George Hotel as an important building and place in its own right.

A building height control as proposed would allow a multi-storey building to become the central element of the vista, relegating the heritage buildings to a secondary role in the vista and diminishing their value as contributors to East Fremantle's unique sense of place. A development which dominates the skyline would be completely out of context with any of its surroundings.

#### Orderly and Proper Planning Considerations

A building which would exceed the height of the Hotel on such a small building footprint (less than 750m<sup>2</sup> of land area in a triangle shape) is considered to be of a height and scale that is irreconcilable with its context and location and not justifiable other than to provide an increased number of apartments with views that cannot be obtained from a building of a lesser height.

Any further development of the site should result in a total and integrated redevelopment which complements and respects the Royal George Hotel and does not detract from the building or the surrounding area. Development on the site must integrate as seamlessly as possible (in all aspects of operation, parking and land use) with the surrounding established residential area and be able to adequately address the considerable constraints pertaining to this site. It is therefore considered imperative that the decision maker does not have the discretion to approve a development which does not meet the high standards of planning and design required by the Town and expected by the community for a development outcome suitable to this site, the heritage building and the historic Plympton Precinct. The character and appeal of the area that has been preserved by the Town must be maintained, especially as it relates to this landmark building. Overdevelopment which would result in excessive traffic and parking with access and servicing issues will not be contained to the site but has the potential to greatly impact the remainder of the precinct because of the limited vehicular access to this neighbourhood.

It has been argued by some that the rear of the site should not be redeveloped but should be made available for parking for use by the Hotel tenants. In previous Officer reports it has been stated that a more realistic approach is to reach an acceptable compromise between: a building height that achieves the restoration of the Hotel; the activation of the eastern end of George Street; the community's expectations for redevelopment; an opportunity to provide some additional dwellings in the Town with a built form outcome that is not incompatible with the location and is not simply a set of planning controls for the site alone which stand in isolation from the planning issues and the controls which apply to the surrounding area.

The argument that a slender tall building of substantial height is a better design outcome is not considered to be a convincing argument in that a building of any significant height above the Hotel is viewed as being out of character and scale with all that surrounds it. The Town does not have any large scale industrial or commercial buildings and does not have an Activity Centre that overtime might be developed with buildings of any substantial height. It is the Town's view there is no rational argument that would support development controls which would permit a building to well exceed the height of the Hotel and any other building in the Fremantle region.

There is no precedence for a multi-storey building of the height that could be achieved with a plot ratio of 2:1 anywhere in the metropolitan area that is not within 5kms of the CBD and also within walking distance of a major transport interchange. The height, density and building form proposed with the modifications is out of context in relation to the State Planning Framework (*Perth and Perth @3.5M*). This site is not located in a station precinct, Metronet Station or Activity Centre. It is not even classified as a neighbourhood centre which is the classification given to the East Fremantle Town Centre. Implementation Action - Table 3 of the *Central Sub-regional Planning Framework* states: *'Ensure that attractive character and heritage values within the suburbs are retained and minimise changes to the existing urban fabric'* – a multi-storey building would be totally out of character with the most precious heritage area of the Town and arguably a heritage area unique in the Perth metropolitan area which is immediately adjacent to the site.

The proposed modifications to the Schedule of Modifications in restricting building height and lowering plot ratio and thereby the development potential are considered to align with the built form and residential scale of development. The negative impact that a development which has the potential to introduce significantly more activity, vehicles and traffic to the area would be contrary to the orderly and proper planning of the locality. The Town supports the residents' viewpoint that refurbishment of the Hotel should not come at the cost of significant loss of amenity resulting from the development of a high-rise building with intensified activity.

Therefore the argument that additional apartments are justified and required to fund the restoration of the Hotel is not considered valid.

In light of the above discussion the following proposed changes to the Schedule of Modifications is recommended.

Proposed modifications to Schedule of Modifications (as directed by Minister)

The proposed changes to various clauses are discussed below under the relevant sub-headings. The Minister's modifications are noted in italics and the recommended modifications to the Minister's modified Amendment are indicated in bold italics with changes to the text or additional text highlighted in red following discussion on the reasons for the modifications.

Special Zone – Royal George Hotel Objectives

The Town is supportive of the approach taken in introducing a set of specific objectives which apply to the Special Zone in addition to those already included in the Scheme Text objectives for the Royal George Hotel site. However, the link between the plot ratio permitted and satisfaction of the objectives is not considered legally strong in the Town's opinion. It is therefore considered necessary to recommend changes to various clauses that are linked to satisfying the objectives to ensure that *all* objectives are considered and given equal consideration in the assessment of plot ratio allocation.

Clause 4.2 of LPS 3 - Additional points below existing zone objectives

*"A mixed use development on the northern portion of the site together with the restoration of the existing Royal George Hotel building is considered an appropriate use of the site."*

Due to concerns relating to overdevelopment of the site a purely residential development rather than a mixed use development is likely to be preferred by the Town, particularly if this reduces the car parking, traffic and access burden on the site overall and more so if the Hotel is to be used for a variety of other purposes. However, the Minister's additional objective for the Special Zone specifies a mixed use development. What is more, clause 5.9.7.4 provides that the maximum plot ratio of 2.0:1 is only available where all zone objectives are satisfied. Since one of the zone objectives would become the requirement for a mixed use development on the northern portion of the site, the ability to access the maximum 2.0:1 plot ratio would be dependent on the northern portion of the site being proposed for mixed use if the decision maker were to strictly adhere to the wording of the clause.

Following on from the above point the requirement to achieve satisfaction of all zoning objectives, is considered a 'standard or requirement' that is capable of being relaxed under LPS 3 cl. 5.6 or Deemed Provision clause 12. The working position of the Town with regard to the possible relaxation of the 'mixed use' objective, would be that a decision maker would require a very strong argument that the objective should be disregarded or varied. This is a point which may not be in the best interests of the overall and long term planning for the site. In this case it is likely a purely residential development will be considered more desirable, so from the Town's perspective the mixed-use objective should be amended, particularly if the Minister determines that the other development standards remain variable and that results in further development potential.

It is therefore recommended that this additional point under the zone objectives should be modified to allow for solely residential development to occur on the northern portion of the site. The recommended modified wording is stated below:

**Special Zone – Royal George Hotel Objectives**

***A mixed use development on the ~~northern portion of the~~ site (Lot 303) together with the restoration of the existing Royal George Hotel building is considered an appropriate use of the site.***

A number of other changes to wording are minor in nature in regarding changes to the text but are significant in terms of interpretation and intent in respect to the intent of the Amendment as a whole. The following changes are recommended to be made to the Special Zone objectives.

The first is to objective (a) to include the words Plympton Precinct and George Street designated heritage area to encompass the wider local precinct area and the George Street heritage area as listed in LPS 3. These areas and heritage places must be considered in the consideration of architecture and urban design not just the Hotel in isolation of the Plympton neighbourhood and the ‘main street’ of the Precinct.

***(i) Provide high quality, contemporary architecture and urban design that responds to and enhances the heritage value of the existing Royal George Hotel and the wider Plympton Precinct and George Street designated heritage area, in interpreting rather than replicating existing features.***

The change to cl. 5.9.3 is to introduce the word “all” to emphasize that no objective is to be disregarded in the consideration of design or plot ratio.

***Cl. 5.9.3***

***In assessing any application for development within the zone, the decision maker and State Design Review Panel shall have due regard to **all** the zone objectives provided in Section 4.2 of the scheme.***

The change to cl. 5.9.2 is to correct a typographical error.

***5.9.4***

***When considering **with** a development application on which advice has been provided by the State Design Review Panel the decision-maker shall have due regard to that advice.***

**Plot Ratio – cl. 5.9.7.4**

***“Development up to the maximum plot ratio permitted on the site shall only be approved where the decision maker, having due regard to the advice of the State Design Review Panel, is satisfied the development meets all the objectives of the Special Zone - Royal George Hotel.”***

Although a plot ratio of greater than 2.0:1 is incapable of being approved (see cl. 5.9.7.1 and cl. 5.9.7.3) the requirement to satisfy all zone objectives, before the maximum can be approved, is arguably capable of being relaxed. This was identified as a concern in the Town’s initial response to the modifications in September 2018 before the matter was considered by the SPC but it was not addressed in the Minister’s modifications. Neither was the issue of a base starting point for determining plot ratio. Cl. 5.9.7.4 refers only to a maximum and does not provide a base plot ratio if only some and not all of the objectives are considered to be satisfied. In theory, if none of the objectives were satisfied then how is the plot ratio determined. A base starting point has not been determined.

With the current wording of the plot ratio provision, the maximum plot ratio would be capable of

being approved even where not all the zone objectives are fulfilled; that outcome being achieved through the use of the variation of standards cl. 5.6 or Deemed Provision 12. Cl. 5.6 can be applied to vary any 'standard or requirement' imposed by the Planning Scheme. It is therefore considered necessary to introduce a clause stating that *no* zone objective is to be varied and that *all* zone objectives are to be satisfied to achieve the maximum plot ratio as it is highly likely that a developer will not seek anything lower than a plot ratio of 2:1.

Notwithstanding the above comments related to a 2:1 plot ratio it is also considered necessary to propose to reduce the maximum plot ratio from 2:1 to 1.5:1. The plot ratio proposed can only be developed at the rear of the site on approximately 750m<sup>2</sup> of vacant land. However, the plot ratio is to be calculated based on the total land area of 1,499m<sup>2</sup> and does not include the floor space of the Hotel, therefore the developable floor space is ~3,000m<sup>2</sup> over a 750m<sup>2</sup> site. Without a capped building height provision a maximum plot ratio of 2:1 provides enough floor space to allow for the construction of approximately 16 storeys where as a plot ratio of 1.5:1 will allow for the construction of an approximately 9 storey building (based on the developer's plans and drawings for a multi-storey tower which is proposed for the site). The owner's architect has reinforced this concern by stating in his submission that *"the maximum height of 7 storeys doesn't permit a development of anything near the maximum plot ratio of 2.0:1. Taking account of the mandatory onsite parking provisions, the maximum achievable plot ratio within the building envelope is 0.95:1. There is a mismatch between the perceived development potential (PR) and the limited height permitted on a very small triangular site."* The reduction of plot ratio is considered a necessary safeguard against the scenario of the WAPC and the Minister not being in agreement with the Town in capping building height and disapplying cl. 5.6 which allows a decision maker to vary the height. Whilst a nine storey building is not endorsed this amount of plot ratio would enable a development more aligned within the height parameters preferred by the Town and intended by the Minister. The relevant clause is therefore proposed to be amended accordingly.

Further to the above point the Town holds the view that a number of the objectives will not be achievable if a maximum plot ratio of 2:1 was approved for the site and there was no maximum height cap. Objectives which aim to mitigate visual impact, not obstruct views of the cupola, maintain primary views of the Hotel and locate car parking to minimise negative impacts to the public realm are not considered achievable with the potential for the site to be developed with minimal setbacks and a plot ratio of 2:1 (i.e. ~16 storeys). The amount of developable floor space resulting from a 2:1 plot ratio (with no height cap) would allow for the development of a multi-storey building with a much larger number of apartments and car bays. In that scenario a multi-storey building, would need to incorporate a podium car park and an overall development that is well beyond what would reasonably be expected to resemble a seven storey building. This is in sharp contrast to the Council's Amendment which clearly defined a building envelope which could not be varied by the decision maker and could accommodate an appropriate number of car bays for the site and restrained traffic into the area. Under the Council's Amendment a plot ratio control was not required as the developable floor space was controlled by the maximum height and building setbacks.

The following modifications to the plot ratio provisions (new text in red) are therefore recommended.

### Plot Ratio

#### 5.9.7.1

*The maximum plot ratio of development within the zone is not permitted to exceed ~~2.0:1~~ 1.5:1.*

#### 5.9.7.2

***The maximum plot ratio excludes the floor space of the existing Royal George Hotel Building.***

#### 5.9.7.3

***Development up to the maximum plot ratio permitted on the site shall only be approved where the decision maker, having due regard to the advice of the State Design Review Panel, is satisfied the development meets all the objectives, as stated in clause 4.2, of the Special Zone - Royal George Hotel.***

#### 5.9.7.4

***Clause 4.2 (Special Zone – Royal George Hotel), clause 5.9.3, clause 5.9.7.1 and clause 5.9.7.3 are not open to any variation through any provision of this scheme or any other mechanism.***

#### Building Height – cl. 5.9.7.5

It appears from the Minister's public announcement in November 2018 that it was her intent to apply a maximum height of seven storeys. However, as noted above, on closer examination of the clause and in light of the release of SPP 7.3 – R-Codes – Apartments the Town is concerned about the degree of flexibility in relation to the development controls, both in the new R-Codes and the modified Amendment, and ultimately the greater degree of discretion available to the decision maker to vary height.

The overriding concern is that the modified building height clause does not dis-apply the 'variations to site and development standards and requirements' clause (i.e. cl. 5.6.1) in the Town's Planning Scheme, as is the case with cl. 5.9.7.3 in regard to plot ratio (refer to Attachment 2). In that clause it is specified that plot ratio is *not open to any variation under the Scheme or any other mechanism*.

The Town wrote to the Minister seeking clarification as to why the building height clause was modified enabling a decision maker to approve of a building greater than seven storeys; beyond what the community would reasonably expect to be seven storeys (including basement levels) and therefore exceed the height of the Hotel spire. If it was the Minister's intention to cap the height at seven storeys it is not clear to the Town why the same clause as applied to plot ratio was not applied or why it was not specified that building height (equivalent to seven storeys) not exceed a specified number of metres above AHD.

It appears the majority of the community hold the same view and have expressed the same uncertainty and concerns, based on the Ministerial announcement, that development would be limited to seven storeys. From the outset of the statutory advertising period, the community have understood the seven storey height provision to be the *maximum* height limit of a building. If the Minister were to support the modifications in their current form the potential impact of a building height exceeding seven storeys would be probable and significant and not become apparent until a development approval application was lodged and advertised to the community. This issue remains of concern from a community awareness and expectation perspective.

Given the current wording of the building height and other interconnected clauses which have an impact on building height the Town has reached the conclusion that it cannot support the modified Amendment in its current form. The purpose of the Council endorsed building height clause was to incorporate built form provisions into the Scheme that would define a building envelope to provide certainty and clarity to all stakeholders and in the Town's opinion this cannot be balanced with the flexibility and scope for building height to be increased in the current

drafting of the clause as proposed by the Minister. The reasoning behind the Council endorsed building height provisions has been discussed at length in previous reports and reiterated above.

The Amendment has been modified to allow for a building height that is not only higher than that endorsed by Council but which cannot be specified in metres. Therefore it cannot be determined how high a building on the vacant portion of the site might be in comparison to the Hotel. This is because building height, as specified in storeys is not adequately fixed at a given height or because other provisions in the Amendment and in LPS 3 allow for a decision maker to vary the development controls. An exact capped maximum height of a development is not specified.

The Town has identified significant issues that it believes calls for further examination and consideration by the Department of Planning and the Minister prior to reaching a final decision on the Amendment, particularly given the Minister's undertaking to cap the height at a maximum of seven storeys in response to the community's concerns.

The Council endorsed building height and setback clause was substantially modified to remove the Council's *Building Height and Setback Table* which specified specific building heights for each level of a building which corresponded to building setbacks for each level. The Minister's modified clause reads as follows and the Town's issues with the modified provisions are discussed below.

*"The maximum height of development within the zone is not permitted to exceed seven storeys above natural ground level measured at the lowest point of the Lot 303 boundary fronting Duke Street."*

In the Town's view the wording of this clause, in conjunction with other Scheme Text provisions (cl. 5.6 and Deemed Provision 12) and the SPP 7.3 – R-Codes – Apartments will give rise to the following matters which cannot be disregarded and which will influence the built form outcome of development of the rear of the site.

The matters are technical in nature but relevant to the assessment of a development approval application for a multi-storey building behind the Hotel which would be subject to assessment under the R-Codes. The following aspects of an R-Code based assessment will impact on the overall building height outcome.

Natural ground level – will be open to be approved by planning decision makers as being post site-works. In summary, site works can change the natural ground level and this change can be approved by a decision maker. It is therefore not a foregone conclusion that the natural ground level as it is today will be the starting point from which building height will be calculated. It is noted that this is contrary to correspondence from Department of Planning staff (email dated 30 November 2018) that confirmed that natural ground level was to be taken from the lowest point on the Duke Street boundary.

Basements – will not constitute a storey in their own right. In so far as they protrude above ground level, the counting of storeys will only commence for levels of the building above the basement.

The new SPP 7.3 R-Codes – Apartments defines 'storey' as *the portion of a building which is situated between the top of any floor and the top of the floor next above it and if there is no floor above it, that portion between the top of the floor and the ceiling above it but does not include:*



- a basement
- a space that contains only a lift shaft, stairway or meter room
- a mezzanine
- a loft

*Double height floors greater than 5m floor to ceiling are counted as two floors.*

*The definite exclusion of 'basement' from counting storeys is critical to the calculation of the overall height of a building. The new R-Codes definition of 'basement' is a building floor level in which 50% or more of its volume is below natural ground level. It is noted that the definition is based on 'volume' not on the basement protruding above ground level more than a stipulated height (as it was in the Council's Amendment). It is therefore plausible that part of a basement could be an indefinite height above natural ground level provided there is always a compensatory 50% of the volume below natural ground level. Basements do not have to contain parking, they may be used for other purposes such as storage. When this scenario is combined with the understanding that 'natural ground level' does not always mean the current levels of the site, the effective starting point for counting storeys could be an indefinite height or level.*

Storey – Individual storeys could be built, each up to five metres high. Therefore a developer who chooses to build a series of storeys with especially high ceilings, could produce a building of a height significantly in excess of what might normally be associated with a seven storey concept. If only for this reason, the clause is likely to produce a building of indefinite height. Only when a storey exceeds 5 metres is it counted as if it comprises two floors.

Mezzanine and loft levels – will not be counted as a separate storey. The fact that mezzanine levels are not counted as separate storeys in their own right is clear from the new R-Codes 'definition of 'storey' quoted above. 'Mezzanine' is defined as '*an intermediate floor between main floors of a building*'. It is easy to envisage various forms of mezzanine which might not be regarded as 'storeys' in their own right, particularly if there is a void to the room below, which is very common with mezzanine levels. Similarly, many forms of design for areas within or above a roof would not be counted as storeys. As emphasized by the Department of Planning the new R-Codes are designed to encourage imaginative and productive use of the area on top of roofs of apartment buildings. Furthermore, a 'loft' is excluded from being a 'storey' by the definition of 'storey'. A 'loft' is defined in the new R-Codes as '*Loft - a room or space within the roof space of a building.*' There is even a new design element introduced into the new R-Codes, Part 4.11 entitled 'Roof Design'. One of the 'Element Objectives' for Part 4.11 is:

*'Where possible, roof spaces are utilised to add open space, amenity, solar energy generation or other benefits to the development. With the 'design guidance' section of Part 4.11, 'concealed roofs' are encouraged, as are provision of private or communal open space, rooftop garden beds, landscaping, green moves, photovoltaic collector panels and other sustainability infrastructure.'*

Disputes about interpretation could conceivably arise as to whether a proposed space in a building comprises a 'loft' or whether it should be considered as a 'storey'. With regard to features within the roof structure or on top of the roof, again there is a range of variations, and it can be essentially a subjective and debatable matter as to whether a particular feature is a separate storey. Roof structures and their interpretation is another design element to which the above argument would apply. A mansard roof of up to 2.4 metres in height would not count as a storey in its own right.

With the new R-Codes the base building height almost solely refers to the concept of 'storey' rather than absolute heights in metres. The provisions relating to height are qualitative and open textured and refer to 'indicative' overall heights matching with number of storeys. If a proposal does not comply with the number of storeys then it is still capable of being approved with discretion if it complies with the more qualitative, open-textured 'Element Objectives' for building height. The new R-Codes provide 'planning guidance' for local governments in the 'Building Height' section which includes the following:

*"Building heights should typically be expressed in storeys to allow flexibility of design solutions at ground and roof levels, promote generous floor to ceiling heights and provide for future building adaptability."*

*This provides a relevant contextual background to the likely thinking underpinning the Minister's modifications and one that has been reiterated by the Minister's advisors in discussions with the Town's Planning Officers. The above demonstrates that the philosophy of the new R-Codes actually encourages flexibility of design, promotes generous floor to ceiling heights and promotes rooftop articulation. It is the Town's viewpoint that it is not unreasonable to say that the approach to height and assessment of compliance with building height under the new R-Codes may result in the maximum possible limit of building height being sought in this circumstance given the owner's desire to develop substantially more apartments on the site than the Town and the community believe is acceptable.*

These are important considerations in regard to the potential for building height to be varied and addresses the Town's initial concerns with the change to this provision and the greater degree of scope and power to vary the building height clause despite the reference to a cap of a maximum of seven storeys.

The Minister's modifications to the building height clause are therefore only considered supportable on the basis that further amendments are made to the clause that will ensure the scale and height of the development is not open to variation addresses the heritage and planning considerations discussed earlier in the Report.

The argument that flexibility with regard to building height will result in a better design outcome because a taller slender tall building will be the best design outcome is not considered to be a convincing or compelling argument for no maximum upper limit control over height. There are many fine examples of smaller buildings of three and four storeys that are of outstanding architectural merit and complement heritage buildings and streetscapes in terms of scale and design. A tall slender building would only seem to serve the purpose of allowing greater development potential for the site. Once a building exceeds the height of the Hotel then the importance of the Hotel as a landmark has been compromised.

It is therefore recommended that a maximum height control be introduced which reflects the Minister's wish to cap the height at seven storeys but still allows for generous four metre floor to ceiling heights (i.e. 43.0m AHD). This allows for a building of seven levels, including parking level(s) which will be approximately 1.0m higher than the top of the spire of the Hotel (~AHD 42.04m). It is also proposed that all rooftop structures and services will be required to be contained within this height limit so they do not dominate the skyline at or above the height of the Hotel cupola and spire. It is considered the building height must be non-variable to protect the important heritage and built form elements of this important landmark corner site and the Precinct. This is considered a significant compromise as this is a 7.0m height increase on Council's

height control and does not support the majority of the submitters who wanted the height control to remain capped at 36.0 metres AHD (top of the cupola is 36.13m AHD). To ensure the building height cap is not capable of variation by a decision maker it is considered necessary to introduce a clause which disallows cl. 5.6 of LPS 3 or any other mechanism of the Scheme or otherwise as a separate provision to be reinstated in the Amendment. Due to the impacts of the new R-Codes it is also considered necessary to specify in the Scheme Text a starting point for the calculation of building height. This is confirming in words in the Scheme Text the Minister's intent for the building height to be calculated from the lowest point of the Duke Street lot boundary.

As a consequence of the above comments and to address the above issues and the concerns raised by the majority of submitters the following recommended modifications to building height and setbacks (amendments highlighted in red text) are deemed necessary by the Town.

### **Building Height and Setbacks**

#### **Cl. 5.9.7.5**

***(i) The maximum height of development within the zone is not permitted to exceed seven storeys above natural ground level measured at the lowest point of the Lot 303 boundary fronting Duke Street and in any event shall not be permitted to exceed 43.0 metres AHD or seven storeys whichever is the lesser.***

***(ii) No part of the building, any external services, solar collectors, air conditioning units, mechanical plant rooms, lift overruns, antennae and communication masts or the like shall exceed the maximum heights specified in 5.9.7.5 (i). These fixtures must be screened from public view to the satisfaction of the decision maker.***

#### **Cl. 5.9.7.6**

***Clause 5.9.7.5 (i) and (ii) are not open to any variation through any provision of this Scheme or any other mechanism.***

***Note: For the purpose of clause 5.9.7.5 the lowest point on Duke Street is recorded as 15.0 metres AHD. This AHD level is to be used for the purpose of calculating the height of a building regardless of any approved or unapproved change to the natural ground level on the site.***

#### **Cl. 5.9.7.7**

***Development up to the eaves height of the existing Royal George Hotel building may have a nil setback to all boundaries.***

#### **Cl. 5.9.7.8**

***Notwithstanding Clause ~~5.9.7.6~~ 5.9.7.7 development shall be sufficiently setback from the existing Royal George Hotel building to the satisfaction of the decision maker in consultation with the Heritage Council of WA and having regard to the advice of the State Design Review Panel.***

#### **Cl. 5.9.7.9**

***Development, including balconies and other projections above the eaves height of the existing Royal George Hotel building is to be set back from the Duke Street boundary and the Royal George Hotel building, and located to maintain primary views from the immediate and surrounding locality to the Royal George Hotel building, including its cupola.***

#### **Cl. 5.9.7.10**

---

***In considering the height and setbacks of proposed development, the decision maker shall have due regard to the advice of the State Design Review Panel and all the objectives of the Special Zone – Royal George Hotel.***

**Vehicle parking – cl. 5.9.7.10 and cl. 5.9.7.11**

*The Schedule of Modifications resulted in a number of clauses regarding vehicle parking being deleted from the Council endorsed Amendment. As far as the Town is concerned this is not satisfactory as parking is one of, if not the most significant issue in this precinct and there should be no ambiguity in regard to the controls which apply to parking for various uses or in their interpretation. As the wording of the clauses now stand the Town considers this not to be the case.*

The Minister's wording of cl. 5.9.7.10 would impose the Planning Scheme's 'Commercial Zone' parking requirements in respect of non-residential development and cl. 5.9.7.11 provides that the decision maker may consider reducing car parking requirements otherwise applicable, by a maximum of 20% where certain criteria are satisfied.

There is no proposed clause under the Minister's modifications, which specifically applies any particular parking standards to the residential component of development in the Special Zone. The Town's Amendment, on the other hand, provided in cl. 5.9.9.5 (iii) *that parking for residential development shall be provided in accordance with State Planning Policy 3.1 - Residential Design Codes*. It seems likely that the Minister's modifications, assumed that the new R-Codes would apply to the residential development within the Special Zone, and that this did not need to be overtly stated in the provisions. However, in SPP 7.3 the clause entitled '*Application of Volume 2 of the Residential Design Codes*', reads as follows:

'Volume 2 of State Planning Policy 7.3 Residential Design Codes - Apartments applies to the development of multiple dwellings in areas coded R40 and above (including the dwelling components of mixed use development and activity centres).

For multiple dwelling developments in areas coded below R40, refer to Volume 1 of the R-Codes.'

In the Town's opinion the 'Special Zone - Royal George Hotel' is not classified as an area coded R40 or above. The site does not have an R-Code density designation and is not zoned residential. Therefore, a developer could argue that the planning provisions of the Amendment do not address any vehicle parking requirements applicable to the residential component of development within the Special Zone. It is the Town's view that parking for the residential component of any development should be provided in accordance with the R-Codes as was the case with the Council endorsed Amendment. A site inspection will demonstrate there are no other easily accessible or appropriate options for accommodating residential and residential visitor parking in this area. It is therefore recommended that a clause be reinstated in the Amendment so the R-Code vehicle parking provisions apply to residential development.

In addition, the new R-Codes provide 'Acceptable Outcomes' which go a long way to demonstrating compliance with the 'Element Objectives', but are not strictly speaking 'deemed-to-comply', in so far as they provide any specific number. It is in Table 3.9 which is adopted by cl. A3.9.2. If an applicant proposes low parking bay numbers in reliance upon the qualitative, open-textured 'Element Objectives' rather than the requirement in Table 3.9 of the new R-Codes, then it could be argued that does not readily come within the concept of '*reducing the requirement for car parking spaces*', to use the language of cl. 5.9.7.11. This site is no different to any other

development site and due to the heavy site constraints which are applicable it could be argued that firmer controls are warranted.

Assuming that the new R-Codes requirements as to vehicle parking will apply it is also questionable whether parking for the combined residential and non-residential components can in any event be reduced below 20%. The point is highly ambiguous. On one hand, the Minister's cl. 5.9.7.11 refers to reducing LPS 3 *Schedule 10* requirements by a maximum of 20%. In that regard, Schedule 10 has provisions referring to both residential and non-residential components. That is one factor which could support the view that cl. 5.9.7.11 applies collectively to the residential and non-residential components. Another factor leaning towards that interpretation is a reference to shared parking arrangements and peak demand for parking not occurring at the same time. Typically, that applies to the interrelationship between residential and commercial parking. However reciprocal parking arrangements need not be absolutely confined to the commercial/residential use relationship. Moreover, with regard to cl. 5.9.7.11's reference to Schedule 10, whilst it is true that Schedule 10 includes reference to residential parking standards, the reference to Schedule 10 does not conclusively demonstrate that the power to reduce parking by 20% applies collectively to both residential and non-residential components. This is because Minister's cl. 5.9.7.10 only provides parking standards for non-residential/commercial development. Nonetheless it is not beyond question as to whether the concession would *only* apply to non-residential development so it is recommended that clauses clearly dealing with vehicle parking requirements for residential development and possible parking concessions are reinstated.

*In light of the above comments the following modifications to the vehicle parking provisions of the Amendment are recommended and are listed below (highlighted in red text).*

These provisions still provide flexibility in regard to the commercial parking for the Hotel but require residential parking to be provided on the site and in accordance with the R-Codes. However, there would still be a discretionary power within LPS 3 for a decision maker to vary these provisions if other valid parking solutions with no amenity considerations emerge and are considered reasonable by a decision maker.

The Council's vehicle parking clauses were drafted with the intent of reducing any ambiguity as to what controls applied. The proposed wording is considered more legally sound and stronger in regard to ensuring compliance and less open to misinterpretation and misuse, even though variation of standards is possible.

#### Vehicle Parking

~~Cl. 5.9.7.11 Parking for non-residential development within the Special Zone – Royal George Hotel shall be in accordance with the requirements provided for Commercial Zones in Clause 5.8 of the scheme.~~

***“Notwithstanding any other provision of this Scheme or of the Residential Design Codes Volume 1 and Volume 2 the following applies:***

- (i) Vehicle parking for commercial and other non-residential uses shall be provided in accordance with the provisions of the Scheme and the standards set out in Schedule 10 of the Scheme and the specifications in Schedule 11 of the Scheme;***
- (ii) Clauses 5.8.5, 5.8.6, 5.8.7 and 5.8.8 of the Scheme also apply to development within ‘Special Zone – Royal George Hotel’;***

- (iii) Parking for residential development shall be provided in accordance with State Planning Policy 7.3 - Residential Design Codes – Volume 1 and Volume 2 as applicable to the type of dwelling proposed;*
- (iv) Vehicle parking shall be located either behind street front tenancies or dwellings, below ground level when viewed from the street, or otherwise suitably screened from view from the street to the satisfaction of the decision maker; and*
- (v) To the extent that vehicle parking is required for the residential component all vehicle parking for the residential component of the development shall be provided on-site in accordance with a traffic and parking management plan, to the decision maker's satisfaction, being submitted and approved at Development Approval application stage.*

**Cl. 5.9.7.12.**

**Should the decision maker determine that demand for *commercial and non-residential parking only* parking may be lessened due to alternative modes of transport, reciprocal or shared parking arrangements, it may consider reducing the requirement for car parking spaces by a maximum of 20% of the requirements of Schedule 10 of the Scheme where it can be demonstrated to its satisfaction that:**

- (i) The peak demand for parking by two or more uses will not occur at the same time;*
- (ii) The combined supply of car parking is sufficient to meet the estimated peak combined demand;*
- (iii) The arrangements are secured and that any future change will not result in a shortfall; and*
- (iv) Parking arrangements are detailed in a Parking Management Plan.*

**Cl.5.9.7.13**

***Clause 5.9.7.12 is not open to any variation through any provision of the Scheme or any other mechanism.***

*Residential Development*

The Council endorsed Amendment contained a clause regarding residential development which read as follows:

*“With exception of building height and building setbacks residential development shall be in accordance with State Planning Policy 3.1 - Residential Design Codes - Part 6 for multiple dwellings and Part 5 for grouped and aged and dependent persons’ dwellings (dependent on the form of dwelling type for aged and dependent persons’ dwellings Part 6 may be applied).”*

This clause was deleted by Department of Planning officers and was also not included in the Minister’s modifications. The planning control issues in this regard have been outlined above in the vehicle parking section of the Report. The Town believes it is necessary for this clause to be reinstated so there is no ambiguity as to what controls apply to residential

development and that residential development, in whatever form is subject to the same development controls and standards as for all other residential development in WA.

The following additional clause is therefore recommended to be reinstated in the Amendment provisions so it is clear that the SPP 7.3 – R-Codes – Apartments will apply to residential development.

### ***Residential Development***

#### ***Cl. 5.9.7.14***

***With exception of building height, plot ratio and building setbacks residential development shall be in accordance with State Planning Policy 7.3 - Residential Design Codes – Volume 2 – Apartments for multiple dwellings and Volume 1 for grouped and aged and dependent persons’ dwellings (dependent on the form of dwelling type for aged and dependent persons’ dwellings Volume 2 may be applied).***

### ***Heritage Conservation***

There are no heritage provisions in the Schedule of Modifications endorsed by the Minister. These provisions were removed by the Department of Planning Officers and not reinstated on the basis that a Heritage Agreement was in place, which in their view was considered adequate in terms of protecting the heritage of the Hotel and ensuring restoration.

The Town's cl. 5.9.5 provided that development would not be supported unless the Royal George Hotel building has already been restored to the satisfaction of Council or the development was staged in such a manner as to achieve the restoration of the Hotel before commencement of occupation of any other areas of the land. The removal of this clause has raised concerns for the Town because the owner of the site has not commenced the restoration works and two years have now passed since the Heritage Agreement was signed.

A three year time frame was set down in the Agreement as the deadline for the most pressing conservation works to be completed and since the commencement of the Agreement it appears the owner has done nothing to meet the obligations under the Agreement. It appears substantial works identified in the Agreement as requiring “*Immediate Attention: To be carried out within 6-12 months*” (see Heritage Agreement Annexure A) have not commenced two years after the Agreement was signed. The three-year deadline for completion of the entire restoration expires in less than a year (see Heritage Agreement attached). Nothing has been done and the Hotel is in a poor state.

This matter has been raised in a large number of submissions. The community is very aware that the owner, despite being sold the site at what could reasonably be argued was a less than market value price, given land values in the area, appears to have not honoured the Agreement in that specific works were required to be completed within the first, second and third years. The Town and the community have raised these concerns a number of times with the Heritage Council, the Minister for Planning and the Minister for Heritage. It is the Town’s understanding that no action by the Heritage Council or the Minister for Heritage has been taken in regard to why the works have not commenced or instructing the owner to undertake the works that were required to be completed in the first year.

Given the above concerns and the strong sentiment expressed in the submissions it is recommended that the clause related to heritage conservation be partly reinstated in the Amendment and read as follows:



**Heritage Conservation**

**CI 5.9.7.15**

***Development of any part of the land will not be supported unless:***

- i) The Royal George Hotel has already been restored to the satisfaction of the Local Government;***
- or***
- ii) The development is staged in such a manner as to secure, by staging conditions and/or by appropriate legal agreement with the Town of East Fremantle, legally enforceable means to the satisfaction of the Local Government for achieving the restoration of the Royal George Hotel before commencement of occupation of the use(s) approved for any other areas of the land.***

**Conclusions**

*From the outset the overriding concern with this site, based on the owner's redevelopment concept, was that it will be overdeveloped and that development to the rear would be of a scale that is disproportionate to the surrounding area in terms of historical context and setting resulting in a detrimental impact on the Town's heritage precinct. Overdevelopment would also result in significant amenity, access and operational impacts for the surrounding area. The Council's Amendment was adopted to ensure that development was at a level that would have minimal impact on the precinct. Development provisions that permit anything much greater than the Council endorsed Amendment which allowed for approximately 19 dwellings is considered will result in adverse consequences for the orderly and proper planning of the precinct.*

*The focus of concern with the Minister's modified development controls for the site is that they do not provide any certainty for the community in respect to the potential height and scale of a building that could be developed. In fact, the flexibility that is currently available in terms of the building height provision and the corresponding plot ratio, in the Council's view, will potentially result in just the opposite eventuating with the potential for a building of much greater height than what is conventionally understood to be seven storeys being constructed.*

*The ambiguity in respect to a number of provisions in the Schedule of Modifications means it has been very difficult to convey the implications of the modifications to the community. This is mainly because the technical and literal interpretations of planning provisions are difficult to communicate to the community who do not have the technical knowledge of the operational aspects of planning schemes. It could reasonably be argued that the community has not been fully informed or been adequately provided with all the information in respect to making a submission on the advertised modifications during the advertising period. The Town certainly holds the view that if the community had been more fully informed then there may not have been the level of support for the Minister's seven storey proposal and there may have potentially been further objections to the Schedule of Modifications.*

The Town's position in respect to its reasoning for the development controls proposed in the Council endorsed Amendment has not changed and the submissions received during advertising demonstrates the ongoing degree of community objection to the modifications given that 93% of the submissions requested Council's Amendment be reinstated. Keeping in mind also that in excess of 2,200 signatures on a petition were presented to Parliament in support of the Council's Amendment. Therefore the Town can only support the Minister's Schedule of Modifications on



the basis that further amendments are made which address the areas of concern outlined in the body of this Report.

The owner of the site has continued to raise the issue of needing to develop a particular number of apartments for the refurbishment of the Hotel to be a financially viable venture, arguing they that they cannot afford to restore the hotel unless they build a multi-storey building with a significantly larger number of apartments. When the owner's purchased the Hotel in 2017 they were given no commitment by the State government that any development behind the Hotel was guaranteed and they were made aware in writing that the sale of the property was separate to planning approval processes. It is understood the owner's bid for the Hotel was given exclusive consideration by the State government on the basis of accepting the owner's commitment that it had funds available to undertake the project, and that its plans were "economically viable" and compliant with heritage constraints on the site. So from the perspective of orderly and proper planning this argument that the development controls are restricting the financial viability of the project is not considered to warrant any consideration whatsoever. However, that being said it is considered the Town's provisions provide for a viable proposal.

The cost of the Hotel's building restoration works, as approved by the Heritage Council, must be viewed separately to the further works required to fit-out the Hotel for other commercial purposes specific to the intended occupants which would impact on the overall financial costs. This should not be factored into the restoration costs nor on whether the project will be economically viable. The Town's advice in this regard has indicated that the number of apartments possible under the Council's Amendment will facilitate a viable option for the owner. In any case it is not considered the Town's responsibility to have to demonstrate that the planning controls present an economically feasible option or the State government's role to facilitate development that it considers might be economically viable for one particular owner. It is quite feasible that ownership of the site could change hands presenting a different set of economic circumstances. The Council's role is to preserve the heritage and amenity of the area through orderly and proper planning.

Based on the vast majority of submissions requesting that the Town's Amendment be reinstated to ensure a height cap that cannot be varied and restricting the height of a building to within the same height parameters as the Hotel it is hoped the Minister will honour the commitment made to the community to cap the height of a building at the rear of the Hotel to seven storeys. Whilst the Town's recommended modifications to the Amendment do not completely address the submissions the intent to restrict the building height is the objective and this aligns with community sentiment whilst respecting the Minister's decision to cap the height at a maximum of seven storeys.

It is therefore recommended that Council resolve to support Amendment No. 15 subject to the proposed modifications to the Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) and as outlined below in the Officer Recommendation and in Attachment 4. It is also recommended that Council receives the submissions and notifies those who made a submission of the outcome of Council's decision.

A further recommendation is that Council forward to the WAPC and the Hon. Minister for Planning the reasons outlined in the Officer's Report for Council's non-support of specific provisions in the Schedule of Modifications and for Council's proposed modifications and requests that the Town be directly involved in drafting of provisions if the Council's proposed amendments to the Schedule of Modifications are not supported or there are any further modifications to the Amendment by the WAPC or the Hon. Minister for Planning.



**OFFICER RECOMMENDATION**

**That Council:**

- A. (i) Pursuant to Section 75 of the Planning and Development Act 2005 and Regulation 41(3) (c) of the Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015 resolves to support complex Amendment No. 15 to Local Planning Scheme No. 3 subject to the modifications to the Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) as outlined below and in Attachment 4;**
- a) Amend point (i) by deleting the words “northern portion of the” from the first paragraph;**
  - b) Amend point (i) (a) by inserting the words “and the wider Plympton Precinct and George Street designated heritage area” after the word “Hotel”;**
  - c) Amend clause 5.9.3 by inserting the word “all” before the words “the zone objectives”;**
  - d) Amend clause 5.9.4 by deleting the word “with” after the words “When considering”;**
  - e) Amend the “Maximum Plot Ratio” provision by modifying:**
    - i) clause 5.9.7.1 by deleting the ratio “2.0:1” and replacing it with “1.5:1”;**  
**and**
    - ii) clause 5.9.7.3 by adding the words “Clause 4.2 (Special Zone – Royal George Hotel)” at the beginning of the clause and deleting the word “is” after “5.9.7.1” and inserting the following words “and clause 5.9.7.4 are not open to any”;**
    - iii) clause 5.9.7.4 by inserting the word “, as stated in clause 4.2” after the word “objectives”; and**
    - iv) reverse the numbering order of clause 5.9.7.3 and clause 5.9.7.4;**
  - f) Amend the “Building Height and Setbacks” provisions and renumber subsequent clauses accordingly by:**
    - (i) modifying clause 5.9.7.5 by inserting the following modified clauses:**
      - “(i) The maximum height of development within the zone is not permitted to exceed seven storeys above natural ground level measured at the lowest point of the Lot 303 boundary fronting Duke Street and in any event shall not be permitted to exceed 43.0 metres AHD or seven storeys whichever is the lesser” after the words “Duke Street”;**
      - (ii) No part of the building, any external services, solar collectors, air conditioning units, mechanical plant rooms, lift overruns, antennae and communication masts or the like shall exceed the maximum heights specified in 5.9.7.5 (i). These fixtures must be screened from public view to the satisfaction of the decision maker.”**
    - Note: For the purpose of clause 5.9.7.5 the lowest point on Duke Street is recorded as 15.0m AHD. This AHD level is to be used for the purpose of calculating the height of a building regardless of any approved or unapproved change to natural ground level on the site.”;**



- (ii) introducing new clause 5.9.7.6 to follow clause 5.9.7.5 and to read as follows:

“5.9.7.6 Clause 5.9.7.5 (i) and (ii) is not open to any variation through any provision of this scheme or any other mechanism.”
- (iii) modifying clause 5.9.7.8 by inserting after the word “Development” the words “, including balconies and other projections”;
- g) Amend clause 5.9.7.9 by inserting the words “all” before the words “the objectives” and replacing the word “zone” with “Special Zone – Royal George Hotel”;
- h) Amend the “Vehicle Parking” provision by:
  - i) deleting clause 5.9.7.10 and inserting the following clauses and adjusting the subsequent numbering of clauses accordingly:

“Notwithstanding any other provision of this Scheme or of the Residential Design Codes Volume 1 and Volume 2 the following applies:

    - (i) Vehicle parking for commercial and other non-residential uses shall be provided in accordance with the provisions of the Scheme and the standards set out in Schedule 10 of the Scheme and the specifications in Schedule 11 of the Scheme;
    - (ii) Clauses 5.8.5, 5.8.6, 5.8.7 and 5.8.8 of the Scheme also apply to development within ‘Special Zone – Royal George Hotel’;
    - (iii) Parking for residential development shall be provided in accordance with State Planning Policy 7.3 - Residential Design Codes – Volume 1 and Volume 2 as applicable to the type of dwelling proposed;
    - (iv) Vehicle parking shall be located either behind street front tenancies or dwellings, below ground level when viewed from the street, or otherwise suitably screened from view from the street to the satisfaction of the decision maker; and
    - (v) To the extent that vehicle parking is required for the residential component all vehicle parking for the residential component of the development shall be provided on-site in accordance with a traffic and parking management plan, to the decision maker’s satisfaction, being submitted and approved at Development Approval application stage.”;
  - ii) amending clause 5.9.7.11 by inserting the words “commercial and non-residential parking only” after the words “demand for”; and
  - iii) inserting clause 5.9.7.12 after clause 5.9.7.11 (d) to read as follows:

“Clause 5.9.7.11 is not open to variation through any provision of this scheme or any other mechanism.”;
- i) Insert the additional provision “Residential Development” after the clause 5.9.7.12;
- j) Insert an additional clause under the heading “Residential Development” to read as follows:

**“5.9.7.13 With exception of building height, plot ratio and building setbacks residential development shall be in accordance with State Planning Policy 7.3 - Residential Design Codes – Volume 2 – Apartments for multiple dwellings and Volume 1 for grouped and aged and dependent persons’ dwellings (dependent on the form of dwelling type for aged and dependent persons’ dwellings Volume 2 may be applied).”**

- k) Insert the additional provision “Heritage Conservation” after Clause 5.9.7.13 and insert the following clause under that provision:**

**“5.9.7.14 Development of any part of the land will not be supported unless:**

- (i) The Royal George Hotel has already been restored to the satisfaction of the Local Government; or**
  - (ii) The development is staged in such a manner as to secure, by staging conditions and/or by appropriate legal agreement with the Town of East Fremantle, legally enforceable means to the satisfaction of the Local Government for achieving the restoration of the Royal George Hotel before commencement of occupation of the use(s) approved for any other areas of the land.”; and**
- (ii) Resolves that the submissions made in regard to the advertised Schedule of Modifications be received, Council’s recommendation in respect to each submission noted and those who made a submission be notified of this decision; and**
- B. (i) Forwards to the Western Australian Planning Commission and the Hon. Minister for Planning the reasons outlined in the Officer’s Report for Council’s non-support of specific provisions in the Schedule of Modifications and for Council’s proposed amendments; and**
- (ii) Requests that the Town be directly involved in drafting of provisions if the Council’s proposed amendments to the Schedule of Modifications are not supported or there are any further modifications to the Amendment provisions by the Western Australian Planning Commission and/or the Hon. Minister for Planning.**

**8. CLOSURE**

NO. 34 (LOT 303) DUKE STREET-ROYAL GEORGE HOTEL – CATEGORY A



## Schedule of Modifications

Replace Council's Resolution with the following:

Pursuant to Section 75 of the Planning and Development Act 2005 and Regulation 41(3)(b) of the Local Planning Schemes Regulations 2015 resolves to support complex Amendment No. 15 to Local Planning Scheme No. 3 with proposed modifications to the Scheme Text as outlined below:

- (i) Modifying Section 4.2 Zone Objectives for the Special Zone - Royal George Hotel by adding the following additional points below the existing zone objectives:

*A mixed use development on the northern portion of the site together with the restoration of the existing Royal George Hotel building is considered an appropriate use of the site.*

*Development must achieve urban design and architecture that is exemplary with respect to heritage conservation, adaptive re-use and multi-residential design. The design of any new development must:*

- (a) Provide high quality, contemporary architecture and urban design that responds to and enhances the heritage value of the existing Royal George Hotel, interpreting rather than replicating existing features;*
- (b) Respond to and enhance the identity of the Plympton precinct, including its streetscapes and neighbourhood;*
- (c) Deliver a building that demonstrates well-considered materiality, colour, articulation and detailing;*
- (d) Ensure the siting, height and built form of new buildings maintains primary views from the immediate and surrounding areas to the Royal George Hotel, including its cupola, southern, western and eastern façades;*
- (e) Demonstrate sensitivity to the built form and scale of the Royal George Hotel including its grain, rhythm, order and proportions of elements and openings;*
- (f) Demonstrate the careful arrangement of building massing and height to minimise the perception of bulk, create good levels of visual separation from the heritage fabric and mitigate negative impacts on the amenity and character of adjacent streets and properties;*
- (g) Maximise the opportunity for the development to engage with the public realm at ground level with consideration given to providing good levels of permeability where possible;*
- (h) Demonstrate well-designed layouts and internal arrangements for apartments and other residential uses that:
 
  - i) Achieve excellent amenity through careful consideration of optimal sun access, daylighting, natural ventilation and visual and acoustic privacy;*
  - ii) Are diverse and adaptable to support different household types now and into the future; and*
  - iii) Are served by excellent circulation and communal spaces.**
- (i) Provide high quality, well-integrated hard and soft landscaping elements that respond to existing streetscape character;*
- (j) Provide considered location of car parking to minimise negative impacts to the*

*public realm; and*

- (k) *Ensure public access to and enjoyment of the interior spaces of the existing Royal George Hotel building is allowed for through a use or uses which are consistent with the buildings original function and its recognised importance as a community gathering place.*

- (ii) Adding a fifth column entitled 'Special Zone – Royal George Hotel' to the Zoning Table after the 'Town Centre' column and inserting the following listed uses and the corresponding use class permissibility symbol:

- Advertising Sign as 'A' ;
- Aged or Dependent Persons Dwelling as 'D';
- Amusement Parlour as 'X';
- Ancillary Accommodation as 'D';
- Bed and Breakfast as 'A';
- Caretaker's Dwelling as 'D';
- Child Care Premises as 'A';
- Cinema / Theatre as 'A';
- Club Premises as 'A';
- Community Purposes as 'D';
- Consulting Rooms as 'D';
- Convenience Store as 'A';
- Educational Establishment as 'A';
- Exhibition Centre as 'D';
- Family Day Care as 'D';
- Fast Food Outlet (Refer 5.8.9) as 'A';
- Funeral Parlour as 'A';
- Grouped Dwelling as 'D';
- Home Business as 'D';
- Home Occupation as 'D';
- Home Office as 'P';
- Home Store as 'D';
- Hospital as 'X';
- Hotel 'A';
- Industry – Cottage as 'D';
- Industry – Service as 'D';
- Market as 'A';
- Medical Centre as 'A';
- Motel as 'A';
- Multiple Dwelling as 'A';
- Night Club as 'X';
- Office as 'A';
- Place of Worship as 'A';
- Pre-School / Kindergarten as 'D';
- Recreation – Private as 'A';
- Residential Building as 'A';
- Restaurant as 'A';
- Service Station as 'X';
- Shop as 'D';
- Showrooms as 'A';
- Single House as 'D';
- Small Bar as 'A';

- Tavern as 'A';
  - Telecommunications Infrastructure as 'A4'; and
  - Veterinary Centre as 'A'.
- (iii) Deleting Clause 5.9.1(a) and Clause 5.9.1(b) and re-numbering Clause 5.9.1 (c) to Clause 5.9.1.
- (iv) Inserting the following additional clauses after Clause 5.9.1:

5.9.2 *Any development application for the site shall be subject to review by the State Design Review Panel prior to determination of that application.*

5.9.3 *In assessing any application for development within the zone, the decision maker and State Design Review Panel shall have due regard to the zone objectives provided in Section 4.2 of the scheme.*

5.9.4 *When considering with a development application on which advice has been provided by the State Design Review Panel the decision-maker shall have due regard to that advice.*

5.9.5 *In respect of any part of the zone other than the Royal George Hotel building itself, development shall not be solely for commercial purposes. A residential component is mandatory and developments shall incorporate a minimum of 60% net lettable area of residential floor space.*

5.9.6 *Clause 5.3.4 of the Scheme does not apply to development within this zone.*

5.9.7 *The following site and development standards apply to development in the Special Zone - Royal George Hotel:*

Maximum Plot Ratio

5.9.7.1 *The maximum plot ratio of development within the zone is not permitted to exceed 2.0:1.*

5.9.7.2 *The maximum plot ratio excludes the floor space of the existing Royal George Hotel Building.*

5.9.7.3 *Clause 5.9.7.1 is not open to variation through any provision of this scheme or any other mechanism.*

5.9.7.4 *Development up to the maximum plot ratio permitted on the site shall only be approved where the decision maker, having due regard to the advice of the State Design Review Panel, is satisfied the development meets all the objectives of the Special Zone - Royal George Hotel.*

Building Height and Setbacks

5.9.7.5 *The maximum height of development within the zone is not permitted to exceed seven storeys above natural ground level measured at the lowest point of the Lot 303 boundary fronting Duke Street.*

5.9.7.6 *Development up to the eaves height of the existing Royal George Hotel building may have a nil setback to all boundaries.*

5.9.7.7 *Notwithstanding Clause 5.9.7.6 development shall be sufficiently*



*setback from the existing Royal George Hotel building to the satisfaction of the decision maker in consultation with the Heritage Council of WA and having regard to the advice of the State Design Review Panel.*

*5.9.7.8 Development above the eaves height of the existing Royal George Hotel building is to be set back from the Duke Street boundary and the Royal George Hotel building, and located to maintain primary views from the immediate and surrounding locality to the Royal George Hotel building, including its cupola.*

*5.9.7.9 In considering the height and setbacks of proposed development, the decision maker shall have due regard to the advice of the State Design Review Panel and the objectives of the zone.*

#### Vehicle Parking

*5.9.7.10 Parking for non-residential development within the Special Zone – Royal George Hotel shall be in accordance with the requirements provided for Commercial Zones in Clause 5.8 of the scheme.*

*5.9.7.11 Should the decision maker determine that demand for parking may be lessened due to alternative modes of transport, reciprocal or shared parking arrangements, it may consider reducing the requirement for car parking spaces by a maximum of 20% of the requirements of Schedule 10 of the Scheme where it can be demonstrated to its satisfaction that:*

- (a) The peak demand for parking by two or more uses will not occur at the same time;*
- (b) The combined supply of car parking is sufficient to meet the estimated peak combined demand;*
- (c) The arrangements are secured and that any future change will not result in a shortfall; and*
- (d) Parking arrangements are detailed in a Parking Management Plan.*

**TOWN OF EAST FREMANTLE**  
**LOCAL PLANNING SCHEME NO. 3 – COMPLEX AMENDMENT NO. 15**  
 (Royal George Hotel Site)

**SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS**  
**MODIFICATIONS TO SCHEME AMENDMENT**  
 (as directed by Minister for Planning)

**Recommendation and Response to Submissions**

Each submission (Form 4) has been reviewed and entered in the Schedule of Submissions (below). The Recommendation in response to each submission is classified as either supported in part, supported, not supported or noted. A response number which corresponds with the Recommendation has also been entered in the Recommendation column. This number then corresponds with a general response which is provided below.

Four basic responses to the submissions have been provided. Three responses provide a general response to the issues and comments noted in the submissions and one other notes or acknowledges submissions that are not relevant to the planning considerations of the Amendment. Further detail regarding submission responses is contained in the Officer's Report where the Town's response to the Schedule of Modifications is discussed in more detail than can be provided in the Schedule of Submissions. Reference should also be made to the Officer's Report and Recommendation for the detailed Council Resolution in respect to the Schedule of Modifications to Amendment No. 15.

**Support in Part**

**Recommendation:** Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.

**Response #1**

*The submission is supported in part. The Council does not support the Schedule of Modifications (as advertised). It is the Council's view the modifications will not result in development controls and planning provisions for the site that reflect orderly and proper planning or respect the heritage values of the surrounding area, due to the potential height and scale of a building which may result. The Council believes the modifications do not reflect the cultural heritage values of the Hotel, the Plympton or George Street precincts or the wider suburban area of East Fremantle. Furthermore, the modifications do not ensure the Hotel will be restored and refurbishment completed prior to additional development occurring or being completed on the site or the Heritage Agreement being executed. Further modifications to the Schedule of Modifications are required to ensure building height is capped and non-variable at seven storeys and development controls related to plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation are either amended or reintroduced to reflect the intent of the Council endorsed Amendment.*

**Supported**

**Recommendation:** Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.

**Response #2**

*The submission is supported as the Council does not support the Schedule of Modifications (as advertised - refer to Response #1). Support for the maximum 7 storeys height limit (as proposed in the Minister's modifications) and the development controls specified in the Council endorsed Amendment is on the basis that the proposed modifications to the building height clause specifies a maximum building height that cannot be varied and therefore would not permit a building to exceed seven storeys or 43.0m AHD whichever is the lesser (refer to Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019 and Attachment 4 which justifies support for a seven storey height limit).*

**Not Supported**

**Recommendation:** Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) not supported. The WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider further modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which would result, if endorsed, to changes to the Amendment that would not align with the matters raised in the submission.

**Response #3**

*The submission is not supported. The Council does not support the Schedule of Modifications (refer to Response #1 and #2). The Council's Amendment does not support a multi-storey apartment building on the site which would increase the dwelling yield and the vehicle parking numbers nor respect the heritage elements of the Royal George Hotel or the Plympton and George Street precincts. Council is of the view that the modifications and the resulting development controls and planning provisions will not guarantee high quality architecture or building design or the restoration of the Royal George Hotel. In respect to comments regarding urban infill/consolidation/sustainability/environmental considerations/dwelling targets it is noted that the Council endorsed Amendment provides for an increase in dwellings at a scale and level of development that is appropriate to the heritage surrounds and a local neighbourhood context. This site is not within an activity centre, a station precinct or a major transport corridor and is therefore not considered suitable for high density development. The new State Planning Policy 7.3 – R-Codes – Volume 2 - Apartments requires that all new apartment developments are designed so that they are developed to the highest environmental standards.*

**Noted**

Comments acknowledged and/or further comment and miscellaneous comments not related to Amendment No. 15. Not a planning consideration. Comments not relevant to the planning considerations and proposals of the modified Amendment.

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
1	89 Hubble Street East Fremantle	<p>Affected as a resident of Hubble Street and Plympton ward. Like the majority of residents in East Fremantle and the Plympton ward my property won't be directly affected by a development of the Royal George and its rear lot. But given those not affected argued against the recent proposal and their opinion was taken into account, I assume everyone gets a say regardless of how close to the site you live. I strongly feel a high quality development is needed to restore and improve the site and its surrounds. This will take compromise from the Developers, residents and Council. Despite the press and vocal opposition, many residents were supportive of the proposed Saracen development. It would have restored the hotel, and provided great commercial/ recreational amenity to the community at the site and surrounding area. The residential tower was also of high quality in my opinion and we must acknowledge the development does need to be commercially viable for those taking on the risk. (the Developer) I also feel strongly that EVERY council in Perth needs to contribute to the mandate to slow urban sprawl through higher density. The location on a major transit route was an appropriate location for East Fremantle to do its bit (rather than subdividing and increasing density on our suburban streets). I would be supportive of the WAPC proposal for 7 storeys and am not concerned about the height. I would rather see a high quality, modern, taller residential building behind the heritage hotel than the terrible design depicted on the height limit opposition posters around the neighbourhood recently. The low "boxy" look proposed by council is terrible and reminiscent of the poor outcome at Richmond Quarter which will date poorly and is not looked upon favourably by the community.</p>	<p><b>Not Supported</b>  <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) not supported. The WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider further modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which would result, if endorsed, to changes to the Amendment that would not align with the matters raised in the submission.  <b>Response #3</b></p>
2	64 George Street East Fremantle	<p>Owner and occupier of nearby property. There is little mention of sustainability considerations for development on the site, which obviously has the capacity of adversely or beneficially impact the surrounding community and occupiers of the building. The planning conditions recognise hard and soft landscaping features, but don't consider urban cooling provisions from greenery (or other means) whether incorporated on the building and/or around the building. Other issues for the development, such as climate responsive design and use of alternative energy sources, encouragement of active and public transport, reduction in potable water use, on-site water reuse, and recycling of construction materials could at least be alluded to in the planning scheme, even though they may be more appropriate to the development application and approval process. I would suggest East Fremantle Council require the developers to obtain certification under the Urban Development Institute of Australia's Enviro - Development Standard. I am disappointed to see the height restriction of only 7 storeys:                      - To achieve an economically viable development coupled with restoration of the Royal George I fear a relatively unattractive, bulky 'box' similar to Richmond Quarters will result.                      - Urban infill is required, both by State government, but also to improve the viability of services such as public transport, viability of local suppliers of goods and services, and reduce urban sprawl.                      I believe a tall, lean structure would be aesthetically more pleasing and have less visual and physical impact. I believe the location adjacent to Stirling Highway would be appropriate for a tall structure, providing due consideration to potential for physical impact on nearby properties.                      Potential to open up the entry to the Stirling Highway underpass as part of the development, and originally proposed by the developers, would be a strong local community benefit which I hope will not be lost.                      I shop locally to this development.</p>	<p><b>Not Supported</b>  <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) not supported. The WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider further modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which would result, if endorsed, to changes to the Amendment that would not align with the matters raised in the submission.  <b>Response #3</b></p>
3	No comment		<p><b>Supported in Part</b></p>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
		<p>These modifications may be detrimental to local amenity. My concerns are: traffic congestion, development is too high and parking facilities must be adequate.</p>	<p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #1</b></p>
4	N/A	<p>Local resident and frequent the area often and find it difficult to park and move through in vehicles. Concerns about high density coming to this area. Additional people, cars, visitors and impact this has on an area with very limited parking, narrow streets etc. Although I don't oppose development the road infrastructure, parking and access must be considered and applied to the design first.</p>	<p><b>Supported in Part</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #1</b></p>
5	No comment	<p>Private citizen. The George Street Hotel should not have a tower built next to it especially anything exceeding 6 storeys. George Street is a very small and historic area and will not support a large and busy building. As a resident of East Fremantle I am very concerned about the lack of government respect for our local government and the opinions of the local people.</p>	<p><b>Supported in Part</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning</p>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
			<p>requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #1</b></p>
6	N/A	<p>Negatively affected as a private citizen. I am a resident of East Fremantle expressing my concern and dismay about the development on the rear of the Royal George Street Hotel site. I am not in favour of any development on the rear of the site – though I am fully supportive of regenerative works on the historic hotel. A seven storey development is an absolute monstrosity in East Fremantle. We already have three monstrosities in the suburb: on the corner of East and George Street, Richmond Quarter and the reprehensible complex on Angwin Street. These buildings are out of character for the historic and charming East Fremantle, and because we already have three is not a reason for why we should have a fourth.</p>	<p><b>Supported in Part</b>  <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer’s Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #1</b></p>
7	No effect	Royal George Hotel Site. We support Amendment No 15. We as ratepayers have someone else to develop (and pay) the hotel site. Let them make a dollar as an incentive to build it.	<p><b>Not Supported</b>  <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) not supported. The WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider further modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which would result, if endorsed, to changes to the Amendment that would not align with the matters raised in the submission.</p> <p><b>Response #3</b></p>
8	No comment	Private citizen.	<b>Supported in Part</b>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
		<p>I would like to keep the Royal George intact and used by the public preferably back to a public house. It is the only historic hotel in East Fremantle and it is my belief that it could be an iconic piece of history that would anchor George Street and East Fremantle as a tourist destination providing much more culture than we need for our community in saying this it is also vital to limit the height to retain the historic feel of George Street and ensure that the Royal George retains its historic feel. I would like the height limited to 7 storeys.</p>	<p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation. <b>Response #1</b></p>
9	<p>All</p>	<p>Private citizen. The building is not to have a negative impact on streetscape. Must fit in with heritage colour schemes. Argument: building needs to blend into surrounding areas and design. Failure of this will result in distasteful area of East Fremantle.</p>	<p><b>Supported in Part Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation. <b>Response #1</b></p>
10	<p>31 Dalgety Street East Fremantle</p>	<p>Private citizen. My comments relate to the vista I have looking west from the rear of our house. Given the landscape view at present is trees and roof tops and chimneys, my preference is that such an outlook remains without sighting a high rise monolith that will be unsightly. Hence I support no more than the maximum of 6 levels as proposed by Council or preferably less albeit this is an unlikely outcome</p>	<p><b>Supported in Part Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019.</p>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
			<p>WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #1</b></p>
11	<p>78A Irwin Street East Fremantle and the Swan Coastal Plain</p>	<p>A ratepayer and citizen of a planet that needs higher density in-fill in prime locations- a citizen who is thinking of future proofing not creating sub- standard small buildings that won't see us into the future. Building cities upward rather than outward can help solve a lot of problems that come with living in our terrible urban sprawls, sprawls that are seeing us lose the habitat that we share with the many flora and fauna of the Swan Coastal plain. Along with the slowing of urban expansion, people would spend less time stuck in traffic during their commutes. Water could be saved with smaller distribution and less pipe leakage. We'd reduce our carbon footprint. Taller buildings can be stunning examples of modern architecture. Taller cities makes more sense both socially and economically. Higher development in East Fremantle would afford new residents living in high rise development with excellent natural ventilation and fresh air and is away from the street pollution of Stirling Highway. Homes on higher floors tend to have a more open and airy feel, with plenty of natural light and none of the congestion usually associated with homes in low-rise buildings. Moreover, high-rise development in East Fremantle offer more in terms of connectivity to community and security. The tall building and the city are intertwined; and their future prospects are tied together. When a tall building is built it must work well with the city, not just at the present but also in the future. Both tall buildings and cities are multi-faceted and multi-disciplinary in nature. They both have a common goal of realizing a sustainable future for their posterity. Therefore, the integration of their respective systems and professional collaboration among planners, architects, engineers, developers, and contractors, as well as cooperation and support of the city officials and the public at large, are all essential. For East Fremantle to enter the 21st century, we need to embrace a sustainable future that doesn't mean more of the swan coastal plain is consumed in residential low rise development. Sustainability or sustainable development is increasingly making its way the top of the agenda of many planning and urban design policies and regulations. THIS MUST BE A PRIORITY FOR GOVERNMENT AND THE TOWN OF EAST FREMANTLE. Sustainability promotes dense and mixed-use living that reduces travel time and carbon emission. Although vertical density is not the only way to achieve dense living, it is a viable option particularly in areas where land is on demand and expensive. Please listen to the future not the vested interests of the short sighted residents who will have an afternoon shadow.</p>	<p><b>Not Supported</b> <b>Recommendations:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) not supported. The WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider further modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which would result, if endorsed, to changes to the Amendment that would not align with the matters raised in the submission. <b>Response #3</b></p>
12	No comment		<b>Supported</b>



No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
		<p>Because of "Heritage" building ie "Royal George" Hotel I believe height should not exceed 7 storeys. Would look outdated.</p>	<p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #2</b></p>
13	<p>No comment</p>	<p>Private citizen.                      I object to the deletion of the heritage provisions on the Royal George site and believe that these should be maintained to preserve the history and ambience of the local area. That building is a significant landmark that local residents and visitors identify with and should be preserved.                      The area around George Street precinct is high density and consideration must be given to maintaining a residential feel, adequate parking and amenity. This area is home to young families who live there to be close to schools and parks.                      I object to the 7 storeys plus the uncapped height.</p>	<p><b>Supported in Part Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #1</b></p>
14	<p>No comment</p>	<p>As a resident I fully support the Town of East Fremantle's as to the recommendations as to the above project.</p>	<p><b>Supported in Part Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the</p>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
			<p>Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #1</b></p>
15	No comment	Private citizen. Council amendment to stay, no change to maintain character of the area.	<p><b>Supported in Part</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #1</b></p>
16	No comment	Resident of East Fremantle. I have no objection to the WAPC changes to the amendment and do not support the EF Council's appeal to those changes.	<p><b>Not Supported</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) not supported. The WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider further modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which would result, if endorsed, to changes to the Amendment that would not align with the matters raised in the submission.</p>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
17	36 Gill Street East Fremantle	<p>Owner.</p> <p>We are encouraged by the proactive approach by the WAPC and Minister of Planning are supportive of the development and planning changes and review/relaxation of the heritage controls.</p> <p>We believe the Town of East Fremantle is out of step with the wider community and population of Perth, regarding today's societal and environmental issues.</p> <p>We believe the Town of East Fremantle needs to review its strategic planning in regards to residential development to reflect the changing times that we live in, with particular reference to increasing the residential density zoning of the Gill Street area to R20.</p>	<p><b>Response #3</b></p> <p><b>Not Supported</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) not supported. The WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider further modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which would result, if endorsed, to changes to the Amendment that would not align with the matters raised in the submission.</p> <p><b>Response #3</b></p> <p><b>Supported in Part</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019.</p>
18	45 Duke Street East Fremantle	<p>Owner and occupier of 45 Duke Street.</p> <p>We continue to support the Town of East Fremantle's Amendment to its Planning Scheme which we believe carefully and comprehensively considered all aspects of this difficult site and historical precinct. The Minister's proposed Amendment does not appear to provide the same level of certainty as to outcome, control and enforceability as the Town's Amendment. Specifically we believe the Minister's proposed Amendment does not provide;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Certainty in respect to the absolute height of the proposed development and thereby its relationship to the Royal George Hotel and surrounding tightly constrained precinct. The Town's Amendment contains a 36 metre AHD stipulation.</li> <li>2. Certainty in respect to outcomes. The Town's Amendment sets down clearly desired outcomes for the site and has better measures to achieve specific performance. Subjective assessments or matters left to future determination by external parties may not deliver to the Community or the Town expected outcomes.</li> <li>3 The Minister's Amendment does not appear to compel the Developer to complete or commence (staged) restoration works on the Royal George Hotel before development of the northern part of the site is undertaken.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Response #1</b></p> <p><b>Supported in Part</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p>
19	No comment	<p>Owner of property.</p> <p>I reject the WAPCs changes to the amendment. The Council's current position allows for development while still protecting the unique and rare historical heritage of the building and wider community. I strongly oppose any deletion of the heritage provisions as endorsed by the Council.</p> <p>The Council's current position maintains the community's character, history, respects current residents' amenity, while still allowing progress and responsible development.</p> <p>Please do not allow East Fremantle to become a monotonous community.</p> <p>The developer was aware of the historical considerations from Day 1.</p>	<p><b>Response #1</b></p> <p><b>Supported in Part</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019.</p> <p>WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission,</p>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
20	No comment	<p>Owner. I am happy with 6 storey application, as long as it does not exceed that. This is a relatively low building height area and should remain so. The high rise movement should be stopped with this application.</p>	<p>including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation. <b>Response #1</b></p> <p><b>Supported in Part</b> <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation. <b>Response #1</b></p>
21	No comment	<p>Owner. We support the Council decision on height restrictions and feel that any increased adjustments would not be in keeping with the surrounding area.</p>	<p><b>Supported in Part</b> <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation. <b>Response #1</b></p>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
22	No comment	<p>Owner and occupier of property.</p> <p>Considering the site location, that is the heritage value and character of the area, the maximum height should only be equated with Council submission of 6 storeys ensuring the restoration of the hotel.</p> <p>In view of the Roofing 2000 site coming on board increasing traffic and parking for residents will no doubt increase.</p>	<p><b>Supported in Part</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #1</b></p>
23	19 Sewell Street East Fremantle	<p>As an advocate for retaining the fragile heritage of this Town it is essential that one of its icons, the Royal George Hotel, is restored soonest.</p> <p>First, the modified amendment #15.</p> <p>1. I believe it will be difficult to preserve the views mentioned in #d, given the permitted height of any new development on the northern part of the site.</p> <p>2. Given the allowed setbacks and plot ratio permitted, the required landscaping will be problematic.</p> <p>General comments:</p> <p>I believe that the Minister's compromise to the developers' request and the East Fremantle Council's amendment #15 is a fair and reasonable one.</p> <p>However, the plot ratio of 2.1 could allow a building in excess of 7 storeys for example: there is no mention of a basement or mezzanine floors being excluded from the 7 storeys.</p> <p>The wording of the Minister's modifications is ambiguous so we would like to see a further modification which guarantees a maximum AHD height of 38.5m.</p> <p>There is no doubt that the community would prefer a lower maximum height on any new development at the rear of the site which would not overshadow or diminish the George but any delay to an acceptable planning application would delay even further the urgent restoration of this iconic heritage building.</p> <p>Further, a condition of approval should be that the George is fully restored to prescribed heritage standards prior to the commencement of any work at the rear of the site.</p>	<p><b>Supported in Part</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #1</b></p>
24	12 Canning Hwy East Fremantle	<p>My interest is affected by the very fact this Muppet council negotiated a sale of such an impressive heritage building at a ridiculously low price and did not safe guard the rate payers from having to now fight their battles because they lack the foresight and intelligence.</p> <p>This council is the most useless underhanded, domineering and rude council I have dealt with.</p>	<p><b>Supported in Part</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the</p>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
		<p>Did the rate payers pay for the letter drop and postals, did the ratepayers make a decision to sell such a beautiful building to a developer who will only want to overdevelop?                      You guys are a blundering useless bunch                      How about you stop making fake claims on heritage, look at the real issues in the town and realise more than anything you Muppets work for the rate payers and NOT we obey your bullshit                      If it goes through I will sign the vote of no confidence that is circulating regarding this council and will lead the charge to have you all dismissed                      You are all a bunch of clowns that should realise your place                      I will guarantee this does not get submitted but have a look at what you guys do! Make life hard for rate payers and show sheer arrogance in all you do                      What about you hiding public comment on land amalgamations                      CLOWNS!</p>	<p>Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019.                      WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.  <b>Response #1</b></p>
25	117 George Street East Fremantle	<p>Owner occupier of our house on George Street                      I support a CAPPED maximum height of seven storeys at the Royal George site.                      The hotel is located in a historic neighbourhood and I firmly believe any height greater than seven storeys would be detrimental to the area.</p>	<p><b>Not Supported</b>                      Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) not supported. The WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider further modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which would result, if endorsed, to changes to the Amendment that would not align with the matters raised in the submission.  <b>Response #3</b></p>
26	No comment	<p>Private citizen                      I feel very strongly that a building of any size in that location will be a huge mistake.                      The Royal George Hotel is the crown jewel of East Fremantle, and it is totally inappropriate to even consider squeezing in anything on that slither of land between the highway and Duke Street.                      Fremantle is known across Australia for its preserved heritage architecture, in which George Street is a fine example. This restoration can be competed without the need for extra buildings as has been proved with the National and Guildford Hotels.                      If this means ownership has to be changed, SO BE IT!</p>	<p><b>Supported in Part</b>                      Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019.                      WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
27	No comment	<p>I am totally opposed to WAPC making changes to the Councils Planning Scheme and wanting greater building heights, lesser building setbacks.</p> <p>I would hate to see this area split and end up looking like the Canning Bridge precinct with all the high rise going up there plus traffic congestion that follows.</p>	<p><b>Response #1</b></p> <p><b>Supported in Part</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p>
28	No comment	<p>Private citizen.</p> <p>The Royal George should have been the jewel in the George Street crown. Instead it has been left to molder and degrade for over a decade.</p> <p>The hotel has immense heritage value and it could be plain beautiful. The Council's heritage protection clauses are essential to ensure the faithful restoration of the building- can we PLEASE, finally see it restored, not debased by greedy developers. This includes setbacks that allows the George space to display its architectural significance. Parking must be generous (there is no parking in George Street) but discrete so as not to detract from the appearance of the hotel.</p> <p>Finally- height restrictions are a must! Overshadowing this beautiful building by a modern monstrosity (as in the Perth CBD) is to render it valueless. East Freo is an urban heritage area with most buildings of single or double storey. A 7 storey building would be an anathema and detract enormously from the appeal of George Street and the Plympton Ward.</p>	<p><b>Response #1</b></p> <p><b>Supported in Part</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p>
29	No comment	<p>Would like to see a good development as the property as the property is an eyesore, I am thinking of moving into East Freo shortly. I also have an interest in a property corner of Glyde Street and Canning Highway.</p> <p>Would like to see a good development as the property is an eyesore at present, I am presently looking at available properties in East Fremantle as I am thinking of moving into this area.</p>	<p><b>Response #1</b></p> <p><b>Noted</b></p> <p>Comments acknowledged, and/or further comment and miscellaneous comments not related to Amendment No. 15.</p>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
30	No comment	<p>We need appropriate infill to reduce urban sprawl. This variation is not "over the top" and again gives the opportunity for better design for what should be an iconic landmark for East Fremantle. We need to accept change for the better and do our bit to limit the relentless sprawl and all of the costs to society that that brings.</p>	<p>Not a planning consideration. Comments not relevant to the planning considerations and proposals of the modified Amendment.</p> <p><b>Not Supported</b>  <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) not supported. The WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider further modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which would result, if endorsed, to changes to the Amendment that would not align with the matters raised in the submission.  <b>Response #3</b></p>
31	76 Sewell Street East Fremantle	<p>Private citizen and resident of Plympton Ward. I am pleased that the Minister for Planning has partially listened to the community, and rejected the 21 storey proposal for the Royal George development. I am however concerned that the 7 storey proposal does not include any kind of physical height limit. I still believe that 7 storeys is too many, however, if State Planning is unwilling to move on this, then there must be a physical height restriction for the development. I believe the amendment should state that the new building cannot exceed the existing height of the Royal George Hotel dome (excluding spire), in order that it does not become the dominant building in the area.</p>	<p><b>Supported in Part</b>  <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.  <b>Response #1</b></p>
32	No comment	<p>We reside near the proposed development; walk, ride and drive past the site daily, and will be appalled and saddened at the loss of visual amenity that this proposal threatens to the town. Approval of a 7 storey height is undesirable since this will exceed the current height of the George Hotel: 6 storeys has to be the height limit and this needs to be a FIXED HEIGHT limit- the proposed amendments does NOT fix the height of the development. The amenity of our town will be forever lost if building heights are allowed to creep up from present limits, such</p>	<p><b>Supported in Part</b>  <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to</p>



No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
		<p>as Richmond Quarter (which is only JUST acceptable). Once precedents are set, there will be no turning back and the town will never be the same.</p>	<p>the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation. <b>Response #1</b></p>
33	<p>No comment</p>	<p>Private citizen. I support the Town of East Fremantle amendments No 15. It's more conducive and in keeping to the Town's character.</p>	<p><b>Supported in Part Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation. <b>Response #1</b></p>
34	<p>33 King Street East Fremantle</p>	<p>I am an owner/occupier living in close proximity to the Royal George Hotel. I support the Town of East Fremantle Amendment No. 15 adopted in June 2018 with the exception of seven storeys instead of six, which also includes the basement level. I am very concerned that no restoration work has commenced on the restoration of the Royal George even though a period of 18 months has elapsed of the three year restoration time frame.</p>	<p><b>Supported Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning</p>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
		<p>I ask that the Heritage Commission, State and local governments enforce the orders for restoration in the time frame already agreed without allowing a deferral to ensure the Royal George is restored, as agreed by the developers, by the deadline of June 2020.</p>	<p>requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation. <b>Response #2</b></p>
35		<p>Private citizen. As a heritage structure the building must maintain the focus on this aspect. The footprint must remain the same. A multi 30 storey building would totally detract from its beauty. I am totally opposed to a multistorey addition to this building, a small structure to this building, if small and in keeping with the existing building may be ok if kept low and small.</p>	<p><b>Supported in Part</b> <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation. <b>Response #1</b></p>
36	<p>26 Irwin Street East Fremantle Near Millenden Street intersection</p>	<p>As a long term resident and property owner I wish to see any development respect the heritage value and history of the Town. As well as restricting to seven storeys there should be an absolute height limit stated. The setback above eaves height should also be quantified. Apart from this the proposed modifications are acceptable.</p>	<p><b>Not Supported</b> <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) not supported. The WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider further modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which would result, if endorsed, to changes to the Amendment</p>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
37	No comment	<p>Local resident, commutes along Duke and George Streets and frequents George Street businesses. I am concerned the maximum building height has not been specified. The Royal George site must be sympathetic to and relate to the Royal George Hotel and surrounding properties. I wish the new development on this site not exceed the height of the Royal George Hotel dome, that is keep it in proportion.</p> <p>Sited in a normal suburban street I believe the proposed new development requires setbacks of several metres, otherwise it will be too imposing for the scale of the remainder of the street. Setbacks are most important for the Duke Street side of the development.</p> <p>Besides increased setbacks I petition that the mature trees in the "hotel backyard" be saved. We do not have enough mature trees. Why do the trees always have to be torn down? I would plead that community and East Fremantle Council concerns be respected. The last thing we need is overdevelopment, more concrete and ugliness.</p> <p>As well the increase in parking will overwhelm Duke and George Streets.</p>	<p>that would not align with the matters raised in the submission.</p> <p><b>Response #3</b></p> <p><b>Supported in Part</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #1</b></p>
38	No comment	<p>Private citizen.</p> <p>As a heritage structure I believe that the height, size, footprint and outward appearance must not be changed from the original design. The height and footprint of the existing building must not change.</p>	<p><b>Supported in Part</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #1</b></p>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
39	51 Moss Street East Fremantle Corner of Moss and George Street	<p>My wife and I are totally opposed to the proposed changes to the Town of East Fremantle (TEF) Local Planning Scheme No. 15 (the Scheme). We are local residents who walk, cycle and drive around this location on a daily basis.</p> <p>We submit that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The TEF Council has already made significant changes to the Scheme and we understand already exceeds density targets set out by the State government.</li> <li>The Council is elected by local ratepayers. They are best positioned to understand local planning issues and objectives. Council elections are actually the best forum for local residents to have any say in the planning of their community. TEF has its own planning staff and advisors.</li> </ol> <p>Therefore it is totally unreasonable that TEF Council decisions in terms of planning applications would be subject to new clause 5.9.2- where any development application is subject to review of the State Design Review Panel (SDRP). We strongly disagree with any outside interference such as from a State Minister, the SDRP, the WA Planning Commission (WAPC) or any other government authority. This amendment completely usurps the role of Council in planning decisions and fosters a non-transparent potentially corruptible process of intervention and far exceeds any appeal process which should be limited to errors of applying approved schemes.</p> <p>This is Council's key, forward planning role- is government seeking to make local councils simply administrators of dog laws and rubbish collections?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Looking at the detail- what is 7 storeys? Why can't the WAPC specify a height- that is the transparent, detailed way to describe a building specification? Notwithstanding, 7 storeys is too high. The TEF Council approved 6 after long contentious deliberation with a range of stakeholders and specified heights. It should remain as 6 storeys.</li> <li>Six storeys also keeps the traffic impacts modest on an already congested residential area.</li> <li>These changes potentially impact the feel of the community, the heritage value and will negatively impact the historic George Street residential precinct with overlooking, shadows and simply an unsightly scar on the streetscape and skyline. All of which impact our amenity of our neighbourhood where we have lived for the past 25 years.</li> <li>A further consideration is that Council should also be free to assess the commercial risk and consequences to the community of overcapacity. The consequence of a failed development is a "ghost development" which Richmond Quarters almost fades into or a dusty vacant block because of a lack of being able to fund an overcapitalized development proposal. (Funding is predicated on pre-sales and in this market there is no shortage of stock in East Fremantle with units for sale in Brush Factory and Richmond Quarters).</li> <li>Heritage provisions- what is the basis for removing specific heritage provisions for a historical building in a historical precinct. This is also unreasonable.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Supported in Part</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #1</b></p>
40	No comment	<p>Private citizen and longtime property owner.</p> <p>The Royal George Hotel is an iconic landmark in East Fremantle. It was the first place identified from Gage Road when Diggers returned from World War one. My father being one.</p> <p>It should be the focal point of the area not over shadowed or built out when an upgrade takes place.</p> <p>No high rise or "concrete towers".</p> <p>Keep what little heritage we have in a worthy situation and surroundings.</p>	<p><b>Supported in Part</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to</p>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
			<p>the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation. <b>Response #1</b></p>
41	No comment	Greedy developers LOBBY LOBBY- destruct local communities AND MOVE ON AND OUT...LISTEN TO THE LOCALS	<p><b>Supported in Part</b> <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation. <b>Response #1</b></p>
42	No comment	Private. The height of any proposed development to the rear of the Royal George should not exceed the roofline of the existing building excluding the tower. This should be obvious from a historic and aesthetic viewpoint.	<p><b>Supported in Part</b> <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be</p>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
43	<p>94 King Street East Fremantle</p>	<p>Traffic flow. King Street is already a busy thoroughfare, particularly for a narrow street. In light of the proposed high density residential/commercial development (Roofing 2000 site), it will have an enormous impact on traffic in King Street, in particular.</p>	<p>varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation. <b>Response #1</b></p> <p><b>Supported in Part</b> <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation. <b>Response #1</b></p>
44	<p>48 Duke Street near corner of George Street</p>	<p>Owners occupiers of property. We support East Fremantle's 2018 Amendment plan No 15. We agree with the seven storeys and should not exceed the height of the final of the Royal George. We think the restoration of the heritage hotel should not be overshadowed by a building taller than itself.</p>	<p><b>Supported</b> <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
45	No comment	<p>Concerns as local resident re: appearance of building and effect on George Street traffic- already congested. I am concerned that any building can go above 4 storeys in East Fremantle but would definitely be against any building above 6 storeys.</p> <p>I hope in residential streets that there is a 2 storey limit and only those facing highways to go above this- with regard to the Royal George Hotel can we please ensure that the heritage building is appropriately renovated in keeping with its history and that any buildings attached are in keeping with the heritage building style- that the addition include sufficient parking not just for residents in building but also for visitors to the George St Hotel once functioning again.</p>	<p><b>Response #2</b>  <b>Supported in Part</b>                      Recommendation: Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #1</b>  <b>Supported</b>                      Recommendation: Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p>
46	10 Hubble Street East Fremantle	<p>I live in the Plympton Ward and we need to preserve and care for historic buildings and maintain the unique area.</p> <p>I continue to support the Town of East Fremantle Amendment No. 15 (Royal George Hotel) as adopted in June 2018 with the exception of seven storeys instead of six, including the basement level.</p> <p>I also would like the Heritage Commission, State and local governments to enforce the orders to ensure the restoration of the Royal George so that the restoration can be completed by June 2020.</p>	<p><b>Response #2</b>  <b>Supported</b>                      Recommendation: Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #1</b>  <b>Supported</b>                      Recommendation: Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p>
47	23 King Street East Fremantle	<p>Occupier living near the Royal George Hotel.</p> <p>I support the Town of East Fremantle Amendment No.15 as adopted in June 2018, with the exception of seven storeys instead of six, including the basement level.</p>	<p><b>Response #2</b>  <b>Supported</b>                      Recommendation: Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #1</b>  <b>Supported</b>                      Recommendation: Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
		<p>I am concerned that no work has commenced on the restoration of the hotel considering that 18 months of the 3 year restoration time frame has elapsed.                      I call upon the Heritage Commission, State and local governments to enforce these orders and strengthen them if necessary to ensure that the Royal George is restored by June 2020.</p>	<p>subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.  <b>Response #2</b></p>
48	23 King Street East Fremantle	<p>Owner Occupier living near the Royal George Hotel.                      I support the Town of East Fremantle Amendment No.15 as adopted in June 2018.                      No work has commenced on the restoration of the hotel after 18 months of the 3 year restoration time frame has elapsed.                      I ask that State and Local governments enforce these orders to ensure that the Royal George is restored by June 2020.</p>	<p><b>Supported in Part</b>  <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.  <b>Response #1</b></p>
49	48 King Street East Fremantle	<p>Occupier living near the Royal George Hotel.                      I support the Town of East Fremantle Amendment No. 15 except for the 7 storeys, it should be 6 storeys including the basement level.                      As I live very close to the Royal George Hotel I am very concerned as to how such a big development is going to be managed and ask the council to ensure that the noise level is kept to a minimum as well as the parking close by not be taken up with trucks etc.</p>	<p><b>Supported in Part</b>  <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019.</p>



No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
		<p>I am also concerned that we are already into 18 months of the 3 years that the Royal George Hotel was supposed to be renovated and ask that the Town of East Fremantle and State government ensure that this is not delayed in being renovated.</p>	<p>WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #1</b></p>
50	<p>51 Duke Street East Fremantle George Street East Fremantle</p>	<p>As an owner occupier of property in Duke Street. The atmosphere of our beautiful quiet friendly street would be completely destroyed by the building of a large complex. We can live with 6 storeys, but anything higher would block sunlight, introduce incredible noise, make the already difficult parking impossible. I certainly would sell my property and move elsewhere if this modification does not specify a 7 storey cap.</p>	<p><b>Not Supported</b> <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) not supported. The WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider further modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which would result, if endorsed, to changes to the Amendment that would not align with the matters raised in the submission.</p> <p><b>Response #3</b></p>
51	<p>Corner Silas Street and St Peters Street</p>	<p>Private citizen. As the Royal George site slopes down away from Royal George. The new height of 7 storeys should be from the lowest point of the site. The development closest to the Royal George should be the same height (approximately) as/to highest point of Royal George.</p>	<p><b>Supported</b> <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
52	28 King Street East Fremantle	<p>Our property has a swimming pool, high rise concern. Great concern our private backyard with pool will become visible to building development. We currently have clear view of Royal George and are concerned our horizon will become high rise. Already have to look at Silas Street high rise. Traffic- since closing Sewell Street makes King Street busy for such a small road. Very dangerous. More people means more traffic.</p>	<p><b>Response #2</b>  <b>Supported in Part</b>  <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p>
53	76 Sewell Street East Fremantle The nearest intersection is Marmion Street	<p>My interests are affected as a private citizen who is a home owner in the immediate vicinity of the building. I am pleased that the Minister for Planning rejected the 21 storey proposal for the Royal George Development but I am deeply concerned that the 7 storey proposal does not include any kind of physical height limit. There must be a physical height restriction for the development. I request the Amendment states that the new building cannot exceed the existing height of the Royal George Hotel dome (excluding spire). Seven storeys is still a very large building and if the height is not limited it would severely overlook and overshadow many of the surrounding family homes. Additionally, I am concerned that no work has commenced on the restoration of the Hotel considering that 18 months of the 3 year restoration time frame has elapsed. I call upon the Heritage Commission, State and local governments to enforce these orders and strengthen them if necessary to ensure that the Royal George is restored by June 2020.</p>	<p><b>Response #1</b>  <b>Supported</b>  <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p>
54	Royal George Hotel 34 Duke Street East Fremantle	<p>I am a resident of East Fremantle. I very much enjoy living in the Town, something which I have done for almost 24 years, and wish to continue to support the amenity of the area.</p>	<p><b>Response #2</b>  <b>Supported</b>  <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported</p>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
55	Royal George Hotel, George and Duke Streets	<p>As owner/occupier                      I support the Town of East Fremantle Amendment No.15 (Royal George Hotel) as adopted in June 2018, including the limitation to six storeys to a maximum height of 36 m AHD.                      I am concerned that no work has commenced on the restoration of the hotel considering that 18 months of the 3 year restoration time frame has elapsed.                      I call upon the Heritage Commission, State and local governments to enforce these orders and strengthen them if necessary to ensure that the Royal George is restored by June 2020.</p>	<p>subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019.                      WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.  <b>Response #2</b></p> <p><b>Supported in Part Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019.                      WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.  <b>Response #1</b></p>
56	38 Osborne Road East Fremantle	<p>Owner occupier in the suburb                      I support the Town of East Fremantle Amendment No.15 as adopted in June 2018, with the exception of seven storeys instead of six, including the basement level.                      Given that no work has commenced on the restoration of the hotel despite 18 months of the 3 year restoration time frame having elapsed.</p>	<p><b>Supported Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019.</p>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
		<p>I call upon the Heritage Commission, State and local governments to enforce these orders and strengthen them if necessary to ensure that the Royal George is restored by June 2020.</p>	<p>WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #2</b></p>
57	<p>38 Osborne Road East Fremantle</p>	<p>I am an owner occupier in the East Fremantle area. I support the Town of East Fremantle Amendment No.15 (Royal George Hotel) as adopted in June 2018, with the exception of seven storeys instead of six, including the basement level. Given that no work has commenced on the restoration of the hotel considering in 18 months of the 3 year restoration time frame I propose the Heritage Commission, State and local governments seek to enforce these orders and strengthen them if necessary to ensure that the Royal George is restored by June 2020. This is a wonderful building and we as a community would love to see it brought back to life with a purpose for the future.</p>	<p><b>Supported</b> <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #2</b></p>
58	<p>26 East Street East Fremantle</p>	<p>Owner occupier Plympton ward I support the Town of East Fremantle Amendment No.15 (Royal George Hotel) as adopted in June 2018, with the exception of seven storeys instead of six, including the basement level. I propose the Heritage Commission, State and local governments seek to enforce restoration orders and strengthen them if necessary to ensure that the Royal George is restored by June 2020 as agreed.</p>	<p><b>Supported</b> <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to</p>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
59	<p>26 East Street East Fremantle</p>	<p>Owner occupier of property. I support the Town of East Fremantle Amendment No.15 as adopted in June 2018, with the exception of seven storeys instead of six, including the basement level. The Richmond Quarter development is a great example of how development can add harmoniously to the charm of our suburb. It is concerning that no work has commenced on the restoration of the hotel in 18 months of the 3 year restoration time frame. The Heritage Commission, State and local governments must seek to enforce these orders and strengthen them if necessary to ensure that the Royal George is restored by June 2020.</p>	<p>the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation. <b>Response #2</b></p>
60	<p>No comment</p>	<p><b>Supported</b> <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation. <b>Response #2</b></p>	<p><b>Supported in Part</b> <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission,</p>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
61	No comment	Ratepayer of Town of East Fremantle I disagree with the substantial changes to the Amendment 15 particularly with regard to building height and heritage controls. The changes will allow substantial reductions to the heritage value and the character and amenity of the surrounding George Street precinct.	including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation. <b>Response #1</b> <b>Supported in Part</b> <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation. <b>Response #1</b>
62	No comment	Private citizen- resident of East Fremantle. I am concerned at any development of the Royal George Hotel site which increases density in the location without traffic flow being addressed and access to George Street being considered. I would like to see George Street retain its heritage charm and appeal as a local destination for cafes and parks, and a safe street for families.	<b>Supported in Part</b> <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation. <b>Response #1</b>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
63	No comment	<p>Aesthetics and increased vehicles on George Street.                      I do not endorse the WAPC 7 storey decision, especially without specifying an overall building height. 6 floors is in harmony with the Royal George Hotel, 7 overpowers. Hold your ground and argue for 6. Traffic and parking on George Street is now at capacity.</p>	<p><b>Supported in Part</b>  <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019.                      WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.  <b>Response #1</b></p>
64	85 Sewell Street (which crosses George Street)	<p>Occupier living near George Street site.                      I support the Town of East Fremantle's Amendment #15 as adopted in June 2018.                      As yet no work has commenced on the hotel restoration which is due to be completed by June 2020.</p>	<p><b>Supported in Part</b>  <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019.                      WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.  <b>Response #1</b></p>
65	36/330 South Terrace	<p>I support the Town of East Fremantle Scheme Amendment No15 as adopted in June 2018.                      I am concerned that no work has commenced on the restoration of the hotel, considering that 18 months of the 3 year restoration timeframe has elapsed.                      I call upon the Heritage Council, State and local governments to enforce these orders and strengthen them if necessary to ensure that the Royal George is restored by June 2020.</p>	<p><b>Supported in Part</b>  <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019.</p>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
			<p>WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #1</b></p>
66	<p>9 Curedale Street Beaconsfield</p>	<p>Don't want to see Freo lose its charm. I support the Town of East Fremantle Scheme Amendment No15 as adopted in June 2018. I am concerned that no work has commenced on the restoration of the hotel, considering that 18 months of the 3 year restoration timeframe has elapsed. I call upon the Heritage Council, State and local governments to enforce these orders and strengthen them if necessary to ensure that the Royal George is restored by June 2020.</p>	<p><b>Supported in Part</b> <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #1</b></p>
67	<p>14 Glyde Street East Fremantle</p>	<p>I support the Town of East Fremantle Scheme Amendment No. 15 as adopted in June 2018. I am concerned that no work has commenced on the restoration of the hotel, considering that 18 months of the 3 year restoration timeframe has elapsed. I call upon the Heritage Council, State and local governments to enforce these orders and strengthen them if necessary to ensure that the Royal George is restored by June 2020.</p>	<p><b>Supported in Part</b> <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be</p>



No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
68		<p>I support the Town of East Fremantle Scheme Amendment No15 as adopted in June 2018.                      I am concerned that no work has commenced on the restoration of the hotel, considering that 18 months of the 3 year restoration timeframe has elapsed.                      I call upon the Heritage Council, State and local governments to enforce these orders and strengthen them if necessary to ensure that the Royal George is restored by June 2020.</p>	<p>varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.  <b>Response #1</b>  <b>Supported in Part</b>  <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.  <b>Response #1</b></p>
69	<p>3 Windsor Road                      Owner                      I support the Town of East Fremantle Scheme Amendment No15 as adopted in June 2018.                      I am concerned that no work has commenced on the restoration of the hotel, considering that 18 months of the 3 year restoration timeframe has elapsed.                      I call upon the Heritage Council, State and local governments to enforce these orders and strengthen them if necessary to ensure that the Royal George is restored by June 2020.</p>		<p><b>Supported in Part</b>  <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.  <b>Response #1</b></p>
70	<p>No comment</p>	<p>I support the Town of East Fremantle Scheme Amendment No15 as adopted in June 2018.</p>	<p><b>Supported in Part</b></p>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
71	No comment	<p>Proposal does not fit the character of the area.</p> <p>I support the Town of East Fremantle Scheme Amendment No15 as adopted in June 2018.</p> <p>I am concerned that no work has commenced on the restoration of the hotel, considering that 18 months of the 3 year restoration timeframe has elapsed.</p> <p>I call upon the Heritage Council, State and local governments to enforce these orders and strengthen them if necessary to ensure that the Royal George is restored by June 2020.</p>	<p><b>Response #1</b></p> <p><b>Supported in Part</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p>
72	No comment	<p>I support the Town of East Fremantle Scheme Amendment No15 as adopted in June 2018.</p> <p>I am concerned that no work has commenced on the restoration of the hotel, considering that 18 months of the 3 year restoration timeframe has elapsed.</p> <p>I call upon the Heritage Council, State and local governments to enforce these orders and strengthen them if necessary to ensure that the Royal George is restored by June 2020.</p>	<p><b>Response #1</b></p> <p><b>Supported in Part</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
			<p>requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #1</b></p>
73	<p>15 Preston Point Road East Fremantle</p>	<p>Private citizen, owner of the property in the area The area around the submission is full of character and traditional buildings. A large development especially where height is impacted will destroy this character which makes the area unique. It is not in keeping with the area.</p>	<p><b>Supported in Part</b> <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #1</b></p>
74	<p>3 Richmond Circus East Fremantle</p>	<p>Owner of property. I support the Town of East Fremantle Amendment No 15 (Royal George) as adopted in June 2018 with the exception of seven storeys instead of six including the basement level. I am concerned no work has commenced with only 18 months timeframe remaining. The Heritage Commission State and local government must enforce these orders and strengthen them if required to ensure the Royal George is restored by June 2020.</p>	<p><b>Supported</b> <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building</p>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
			<p>height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #2</b></p>
75	<p>Owner</p>	<p>I support the Town of East Fremantle Amendment No15 (Royal George Hotel) as adopted June 2018. I am concerned there is "no capped maximum building height" as this seems to contradict the "7storey" limitation. I am concerned that the building has deteriorated over the past three years and no restoration has taken place 18 months into the 3 year restoration period.</p> <p>I call for the Heritage Commission, State and Local government enforce those orders and strengthen them if need be to ensure the Royal George Hotel is restored by June 2020.</p>	<p><b>Supported in Part</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #1</b></p>
76	<p>Local Planning Scheme No 3 Royal George Hotel site</p>	<p>Owner occupier in Town of East Fremantle.</p> <p>The development of the vacant land behind the George Hotel should not be changed to what was proposed by Council as the height of any new development will impact on the existing amenity of the current adjoining residents. The impact will be overlooking considerations, increase of local traffic, and parking issues due to additional local visitors to the new development. George Street in a prime heritage zone for the Town of East Fremantle and should be given wider consideration when new developments are being considered.</p>	<p><b>Supported in Part</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #1</b></p>
77	<p>No comment</p>	<p>Resident of East Fremantle with an interest in the integrity of the suburb.</p>	<p><b>Supported</b></p>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
		<p>The utmost priority is preserving the "Royal George"! But at what cost should that be achieved? I believe the Minister's compromise to the developers is a fair one. Further modifications should be made to guarantee the maximum height. Lower the better but not to the detriment of restoration of the Royal George. The site has been neglected for too long and a compromise must be achieved.</p> <p>I believe the maximum height should be 7 storeys, but discretion should be utilised by the developer not to overshadow the Royal George Hotel.</p>	<p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #2</b></p>
78	100 King Street East Fremantle 6158	<p>I am a private citizen and an owner occupier in the Plympton Ward. I am in agreement with all of the Councils positions, in particular the following:                      Building Height: While I support development of the Royal George site I believe it is important to maintain the existing Royal George Hotel as a key focal point of the site. The proposed 6 storeys is the right balance between maintaining the historic building and the new build.                      Vehicle Parking: Duke Street and surrounding streets cannot support additional street parking, all parking must be contained within the building boundaries.                      Additionally, during the build and restoration works access to the site should be limited to minimise traffic to surrounding streets. No building traffic should be permitted on George Street, or allows to cross George Street- to achieve this traffic should be routed via Canning Highway to approach Duke St from the Northern End only.</p>	<p><b>Supported in Part</b>  <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #1</b></p>
79	100 King Street East Fremantle 6158	<p>Owner of Property.                      I agree with the East Fremantle Council's Amendment No. 15 (endorsed Council meeting 6 June 2018.).                      I am in particular in strong favour of the council amendment that all residents and visitor parking be provided on site. I am totally against the Minister's amendment to allow the developer to reduce the parking requirements by any percentage.                      No development should be allowed until the Royal George has been totally restored to Council's satisfaction.</p>	<p><b>Supported in Part</b>  <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to</p>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
		<p>Trucks and vehicles used during the development of this site should only be allowed to use the Canning Hwy, Sewell Street, Peters Place route to gain entry to site. This route has the minimal impact on residents with heavy trucks not using residential streets where children walk to school.</p>	<p>the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #1</b></p>
80	<p>83 Sewell Street East Fremantle Marmion or George Street intersections</p>	<p>Owner / occupier, Plympton ward. I continue to support the Town of East Fremantle's Amendment No 15 adopted in June 2018. The one exception to the Council's adopted Amendment is the seven storey limit detailed by the Minister which I somewhat reluctantly support. I do have concerns that this magnificent heritage building continues to languish in a state of dilapidation and that a good portion of the time-frame allotted to the developer has elapsed without any works occurring. The restoration of the hotel is paramount and entities within the State government sector such as the State Heritage Office as well as local government continue to oblige the developer to proceed, with a view toward full restoration by June 2020.</p>	<p><b>Supported</b> <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #2</b></p>
81	<p>145 George Street East Fremantle 6158 adjacent to Silas Street</p>	<p>Owner Occupier of property. As an East Fremantle owner occupier living in close proximity to the Royal George project I am concerned with the overall height of any new building proposed for the site. Considering overlooking, overshadowing, traffic congestion, overcrowding and the consequent stress on the current infrastructure of the surrounding area. I support the Town of East Fremantle Planning Scheme No 3 - Amendment No 15 with the condition that it is imperative that any building on the site is restricted to 7 storeys capped height.</p>	<p><b>Supported</b> <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which</p>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
			<p>justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #2</b></p>
82	7 Riverside Road East Fremantle, I think Lot 8	I agree with Council's position on this.	<p><b>Supported in Part</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #1</b></p>
83	70 East Street East Fremantle 6158 East Street and George Street	<p>I'm a private citizen living close to George Street and the Royal George Hotel in a heritage listed house.</p> <p>The Royal George is in an historic precinct and needs to be saved from inappropriate and insensitive development.</p> <p>The height of the development should be no more than 6 storeys including the basement level. It should be no higher than the Royal George spire.</p> <p>I am also concerned that of the 3 year restoration time frame 18 months has lapsed. I call upon the Heritage Commission, local and State governments to enforce these orders and ensure that the Royal George is restored by June 2020.</p>	<p><b>Supported in Part</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks,</p>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
84	70 East Street East Fremantle 6158	I'm a private citizen living close to George Street and the Royal George Hotel in a heritage listed house. The Royal George is in an historic precinct and needs to be saved from inappropriate and insensitive development. The height of the development should be no more than 6 storeys including the basement level. It should be no higher than the Royal George spire. I am also concerned that of the 3 year restoration time frame 18 months has lapsed. I call upon the Heritage Commission, local and State governments to enforce these orders and ensure that the Royal George is restored by June 2020.	residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation. <b>Response #1</b> <b>Supported in Part</b> <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation. <b>Response #1</b>
85	2 Hillside Road East Fremantle Nearest intersection with Preston Point Road	Live at No. 2 Hillside Rd, East Fremantle. The dwelling has views directly towards the Royal George site. Whilst a major development at the Royal George site would have significant visual impact on our property, a carefully considered development of a high quality of design would be acceptable. A taller building with a lesser footprint over the site would appear to be the most appropriate solution given the significance of the existing heritage built form. We would welcome some strategic increased density and urban infill within East Fremantle.	<b>Not Supported</b> <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) not supported. The WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider further modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which would result, if endorsed, to changes to the Amendment that would not align with the matters raised in the submission. <b>Response #3</b>
86	Royal George Hotel site	I would like to see a minimum of 5 floors of height. I believe not only does this change the heritage perspective of East Fremantle but also affect the lives of the local residents by overlooking and shadowing other buildings and massive traffic increase. Please keep the height of this new building to a minimum of 5 floors.	<b>Supported</b> <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to



No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
			<p>the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #Z</b></p>
87	<p>No comment</p>	<p>Private citizen. A nearby resident. I live three streets away from Duke Street, the site of the Royal George Hotel building. I reject WAPC's proposed changes to East Fremantle Council's Amendment No 15 to its planning scheme for the Royal.</p>	<p><b>Supported in Part</b>  <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #1</b></p>
88	<p>No comment</p>	<p>I have been a long term resident of East Fremantle and have lived here for 20 years. I have been concerned with the development and deterioration of the Royal George over the last 10 years since it was boarded up. I would like to see it have community based activities and preserving the Royal George as it is without substantial change. I think the building at the back should be completely separate so the Royal George is completely independent. The original height and footprint of the new building and development should be followed.</p>	<p><b>Supported in Part</b>  <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum</p>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
89	No comment	<p>Private citizen, property owner- local resident. I am concerned for the adverse effect of the development on local amenity and lack of sympathy of a multi-storey building in the heritage precinct (Plympton Ward) of East Fremantle.</p> <p>I support the Town of East Fremantle Amendment No 15 (Royal George Hotel) as adopted in June 2018, with the exception of seven storeys instead of six, including the basement level.</p> <p>The Royal George is a majestic local landmark and should not be diminished by any future development. The height of the development should be capped so it does not exceed the hotel roofline.</p> <p>The heritage values and amenity of East Fremantle should be protected in perpetuity. Any development should be in a style in keeping with the existing style of Plympton Ward.</p> <p>I am concerned that work has not yet commenced on the restoration of the Royal George Hotel by the developer. This needs to be pursued by the relevant bodies to ensure restoration by June 2020.</p> <p>Please protect the current amenity of East Fremantle and the much valued heritage values of Plympton Ward. This is why we live here!</p>	<p>capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #1</b></p> <p><b>Supported</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #2</b></p> <p><b>Supported</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p>
90	No comment.	<p>Private citizen, property owner- local resident. I am concerned for the adverse effect of the development on local amenity and lack of sympathy of a multi-storey building in the heritage precinct (Plympton Ward) of East Fremantle.</p> <p>I support the Town of East Fremantle Amendment No 15 (Royal George Hotel) as adopted in June 2018, with the exception of seven storeys instead of six, including the basement level.</p> <p>The Royal George is a majestic local landmark and should not be diminished by any future development. The height of the development should be capped so it does not exceed the hotel roofline.</p> <p>The heritage values and amenity of East Fremantle should be protected in perpetuity. Any development should be in a style in keeping with the existing style of Plympton Ward.</p> <p>I am concerned that work has not yet commenced on the restoration of the Royal George Hotel by the developer. This needs to be pursued by the relevant bodies to ensure restoration by June 2020.</p> <p>Please protect the current amenity of East Fremantle and the much valued heritage values of Plympton Ward. This is why we live here!</p>	<p>capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #1</b></p> <p><b>Supported</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #2</b></p> <p><b>Supported</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
91	No comment	Re: Heritage. I oppose the height of the building.	<p>development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #2</b></p> <p><b>Supported in Part</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #1</b></p>
92	No comment	<p>The WA Planning Commission's (WAPC) changes to Amendment 15 seem a reasonable compromise given the original development proposal by Saraceni was for over 20 storeys. The non-specified height gives the developer some flexibility in design thereby allowing for a more interesting building. We believe this is acceptable and indeed preferable if a more upmarket and aesthetically pleasing building is the result.</p> <p>Over the years the Royal George Hotel site has had a number of development proposals which unfortunately have not proceeded. Assuming that neither the Council nor the State government want to provide required capital injection to restore and reinvigorate the Royal George Hotel then the private sector is probably best placed to undertake the refurbishment, provided there is a commercial return on their investment. A win-win for the East Fremantle community.</p> <p>In addition, both the Royal George and the Roofing 2000 redevelopments have the potential to provide an economic and social stimulus to those small business operators currently struggling in the George Street precinct.</p> <p>Kathy and I are comfortable with, and support, the changes initiated by the WAPC.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this proposal</p>	<p><b>Not Supported</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) not supported. The WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider further modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which would result, if endorsed, to changes to the Amendment that would not align with the matters raised in the submission.</p> <p><b>Response #3</b></p>
93	No comment	<p>I support modification to Scheme Amendment No 15, with the provisos</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No more than 6 storeys (including basement)</li> <li>2. The height is no more than the dome of the Royal George</li> <li>3. That there is sufficient landscaping and sensitivity in the design</li> <li>4. Considers the amount of parking and traffic congestion.</li> <li>5. Call on Heritage Commission and local government to restore the Royal George preferably community involvement.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Supported in Part</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning</p>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
			<p>requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #1</b></p>
94	36 King Street (Lot 449) close to Duke Street junction	<p>We support the Town of East Fremantle's Amendment No. 15 as adopted in June 2018, with the exception of seven storeys instead of six, including the basement level.</p> <p>We are concerned that no work has commenced on the restoration of the hotel, given that 18 months of the 2 year restoration time have already elapsed.</p> <p>We request that the Heritage Commission and State and local government enforce these orders to ensure that the Royal George Hotel is restored by June 2020.</p>	<p><b>Supported Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019.</p> <p>WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #2</b></p>
95	42 Duke Street East Fremantle	<p>The heritage provisions endorsed by East Fremantle Council should be maintained. The Royal George Hotel site is surrounded by single storey/double storey dwellings with some low key commercial buildings on George Street. This residential scale must be maintained. In my opinion, any development should be no higher than the turret (not the spire) of the Royal George Hotel. The architecture should be approved by a local registered architect e.g. Michael Patroni to ensure local character and scale is maintained</p>	<p><b>Supported in Part Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019.</p> <p>WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum</p>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
96	No comment	We support the Council's Scheme Amendment of April 2018. All historical features of the Royal George Hotel should be preserved (including stable doors).	<p>capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #1</b></p> <p><b>Supported in Part</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #1</b></p>
97	46 King Street East Fremantle	<p>Owner.</p> <p>I DO support the Town of East Fremantle Council's Amendment No. 15 - Royal George Hotel Site (April 2018).</p> <p>I DO NOT support the Minister's proposed modifications as there is a lack of clarity to do with heights and parking. An AHD height needs to be nominated for the maximum height cap.</p> <p>Parking and traffic management needs to be addressed in the early stage of the design process. The traffic and parking surrounding this site are already at capacity. With a dead end street in one direction, a very narrow and busy street in another and the last access point 100m away delivers you onto another new high density development which also has limited traffic access</p> <p>AND most importantly, the heritage aspect of the amendment needs to be re-instated to ensure that the Royal George is not left to disrepair any longer. And it is protected in the construction process. The property was sold under dubious circumstances as it is, and to not hold any stipulation over the developer to restore the Royal George Hotel in good time, is a crime.</p>	<p><b>Supported in Part</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #1</b></p>
98	46 King Street	Owner of 46 King St, East Fremantle.	<p><b>Supported in Part</b></p>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
	<p>East Fremantle, corner King and George</p>	<p>I DO support the Town of East Fremantle Council Amendment No. 15 - Royal George Hotel Site (April 2018). I DO NOT support the Minister's proposed modifications for the following reasons:                      The deletion of the CMS and the omission of requirement for the Royal George to be restored prior to using the land or building being used. This opens up a too much leeway for the RGH to be left to ruin for many more years to come, potentially not being cared for during the course of construction, then leading to the scenario of it being too expensive to repair. The Royal George was sold at an exceptionally cheap price (A whole other issue) supposedly because of the cost of repairs. The developer is clearly not interested in the restoration otherwise it would have started them by now. By removing this clause then is no incentive for the developer to make good on the deal of restoration!                      I'm concerned about the lack of a specific height datum for the building height cap. Interpretation of the '7 storeys being nominated can vary the overall height significantly depending on the floor to floor height. The difference between a standard 3m floor to floor height, and a luxurious 4m floor 4m to floor height could result in the building being an additional 7m taller. Also, it does not mention that the 7 storeys is to include the basement.                      In principle, I find acceptable 7 storeys at a 3m floor to floor level, and including any basement levels. This would be in keeping with the scale of the street. However, the potential of 7 storeys at 4m floor to floor level, on top of a basement, is not acceptable.                      Please put an AHD cap in place!                      The lack of definition with the Setback from Duke St is required but not specified - how does that even begin to be a useful guideline? It could be set back 20mm and still be considered a setback in a court of law!                      The lack of clarity regarding the parking - what would classify certain circumstances? This site is so constrained when it comes to traffic management and parking it isn't funny! The site needs strict parking requirement/traffic management guidelines and if stacking mechanisms are to be employed, then strict guidelines on access and noise. These are issues that need to be dealt with at the beginning of the design process. It is not something that can be left to the last to 'try' and rectify.                      As owner of the property on 53 Sewell Street I am affected by the immediate visual impression with high rise storeys, contrasting strongly with the historical look of my home and the other houses. I am affected by the effects on George Street which is the community lifeline of the precinct, including parking and traffic being of concern.                      I support the Town of East Fremantle Amendment No.15 (Royal George Hotel) as adopted in June 2018, with the exception of seven storeys instead of six, including the basement level.                      I am concerned that no work has commenced on the restoration of the hotel considering that 18 months of the 3 year restoration time frame has elapsed.                      I call upon the Heritage Commission, State and local governments to enforce these orders and strengthen them if necessary to ensure that the Royal George is restored by June 2020.</p>	<p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.  <b>Response #1</b></p>
99	<p>I am at 53 Sewell Street which intersects George Street</p>	<p>As owner of the property on 53 Sewell Street I am affected by the immediate visual impression with high rise storeys, contrasting strongly with the historical look of my home and the other houses. I am affected by the effects on George Street which is the community lifeline of the precinct, including parking and traffic being of concern.                      I support the Town of East Fremantle Amendment No.15 (Royal George Hotel) as adopted in June 2018, with the exception of seven storeys instead of six, including the basement level.                      I am concerned that no work has commenced on the restoration of the hotel considering that 18 months of the 3 year restoration time frame has elapsed.                      I call upon the Heritage Commission, State and local governments to enforce these orders and strengthen them if necessary to ensure that the Royal George is restored by June 2020.</p>	<p><b>Supported Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
100	40 King Street East Fremantle. Our property is on the eastern side of King Street, with Duke Street properties to our rear, and near the intersection with George Street	<p>We are the joint owners of the property at 40 King Street, with the rear of our house facing east towards the Royal George Hotel. We are directly affected as any development of the site would likely directly overlook the rear of our property.</p> <p>We support the building setbacks and heritage controls contained in the Town of East Fremantle's Amendment No 15 (Royal George Hotel Site) as adopted in June 2018.</p> <p>We support the cap of 7 storeys for the site, recommended by the WA Planning Commission</p>	<p>development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #2</b></p> <p><b>Supported</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #2</b></p>
101	N/A	<p>My interests are affected as a private citizen residing near the land on which the planning scheme amendment is proposed. I support the Town of East Fremantle's Amendment No.15 as adopted in June 2018. I believe the controls outlined within the Amendment regarding height, land use and density, parking, conservation management, and heritage provisions, meet the need of enabling development of the site to offset the restoration costs of the hotel. I believe the Minister's amendments, while beneficial in terms of height limits, have removed additional controls that provided certainty to the community and developer regarding suitable development of the site, and therefore these controls should be reinstated (e.g. land use and density, parking, conservation management, and heritage provisions).</p> <p>If the current owner of the site believes the controls as outlined in the Amendments proposed by Town of East Fremantle in June (2018) make the site untenable, they could sell the site (at the cost they paid for it) to another party who could achieve the outcomes sought. The controls in place seek to ensure benefits to all (owners, developers, residents and the broader community), and should not be compromised to deliver profits to a single party.</p>	<p><b>Supported in Part</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #1</b></p> <p><b>Supported</b></p>
102	Royal George Hotel	Private Citizen and resident of East Fremantle.	

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
103	<p>36 Glyde street near George street intersection</p>	<p>I support the Council's Amendment No.15 as previously advertised. In considering the changes proposed by the Minister I am concerned there is not enough emphasis on preserving the heritage and ensuring the renovation of the Royal George Hotel. There should be a guarantee that development of the vacant part of the land cannot commence until the renovation of the hotel is completed.</p> <p>I am also concerned that the Minister's amendments do not give enough restrictions to ensure that the height and plot ratio cannot be varied through discretion by the decision makers. The height should be stated as a maximum of 7 storeys or no higher than the height of the Dome.</p> <p>The setbacks that protect the views of the dome should be specified as per the Council recommendation.</p> <p>No variations to the conditions should be permitted without further advertisement.</p>	<p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019.</p> <p>WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #2</b></p>
104	<p>No comment</p>	<p>Occupier living near the Royal George Hotel</p> <p>I support the Town of East Fremantle Amendment No. 15 as adopted in June 2018.</p> <p>I am concerned that a proposed apartments building, even if it is no more than 6 storeys, would overshadow such a superb heritage building as the Royal George Hotel is.</p> <p>I am also concerned about the loss of character of the Plympton precinct that a block of apartments would cause.</p>	<p><b>Supported in Part Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019.</p> <p>WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #1</b></p>
104	<p>No comment</p>	<p>Owner occupier. Overshadowing Noise and disruption during and after building. Lack of adequate parking.</p>	<p><b>Supported in Part Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the</p>



No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
		Height limits should be firmly locked in.	Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation. <b>Response #1</b>
105	George Street junction of Duke Street	Private citizen. I support the Town of East Fremantle Scheme Amendment No 15 as adopted in June 2018. Traffic increase has not been adequately addressed. I am concerned that no work has commenced on the restoration of the hotel, considering that 18 months of the 3 year restoration timeframe has elapsed. I call upon the Heritage Council, State and local governments to enforce these orders and strengthen them if necessary to ensure that the Royal George is restored by June 2020.	<b>Supported in Part</b> <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation. <b>Response #1</b>
106	49 Duke Street (George Street nearest intersection)	Private citizen. The use of high rise developments for the purpose of dwelling places is a well-documented failure in terms of social interaction and the knock on anti-social effects are legion. Also the proposed design is just plain ugly and aesthetically offensive. I think no development should exceed the height of the existing Royal George roof. I am concerned that no work has commenced on the restoration of the hotel, considering that 18 months of the 3 year restoration timeframe has elapsed. I call upon the Heritage Council, State and local governments to enforce these orders and strengthen them if necessary to ensure that the Royal George is restored by June 2020.	<b>Supported in Part</b> <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission,

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
107	<p>49 Duke Street East Fremantle 6158</p>	<p>Uglification of area, Old George must be tastefully restored asap. I support the Town of East Fremantle Scheme Amendment No 15 as adopted in June 2018, with the exception of seven storeys instead of six, including the basement level. I am concerned that no work has commenced on the restoration of the hotel, considering that 18 months of the 3 year restoration timeframe has elapsed. I call upon the Heritage Council, State and local governments to enforce these orders and strengthen them if necessary to ensure that the Royal George is restored by June 2020.</p>	<p>including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation. <b>Response #1</b> <b>Supported in Part</b> <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation. <b>Response #1</b></p>
108	<p>Royal George Hotel</p>	<p>Owner occupier and private citizen. I support the Town of East Fremantle Amendment No 15 (Royal George Hotel) as adopted in June 2018 with the exception that I would limit the build to a height that does not go higher than the Dome on the Royal George Hotel. I am concerned about overshadowing and overlooking impacting on existing residences and the number of cars and people being brought into a very small area. I am also concerned that 18 months into a 3 year restoration, nothing at all has been done on the restoration of the Royal George Hotel. I would like to see this work begin immediately as the heritage building is in need of urgent and immediate work.</p>	<p><b>Supported in Part</b> <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation. <b>Response #1</b></p>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
109	No comment	<p>Private citizen and, owner and occupier.</p> <p>I support the Town of East Fremantle Amendment No. 15 (Royal George Hotel) as adopted in June 2018, with the exception of 7 storeys instead of six (including the basement level and no higher than the dome of the Royal George).</p> <p>I am concerned that no work has commenced on the restoration of the hotel considering 18 months of the 3 year restoration timeframe has elapsed.</p> <p>I call on the Heritage Commission, State and local governments to enforce these orders and strengthen them if necessary to ensure that the Royal George is restored by June 2020.</p>	<p><b>Supported Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019.</p> <p>WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #2</b></p>
110	<p>All of the addresses in East Fremantle and Australia present and future.</p>	<p>The Royal George Hotel and site must not be developed other than to restore its heritage value and make structural repairs in the exact look/aesthetic that has existed.</p> <p>Upon which locally minded business may lease the interior space for nature of art galleries, restaurants, cafes, bars and the like.</p> <p>The reason being is common sense... it's one of the only remaining intact heritage precincts in Australia. This is due to the integrity of its built urban fabric including height and materials/age.</p> <p>The building height must not be altered, the number of storeys must remain as is and not increase, the architect who carefully crafted the cupola would turn in his grave. Height would over-shadow the street too. I believe in housing infill and diversity, but not in that square kilometer. Nedlands on the other hand has little character worth retaining. George Street does.</p>	<p><b>Supported in Part Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019.</p> <p>WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #1</b></p>
111	<p>Royal George Hotel Scheme No 3</p>	<p>Concerned citizen.</p> <p>I agree with the East Fremantle Council's recommendations height of 6 storeys including basement and carpark.</p> <p>The building must be capped at 6 storeys.</p> <p>All the council's recommendations must be observed.</p>	<p><b>Supported in Part Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the</p>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
112	<p>12 Sewell Street EAST FREMANTLE near corner of St Peters Way</p>	<p>Occupier living near the Royal George Hotel. I support the Town of East Fremantle Scheme Amendment No 15 as adopted in June 2018, with the exception of seven storeys instead of six, including the basement level. I am concerned that no work has commenced on the restoration of the hotel, considering that 18 months of the 3 year restoration timeframe has elapsed. I call upon the Heritage Council, State and local governments to enforce these orders and strengthen them if necessary to ensure that the Royal George is restored by June 2020.</p>	<p>Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation. <b>Response #1</b> <b>Supported</b> <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation. <b>Response #2</b> <b>Supported</b> <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to</p>
113	<p>12 Sewell Street near St Peters Way</p>	<p>Owner Occupier living near the Royal George Hotel. I support the Town of East Fremantle Scheme Amendment No 15 as adopted in June 2018, with the exception of seven storeys instead of six, including the basement level. I am concerned that no work has commenced on the restoration of the hotel, considering that 18 months of the 3 year restoration timeframe has elapsed. I call upon the Heritage Council, State and local governments to enforce these orders and strengthen them if necessary to ensure that the Royal George is restored by June 2020.</p>	<p>Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation. <b>Response #1</b> <b>Supported</b> <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to</p>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
			<p>the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #2</b></p>
114	<p>No comment</p>	<p>Owner Occupier living near the Royal George Hotel.                      I support the Town of East Fremantle Scheme Amendment No 15 as adopted in June 2018, with the exception of seven storeys instead of six, including the basement level.                      I am concerned that no work has commenced on the restoration of the hotel, considering that 18 months of the 3 year restoration timeframe has elapsed.                      I call upon the Heritage Council, State and local governments to enforce these orders and strengthen them if necessary to ensure that the Royal George is restored by June 2020.</p>	<p><b>Supported</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #2</b></p>
115	<p>144 George Street                      EAST FREMANTLE</p>	<p>My property is approximately 150m from the Royal George.                      I fully support Council's Scheme Amendment No 15.                      I do not support any amendments to the scheme amendment.                      The WAPC has not convinced me that their changes are necessary. I live her. Members of the WAPC do not (I assume).</p>	<p><b>Supported in Part</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission,</p>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
116	12 Sewell Street EAST FREMANTLE	<p>I support the Town of East Fremantle Scheme Amendment No 15 as adopted in June 2018, with the exception of seven storeys instead of six, including the basement level.</p> <p>I am concerned that no work has commenced on the restoration of the hotel, considering that 18 months of the 3 year restoration timeframe has elapsed.</p> <p>I call upon the Heritage Council, State and local governments to enforce these orders and strengthen them if necessary to ensure that the Royal George is restored by June 2020.</p>	<p>including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #1</b></p> <p><b>Supported</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019.</p> <p>WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #2</b></p> <p><b>Supported</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019.</p> <p>WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio,</p>
117	32 King Street EAST FREMANTLE	<p>Owner occupier.</p> <p>I support Amendment No. 15 with the following exceptions;</p> <p>A maximum building height (7 storeys) be in place as the maximum building height as per Council amendment. This is in keeping with past and to be with future developments within the Council's borders.</p> <p>The heritage provisions remain.</p>	<p><b>Response #2</b></p> <p><b>Supported</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019.</p> <p>WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio,</p>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
			<p>building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #2</b></p>
118	41 Sewell Street EAST FREMANTLE	<p>The loss of the neglected old Royal George Hotel; a nonsense skyscraper for East Fremantle; total parking difficulties. We the residents of East Fremantle regard the old Royal George Hotel as an historical and architectural treasure which matches the style of most of our buildings. It has been neglected for far too long and will collapse if not restored soon. A 21 storey skyscraper in this neighbourhood is a stylistic nonsense. If anything is to be built at its rear it must not exceed 6 storeys including the parking, and the 2 highest storeys should be narrower (see our Friends of TORGH poster) so that it will not overshadow or spoil the view of the ORGH.</p> <p>There is no room for more parking in East Fremantle. Most homes do not have drives and cars are parked in the street. We value our parks, with so much traffic pollution around us, and do not wish for our health and safety, for them to be turned into carparks.</p>	<p><b>Supported in Part</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #1</b></p>
119	No comment	<p>Owners. We support the Council's planning scheme 2018 amendment.</p>	<p><b>Supported in Part</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #1</b></p>
120	73 Duke Street (Duke and George Street)	<p>Owner and occupier. I support the Town of East Fremantle Amendment No 15 as adopted in June 2018.</p>	<p><b>Supported in Part</b></p>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
		<p>I support the building height being no higher than the height of the dome of the Royal George Hotel. I am concerned that no work has commented on the restoration of the hotel and that there are only 18months left of the agreed restoration time; this must be honoured by the developers. I ask that the Heritage Commission, State and local government ensure that commitments are honoured and the hotel restored by 2020/June.</p>	<p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #1</b></p>
121	73 Duke Street Duke and George	<p>I support the Town of East Fremantle Amendment No 15 as adopted in June 2018. I support the building height to be no taller than the height of the dome. I implore the Heritage Commission, State and local governments insist the developers honour the renovation of the Royal George Hotel timeframe of completion by June 2020.</p>	<p><b>Supported in Part</b> <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #1</b></p>
122		<p>I support the Town of East Fremantle Amendment No 15 as adopted in June 2018. I support the building height to be no higher than the height of the dome of the Royal George Hotel. I urge the Heritage Commission, State and local governments to insist the developers honour the timeframe of the restoration being completed by June 2020, as agreed to.</p>	<p><b>Supported in Part</b> <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning</p>



No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
			<p>requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #1</b></p>
123	32B Stratford Street EAST FREMANTLE	<p>I am concerned with the impact the development will have on the local area especially in regards to traffic and congestion, as well as a degradation in the community spirit of East Fremantle. A large overlooking building will not fit into the East Fremantle landscape.</p>	<p><b>Supported in Part</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #1</b></p>
124	6/29 Preston Point Road EAST FREMANTLE	<p>We do not want high rise building in East Freo. We moved to East Fremantle over 30 years ago. We are not against change but do not think a 7 storey building in the middle of a heritage classy area is appropriate. Parking in George Street precinct is already hard. With more residents and commercial buildings it will be impossible. The building should not exceed 15m at the highest point- underground parking for all residents plus 2 bays for each shop or office as a minimum. We are against the changes.</p>	<p><b>Supported</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building</p>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
125	No comment	<p>Impact of enjoyment of cultural built heritage of Royal George Hotel.</p> <p>I confess I did not believe that any developer would contemplate a tall building that would dwarf the Royal George Hotel's familiar and culturally important skyline but early plans showed just this. I was relieved these did not eventuate.</p> <p>The Council's proposals seemed more sensible as a compromise but now I am concerned that the proposed height increases will impact upon the skyline at a historically significant part of East Fremantle (one of the very few still remaining). I plead that a realistic option be developed that will help preserve the Royal George Hotel but not initiate high rise in the area please.</p>	<p>height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #2</b></p> <p><b>Supported</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #2</b></p>
126	No comment	<p>I support the Town of East Fremantle Amendment No 15 (Royal George Hotel) as adopted in June 2018 with the exception of seven storeys (maximum) including the basement levels. Each level should be a maximum height of no more than specified in the Council's amendment.</p> <p>I am concerned about parking a vehicle, access and the maintenance of public amenity. I am also concerned that no work has commenced on the restoration of the hotel considering 18 months of the 3 year restoration time frame has elapsed. I call upon the Heritage Commission, State and local government to enforce these orders and strengthen them as necessary to ensure that the historic building is restored by June 2020.</p>	<p><b>Supported</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
127	Royal George Hotel site	<p>We are East Fremantle Town Council ratepayers and will be affected by the addition of inappropriate buildings. We support the Council's original amendments (Scheme Amendment No 15(Royal George Hotel site) passed by the Council in June 2018) in preference to the Minister's modified amendments.</p> <p>We also reject almost all of the Minister's modifications, both individually – eg overshadowing may seem hard to decide, but if individuals cannot easily provide their own solar power, we say the Minister's allowance is unsatisfactory- and also collectively- on the grounds that a local Council should be allowed to determine development on its own domain, unless there is a serious dysfunction there. This is clearly not the case in East Fremantle Town Council.</p> <p>Finally we point out that over 1400 signatures on the initial petition suggests that this topic is NOT easily solved with minor modifications, without addressing the key topics in that petition of height and bulk.</p>	<p>development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #2</b></p> <p><b>Supported in Part</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #1</b></p>
128	No comment	<p>Owner/occupier and of behalf of the residents.</p> <p>Any developments should be sympathetic to the historical and ambient nature of the area- basically a quiet residential area with pockets of commercial development to service the area.</p> <p>Development to be locked into the 6(?) storeys advocated by the Minister.</p> <p>The Royal George to be renovated sensitively and used as a community amenity.</p> <p>Adequate parking to be implemented.</p> <p>Residents' needs to be considered during building regarding noise and parking.</p>	<p><b>Supported in Part</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #1</b></p>
129	140 Canning Hwy East Fremantle near Stirling Hwy intersection	<p>Owner Occupier living near the Royal George hotel I support the Town of East Fremantle Amendment No.15 (Royal George Hotel) as adopted in June 2018, except for seven storeys instead of six, including the basement level.</p>	<p><b>Supported</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported</p>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
130	140 Canning Hwy East Fremantle near Stirling Hwy intersection	<p>I am concerned that no work has commenced on the restoration of the hotel considering that 18 months of the 3-year restoration time frame has elapsed.</p> <p>I call upon the Heritage Commission, State and local governments to enforce these orders and strengthen them if necessary, to ensure that the Royal George is restored by June 2020.</p> <p>Owner Occupier living near the Royal George hotel.</p> <p>I support the Town of East Fremantle Amendment No.15 (Royal George Hotel) as adopted in June 2018, except for seven storeys instead of six, including the basement level.</p> <p>I am concerned that no work has commenced on the restoration of the hotel considering that 18 months of the 3-year restoration time frame has elapsed.</p> <p>I call upon the Heritage Commission, State and local governments to enforce these orders and strengthen them if necessary, to ensure that the Royal George is restored by June 2020.</p>	<p>subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #2</b></p> <p><b>Supported</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p>
131	55 King Street	<p>As an owner of a property in a street nearby to the development I support the Town of East Fremantle Amendment No.15 (Royal George Hotel) as adopted in June 2018, with the exception of seven storeys instead of six, including the basement level. I am concerned about the height and style of the development would like to see the Heritage Building as the dominant feature and the overall development be in keeping with the Heritage Precinct area.</p>	<p><b>Response #2</b></p> <p><b>Supported</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to</p>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
		<p>I am concerned about increased traffic in the area and request that the council to reconsider the local traffic plans for the Plympton ward considering there are two developments going up in close proximity. Living on King Street we have a lot of through traffic considering Duke Street is a cul-de-sac and Sewell and Hubble Streets are only one way on the northern end. I am concerned about on-street parking as there is currently a shortage of parking due to most properties having limited off street parking and also commercial customers on George Street parking on surrounding Street's daily. I would like to see the Royal George development accommodating all parking on site, as I don't see there is any more room for on street parking in the area.</p> <p>I am concerned that no work has commenced on the restoration of the hotel considering that 18 months of the 3-year restoration time frame has elapsed. I call upon the Heritage Commission, State and local governments to enforce these orders and strengthen them if necessary to ensure that the Royal George is restored by June 2020.</p>	<p>the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #2</b></p>
132	36 Glyde street East Fremantle	<p>Owner occupier</p> <p>I support Amendment No. 15 with the exception of seven storeys instead of six storeys. The developer needs to be held accountable if they don't complete restoration of the Royal George as per their contracted agreement June 2020. The Royal George is a significant heritage and cultural icon of Fremantle and Western Australia and needs to be restored to its former glory, which will benefit the entire community. There is no valid business case from the developer to require building dozens of apartments to offset cost. There is many examples in WA whereby significant heritage buildings have been restored and are viable and profitable.</p>	<p><b>Supported</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #2</b></p>
133	Impact of scheme 15 on 69 King Street East Fremantle	<p>Resident of King Street</p> <p>I do not support the Minister's modifications to Scheme Amendment No.15: The historic Royal George Hotel should retain its position as the dominant feature of the streetscape and any development should not be able to dominate. To this end, development should not be higher than the base of the dome (i.e. the roof line of the hotel) and design should be stipulated to fit the heritage aesthetics of the hotel. Height should be stipulated in metres rather than number of storeys.</p>	<p><b>Supported in Part</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning</p>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
134	53 Sewell Street	<p>Without specifying the total height, or the height of each storey and roof space, the Minister's proposal leaves too much open to interpretation and creates the likelihood that the development would be higher than the base of the dome and probably higher than the spire, thus allowing the development, rather than the historical hotel, to be the dominant feature of the area. Further, the lack of clarity regarding parking obligations within the 7 storeys indicates reduced amenity and traffic problems in a precinct already suffering from parking problems.</p> <p>In effect, I support the council's scheme Amendment 15 as passed in April 2018 with the exception that I would like height restricted to the base of the dome and to be expressed in metres rather than number of storeys.</p> <p>I would also like the Plympton precinct to be registered as a Heritage area and for scheme amendment 15 (and amendment 14) to be assessed in the context of the character and heritage value of the total precinct.</p> <p>I support the Town of East Fremantle Amendment No. 15 (Royal George Hotel) as adopted in June 2018, with the exception of seven storeys instead of six, including the basement level.</p> <p>I am concerned that no work has commenced on the restoration of the hotel given that we are now 18 months into the 3 year restoration time frame.</p> <p>I call upon the Heritage Commission, State and local governments to enforce these orders and strengthen them if necessary to ensure that the Royal George is restored by June 2020.</p>	<p>requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #1</b></p> <p><b>Supported</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019.</p> <p>WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #2</b></p> <p><b>Supported</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019.</p> <p>WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the</p>
135	83 Sewell Street cnr Sewell and George Streets	<p>Parents owner /occupiers, born and bred in Plympton Ward</p> <p>I support the town of East Fremantle Amendment No. 15 except I prefer the seven storey modification including the basement.</p> <p>I would like to see the heritage restoration proceed post haste and I am concerned that nothing has happened in the last 18 months of a three year restoration period.</p> <p>State and local government authorities should be enforcing the requirement to commence heritage works.</p>	<p><b>Response #2</b></p> <p><b>Supported</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019.</p> <p>WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the</p>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
136	83 Sewell Street - cnr Sewell and George Streets	<p>Owner occupier long term resident Plympton precinct</p> <p>I support the Town of East Fremantle's Amendment No15 adopted in June 2018 and reluctantly accept seven storeys instead of six including the basement level.</p> <p>I am would have expected restoration work to have commenced on the hotel by now as a significant portion of the 3 year restoration period has now passed by, while the building remains dilapidated and ever more vulnerable..</p> <p>I ask that State and local government entities press this case for developers to proceed so that the building is restored by June 2020.</p>	<p>content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #2</b></p> <p><b>Supported</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p>
137	40 May Street EAST FREMANTLE	<p>Private Citizen, resident in the area</p> <p>We will see this every day</p> <p>I support the Town of East Fremantle Amendment No.15 (Royal George Hotel) as adopted in June 2018, with the exception of seven storeys instead of six, including the basement level to a maximum height of 36.0 m AHD, regardless of the number of storeys.</p> <p>I am concerned that no work has commenced on the restoration of the hotel considering that 18 months of the 3 year restoration time frame has elapsed.</p> <p>I call upon the Heritage Commission, State and local governments to enforce these orders and strengthen them if necessary to ensure that the Royal George is restored by June 2020.</p>	<p><b>Response #2</b></p> <p><b>Supported</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building</p>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
138	46 King St, East Fremantle cnr George and King Streets	<p>Occupier</p> <p>I DO support the Town of East Fremantle Council Amendment No. 15 - Royal George Hotel Site (April 2018).</p> <p>I DO NOT support the Minister's proposed modifications.</p> <p>Please reassess the modifications to give clear direction that will be binding in court! There are too many loop holes of height, setbacks, traffic management and most importantly, nothing to stand up for the Heritage.</p> <p>We want to see specific heights and setbacks nominated - to be in context with existing site and building.</p> <p>We want to see that the traffic management and parking issues are considered and resolved before the design is signed off.</p> <p>We want absolute guarantees that the Royal George will be restored properly and in good time as per the agreement as when it was sold.</p> <p>We have to live with whatever is built, please make sure it is in keeping with our precious and historic neighbourhood.</p>	<p>height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #2</b></p> <p><b>Supported in Part</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #1</b></p>
139	46 King St, Cnr King and George St	<p>Occupier</p> <p>I DO support the Town of East Fremantle Council Amendment No. 15 (April 2018).</p> <p>I DO NOT support the Minister's proposed modifications for the following reasons:</p> <p>We have to live here. We do not want to be towered over or struggle to park our cars.</p> <p>We want the heritage of our area to be preserved.</p>	<p>Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #1</b></p>
140	85 Duke Street	<p>Owner occupier living on the same street as the Hotel and the proposed development.</p>	<p><b>Supported in Part</b></p>



No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
	EAST FREMANTLE	<p>I do not support the Minister's modifications to Scheme Amendment No. 15 because those modifications would allow a development behind the hotel that would be much too bulky and potentially be higher than its spire. This would totally dominate the hotel and ruin its landmark and heritage status. Any increased density will impact negatively on this unique, historic neighbourhood, in particular with regards to traffic and parking, which are already strained.</p> <p>At the point of sale to Saracen Properties, the developer's proposal for the site apparently "complied with the conservation plan for the site" (Sue Ellery, Hansard, 21 November 2018). The Conservation Plan's policies state:</p> <p>Policy 19</p> <p>The Hotel is the most prominent building in the Plympton Precinct and should be conserved and maintained in a manner befitting its prominence and its heritage significance.</p> <p>Policy 20</p> <p>The Hotel should be promoted as a landmark structure, when viewed from outside the Plympton Precinct, which marks the heart of the precinct, the high ground location of the former neighbourhood focus, and provides its signature identity.</p> <p>I do not support any development behind the hotel that does not comply with the Conservation Plan for the site.</p> <p>I urge the Government to enforce the terms of the Heritage Agreement that Saracen signed in relation to the restoration of the hotel - none of restoration works identified as URGENT have been done in the nearly two years since the hotel was bought and the building is graffitied and deteriorating every day.</p> <p>I support the Scheme Amendment No. 15 (Royal George Hotel) that was passed by the Council in June 2018 insofar as it imposes height limits and setback requirements on the development.</p>	<p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019.</p> <p>WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #1</b></p>
141	80 King Street, East Fremantle 6158.	<p>We are the owner occupier of a property</p> <p>Nearest Street intersection is George St East Fremantle.</p> <p>WE want 6 storeys not 7 storeys to be constructed at the Royal George site. This includes basement level.</p> <p>WE reject the 7 storey proposal because the area has a historical significance to Western Australia .The 7 storeys would be aesthetically unappealing and detrimental because it would be higher and overshadow the Royal George Hotel. We are in support of the Town of East Fremantle Amendment No 15 (Royal George Hotel) but without the 7 storey development, including basement. The Royal George Hotel has major historical significance and needs to look good in keeping with the rest of the other historical buildings and historical architecture.</p>	<p><b>Supported in Part Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019.</p> <p>WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #1</b></p>
142	34 May Street, East Fremantle George street and May street	<p>Owner occupier living near the Royal George Hotel that is visible from the front of the house and street.</p> <p>I support the Town of East Fremantle Amendment No. 15 as adopted in June 2018, of the maximum height of and setback.</p> <p>Concerns of the ministerial changes:</p>	<p><b>Supported in Part Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the</p>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
		<p>I have concerns, that there has been lack of work on the Royal George to date, to the that has been done half way through the time allocated for the restoration of the George Hotel.</p> <p>I would hope the Heritage Commission that sold the Royal George Hotel site with the clause that the Hotel was restored before any great building was finished, and I call Heritage Commission and State and local government to ensure the Royal George Hotel is restored by or before June 2020.</p> <p>I am also concerned of the disregard for historical area, that the apartments will dwarf the Hotel and a clearly meant to be a focal point for the developers/organisation not the community.</p> <p>Scar on the landscape. Disconnected and Incongruous to the area and community.</p> <p>A small block for a building of ??? number storeys. Out of proportion and over the TOEF planning scheme specifications. Will this open up the opportunity for further high rise developments of pocket handkerchief pieces of land?</p> <p>The impact on local infrastructure. Roads, parks (Green parks as opposed to car parks) amenities. Very few green spaces in area. Why not create a wonderful park on the site instead.</p> <p>With at least 80 cars allocated to the apartments, not including the employees and patrons, there will be a considerable impact on local roads. May Street and Council Place severely impacted,</p> <p>George Street is unable to accommodate such increase in traffic. Difficult to get from Canning Hwy.</p> <p>Visual pollution! The scale of the development is out of scale with the streetscape/size of the plot and local area. Wonderful 'western' view of Royal George Hotel as seen from Marmion Street, local streets and Canning Hwy, will be dwarfed by car stacker and apartments. Disrespectful to the restoration of the Royal George Hotel.</p> <p>Noise: impact from traffic/ truck noise reverberation from Stirling highway bouncing off the car stacker and apartments, then projected, amplified to the East. Currently the noise from the Hwy is excessive. No provision for retrospective fitting of noise barriers.</p> <p>What is the impact of the wind on local residents from the 19 story apartment building? Will it create a wind tunnel effect or increase in turbulence? What modelling have you done?</p> <p>COMMENTS</p> <p>Suggested improvements... No apartments. Leave this alone. Why spoil something unique. Make the Royal George Hotel the focal point. Not the apartments. Design something unique by creating something that other places do not have. Tourists come to visit something different. Not the lookalikes of other big cities.</p> <p>Residents of East Fremantle deserves to be heard, and to give respect our forefathers and our heritage. We do not need a high rise building apartment which is exclusive for a few at this site.</p> <p>We do not need to be another Gold Coast, or inner city Perth.</p> <p>Last but not least I sincerely hope the Minister would listen to the public a little more after all the Minister has been put in for us all to do a good and fair job for us all.</p> <p>A question who dictate to suburban density for all area, and what is the reason for high density build in older towns?</p>	<p>Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019.</p> <p>WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #1</b></p>
143	34 May Street East Fremantle. Intersections George/May Street and St Peters Road /May Streets	<p>I am a resident/owner occupier of 34 May Street East Fremantle and will be significantly affected as a local resident with parking, traffic noise.</p> <p>I support the Town of East Fremantle Amendment No.15 as adopted in June 2018, of the maximum height of and setback.</p> <p>Concerns of the ministerial changes:</p>	<p><b>Supported in Part</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to</p>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
		<p>I have concerns, that there has been lack of work on the Royal George to date, with no work being commenced on the restoration of the hotel considering it is half way through the time allocated for the restoration of the George Hotel. i.e. 18 months of the 3 year time frame for restoration.</p> <p>The Heritage Commission sold the Royal George Hotel site with the clause, that the Hotel was to be restored before any great building development was finished. Therefore I call upon the Heritage Commission and State and local governments to enforce these orders and strengthen them if needed to ensure the Royal George Hotel is restored by or before June 2020.</p> <p>Development concerns:</p> <p>I am also concerned the disregard for historical area, that the apartments dwarf the Hotel and a clearly meant to be a focal point for the developers/organisation not the community.</p> <p>The high rise development will be a Scar on the landscape, disconnected and incongruous to the area and community.</p> <p>A small block for a building of ??? number storeys is clearly out of proportion and over the ToEF planning scheme specifications. The developer's proposed high rise storey building is not in line with the Town of East Fremantle's planning scheme. There is the potential to open up the opportunity for further high rise developments on pocket handkerchief pieces of land</p> <p>The impact on local infrastructure. Roads, parks (Green parks as opposed to car parks) amenities.</p> <p>With at least 80 cars allocated to the apartments, not including the employees and patrons, there will be a considerable impact on local roads. May Street and Council Place severely impacted,</p> <p>George Street is unable to accommodate such increase in traffic. The site is difficult to get to from Canning Hwy, Stirling Highway and Marmion Streets.</p> <p>Visual pollution! The scale of the development is out of scale with the streetscape/size of the plot and local area. Wonderful 'western' view of Royal George Hotel as seen from Marmion Street, local streets and Canning Hwy, will be dwarfed by car stacker and apartments. Disrespectful to the restoration of the Royal George Hotel.</p> <p>Noise: impact from traffic/ truck noise reverberation from Stirling highway bouncing off the car stacker and apartments, then projected, amplified to the East. Currently the noise from the Hwy is excessive. No provision for retrospective fitting of noise barriers.</p> <p>COMMENTS</p> <p>The Royal George Hotel is the 'jewel in the crown' of the Town of East Fremantle and should be the preserved of its significant historical value. The focal point should not be the apartments. Design something unique by creating something that other places do not have. Tourists come to visit something different. Not the lookalikes of other big cities.</p> <p>Residents of East Fremantle deserve to be heard, and to give respect our forefathers and our heritage. We do not need a high rise building apartment which is exclusive for a few.</p> <p>Last but not least I call upon the Minister to listen to the public a little more, after all the minister is meant to act and represent the community for the better good.</p>	<p>the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #1</b></p>
144	Every street in East Fremantle near the Royal George	<p>Owner occupier</p> <p>My lifestyle and amenity will be affected if buildings are allowed to exceed 7 storeys due to higher density of people, traffic and visual blocks due to the shape, size and overlooking issues higher buildings present</p> <p>I don't understand the information in the summary sheet I received in the regular Australia post mail.</p>	<p><b>Supported in Part</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to</p>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
		<p>The 3rd paragraph states, "the modifications most notably impact building height. In summary, the modifications State that a building height is not to exceed 7 storeys. However, a capped maximum building height is not specified. It is therefore not possible to control or establish the exact height of a building in relation to the Hotel under the modified development standards."</p> <p>This paragraph is contrary to the content in "5.9.9.1 Building Height" of the "Council's Amendment No. 15 (endorsed by Council 6 June 2018)"</p> <p>"5.9.9.1 Building Height" states the "The overall maximum building height of development is not to exceed 36.0m Australian Height Datum (AHD) level"</p> <p>So from what I understand, currently building heights are limited at 7 storeys but an actual height limit in metres is not law. 36.0m metres is far too high and the "maximum height of 3.5 metres per floor measured floor to floor" will govern the maximum height anyway.</p> <p>"5.9.9.1 Building Height (i)" states the Ground floor to first floor height shall be a minimum of 3.2 metres and a maximum of 4.0 metres measured floor to floor, with a minimum floor to ceiling clearance of 3.0 metres. All other floors shall be a maximum height of 3.5 metres per floor measured floor to floor;</p> <p>If so, then the developer should not be able to build higher than 25 metres.</p> <p>The calculation is easily carried out ground floor max height = 4 metres All other floors max height = 3.5 metres (3.5 x 6) 25 metres = (3.5 x 6) + 4</p> <p>Therefore, a calculated maximum height will be enforceable at 25 metres due to the maximum height per floor of the "ground floor" and "all other floors"</p> <p>Is that correct? If not, then a maximum of 25 metres should be stipulated, not 36.0 metres. I have no idea how 36.0m is been drawn from. Please explain.</p>	<p>the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #1</b></p>
145	66a Allen Street East Fremantle - nearest intersection Marmion street	<p>An owner occupier and ratepayer of East Fremantle. I support the Council's original amendments (Scheme Amendment No. 15 [Royal George Hotel], passed by the Council in June 2018. From Allen Street we have a clear view of the Royal George and the proposal for extensive high will spoil the landscape and look completely out of place.</p>	<p><b>Supported in Part</b> <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
146	Royal George Hotel, Cnr. Duke and George Streets, East Fremantle	<p>I am a private citizen, living nearby and visit the Plympton precinct for shopping and to visit family living in close proximity to the proposed development.</p> <p>I do not support the Minister's modifications to Scheme Amendment No. 15 because those modifications would allow a development behind the hotel that would be much too bulky and potentially be higher than its cupola. This would totally dominate the hotel and ruin its landmark and heritage status. Any increased density will impact negatively on this unique, historic neighbourhood, especially with regard to traffic and parking, already grossly strained.</p> <p>I urge the Government to enforce the terms of the Heritage Agreement that Saracen signed in relation to the restoration of the hotel - NONE of the restoration works identified as urgent have been done in the nearly two years since the hotel was bought and the building is graffitied and seriously deteriorating every day.</p> <p>I do support the Scheme Amendment No. 15 (Royal George Hotel) that was passed by the Council in June 2018 insofar as it imposes height limits and setback requirements on this development.</p>	<p><b>Response #1</b></p> <p><b>Supported in Part</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019.</p> <p>WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #1</b></p>
147	East Freo	<p>I support the Town of East Fremantle Amendment No.15 (Royal George Hotel) as adopted in June 2018, with the exception of seven storeys instead of six, including the basement level.</p> <p>The maximum height of every storey i.e. 3.5 metres must be defined rather than merely stated as number of storeys.</p> <p>The rooftop features should not exceed the overall height limit.</p> <p>I am concerned that no work has commenced on the restoration of the hotel considering that 18 months of the 3 year restoration time frame has elapsed.</p> <p>I call upon the Heritage Commission, State and local governments to enforce these orders and strengthen them if necessary to ensure that the Royal George is restored by June 2020.</p> <p>The sale of the building to the developer is unseemly if not illegal.</p> <p>Again this construction project seems like 'develop with no conscience' nor consideration to neighboring community, streetscape, scale of building, aesthetics nor heritage.</p> <p>This is a building which locals and passersby hold dear to our hearts and I note that the Guildford, National and Maylands Hotels have each been restored to uphold the heritage values while simultaneously catering to modern living needs.</p> <p>I believe that the Royal George Hotel has a unique underground access to the raceway and that restoration of this is required maintain this feature as well as maintain other aesthetic heritage aspects.</p> <p>I am deeply concerned about the glut of concrete towers and bulky buildings that wear a heavy carbon footprint.</p> <p>The long construction phase is wearisome, noisy, and disturbing for locals who spend daylight hours nearby. Parking and traffic infrastructure are severely hindered in both construction and completion.</p> <p>The resultant bulk and height of a building dampens any moon and sunrise for western folk and sunset and moonsets for eastern dwellers. Over shadowing is also a climatic and psychological concern.</p>	<p><b>Response #1</b></p> <p><b>Supported in Part</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019.</p> <p>WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #1</b></p>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
148	Impact of Scheme Amendment 15 upon 69 King Street East Fremantle.	<p>The heritage Plympton area is congested already and is not suited to bulk nor high buildings. Streetscape, noise reduction, scale and aesthetics are vital and the Town of East Fremantle Amendment 15 seems to appreciate this importance. Thankyou.</p> <p>I am owner and occupier, with family, of 69 King Street East Fremantle in the Plympton precinct.</p> <p>Regarding Scheme Amendment 15.</p> <p>I appreciate the Minister's intention to reach a compromise but cannot support the modifications to Scheme Amendment No. 15:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The historic Royal George Hotel should retain its position as the dominant feature of the streetscape. Without specifying the total height, or the height of each storey and roof space, the Minister's proposal leaves too much open to interpretation and creates the likelihood that the development would be higher than the base of the dome and probably higher than the spire, thus allowing the development, rather than the historical hotel, to be the dominant feature of the area.</li> <li>2. The lack of clarity regarding parking obligations within the 7 storeys indicates reduced amenity and traffic problems in a precinct already suffering from parking problems.</li> <li>3. The proposal does not fully take heritage considerations into account and would reduce the dominance of the Royal George in the streetscape and would destroy the historically significant stable doors at the rear.</li> </ol> <p>To this end, I maintain that no added construction at all should be permitted adjacent to the Royal George Hotel, and that the Minister for heritage be involved in, and take responsibility for, this decision. I would like the Plympton precinct to be registered as a Heritage area and for scheme amendment 15 (and amendment 14) to be assessed in the context of the character and heritage value of the total precinct.</p> <p>Poor infill that is not integrated with the character of the area and which negatively impacts upon local amenity in respect of parking, traffic and school placements will damage support for infill in other areas such as the Leeuwin Barracks. I add that it is unacceptable that the demand for urban infill in East Fremantle is being disproportionately borne by the area that already has the highest housing density and consider it inconsistent that private home owners are expected to bear the costs of their own heritage renovations while developers are given substantial financial concession.</p>	<p><b>Supported in Part</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #1</b></p>
149	47 Duke Street East Fremantle (nearest intersection; George St).	<p>As owners of 47 Duke Street we are near neighbours of the property. The development will lead to a loss of amenity, both during the short term of the building phase and in the longer term after completion. The development may adversely affect our property's value.</p> <p>We support the Town of East Fremantle's 2018 Amendment to its Planning Scheme. The amendment reached a fair and reasonable outcome as to the best development of a unique site, and drew on Council's knowledge of the area and the people who live in it.</p> <p>The Minister's proposed amendment does not provide certainty about the absolute height of the development and its relationship to the Royal George Hotel, it only specifies the maximum number of storeys. The Town's proposal specifies a maximum height of 36 metres.</p> <p>The Minister's amendment does not stipulate that the developer needs to either start – or finish – the restoration of the Royal George Hotel before commencing work on the new section on the northern part of the site.</p> <p>The restoration of the Hotel has been marketed by the developer as being its contribution to the East Fremantle community. Furthermore they have leveraged the physical scale of the new development off the cost of the restoration. To not stipulate the developer starts work on the Hotel first undermines the whole pitch they have made to the community.</p>	<p><b>Supported in Part</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks,</p>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
150	83 Duke Street. Intersection of Duke and George Streets	<p>The developers purchased the Hotel far below market value so that they would be able to spend the required funds to restore it. Yet they now claim that to fund the restoration they also need to reach a certain level of density for the new development. In effect, they want it both ways: buy cheap, then build big, using the same rationale for both.</p> <p>The Minister's Amendment doesn't offer the same certainty of outcomes as that provided in the Town's Amendment – which specifies measurable outcomes for the community.</p> <p>Any increase in the physical scale of the new development will put further stress on the local infrastructure and amenities. The site is wedged between a busy highway to the east and a small, dead end street to the West (Duke Street). There is limited access for construction vehicles and the increased resident and visitor traffic will increase demand for parking which is already at or near its limit at peak times.</p> <p>We are not against development per se and support the renovation of the Hotel (though it's not a huge priority for us personally as it's laid dormant or a decade or more already). But we do believe that development needs to be set to a scale which doesn't affect, or destroy, the character of the suburb – architecturally, socially, and visually. The Town's amendment caps the development at the maximum impact that can be made without an adverse effect on our town.</p> <p>As an owner occupier in Duke Street I will be impacted by increased traffic, parking problems, and the loss of heritage property value - all of which will impact by current life and the value of my property</p> <p>The Plympton area of East Fremantle is made of small lots, and as such the density is already quite high. As a consequence, parking and traffic are already difficult - especially as many residences have very little or no off street parking.</p> <p>The Brush Factory development on the corner of Duke and George Streets is already having a significant impact on access to parking, and even safe entry into the street. On more than one occasion already, I have not been able to get into my street because of congestion.</p> <p>The Royal George Hotel does need to be redeveloped, but not at the cost of quality of life for the people already living in the area.</p> <p>I fully support the Amendment put forward by the Town of East Fremantle. I believe it to be considered and fair, and to take in the interests of all parties.</p>	<p>residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #1</b></p>
151	68 Glyde St East Fremantle	<p>Resident in the East Fremantle area.</p> <p>I support Council Amendment No. 15 (endorsed Council meeting 6 June 2018) and oppose the Minister's modifications to the scheme.</p> <p>I oppose the lack of overall building height for the Royal George residential development.</p> <p>I also strongly oppose:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* the deletion of provisions for parking, noting the existing congestion in the George St Precinct;</li> <li>* the deletion of provisions for noise management in view of the location of the development beside a major road;</li> <li>* the deletion of requirements for the decision maker to consult on heritage matters.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Supported in Part</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019.</p> <p>WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #1</b></p>
151	68 Glyde St East Fremantle	<p>Resident in the East Fremantle area.</p> <p>I support Council Amendment No. 15 (endorsed Council meeting 6 June 2018) and oppose the Minister's modifications to the scheme.</p> <p>I oppose the lack of overall building height for the Royal George residential development.</p> <p>I also strongly oppose:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* the deletion of provisions for parking, noting the existing congestion in the George St Precinct;</li> <li>* the deletion of provisions for noise management in view of the location of the development beside a major road;</li> <li>* the deletion of requirements for the decision maker to consult on heritage matters.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Supported in Part</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019.</p> <p>WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which</p>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
152	92 King Street, East Fremantle, 6158	<p>Owner occupier of property and as a private citizen</p> <p>As a nearby owner occupier I object to the Minister's modifications and deletions in the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Access - as the details of access is unknown and no longer limited to Duke St or to be approved by Council</li> <li>* Variations to site and development standards - building height limit and fixed setbacks are required to ensure the building design and construction is suitable for the location - aesthetically for the area and with regard to traffic flow</li> <li>* Heritage provisions - the Council have represented my interests in expressing what was endorsed on June 6, 2018. For the valid, reasonable and thoughtful reasons this was endorsed, it should also remain.</li> <li>* Residential development - the Council have represented my interests in expressing what was endorsed on June 6, 2018. For the valid, reasonable and thoughtful reasons this was endorsed, it should also remain.</li> <li>* Conservation management strategy - the Council have represented my interests in expressing what was endorsed on June 6, 2018. For the valid, reasonable and thoughtful reasons this was endorsed, it should also remain.</li> <li>* Vehicle parking - needs to be on site as there is no surplus street parking street parking</li> </ul>	<p>address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #1</b></p> <p><b>Supported in Part</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #1</b></p>
153	45 Bedford Street East Fremantle	<p>Both as a private citizen and as an owner occupier of property.</p> <p>I write to express concern that the amendment as passed is far too restrictive to allow for architectural excellence given as I understand its plot ratio of 2?</p> <p>The renders of the block like 6 storey structure show what an ugly form will result</p> <p>The site deserves an elegant modern structure to complement the hotel</p> <p>Some concession to additional height must be part of the fine tuning of the amendment</p> <p>The best architectural design solution is essential as it will long out live the current objections</p> <p>We need excellence of design outcome to be a significant determinant and the job of restoration needs to begin ASAP. The neglect has been a shame on our community</p>	<p><b>Not Supported</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) not supported. The WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider further modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which would result, if endorsed, to changes to the Amendment that would not align with the matters raised in the submission.</p> <p><b>Response #3</b></p> <p><b>Supported in Part</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the</p>
154	42 King Street EAST FREMANTLE nearest intersection George Street	<p>Owner of property.</p> <p>I agree with Council Amendment No 15 (endorsed Council meeting 6<sup>th</sup> June 2018) except that the overall building height cannot be exceeded 36.0m AHD- 6 storeys including basement. I agree each storey should have specific heights measured in metres and the height of a storey is defined as in metres ie 3.5m I agree with the building setbacks.</p>	<p><b>Supported in Part</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the</p>



No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
155	74 Duke Street- Lot 498 (Duke and George)	<p>IT is appropriate that the development is no higher than the dome in the front of the Royal George Hotel. This development is directly behind our house. A building higher than 6 storeys will seriously impact and detract on the heritage value of the area. The shadows that will cover the surrounding houses is a major concern and will impact on our quality of life. Our house will be shadowed significantly. The traffic congestion related to this development is concerning. King Street is already very busy with too much traffic. The heritage value of this part of East Fremantle needs to be recognised, respected, valued and preserved.</p> <p>Owner- absence of privacy, increased congestion, reduced amenity. I fully support East Fremantle Town Council's proposed modification to Scheme Amendment No 15 as adopted in June 2018. I have strong concerns that the alternative proposal for 7 storeys does not adequately define height, in terms of metres, in relation to the Royal George Hotel.</p>	<p>Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #1</b></p> <p><b>Supported in Part</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #1</b></p>
156	32 Silas Street East Fremantle	<p>Owner occupier.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of parking which we are already struggling.</li> <li>• Traffic cars speeding down Silas Street and up Silas Street.</li> <li>• Ugly.</li> <li>• Noise control.</li> <li>• Safety to residents.</li> <li>• High rise in our neighbourhood is not acceptable.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Supported in Part</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission,</p>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
157	No comment	<p>Private citizen with no immediate proximity to site but have broad community interest. The Royal George Hotel is an iconic East Fremantle site and I welcome the long awaited restoration. I consider the plans for adjoining residential development must be sympathetic with the overall character of the building and recognise it is located in a quiet suburban street. I therefore support the Council endorsed Amendment of 6 June 2018 including the maximum height of 36m- 6 storeys including basement.</p>	<p>including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.  <b>Response #1</b></p> <p><b>Supported in Part</b>  <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.  <b>Response #1</b></p>
158	No comment	<p>Private citizen/owner of property and long-time East Fremantle resident. The Royal George Hotel is an iconic, significant and important historical building in East Fremantle and in particular of the charming George Street precinct. It is important that the heritage provisions as outlined by the East Fremantle Town Council for this building, this site and the area as a whole be preserved too and not sacrificed for monetary gain by the developers. It is shameful that the Royal George has been allowed to fall into such disrepair over the last decade. A capped building height should be specified- not just saying it should not exceed 7 storeys. The developers may be able to get around this by building apartments with mezzanine floors etc. so increasing the overall height of the buildings. 6 storeys, including basement parking is tall enough and should be capped also to enable a more sympathetic approach plan to the construction of the building in keeping with the character of the area and more specifically to the Royal George Hotel itself. Setbacks too should follow suit. We need to preserve our historical buildings and areas not just for ourselves but for future generations- ie long term gain- overall ambience, health and happiness. NO QUICK UGLY FIXES!</p>	<p><b>Supported in Part</b>  <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
159	2 Angwin Street EAST FREMANTLE	As a lifetime resident I object to buildings that are not similar in height and appearance to those existing. I contend that the Council's Amendment No 15 (endorsed by Council June 2018) should be maintained. In particular section 5.9.1 building height should be maintained.	<p><b>Response #1</b></p> <p><b>Supported in Part</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #1</b></p>
160	No comment	I support the Council's restrictions on this development and any impacts on the fragile local infrastructure and amenity and historic significance. The design of this building would have to accommodate these factors without trade-offs against height and plot ratio.	<p><b>Supported in Part</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #1</b></p>
161	Hubble/George Streets	Do not want high rise buildings in the area, parking problems etc I support the Town of East Fremantle Scheme Amendment No 15 as adopted in June 2018. I am concerned that no work has commenced on the restoration of the hotel, considering that 18 months of the 3 year restoration timeframe has elapsed.	<p><b>Supported in Part</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to</p>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
		<p>I call upon the Heritage Council, State and local governments to enforce these orders and strengthen them if necessary to ensure that the Royal George is restored by June 2020.</p>	<p>the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation. <b>Response #1</b></p>
162	<p>No comment</p>	<p>I support the Town of East Fremantle Scheme Amendment No 15 as adopted in June 2018. I am concerned that no work has commenced on the restoration of the hotel, considering that 18 months of the 3 year restoration timeframe has elapsed. I call upon the Heritage council, State and local governments to enforce these orders and strengthen them if necessary to ensure that the Royal George is restored by June 2020.</p>	<p><b>Supported in Part</b> <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation. <b>Response #1</b></p>
163	<p>No comment</p>	<p>Owner occupier. I support the Town of East Fremantle Scheme Amendment No 15 as adopted in June 2018. I am concerned that no work has commenced on the restoration of the hotel, considering that 18 months of the 3 year restoration timeframe has elapsed. I call upon the Heritage council, State and local governments to enforce these orders and strengthen them if necessary to ensure that the Royal George is restored by June 2020.</p>	<p><b>Supported in Part</b> <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum</p>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
164	No comment	<p>Private citizen and East Fremantle resident and rate payer.</p> <p>(1) Heritage provisions should be retained as sought by residents of East Fremantle and Council. The owner/developer was very aware this was the condition at time of purchase- there should be a restriction of height- not only number of storeys to ensure compatibility with existing built environment of which much is single storey of a heritage type.</p> <p>(2) The Royal George Hotel site needs attention and it has been a prolonged process. With the Royal George Hotel – there is only a one off chance to develop and restore compatible with the flavour of current and future East Fremantle- so it's crucial the amendments don't dilute the design into an incompatible and cringe worthy building.</p>	<p>capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #1</b></p> <p><b>Supported in Part</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #1</b></p>
165	No comment	<p>As an owner of my home and regular user of George Street. I basically support the proposed modifications to Scheme Amendment No 15. The modifications are in keeping with the Town of East Fremantle's policy on the maximum height of new buildings in the Town- namely 7 storeys.</p> <p>The Royal George is an iconic building and any new building must be in keeping with the history and heritage of the area. Nothing should impinge on the roofline and cupola of the building see point (iv) no. 5.9.7.5; 5.9.7.6</p> <p>I endorse the importance of measuring the 7 storeys proposed from the lowest point on the site at (Lot 3030 no 5.9.7.5). It is hard to comment without seeing a design proposal.</p>	<p>of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #1</b></p>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
166	No comment	<p>I support the Town of East Fremantle Scheme Amendment No 15 as adopted in June 2018, with the exception of seven storeys instead of six, including the basement level.</p> <p>I am concerned that no work has commenced on the restoration of the hotel, considering that 18 months of the 3 year restoration timeframe has elapsed.</p> <p>I call upon the Heritage Council, State and local governments to enforce these orders and strengthen them if necessary to ensure that the Royal George is restored by June 2020.</p>	<p><b>Supported</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019.</p> <p>WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #2</b></p>
167	No comment	<p>New juxtaposed with the old- it will not fit in.</p> <p>I support the Town of East Fremantle Scheme Amendment No 15 as adopted in June 2018, with the exception of seven storeys instead of six, including the basement level.</p> <p>I am concerned that no work has commenced on the restoration of the hotel, considering that 18 months of the 3 year restoration timeframe has elapsed.</p> <p>I call upon the Heritage Council, State and local governments to enforce these orders and strengthen them if necessary to ensure that the Royal George is restored by June 2020.</p>	<p><b>Supported</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019.</p> <p>WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #2</b></p>
168	No comment	<p>I support the Town of East Fremantle Scheme Amendment No 15 as adopted in June 2018, with the exception of seven storeys instead of six, including the basement level.</p>	<p><b>Supported</b></p>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
		<p>I am concerned that no work has commenced on the restoration of the hotel, considering that 18 months of the 3 year restoration timeframe has elapsed.                      I call upon the Heritage Council, State and local governments to enforce these orders and strengthen them if necessary to ensure that the Royal George is restored by June 2020.</p>	<p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #2</b></p>
169	<p>The negative impact on surrounding homes is vast.</p>	<p>I support the Town of East Fremantle Scheme Amendment No 15 as adopted in June 2018, with the exception of seven storeys instead of six, including the basement level.                      I am concerned that no work has commenced on the restoration of the hotel, considering that 18 months of the 3 year restoration timeframe has elapsed.                      I call upon the Heritage Council, State and local governments to enforce these orders and strengthen them if necessary to ensure that the Royal George is restored by June 2020.</p>	<p><b>Supported Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #2</b></p>
170	<p>No comment</p>	<p>I support the Town of East Fremantle Scheme Amendment No 15 as adopted in June 2018, with the exception of seven storeys instead of six, including the basement level.</p>	<p><b>Supported Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported</p>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
		<p>I am concerned that no work has commenced on the restoration of the hotel, considering that 18 months of the 3 year restoration timeframe has elapsed.                      I call upon the Heritage Council, State and local governments to enforce these orders and strengthen them if necessary to ensure that the Royal George is restored by June 2020.</p>	<p>subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #2</b></p>
171	<p>No comment</p>	<p>I support the Town of East Fremantle Scheme Amendment No 15 as adopted in June 2018, with the exception of seven storeys instead of six, including the basement level.                      I am concerned that no work has commenced on the restoration of the hotel, considering that 18 months of the 3 year restoration timeframe has elapsed.                      I call upon the Heritage Council, State and local governments to enforce these orders and strengthen them if necessary to ensure that the Royal George is restored by June 2020.</p>	<p><b>Supported</b>  <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #2</b></p>
172	<p>No comment</p>	<p>Private resident.                      I support the Town of East Fremantle Scheme Amendment No 15 as adopted in June 2018, with the exception of seven storeys instead of six, including the basement level.                      I am concerned that no work has commenced on the restoration of the hotel, considering that 18 months of the 3 year restoration timeframe has elapsed.</p>	<p><b>Supported</b>  <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to</p>



No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
		<p>I call upon the Heritage Council, State and local governments to enforce these orders and strengthen them if necessary to ensure that the Royal George is restored by June 2020.</p>	<p>the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation. <b>Response #2</b></p>
173	<p>No comment</p> <p>Citizen and resident. I support the Town of East Fremantle Scheme Amendment No 15 as adopted in June 2018, with the exception of seven storeys instead of six, including the basement level. I am concerned that no work has commenced on the restoration of the hotel, considering that 18 months of the 3 year restoration timeframe has elapsed. I call upon the Heritage Council, State and local governments to enforce these orders and strengthen them if necessary to ensure that the Royal George is restored by June 2020. Keeping to the integrity of the area, without causing noise, shadow and traffic pollution. Think of European historic cities. No high rise.</p>	<p><b>Supported</b> <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation. <b>Response #2</b></p>	<p><b>Supported in Part</b> <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning</p>
174	<p>My interest is for the good of East Fremantle and caring West Australians</p>	<p>Private citizen overwhelmed by the drastic vandalism to the George &amp; surrounds Simple and to the point. Magnificent heritage hotel. Wondrous site. I understand that to renovate and maintain the George Hotel there is a form of 'blackmail' by the developers. ie Cop this or no historic pub. Please keep control over this hugely strategic area.</p>	<p><b>Supported in Part</b> <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning</p>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
		High on the hill for all to see. if it's bad we have an eyesore forever.	requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation. <b>Response #1</b>
175	George Street, East Fremantle	Regular visitor to George Street precinct. Have friends living in the area. I DO NOT support the Minister's modifications to Scheme Amendment No. 15 because those modifications have removed many of the original Amendment's restrictions on this site and would allow a building that would be too bulky and too tall for this location. Any increased density will impact negatively on this unique, historic neighbourhood, in particular with regards to traffic and parking. I support the Scheme Amendment No. 15 (Royal George Hotel) that was passed by the Council in June 2018. I support the height limits, setbacks and other restrictions stipulated in this original version of the amendment.	<b>Supported in Part</b> <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation. <b>Response #1</b>
176	22 Bay Patch Street EAST FREMANTLE	As a private citizen. I support the Amendment put forward by the Town of East Fremantle in the summary of modifications. The development and renovation of the Royal George needs to progress as soon as possible. I ride my bike past the site on a daily basis. And I have seen the Hotel slowly falling into disrepair. The Hotel has been vacant for too long. This development will significantly improve the atmosphere and popularity of George Street. The Town will gain additional rate payers and that is good for all rate payers. Please get this development underway.	<b>Supported in Part</b> <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks,

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
177	11 Angwin Street, East Fremantle	<p>Owner Occupier corner of Canning Highway and Stirling Highway</p> <p>I support the Town's Amendment 15 passed in June 2018 with appropriate height controls limiting the total building height to the top of the dome.</p>	<p>residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #1</b></p> <p><b>Supported in Part</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #1</b></p>
178	34 Duke Street, East Fremantle (Royal George Hotel site)	<p>On behalf of our wholly owned company, 34 Duke Street Pty Ltd, Saracen Properties (Saracen) wish to make a submission to the Town of East Fremantle (Town) in respect of the abovementioned Scheme Amendment which has been modified and re-advertised as a result of a direction by the Minister for Transport and Planning in late 2018.</p> <p><b>As the sole landowner impacted by this amendment, Saracen remains significantly concerned that the modified Scheme provisions, if approved, will result in unintended consequences for the future development of this important site. In their current form, the provisions do not deliver a feasible development, nor do the plot ratio and height requirements even correspond with each other to achieve a development consistent with the design intent and objectives for the site. This has the potential to jeopardise the entire \$6M restoration and adaptive reuse of the Royal George Hotel by rendering the project unfeasible.</b></p> <p>The unintended impacts of approving this amendment in its current form are significant. While Saracen acknowledges the need to amend its conceptual design to achieve a more mutually balanced outcome in terms of scale and height, the provisions proposed will simply prevent any opportunity for this to occur.</p> <p>The approach of capping plot ratio entirely conflicts with the newly released State Planning Policy 7.0 - Design of the Built Environment (specifically SPP 7.3 - Residential Design Codes Volume 2 - Apartments), which seeks a more performance-based approach (partly through the use of design review) to ensure best practice design outcomes. The provisions also have the potential to significantly mislead an invested community that a particular development scenario can be delivered when it feasibly cannot.</p> <p>This submission seeks to outline the reasons for this position, including articulating the impact of lowering plot ratio on feasibility and built form, and our recommended request.</p>	<p><b>Supported</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
		<p><b>Modified Provisions and Consequences</b></p> <p>We are aware the modified amendment which is currently being advertised for public comment proposes the following key provisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A plot ratio of 2.0 (capped, with no variation permitted).</li> <li>• A maximum building height limit of 7 storeys (with discretion to vary under existing clause 5.6 of the Town's Planning Scheme).</li> <li>• Revised land use permissibility relevant to the site only.</li> <li>• A series of design objectives which includes reference to demonstrating that the careful arrangement of building massing and height to minimise the perception of bulk and create visual separation from the heritage building, consistent with the Heritage Council of WA's requirements.</li> </ul> <p>As the Town is fully aware, Saracen had previous conceptual plans to develop the vacant portion of the site to a maximum height of 19 storeys. Saracen had been very clear with the Town and all stakeholders that this scenario was one option that could be pursued and would not result in additional floor space (and therefore commercial return) over a lower-rise option. Conversely, this option was seen to facilitate greater community outcomes for the site and greater opportunity for architectural expression and the creation of a landmark development. Importantly, it also financially enabled the delivery of a substantial upgrade to the Stirling Highway underpass to improve amenity and safety in the broader George Street area. Saracen has been entirely transparent that this previous proposal was one scenario that could be accommodated on site, however several lower height options were also feasible and could be explored. This was on the basis that the plot ratio was maintained at a suitable level to deliver the required level of additional floor space for a feasible development that enables the significant restoration of the currently dilapidated Hotel.</p> <p>Further, to inform the evolution of the vision and design process, Saracen engaged Creating Communities to undertake a comprehensive three-day community engagement exercise in mid-2018 held at the Royal George Hotel of which approximately 900 community members attended, including local business representatives. At this engagement, the 19 storey residential concept was presented along with conceptual drawings and example images of potential new uses that were being considered for the adaptive reuse of the Hotel. Key feedback collated included the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Of the 175 feedback forms received by Creating Communities, only 74 raised concerns regarding building height (totalling 42% of all response).</li> <li>• Other issues raised included traffic and parking however this comprised under 29% of responses.</li> <li>• There was significant support for the proposed restoration and revitalisation of the Hotel, in particularly for restoring its original features to create a high-quality hospitality venue.</li> </ul> <p><b><i>This demonstrates that, overall, feedback received from the community was very balanced, with many acknowledging that some density and height would be required to facilitate the Hotel restoration. There was also a strong sentiment that the proposal would deliver greater precinct activation on George Street and were excited by the proposal to potentially upgrade the Stirling Highway underpass.</i></b></p> <p>Notwithstanding the balanced community feedback however in acknowledging the assessment process undertaken by both the Town and DPLH, Saracen appreciates the Town's position and the direction to amend its conceptual design (and work towards a more balanced outcome from a scale and height perspective).</p>	<p>The Council notes the submitter's comments in relation to the Schedule of Modifications and the land owner's views in respect to the consequences of the modifications for the future development of the site. However, the Council does not agree with the comments.</p> <p>The Council endorsed Amendment and now the proposed amendments to the Schedule of Modifications address the issue of plot ratio, building height, site development controls and restoration of the Royal George Hotel. Neither support or facilitate development of a multi-storey apartment building at the rear of the site (with an associated podium building for vehicle parking) which the submitter is endorsing by virtue of support for an alternative set of site and development controls and the owner's proposed form of development for the site. In particular the Council does not support the proposed modification to the provisions relating to plot ratio or the change to the building height provision which suggests 9 storeys. Council agrees the proposed height and plot ratio should align, therefore the Town is proposing to reduce the plot ratio to 1.5:1 to more closely align with the Minister's proposed seven storey height limit. The Council's position in relation to the site and development controls, in particular height being capped at a maximum level, as proposed in the modifications to the Minister's schedule of modifications has not changed. Therefore, the proposed</p>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
		<p><i>However, the fundamental issue with the modified provisions is that the delivery of a development at a height of 7 storeys will inevitably result in the need to limit plot ratio on site to a maximum of 0.95. This is due to the need to integrate the required setbacks from the Hotel and Duke Street and achieve a podium/tower configuration consistent with the objectives of the Special Zone - Royal George Hotel.</i></p> <p><i><u>There is therefore a clear disconnect in terms of the relationship between the 2.0 plot ratio and 7 storey building height provisions - they simply are in conflict with each other.</u></i></p> <p><i><b>Further, and critically, 0.95 plot ratio provides insufficient development area to enable the feasible restoration of the heritage building.</b></i></p> <p>Should the modified provisions be gazetted in their current form, they will compromise any ability for the development to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Achieve an architectural outcome which delivers a podium and setback, slender tower structure consistent with the proposed design objectives for the site; and</li> <li>• Meet the Heritage Council of WA's requirements to achieve an appropriate level of separation between the Hotel and residential development; and</li> <li>• Deliver a feasible development which will enable the significant \$6M restoration of the Royal George Hotel consistent with the Heritage Agreement and Conservation Management Plan.</li> </ul> <p>There is a clear need to firstly ensure the final provisions gazetted over this site do not conflict with each other but also critically, to ensure that a feasible development can be delivered on this important site. Capping plot ratio to 2.0, particularly on such a highly constrained site, with no ability to vary, will limit any chance to develop the site to its full potential and will ultimately render the development unfeasible.</p> <p>Given the important role the imminently formed State Design Review Panel (DRP) will have in assessing the design and architectural merit of any future development on this site, it is considered appropriate in this scenario to allow for some discretion (within reason and to the satisfaction of the State DRP) to ensure that the design is workable and has the ability to reconcile numerous design objectives, based on an actual development proposal (as opposed to a scheme amendment). Such an approach is consistent with the newly released <i>State Planning Policy 7.0- Design of the Built Environment and 7.3 - Residential Design Codes Volume 2 -Apartments</i>, which seeks a more performance-based approach (partly through the use of design review) to ensure best practice design outcomes.</p> <p><b>Recommended Updated Provisions</b></p> <p>In considering the above, we consider that there is a need to provide greater flexibility for additional plot ratio to be sought to enable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A feasible development which will facilitate the Hotel restoration.</li> <li>• A podium/tower arrangement consistent with the design objectives.</li> <li>• An appropriate building height which is sensitive to the location and context.</li> <li>• A minor upgrade and beautification of the existing Stirling Highway underpass.</li> </ul> <p>In this context, having reviewed the provisions in detail, we respectfully request the modified provisions be updated as follows (modifications highlighted <b>bold</b>):</p> <p>5.9.7 <i>The following site and development standards apply to development in the Special Zone - Royal George Hotel:</i></p> <p><u>Maximum Plot Ratio</u></p> <p>5.9.7.1 <i>The maximum plot ratio of development within the zone is <del>not permitted to exceed</del> <b>2.0:1.</b></i></p>	<p>changes to the Amendment provisions as outlined in the submission are not supported.</p> <p>The Town has undertaken to consult with the owner as and when requested by the owner to discuss development on the site and has initiated meetings with the owner. However, an alternative proposal, other than a 21 storey apartment tower with associated parking has never been discussed in detail. A 21 storey tower has consistently been promoted to the Town and the community as the preferred development option for the site.</p> <p>Reference to the independent community consultation exercise undertaken by the owner of the site is not relevant to the consideration of the Schedule of Modifications and is not considered relevant to the statutory decision making process for the Amendment. The owner undertook this exercise independently of the Town and the Town had no input into the consultation materials, methodology or distribution area. <u>Note:</u> the Town delayed the Amendment to facilitate the owner undertaking the community engagement exercise, therefore a delay was not as a result of the Town's actions but as a result of the owner's request.</p> <p>The comment in regard to the financial feasibility of the restoration of the Hotel being dependent on the development potential of the site is not a valid planning consideration. It is Council's viewpoint</p>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
		<p>5.9.7.2 2 The maximum plot ratio excludes the floor space of the existing Royal George Hotel Building.</p> <p>5.9.7.3 <del>Clause 5.9.7.1 is not open to variation through any provision of the scheme or any other mechanism.</del></p> <p>5.9.7.4 <del>Development up to the maximum plot ratio permitted on the site shall only be approved where the decision maker, having due regard to the advice of the State Design Review Panel, is satisfied the development meets all the objectives of the Special Zone - Royal George Hotel.</del></p> <p><b>5.9.7.3 Bonus plot ratio to a maximum of 20% may be permitted where the State Design Review Panel is satisfied the development meets all the objectives of the Special Zone - Royal George Hotel.</b></p> <p><b>5.9.7.4 Clause 5.9.7.3 is not open to variation through any provision of the scheme or other mechanism.</b></p> <p><i>Building Height and Setbacks</i></p> <p>5.9.7.5 <del>The maximum height of development within the zone is not permitted to exceed seven nine storeys above natural ground level measured at the lowest point of the Lot 303 boundary fronting Duke Street.</del></p> <p>Further, we reinforce the importance of maintaining the current level of discretion in relation to the maximum building height. Ultimately, this will enable the State DRP to have regard for the provisions while allowing some minor discretion to enable building height to be considered in conjunction with plot ratio and other design factors.</p> <p><b>Process</b></p> <p>Lastly, we would like to address the overall process undertaken by the Town in initiating and progressing this scheme amendment. While we are very cognisant of the various challenges that local governments face in terms of balancing appropriate design and planning outcomes with community sentiment, we do wish to express our disappointment in the process undertaken by the Town to date.</p> <p>Saracen has closely engaged with the Town and all relevant stakeholders since its original interest in the site in early-2014, where it commenced discussions and negotiations with the Department of Lands and National Trust (as the former landowners) and then closely with the Department of Planning, Department of Lands, Heritage Council of WA, Town of East Fremantle (former CEO and staff) and other relevant agencies to discuss the site and its development potential. In the spirit of a collaborative relationship and in recognition of the importance of this Hotel and site in the local community, Saracen maintained this close engagement through the entire process. This included ongoing liaison with the Town of East Fremantle at both Officer and Elected Member level, including various briefings on the community engagement and design process undertaken as well as the outcomes, and personal invitations to all community open says. A presentation to the Town's Community Design Advisory Committee prior to engagement is also undertaken to obtain feedback on the design and engagement process.</p> <p>While we appreciate (and agree) that it is important for the Town to ensure the site is developed sensitively and within its context, for Saracen to hear of the initiation of the amendment by the Town in June 2017, only days before it acquired the site and with no prior engagement, was, quite frankly, very disappointing.</p> <p>Similarly, we note that all of Urbis and Saracen's requests to engage with the Town's independent urban design consultant (a process which was kept highly confidential) were denied, demonstrating the unwillingness of the Town to collaborate and understand Saracen's design drivers and constraints of the site based on detailed architectural and technical investigations. Similarly, this process would have been highly beneficial for Saracen to understand the thought process and intent behind the hand-drawn sketch prepared by the Town's consultant and publicly presented.</p>	<p>therefore that the orderly and proper planning for the site should be based on amenity, streetscape, heritage and land use impact not what the owner believes to be the financial considerations and conditions for redevelopment.</p> <p>The restoration of the Hotel is subject to the Heritage Agreement signed by the owner when the Hotel was purchased. The <i>Conservation Management Plan</i> (addendum to the Heritage Agreement) outlines the conservation works required to be completed by the owner by the end of a three year period as required under the Agreement (i.e. June 2020). These works are not conditional on the development of the rear of the site and are not linked to any form of development scenario for the site. It appears that none of these works have been commenced and there is less than 12 months remaining of the three year time period in which certain high priority works were to be completed by the owner. It is also noted that some high priority works were to be completed within the first 12 months of the Agreement.</p>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
179	68 Glyde St, East Fremantle 6158	<p>Notwithstanding our position and the process to date, we reinforce that Saracen is committed to delivering a development the Town and community can be proud of now and in the future. To this end, we would welcome a further discussion as to how the final Scheme provisions can be crafted which will deliver this outcome while acknowledging the Town's concern regarding the height and scale of the residential building.</p> <p><b>Conclusion</b>                      We trust this clarifies our position of the modified amendment, including the recommended modifications being sought.</p> <p>I am a private citizen living in Glyde St, and my interests will be affected as a resident and a user of the George St precinct. I support an overall height limit on development at the Royal George Hotel site and overall height limits for development in East Fremantle generally.</p> <p>In particular, I support the Council's original amendments (Scheme Amendment No. 15 [Royal George Hotel], passed by the Council in June 2018.</p> <p>In relation to the Sewell St site I support Scheme Amendment No. 14 [Roofing 2000], passed by the Council in April 2018. My concerns about the proposed developments primarily relate to visual amenity impact, however I am also concerned about the impacts of the development on heritage, amenity, traffic, parking, overshadowing, and development precedent. I do not support a development at the Royal George Hotel site which would result in a residential building exceeding the height of the Royal George spire. Consideration should also be given to limiting the number of apartments such that development does not contribute to the parking congestion already occurring in the George St precinct.</p> <p>I oppose the advertised Minister's recommended modifications because of the concerns as stated above.</p>	<p><b>Supported in Part</b>                      Recommendation: Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #1</b></p>
180	68 Glyde St, East Fremantle 6158	<p>I am an East Fremantle resident located in the Plympton ward near both proposed developments. I support the Council's original amendments (Scheme Amendment No. 15 [Royal George Hotel], passed by the Council in June 2018.</p> <p>I also support Scheme Amendment No. 14 [Roofing 2000], passed by the Council in April 2018 in relation to the Sewell St site. My concern primarily relates to the overall HEIGHT of the proposed developments. I support a limit to the number of storeys and an overall height limit to ensure the developments do not adversely affect the amenity of the East Fremantle area. I have further concerns about the impact of the Royal George development on traffic, parking, overshadowing, and development precedent. There is significant traffic and parking congestion in the George Street precinct.</p> <p>I oppose the advertised Minister's recommended modifications because of the concerns as stated above.</p>	<p><b>Supported in Part</b>                      Recommendation: Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #1</b></p>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
181	No comment	<p>As a private resident.</p> <p>I support the Town of East Fremantle Scheme Amendment No 15 as adopted in June 2018, with the exception of seven storeys instead of six, including the basement level.</p> <p>I am concerned that no work has commenced on the restoration of the hotel, considering that 18 months of the 3 year restoration timeframe has elapsed.</p> <p>I call upon the Heritage Council, State and local governments to enforce these orders and strengthen them if necessary to ensure that the Royal George is restored by June 2020.</p>	<p><b>Supported</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #2</b></p>
182	41/1 Silas Street East Fremantle	<p>As a private citizen.</p> <p>I support the Town of East Fremantle Scheme Amendment No 15 as adopted in June 2018, with the exception of seven storeys instead of six, including the basement level.</p> <p>I am concerned that no work has commenced on the restoration of the hotel, considering that 18 months of the 3 year restoration timeframe has elapsed.</p> <p>I call upon the Heritage Council, State and local governments to enforce these orders and strengthen them if necessary to ensure that the Royal George is restored by June 2020.</p>	<p><b>Supported</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #2</b></p>
183	No comment	As a private citizen.	<b>Supported</b>



No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
184	No comment	<p>I support the Town of East Fremantle Scheme Amendment No 15 as adopted in June 2018, with the exception of seven storeys instead of six, including the basement level.                      I am concerned that no work has commenced on the restoration of the hotel, considering that 18 months of the 3 year restoration timeframe has elapsed.                      I call upon the Heritage Council, State and local governments to enforce these orders and strengthen them if necessary to ensure that the Royal George is restored by June 2020.</p>	<p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019.                      WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.  <b>Response #2</b></p>
185	No comment	<p>I support the Town of East Fremantle Scheme Amendment No 15 as adopted in June 2018, with the exception of seven storeys instead of six, including the basement level.</p>	<p><b>Supportede Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019.                      WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.  <b>Response #2</b></p> <p><b>Supported Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported</p>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
		<p>I am concerned that no work has commenced on the restoration of the hotel, considering that 18 months of the 3 year restoration timeframe has elapsed.                      I call upon the Heritage Council, State and local governments to enforce these orders and strengthen them if necessary to ensure that the Royal George is restored by June 2020.</p>	<p>subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #2</b></p>
186	<p>No comment</p>	<p>I support the Town of East Fremantle Scheme Amendment No 15 as adopted in June 2018, with the exception of seven storeys instead of six, including the basement level.                      I am concerned that no work has commenced on the restoration of the hotel, considering that 18 months of the 3 year restoration timeframe has elapsed.                      I call upon the Heritage Council, State and local governments to enforce these orders and strengthen them if necessary to ensure that the Royal George is restored by June 2020.</p>	<p><b>Supported</b>  <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #2</b></p>
187	<p>43 Duke Street East                      Fremantle</p>	<p>Illegal sale reverse the sale.                      I support the Town of East Fremantle Scheme Amendment No 15 as adopted in June 2018, with the exception of seven storeys instead of six, including the basement level.                      I am concerned that no work has commenced on the restoration of the hotel, considering that 18 months of the 3 year restoration timeframe has elapsed.</p>	<p><b>Supported</b>  <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to</p>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
		<p>I call upon the Heritage Council, State and local governments to enforce these orders and strengthen them if necessary to ensure that the Royal George is restored by June 2020.</p>	<p>the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation. <b>Response #2</b></p>
188	<p>No comment</p>	<p>I support the Town of East Fremantle Scheme Amendment No 15 as adopted in June 2018, with the exception of seven storeys instead of six, including the basement level. I am concerned that no work has commenced on the restoration of the hotel, considering that 18 months of the 3 year restoration timeframe has elapsed. I call upon the Heritage Council, State and local governments to enforce these orders and strengthen them if necessary to ensure that the Royal George is restored by June 2020.</p>	<p><b>Supported</b> <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation. <b>Response #2</b></p>
189	<p>43 Duke Street East Fremantle</p>	<p>I support the Town of East Fremantle Scheme Amendment No 15 as adopted in June 2018, with the exception of seven storeys instead of six, including the basement level. I am concerned that no work has commenced on the restoration of the hotel, considering that 18 months of the 3 year restoration timeframe has elapsed. I call upon the Heritage Council, State and local governments to enforce these orders and strengthen them if necessary to ensure that the Royal George is restored by June 2020.</p>	<p><b>Supported</b> <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning</p>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
190	35 King Street East Fremantle WA 6158	<p>I support the Town of East Fremantle Scheme Amendment No 15 as adopted in June 2018, with the exception of seven storeys instead of six, including the basement level.</p> <p>I am concerned that no work has commenced on the restoration of the hotel, considering that 18 months of the 3 year restoration timeframe has elapsed.</p> <p>I call upon the Heritage Council, State and local governments to enforce these orders and strengthen them if necessary to ensure that the Royal George is restored by June 2020.</p>	<p>requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #2</b></p> <p><b>Supported</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019.</p> <p>WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #2</b></p>
191	No comment	<p>I support the Town of East Fremantle Scheme Amendment No 15 as adopted in June 2018, with the exception of seven storeys instead of six, including the basement level.</p> <p>I am concerned that no work has commenced on the restoration of the hotel, considering that 18 months of the 3 year restoration timeframe has elapsed.</p> <p>I call upon the Heritage Council, State and local governments to enforce these orders and strengthen them if necessary to ensure that the Royal George is restored by June 2020.</p>	<p><b>Supported</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019.</p> <p>WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which</p>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
			<p>justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p>
192	No comment	<p>I support the Town of East Fremantle Scheme Amendment No 15 as adopted in June 2018, with the exception of seven storeys instead of six, including the basement level.                      I am concerned that no work has commenced on the restoration of the hotel, considering that 18 months of the 3 year restoration timeframe has elapsed.                      I call upon the Heritage Council, State and local governments to enforce these orders and strengthen them if necessary to ensure that the Royal George is restored by June 2020.</p>	<p><b>Response #2</b>  <b>Supported</b>  <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p>
193	No comment	<p>I support the Town of East Fremantle Scheme Amendment No 15 as adopted in June 2018, with the exception of seven storeys instead of six, including the basement level.                      I am concerned that no work has commenced on the restoration of the hotel, considering that 18 months of the 3 year restoration timeframe has elapsed.                      I call upon the Heritage Council, State and local governments to enforce these orders and strengthen them if necessary to ensure that the Royal George is restored by June 2020.</p>	<p><b>Response #2</b>  <b>Supported</b>  <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the</p>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
194	No comment	<p>I support the Town of East Fremantle Scheme Amendment No 15 as adopted in June 2018, with the exception of seven storeys instead of six, including the basement level.</p> <p>I am concerned that no work has commenced on the restoration of the hotel, considering that 18 months of the 3 year restoration timeframe has elapsed.</p> <p>I call upon the Heritage Council, State and local governments to enforce these orders and strengthen them if necessary to ensure that the Royal George is restored by June 2020.</p>	<p>content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #2</b></p> <p><b>Supported</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p>
195	No comment	<p>Private citizen.</p> <p>I support the Town of East Fremantle Scheme Amendment No 15 as adopted in June 2018, with the exception of seven storeys instead of six, including the basement level.</p> <p>I am concerned that no work has commenced on the restoration of the hotel, considering that 18 months of the 3 year restoration timeframe has elapsed.</p> <p>I call upon the Heritage Council, State and local governments to enforce these orders and strengthen them if necessary to ensure that the Royal George is restored by June 2020.</p>	<p><b>Response #2</b></p> <p><b>Supported</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building</p>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
196	<p>No comment</p>	<p>Private citizen.                      I support the Town of East Fremantle Scheme Amendment No 15 as adopted in June 2018, with the exception of seven storeys instead of six, including the basement level.                      I am concerned that no work has commenced on the restoration of the hotel, considering that 18 months of the 3 year restoration timeframe has elapsed.                      I call upon the Heritage Council, State and local governments to enforce these orders and strengthen them if necessary to ensure that the Royal George is restored by June 2020.</p>	<p>height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.  <b>Response #2</b>  <b>Supported</b>  <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.  <b>Response #2</b></p>
197	<p>No comment</p>	<p>I support the Town of East Fremantle Scheme Amendment No 15 as adopted in June 2018, with the exception of seven storeys instead of six, including the basement level.                      I am concerned that no work has commenced on the restoration of the hotel, considering that 18 months of the 3 year restoration timeframe has elapsed.                      I call upon the Heritage Council, State and local governments to enforce these orders and strengthen them if necessary to ensure that the Royal George is restored by June 2020.</p>	<p><b>Supported</b>  <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.  <b>Response #2</b></p>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
198	No comment	<p>I support the Town of East Fremantle Scheme Amendment No 15 as adopted in June 2018, with the exception of seven storeys instead of six, including the basement level.                      I am concerned that no work has commenced on the restoration of the hotel, considering that 18 months of the 3 year restoration timeframe has elapsed.                      I call upon the Heritage Council, State and local governments to enforce these orders and strengthen them if necessary to ensure that the Royal George is restored by June 2020.</p>	<p>development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.  <b>Response #2</b>  <b>Supported</b>  <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019.                      WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.  <b>Response #2</b></p>
199	No comment	<p>I support the Town of East Fremantle Scheme Amendment No 15 as adopted in June 2018, with the exception of seven storeys instead of six, including the basement level.                      I am concerned that no work has commenced on the restoration of the hotel, considering that 18 months of the 3 year restoration timeframe has elapsed.                      I call upon the Heritage Council, State and local governments to enforce these orders and strengthen them if necessary to ensure that the Royal George is restored by June 2020.</p>	<p><b>Supported</b>  <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019.                      WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p>



No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
200	No comment	<p>I support the Town of East Fremantle Scheme Amendment No 15 as adopted in June 2018, with the exception of seven storeys instead of six, including the basement level.</p> <p>I am concerned that no work has commenced on the restoration of the hotel, considering that 18 months of the 3 year restoration timeframe has elapsed.</p> <p>I call upon the Heritage Council, State and local governments to enforce these orders and strengthen them if necessary to ensure that the Royal George is restored by June 2020.</p>	<p><b>Response #2</b></p> <p><b>Supported</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019.</p> <p>WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #2</b></p>
201	37 King Street East Fremantle	<p>Heritage is not appropriate for this type of development. This will bring hundreds of extra cars into an already congested area.</p> <p>I support the Town of East Fremantle Scheme Amendment No 15 as adopted in June 2018, with the exception of seven storeys instead of six, including the basement level.</p> <p>I am concerned that no work has commenced on the restoration of the hotel, considering that 18 months of the 3 year restoration timeframe has elapsed.</p> <p>I call upon the Heritage Council, state and local governments to enforce these orders and strengthen them if necessary to ensure that the Royal George is restored by June 2020.</p>	<p><b>Response #2</b></p> <p><b>Supported</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019.</p> <p>WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #2</b></p>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
202	No comment	<p>I support the Town of East Fremantle Scheme Amendment No 15 as adopted in June 2018, with the exception of seven storeys instead of six, including the basement level.</p> <p>I am concerned that no work has commenced on the restoration of the hotel, considering that 18 months of the 3 year restoration timeframe has elapsed.</p> <p>I call upon the Heritage Council, State and local governments to enforce these orders and strengthen them if necessary to ensure that the Royal George is restored by June 2020.</p>	<p><b>Supported</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019.</p> <p>WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #2</b></p>
203	No comment	<p>I support the Town of East Fremantle Scheme Amendment No 15 as adopted in June 2018, with the exception of seven storeys instead of six, including the basement level.</p> <p>I am concerned that no work has commenced on the restoration of the hotel, considering that 18 months of the 3 year restoration timeframe has elapsed.</p> <p>I call upon the Heritage Council, State and local governments to enforce these orders and strengthen them if necessary to ensure that the Royal George is restored by June 2020.</p>	<p><b>Supported</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019.</p> <p>WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #2</b></p>
204	No comment	Noise and parking an issue.	<b>Supported</b>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
		<p>I support the Town of East Fremantle Scheme Amendment No 15 as adopted in June 2018, with the exception of seven storeys instead of six, including the basement level.                      I am concerned that no work has commenced on the restoration of the hotel, considering that 18 months of the 3 year restoration timeframe has elapsed.                      I call upon the Heritage Council, State and local governments to enforce these orders and strengthen them if necessary to ensure that the Royal George is restored by June 2020.</p>	<p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019.                      WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.  <b>Response #2</b></p>
205	<p>No comment</p>	<p>I support the Town of East Fremantle Scheme Amendment No 15 as adopted in June 2018, with the exception of seven storeys instead of six, including the basement level.                      I am concerned that no work has commenced on the restoration of the hotel, considering that 18 months of the 3 year restoration timeframe has elapsed.                      I call upon the Heritage Council, State and local governments to enforce these orders and strengthen them if necessary to ensure that the Royal George is restored by June 2020.</p>	<p><b>Supported Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019.                      WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.  <b>Response #2</b></p>
206	<p>No comment</p>	<p>I support the Town of East Fremantle Scheme Amendment No 15 as adopted in June 2018, with the exception of seven storeys instead of six, including the basement level.</p>	<p><b>Supported Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported</p>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
207	60 Duke Street	<p>I am concerned that no work has commenced on the restoration of the hotel, considering that 18 months of the 3 year restoration timeframe has elapsed.                      I call upon the Heritage Council, State and local governments to enforce these orders and strengthen them if necessary to ensure that the Royal George is restored by June 2020.</p> <p>I support the Town of East Fremantle Scheme Amendment No 15 as adopted in June 2018, with the exception of seven storeys instead of six, including the basement level.                      I am concerned that no work has commenced on the restoration of the hotel, considering that 18 months of the 3 year restoration timeframe has elapsed.                      I call upon the Heritage Council, State and local governments to enforce these orders and strengthen them if necessary to ensure that the Royal George is restored by June 2020.</p>	<p>subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #2</b></p> <p><b>Supported</b>  <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #2</b></p> <p><b>Supported</b>  <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to</p>
208	No comment	<p>I support the Town of East Fremantle Scheme Amendment No 15 as adopted in June 2018, with the exception of seven storeys instead of six, including the basement level.                      I am concerned that no work has commenced on the restoration of the hotel, considering that 18 months of the 3 year restoration timeframe has elapsed.</p>	<p><b>Supported</b>  <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to</p>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
		<p>I call upon the Heritage Council, State and local governments to enforce these orders and strengthen them if necessary to ensure that the Royal George is restored by June 2020.</p>	<p>the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.  <b>Response #2</b></p>
209	<p>No comment</p>	<p>I support the Town of East Fremantle Scheme Amendment No 15 as adopted in June 2018, with the exception of seven storeys instead of six, including the basement level.                      I am concerned that no work has commenced on the restoration of the hotel, considering that 18 months of the 3 year restoration timeframe has elapsed.                      I call upon the Heritage Council, State and local governments to enforce these orders and strengthen them if necessary to ensure that the Royal George is restored by June 2020.</p>	<p><b>Supported</b>  <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.  <b>Response #2</b></p>
210	<p>No comment</p>	<p>I support the Town of East Fremantle Scheme Amendment No 15 as adopted in June 2018, with the exception of seven storeys instead of six, including the basement level.                      I am concerned that no work has commenced on the restoration of the hotel, considering that 18 months of the 3 year restoration timeframe has elapsed.                      I call upon the Heritage Council, State and local governments to enforce these orders and strengthen them if necessary to ensure that the Royal George is restored by June 2020.</p>	<p><b>Supported</b>  <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning</p>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
211	No comment	<p>Private citizen- Offensive building size unsympathetic to locality.                      I support the Town of East Fremantle Scheme Amendment No 15 as adopted in June 2018, with the exception of seven storeys instead of six, including the basement level.                      I am concerned that no work has commenced on the restoration of the hotel, considering that 18 months of the 3 year restoration timeframe has elapsed.                      I call upon the Heritage Council, State and local governments to enforce these orders and strengthen them if necessary to ensure that the Royal George is restored by June 2020.</p>	<p>requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.  <b>Response #2</b>  <b>Supported</b>  <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.  <b>Response #2</b></p>
212	No comment	<p>Private citizen.                      I support the Town of East Fremantle Scheme Amendment No 15 as adopted in June 2018, with the exception of seven storeys instead of six, including the basement level.                      I am concerned that no work has commenced on the restoration of the hotel, considering that 18 months of the 3 year restoration timeframe has elapsed.                      I call upon the Heritage Council, State and local governments to enforce these orders and strengthen them if necessary to ensure that the Royal George is restored by June 2020.</p>	<p><b>Supported</b>  <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which</p>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
			<p>justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p>
213	No comment	<p>Private citizen.                      I support the Town of East Fremantle Scheme Amendment No 15 as adopted in June 2018, with the exception of seven storeys instead of six, including the basement level.                      I am concerned that no work has commenced on the restoration of the hotel, considering that 18 months of the 3 year restoration timeframe has elapsed.                      I call upon the Heritage Council, State and local governments to enforce these orders and strengthen them if necessary to ensure that the Royal George is restored by June 2020.</p>	<p><b>Response #2</b>  <b>Supported</b>  <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p>
214	No comment	<p>Private citizen.                      I support the Town of East Fremantle Scheme Amendment No 15 as adopted in June 2018, with the exception of seven storeys instead of six, including the basement level.                      I am concerned that no work has commenced on the restoration of the hotel, considering that 18 months of the 3 year restoration timeframe has elapsed.                      I call upon the Heritage Council, State and local governments to enforce these orders and strengthen them if necessary to ensure that the Royal George is restored by June 2020.</p>	<p><b>Response #2</b>  <b>Supported</b>  <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the</p>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
			<p>content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #2</b></p>
215	<p>No comment</p>	<p>I support the Town of East Fremantle Scheme Amendment No 15 as adopted in June 2018, with the exception of seven storeys instead of six, including the basement level.                      I am concerned that no work has commenced on the restoration of the hotel, considering that 18 months of the 3 year restoration timeframe has elapsed.                      I call upon the Heritage Council, State and local governments to enforce these orders and strengthen them if necessary to ensure that the Royal George is restored by June 2020.</p>	<p><b>Supported</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #2</b></p>
216	<p>No comment</p>	<p>I support the Town of East Fremantle Scheme Amendment No 15 as adopted in June 2018, with the exception of seven storeys instead of six, including the basement level.                      I am concerned that no work has commenced on the restoration of the hotel, considering that 18 months of the 3 year restoration timeframe has elapsed.                      I call upon the Heritage Council, State and local governments to enforce these orders and strengthen them if necessary to ensure that the Royal George is restored by June 2020.</p>	<p><b>Supported</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building</p>



No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
217	No comment	<p>I support the Town of East Fremantle Scheme Amendment No 15 as adopted in June 2018, with the exception of seven storeys instead of six, including the basement level.                      I am concerned that no work has commenced on the restoration of the hotel, considering that 18 months of the 3 year restoration timeframe has elapsed.                      I call upon the Heritage Council, State and local governments to enforce these orders and strengthen them if necessary to ensure that the Royal George is restored by June 2020.</p>	<p>height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.  <b>Response #2</b>  <b>Supported</b>  <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.  <b>Response #2</b></p>
218	No comment	<p>I support the Town of East Fremantle Scheme Amendment No 15 as adopted in June 2018, with the exception of seven storeys instead of six, including the basement level.                      I am concerned that no work has commenced on the restoration of the hotel, considering that 18 months of the 3 year restoration timeframe has elapsed.                      I call upon the Heritage Council, State and local governments to enforce these orders and strengthen them if necessary to ensure that the Royal George is restored by June 2020.</p>	<p><b>Supported</b>  <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.  <b>Response #2</b></p>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
219	<p>No comment</p>	<p>Private citizen.                      I support the Town of East Fremantle Scheme Amendment No 15 as adopted in June 2018, with the exception of seven storeys instead of six, including the basement level.                      I am concerned that no work has commenced on the restoration of the hotel, considering that 18 months of the 3 year restoration timeframe has elapsed.                      I call upon the Heritage Council, State and local governments to enforce these orders and strengthen them if necessary to ensure that the Royal George is restored by June 2020.</p>	<p>development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.  <b>Response #2</b>  <b>Supported</b>  <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.  <b>Response #2</b></p>
220	<p>No comment</p>	<p>I really want the buildings in Plympton to maintain the integrity of the area.                      I support the Town of East Fremantle Scheme Amendment No 15 as adopted in June 2018, with the exception of seven storeys instead of six, including the basement level.                      I am concerned that no work has commenced on the restoration of the hotel, considering that 18 months of the 3 year restoration timeframe has elapsed.                      I call upon the Heritage Council, State and local governments to enforce these orders and strengthen them if necessary to ensure that the Royal George is restored by June 2020.</p>	<p><b>Supported</b>  <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.  <b>Response #2</b></p>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
221	Royal George Hotel, Duke Street EAST FREMANTLE	<p>Architect for the owners of the land and ongoing engagement through the progress of the Amendment. The seemingly balanced outcome foreshadowed by the modifications fails to comprehend the limited and restricted nature of the site and developing it.</p> <p>The untested assumptions to its viability, may well set the scene for the next chapter of long history of stalled hopes for this heritage building.</p> <p>The many objectives of the “Special Zone” are subject to the commercial viability of the project.</p> <p>The maximum height of 7 storeys doesn’t permit a development of anything near the maximum plot ratio of 2.0:1.</p> <p>Taking account of the mandatory onsite parking provisions, the maximum achievable plot ratio within the building envelope is 0.95:1.</p> <p>There is a mismatch between the perceived development potential (PR) and the limited height permitted on a very small triangular site.</p> <p>The special zone was intended to permit otherwise innovative, alternative developments to the norm, in order to afford the restoration of the heritage buildings, in the absence of public monies or commercial viability of the premises as it stands.</p> <p>The planning process will have failed the whole community if it was unable to respond to the challenge of this site, and the current and or future owners of the site are unable to work within the provisions of the scheme and nothing happens.</p> <p>Meanwhile the building remains unused, and continues to decay, getting ever closer to its eventual loss.</p>	<p><b>Response #2</b></p> <p><b>Not Supported</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) not supported. The WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider further modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which would result, if endorsed, to changes to the Amendment that would not align with the matters raised in the submission.</p> <p>The Council does not support the submitter’s comments in regard to plot ratio, heritage and conservation, or the comments in relation to the objectives of the Special Zone – Royal George Hotel.</p> <p>The Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) is supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer’s Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council’s support for a height limit of seven storeys.</p> <p>The Schedule of Modifications addresses the content raised in the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation</p> <p>The Amendment and planning process has been conducted in accordance with</p>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
			<p>the requirements of the <i>Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015</i>.</p> <p>The comment in regard to the commercial viability of the Hotel as it stands being dependent on the development potential of the 'Special Zone' is not considered a valid planning consideration. It is Council's viewpoint therefore that the orderly and proper planning for the site should be based on amenity, streetscape, heritage and land use impact not what the architect for the site believes to be the commercial viability considerations and conditions for redevelopment.</p> <p>The restoration of the Hotel is subject to the Heritage Agreement signed by the owner when the Hotel was purchased. The Conservation Management Plan (addendum to the Heritage Agreement) outlines the conservation works required to be completed by the owner by the end of a three year period as required under the Agreement (i.e. June 2020). These works are not conditional on the development of the rear of the site and are not linked to any form of development scenario for the site. It appears that none of these works have been commenced and there is less than 12 months remaining of the three year time period in which certain high priority works were to be completed by the owner. It is also noted that some high priority works were to be completed within the first 12 months of the Agreement.</p>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
222	No comment	<p>I support restoration of the building and keeping the level in line with roof levels in surrounding area.                      I am concerned that no work has commenced on the restoration of the hotel, considering that 18 months of the 3 year restoration timeframe has elapsed.                      I call upon the Heritage Council, State and local governments to enforce these orders and strengthen them if necessary to ensure that the Royal George is restored by June 2020.</p>	<p><b>Supported in Part</b>                      Recommendation: Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019.                      WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.  <b>Response #1</b></p>
223	N/A	<p>I support the Town of East Fremantle Scheme Amendment No 15 as adopted in June 2018.                      I am concerned that no work has commenced on the restoration of the hotel, considering that 18 months of the 3 year restoration timeframe has elapsed.                      I call upon the Heritage Council, State and local governments to enforce these orders and strengthen them if necessary to ensure that the Royal George is restored by June 2020.</p>	<p><b>Supported in Part</b>                      Recommendation: Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019.                      WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.  <b>Response #1</b></p>
224	Private citizen.	<p>I support the Town of East Fremantle Scheme Amendment No 15 as adopted in June 2018.                      I think that a lower height limit around 6 storeys would enhance the existing character of the suburb.</p>	<p><b>Supported in Part</b>                      Recommendation: Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the</p>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
225	No comment	<p>I am concerned that no work has commenced on the restoration of the hotel, considering that 18 months of the 3 year restoration timeframe has elapsed.                      I call upon the Heritage Council, State and local governments to enforce these orders and strengthen them if necessary to ensure that the Royal George is restored by June 2020.</p> <p>Private citizen/owner of property.                      I would've preferred a planning framework that encourages tall, elegant landmark designs rather than squat bulky buildings. Unfortunately it appears this Amendment over plans the site and will likely result in nothing happening, or a very mediocre building.                      This site deserves a bold and modern development.                      The Town/Minister needs to make a quick clear decision on this Amendment to ensure development will occur and the Royal George Hotel restored. Pandering, delaying and consulting excessively for this site is ridiculous and just plays into the hands of the flat Earth society, sorry Save Royal George people.                      I cringe at the waste of Town officer time and money spent deliberating over this matter which could be spent actually setting a clear long term strategic framework for the Town.</p>	<p>Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019.                      WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #1</b></p> <p><b>Not Supported</b>                      Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) not supported. The WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider further modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which would result, if endorsed, to changes to the Amendment that would not align with the matters raised in the submission.</p> <p><b>Response #3</b></p>
226	No comment	<p>Private citizen, resident of East Freo.                      I support the "Town's" Amendment 15.                      I am concerned that the George's restoration shows no sign of commencement given we are half way through the 3 year timeframe.                      I ask the relevant bodies to enforce this restoration order.</p>	<p><b>Supported in Part</b>                      Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019.                      WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
227	<p>46a Staton Rd East Fremantle. Effected by having another ugly building on the horizon that further destroys the green canopied landscape.</p>	<p>There are numerous compounding effects for the local and broader community as well as having an immediate effect on out visual amenity.                      I support the Council's original amendments (Scheme Amendment No. 15 [Royal George Hotel], passed by the Council in June 2018; and Scheme Amendment No. 14 [Roofing 2000], passed by the Council in April 2018).                      I do not support anything higher than those indicted in those original amendments. And indeed support lower height developments.                      It is clear that the government is pushing an agenda of high rise on constituents when low rise is the extreme majority preference. The consensus of the majority is that the minister is simply overriding the interests and strongly held wishes of the constituents.                      There is also ample evidence to demonstrate that high rise developments area detriment to the local and broader community. (see below)                      Low rise is the preferred and superior option.                      Thus there is repeated evidence that the minister is failing in its charter to act in the best interests of constituents and as such bears a legal liability for such actions.                      Here is a research paper giving a damning assessment of high rise that the minister must, in addition to other such articles, take into account in making its decisions about developments.  <a href="https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/6bb1/a7af32de3cb880192db3734601710ca2fba0.pdf">https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/6bb1/a7af32de3cb880192db3734601710ca2fba0.pdf</a>                      Low rise can outperform high-rise on any measure of performance.                      The decision to develop hi-rise is counter to public interest.</p>	<p><b>Response #1</b>  <b>Supported in Part</b>  <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019.                      WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.  <b>Response #1</b></p>
228	<p>46a Staton Rd East Fremantle. Effected by having another ugly building on the horizon that further destroys the green canopied landscape.</p>	<p>There are numerous compounding effects for the local and broader community as well as having an immediate effect on out visual amenity.                      I support the Council's original amendments (Scheme Amendment No. 15 [Royal George Hotel], passed by the Council in June 2018; and Scheme Amendment No. 14 [Roofing 2000], passed by the Council in April 2018).                      I do not support anything higher than those indicted in those original amendments. And indeed support lower height developments.                      It is clear that the government is pushing an agenda of high rise on constituents when low rise is the extreme majority preference. The consensus of the majority is that the minister is simply overriding the interests and strongly held wishes of the constituents.                      There is also ample evidence to demonstrate that high rise developments area detriment to the local and broader community. (see below)                      Low rise is the preferred and superior option.                      Thus there is repeated evidence that the minister is failing in its charter to act in the best interests of constituents and as such bears a legal liability for such actions.                      Here is a research paper giving a damning assessment of high rise that the Minister must, in addition to other such articles, take into account in making its decisions about developments.  <a href="https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/6bb1/a7af32de3cb880192db3734601710ca2fba0.pdf">https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/6bb1/a7af32de3cb880192db3734601710ca2fba0.pdf</a>                      Low rise can outperform hi-rise on any measure of performance.</p>	<p><b>Response #1</b>  <b>Supported in Part</b>  <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019.                      WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.  <b>Response #1</b></p>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
229	The Royal George, George and Duke Street corner East Fremantle	<p>The decision to develop hi-rise is counter to public interest. We agree with the amendment of the Council.</p>	<p><b>Supported in Part Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #1</b></p>
230	Royal George Hotel Site	<p>Regarding modifications to the Scheme Amendment we are concerned with the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No capped maximum building height</li> <li>• Deletion of heritage provisions</li> </ul> <p>Whilst we are pleased to see development of this historic building we should not lose the local charm and appeal of the area. It would be a shame to have a huge modern structure in the middle this historic part of WA.</p>	<p><b>Supported in Part Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation.</p> <p><b>Response #1</b></p>
231	31 Dalgety Street East Fremantle	<p>Private citizen and owner occupier 31 Dalgety Street. The Royal George site is within the western looking vista of all residents with backyards facing west and front yards facing west i.e. all the streets back from Duke Street (Corner George is the Royal George). There are many streets affected being Dalgety, Allen, Hamilton, Fortescue, Moss, May, and Silas. Similarly the eastern and western vistas from houses in East Street to Duke Street.</p>	<p><b>Supported Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to</p>



No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
		<p>As it presently stands the dome on top of the Royal George can be seen by many residents from a distance. The height of 7 storeys is in my view still too high but given the compromise I am prepared to live with it, however as with the Roofing 2000 development I prefer a facade more in keeping with a heritage design. i.e. not a modern facade, devoid of any architectural significance as was the final outcome of the Richmond Quarter site. I assume the developers have incorporated sufficient parking bays to accommodate the proposed residents.</p>	<p>the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which justifies Council's support for a height limit of seven storeys and addresses the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation. <b>Response #2</b></p>
232	No comment	<p>I do not like the number of storeys to just 6 at the most. Even this is too high behind the Royal George Hotel. It will not enhance the area and just be a problem with more traffic a parking nightmare. I would be very disappointed to see an overly tall building built there.</p>	<p><b>Supported in Part</b> <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation. <b>Response #1</b></p>
233	No comment	<p>Private citizen My comments relate to the vista I have looking west from the rear of the house. Given the landscape view at present is trees and rooftops and chimneys my preference is that such an outlook remains without sighting a high rise monolith that will be unsightly. Hence I support no more than the maximum of 6 levels as proposed by Council. Or preferably less albeit this is an unlikely outcome.</p>	<p><b>Supported in Part</b> <b>Recommendation:</b> Schedule of Modifications (as advertised) supported subject to the modifications to the Schedule as outlined in Attachment 4 to the Officer's Report dated 7 August 2019. WAPC and Minister for Planning requested to consider modifications to the Schedule of Modifications which</p>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
			address the content of the submission, including the matter of a maximum capped building height which cannot be varied, plot ratio, building setbacks, residential development, vehicle parking and heritage conservation. <b>Response #1</b>
	<b>Service Authorities</b>	The Department of Health has no objections to the proposed modifications to Amendment 15.	<b>Noted</b>
		Main Roads has had the opportunity to review the Amendment and has no objection, although would like to note the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transport Noise</li> </ul> As this site abuts a major freight transport corridor any proposed development must implement measures to ameliorate the impact of transport noise and must comply with WAPC State Planning Policy 5.4 "Road and Rail Transport Noise and Freight Considerations in Land Use Planning".	<b>Noted</b> <b>Comments acknowledged.</b>
		The Water Corporation referred to previous advice provided on 5 September 2017 <b>Water and Wastewater.</b> Reticulated water and sewerage is currently available to the subject site. The proposed amendment to the Scheme does not appear to impact on the Water Corporation's assets or operations. <b>General Comments</b> Any major building additions or alterations will require approval by our Building Services section prior to commencement of works. Infrastructure contributions and fees may be required to be paid prior to approval being issued.	<b>Noted</b> <b>Comments acknowledged.</b> <b>Comments forwarded to the land owner as requested.</b>
		ATCO Gas Australia (ATCO) has no objection to the proposed modifications to the Amendments to the LPS No. 3 to facilitate the future development of the nominated sites, based on the information provided and at the direction of the Minister.	<b>Noted</b>
		We request that notifications and memorials are placed on residential development approvals and residential subdivisions respectively, advising of the potential impacts associated with living/working in proximity to the port. Notification and memorial statements shall be as per the standard wording contained in Appendix B of Town of East Fremantle – Fremantle Port Buffer Development Guidelines: Standard Notification and Memorial Wording "The subject lot is located within (x) kilometres of Fremantle Port. From time to time the location may experience noise, odour, light spill and other factors that arise from the normal operations of a 24 hour working port."	<b>Noted</b> <b>Comments acknowledged.</b>
		The Heritage council resolved advise the Town of East Fremantle that the proposed scheme amendment has been considered in the context of the Royal George Hotel and the following advice is given: <b>Findings</b> 1. The Royal George Hotel is a notable landmark and an important townscape element, particularly in the George Street historic precinct.	<b>Noted</b>

No.	Description of Affected Property	Submission	Recommendation
		<p>2. The proposed revised amendment responds well to the recommendations contained in the Heritage Council's previous advice of July 2017.</p> <p><b>Advice</b></p> <p>The revised proposed Scheme Amendment No. 15 for the Royal George Hotel site is supported; however, the Heritage Council would like to advise that while there is no specific objection to stating a building height limit of seven storeys, it will consider any development proposal for its overall impact on heritage values of the Royal George Hotel, with building height being just one of the factors that will be assessed.</p>	

**Schedule of Modifications – tracked changes in red text**

**Note:** renumbering has occurred as a result of reordering and insertion of clauses.

**Replace Minister’s Schedule of Modifications with the following:**

Pursuant to Section 75 of the Planning and Development Act 2005 and Regulation 41(3)(b) of the Local Planning Schemes Regulations 2015 resolves to support complex Amendment No. 15 to Local Planning Scheme No. 3 with proposed modifications to the Scheme Text as outlined below:

- (i) Modifying Section 4.2 Zone Objectives for the ‘Special Zone - Royal George Hotel’ by adding the following additional points below the existing zone objectives:

*A mixed use development on the ~~northern portion of the~~ site together with the restoration of the existing Royal George Hotel building is considered an appropriate use of the site.*

*Development must achieve urban design and architecture that is exemplary with respect to heritage conservation, adaptive re-use and multi-residential design. The design of any new development must:*

- (a) Provide high quality, contemporary architecture and urban design that responds to and enhances the heritage value of the existing Royal George Hotel **and the wider Plympton Precinct and George Street designated heritage area**, interpreting rather than replicating existing features;*
- (b) Respond to and enhance the identity of the Plympton precinct, including its streetscapes and neighbourhood;*
- (c) Deliver a building that demonstrates well-considered materiality, colour, articulation and detailing;*
- (d) Ensure the siting, height and built form of new buildings maintains primary views from the immediate and surrounding areas to the Royal George Hotel, including its cupola, southern, western and eastern facades;*
- (e) Demonstrate sensitivity to the built form and scale of the Royal George Hotel including its grain, rhythm, order and proportions of elements and openings;*
- (f) Demonstrate the careful arrangement of building massing and height to minimise the perception of bulk, create good levels of visual separation from the heritage fabric and mitigate negative impacts on the amenity and character of adjacent streets and properties;*
- (g) Maximise the opportunity for the development to engage with the public realm at ground level with consideration given to providing good levels of permeability where possible;*

- (h) *Demonstrate well-designed layouts and internal arrangements for apartments and other residential uses that:*
- i) *Achieve excellent amenity through careful consideration of optimal sun access, daylighting, natural ventilation and visual and acoustic privacy;*
  - ii) *Are diverse and adaptable to support different household types now and into the future; and*
  - iii) *Are served by excellent circulation and communal spaces.*
- (i) *Provide high quality, well-integrated hard and soft landscaping elements that respond to existing streetscape character;*
- (j) *Provide considered location of car parking to minimise negative impacts to the public realm; and*
- (k) *Ensure public access to and enjoyment of the interior spaces of the existing Royal George Hotel building is allowed for through a use or uses which are consistent with the buildings original function and its recognised importance as a community gathering place.*
- (ii) Adding a fifth column entitled 'Special Zone - Royal George Hotel' to the Zoning Table after the 'Town Centre' column and inserting the following listed uses and the corresponding use class permissibility symbol:
- Advertising Sign as 'A';
  - Aged or Dependent Persons Dwelling as 'D';
  - Amusement Parlour as 'X';
  - Ancillary Accommodation as 'D';
  - Bed and Breakfast as 'A';
  - Caretaker's Dwelling as 'D';
  - Child Care Premises as 'A';
  - Cinema / Theatre as 'A';
  - Club Premises as 'A';
  - Community Purposes as 'D';
  - Consulting Rooms as 'D';
  - Convenience Store as 'A';
  - Educational Establishment as 'A';

- Exhibition Centre as 'D';
- Family Day Care as 'D';
- Fast Food Outlet (Refer 5.8.9) as 'A';
- Funeral Parlour as 'A';
- Grouped Dwelling as 'D';
- Home Business as 'D';
- Home Occupation as 'D';
- Home Office as 'P';
- Home Store as 'D';
- Hospital as 'X';
- Hotel as 'A';
- Industry- Cottage as 'D';
- Industry- Service as 'D';
- Market as 'A';
- Medical Centre as 'A';
- Motel as 'A';
- Multiple Dwelling as 'A';
- Night Club as 'X';
- Office as 'A';
- Place of Worship as 'A';
- Pre-School/ Kindergarten as 'D';
- Recreation - Private as 'A';
- Residential Building as 'A';
- Restaurant as 'A';
- Service Station as 'X';
- Shop as 'D';
- Showrooms as 'A';

- Single House as 'D';
  - Small Bar as 'A';
  - Tavern as 'A';
  - Telecommunications Infrastructure as 'A<sup>4</sup>'; and
  - Veterinary Centre as 'A'.
- (iii) Deleting Clause 5.9.1(a) and Clause 5.9.1(b) and re-numbering Clause 5.9.1 (c) to Clause 5.9.1.
- (iv) Inserting the following additional clauses after Clause 5.9.1:

*5.9.2 Any development application for the site shall be subject to review by the State Design Review Panel prior to determination of that application.*

*5.9.3 In assessing any application for development within the zone, the decision maker and State Design Review Panel shall have due regard to **all** the zone objectives provided in Section 4.2 of the scheme.*

*5.9.4 When considering ~~with~~ a development application on which advice has been provided by the State Design Review Panel the decision-maker shall have due regard to that advice.*

*5.9.5 In respect of any part of the zone other than the Royal George Hotel building itself, development shall not be solely for commercial purposes. A residential component is mandatory and developments shall incorporate a minimum of 60% net lettable area of residential floor space.*

*5.9.6 Clause 5.3.4 of the Scheme does not apply to development within this zone.*

*5.9.7 The following site and development standards apply to development in the Special Zone - Royal George Hotel:*

*Maximum Plot Ratio*

*5.9.7.1 The maximum plot ratio of development within the zone is not permitted to exceed ~~2.0:1~~ **1.5:1**.*

*5.9.7.2 The maximum plot ratio excludes the floor space of the existing Royal George Hotel Building.*

*5.9.7.3 Development up to the maximum plot ratio permitted on the site shall only be approved where the decision maker, having due regard to the advice of the State Design Review Panel, is satisfied the development meets all the objectives, **as stated in clause 4.2**, of the Special Zone - Royal George Hotel.*

**Note:** former cl. 5.9.7.3 is now included in cl. 5.9.7.4.

- 5.9.7.4 **Clause 4.2 (Special Zone – Royal George Hotel), clause 5.9.3, clause 5.9.7.1 and clause 5.9.7.3 is are** not open to **any** variation through any provision of this scheme or any other mechanism.

Building Height and Setbacks

- 5.9.7.5 i) The maximum height of development within the zone is not permitted to exceed seven storeys above natural ground level measured at the lowest point of the Lot 303 boundary fronting Duke Street **and in any event shall not be permitted to exceed 43.0 metres AHD or seven storeys whichever is the lesser.**

**ii) No part of the building, any external services, solar collectors, air conditioning units, mechanical plant rooms, lift overruns, antennae and communication masts or the like shall exceed the maximum heights specified in 5.9.7.5 (i). These fixtures must be screened from public view to the satisfaction of the decision maker.**

- 5.9.7.6 **Clause 5.9.7.5 (i) and (ii) are not open to any variation through any provision of this Scheme or any other mechanism.**

**Note: For the purpose of clause 5.9.7.5 the lowest point on Duke Street is recorded as 15.0 metres AHD. This AHD level is to be used for the purpose of calculating the height of a building regardless of any approved or unapproved change to the natural ground level on the site.**

- 5.9.7.7 Development up to the eaves height of the existing Royal George Hotel building may have a nil setback to all boundaries.

- 5.9.7.8 Notwithstanding Clause ~~5.9.7.6~~ **5.9.7.7** development shall be sufficiently setback from the existing Royal George Hotel building to the satisfaction of the decision maker in consultation with the Heritage Council of WA and having regard to the advice of the State Design Review Panel.

- 5.9.7.9 Development, **including balconies and other projections** above the eaves height of the existing Royal George Hotel building is to be set back from the Duke Street boundary and the Royal George Hotel building, and located to maintain primary views from the immediate and surrounding locality to the Royal George Hotel building, including its cupola.

- 5.9.7.10 In considering the height and setbacks of proposed development, the decision maker shall have due regard to the advice of the State Design Review Panel and **all** the objectives of the **Special Zone – Royal George Hotel.**



Vehicle Parking

~~5.9.7.11 Parking for non-residential development within the Special Zone – Royal George Hotel shall be in accordance with the requirements provided for Commercial Zones in Clause 5.8 of the scheme.~~

*“Notwithstanding any other provision of this Scheme or of the Residential Design Codes Volume 1 and Volume 2 the following applies:*

*i) Vehicle parking for commercial and other non-residential uses shall be provided in accordance with the provisions of the Scheme and the standards set out in Schedule 10 of the Scheme and the specifications in Schedule 11 of the Scheme;*

*ii) Clauses 5.8.5, 5.8.6, 5.8.7 and 5.8.8 of the Scheme also apply to development within ‘Special Zone – Royal George Hotel’;*

*iii) Parking for residential development shall be provided in accordance with State Planning Policy 7.3 - Residential Design Codes – Volume 1 and Volume 2 as applicable to the type of dwelling proposed;*

*iv) Vehicle parking shall be located either behind street front tenancies or dwellings, below ground level when viewed from the street, or otherwise suitably screened from view from the street to the satisfaction of the decision maker; and*

*v) To the extent that vehicle parking is required for the residential component all vehicle parking for the residential component of the development shall be provided on-site in accordance with a traffic and parking management plan, to the decision maker’s satisfaction, being submitted and approved at Development Approval application stage.*

5.9.7.12 Should the decision maker determine that demand for **commercial and non-residential parking only** may be lessened due to alternative modes of transport, reciprocal or shared parking arrangements, it may consider reducing the requirement for car parking spaces by a maximum of 20% of the requirements of Schedule 10 of the Scheme where it can be demonstrated to its satisfaction that:

- i) The peak demand for parking by two or more uses will not occur at the same time;
- ii) The combined supply of car parking is sufficient to meet the estimated peak combined demand;
- iii) The arrangements are secured and that any future change will not result in a shortfall; and
- iv) Parking arrangements are detailed in a Parking Management Plan.

*5.9.7.13 Clause 5.9.7.12 is not open to variation through any provision of the Scheme or any other mechanism.*

**Residential Development**

*5.9.7.14 With exception of building height, plot ratio and building setbacks residential development shall be in accordance with State Planning Policy 7.3 - Residential Design Codes – Volume 2 – Apartments for multiple dwellings and Volume 1 for grouped and aged and dependent persons’ dwellings (dependent on the form of dwelling type for aged and dependent persons’ dwellings Volume 2 may be applied).*

**Heritage Conservation**

**5.9.7.15** *Development of any part of the land will not be supported unless:*

*i) The Royal George Hotel has already been restored to the satisfaction of the Local Government; or*

*ii) The development is staged in such a manner as to secure, by staging conditions and/or by appropriate legal agreement with the Town of East Fremantle, legally enforceable means to the satisfaction of the Local Government for achieving the restoration of the Royal George Hotel before commencement of occupation of the use(s) approved for any other areas of the land.*

## Amendment No. 15 – Timeline of Events

The following is a timeline of events since the Council initiated Amendment No. 15 at the Special Council Meeting of 7 June 2017.

### July 2017

- WAPC grant consent to advertise Amendment - statutory advertising period concluded on 11 September 2017.

### August/September 2017

- Town engages urban design consultant to undertake a built form study and review of Amendment proposals.
- WAPC grants an extension of the statutory period for considering submissions and for preparing the Amendment report until February 2018.

### December 2017

- Meeting held with Saracen to explain the Town is intending to proceed with modifications to Amendment for maximum building height of 6 storeys.
- Saracen requested the Town not proceed with Amendment allowing for continued discussion about development on the site.

### January 2018

- Saracen request the Scheme Amendment be put 'on hold' until their community engagement exercise is completed to gain feedback on a 21 storey tower proposal.
- Town agree to request and WAPC grants an extension of the statutory period for considering submissions and for preparing the Amendment report until July 2018.

### April 2018

- Saracen hold two Community Open Days for residents and the George Street business owners.
- Saracen indicated to the Town and the public at the Community Open Days that a Development Approval application for the 21 storey tower proposal would be submitted in May 2018. In a later presentation to Councillors they also indicated that it was likely a development application would be submitted in July 2018. None have been submitted to date.

### May / June 2018

- Town prepared modifications to the Scheme Amendment, amongst other things, to introduce a capped maximum height of 6 storeys (including basement or semi-basement parking), building setbacks from Duke Street and the Hotel, no plot ratio control (as this would be controlled by height and setbacks), R-Code development standards to apply, no vehicle parking concessions and heritage restoration clauses.

### 6 June 2018

- Council adopt the proposed modifications to the Amendment with no further advertising.

**Post - Council adoption of Amendment** – meetings held with the following people:

- Minister for Planning;
- Senior advisors to the Minister for Planning;
- Local Members of State and Federal Parliament;
- Chair of the Western Australian Planning Commission;
- Director General of the Department of Planning; Lands and Heritage;

- Chief Planning Advisor to the Director General of Planning;
- Chair of the Heritage Council;
- CEO of the State Heritage Office and senior heritage officers; and
- Senior Department of Planning staff.

**24 August 2018**

- Department of Planning notifies the Town of the draft Schedule of Modifications to the Council's Amendment.

**September 2018**

- Town advises Department of Planning that it does not support the proposed modifications to the Amendment.
- Meeting with Saracen to discuss Amendment and site development.

**23 October 2018**

- Mayor, Deputy Mayor and Town Officers, along with various community groups and individuals make deputations to the Statutory Planning Committee (sub Committee of the WAPC).
- Subsequent to this the WAPC provide a recommendation to the Minister for Planning.

**3 December 2018**

- Planning Minister Saffioti directs further modifications to Amendment be advertised for 28 days as modifications are considered significant.

**24 January 2019**

- Meeting with Saracen and Urbis (town planning consultants) to discuss Amendment.
- Town writes to all land owners at commencement of statutory advertising period inviting comment on the Schedule of Modifications (as directed by Minister).

**29 January – 25 February 2019**

- Town commences statutory advertising period utilising social and conventional media channels and the Town's website. 233 submissions received. Approximately 93% support Council endorsed Amendment.

**February 2019**

- WAPC requested to extend advertising period to 11 March 2019. Request declined.
- 18 February - Official launch of State Planning Policy 7.3 R-Codes – Volume 2 – Apartments.
- 20 February - Town Hall Community Information meeting held to explain modifications to Amendment No. 14 and No. 15 to community members.

**March 2019**

- Meeting with Chief Planning Advisor to Director General of Planning to discuss concerns with modifications.
- Council officers meet with Minister Saffioti's staff and senior Officer of the Department of Planning to discuss concerns and issues with modifications to both Amendment No. 14 and No. 15.

**April 2019**

- WAPC approved extension for 30 days to 25 June 2019 following the Town's formal request for extension.
- Further meetings with State and Federal Members of Parliament, Chairman of the WAPC and the Chief Planning Advisor to discuss concerns with the Schedule of Modifications:

**May 2019**

- Town seeks Minister Saffioti's clarification regarding building height and requests meeting to discuss.
- Correspondence sent to all Plympton Precinct owners and all Amendment No. 15 submitters to provide additional building height information and to explain progress Amendment. Over 900 letters sent.
- 24 May – State Planning Policy 7.3 – R-Codes – Volume 2 - Apartments - operational.
- WAPC requested to further extend 'consideration period' for both Amendment No. 15 and No. 14 to allow the Town additional time to consult with State Planning Department Officers and to obtain response from Minister.

**24 May 2019**

- SPP 7.3 – R-Codes – Volume 2 - Apartments gazetted and operational.

**June 2019**

- Further meetings with Department of Planning Officer's to discuss modifications.
- Meeting with Minister for Planning to discuss building height matters.
- WAPC requested to extend timeframe in which Council can make a resolution in regard to the Schedule of Modifications to 9 August 2019.

**9 August 2019**

- Deadline by which Council is required to make a resolution in regard to the Schedule of Modifications and the submissions received.

## Summary of Key Planning Issues resulting from the Schedule of Modifications

**Note:** In the Town's view the following points are considered to be the key planning issues.

### **Special Zone – Royal George Hotel – objectives** (explained in detail on page xx of the Officer's Report dated 7.8.19)

- Zone objectives can be varied or disregarded by the decision maker.
- No mandatory requirement that all objectives are satisfied to achieve maximum plot ratio.
- Zone objective mandating mixed use development on the rear of the site – cannot be solely for residential.
- No mention that architecture and urban design needs to respond to the wider Plympton Precinct and George Street designated heritage area, only to the Royal George Hotel.

### **Building height** (explained in detail on pages 19-24 of the Officer's Report dated 7.8.19)

- Building height not capped – can be varied by a decision maker.
- No maximum building height specified in reference to an Australian Height Datum (metres above sea level) – building height could exceed 7storeys.
- Natural ground level can be altered under R-Codes for apartments, despite nomination of lowest point of natural ground level in modified building height clause.
- External services, solar collectors, air conditioning units, mechanical plant rooms, lift overruns, antennae and communication masts and other roof top structures could exceed height limit of 7 storeys.

### **Building setbacks** (explained in detail on page xx of the Officer's Report dated 7.8.19)

- Nil setbacks permitted.
- No specific setbacks for upper storeys. At the discretion of the decision maker.

### **Plot ratio** (explained in detail on page xx of the Officer's Report dated 7.8.19)

- No starting point from which to determine amount of plot ratio if all objectives are not satisfied.
- Plot ratio of 2.0:1 could potentially allow for 16+ storeys without maximum building height cap that cannot be varied by a decision maker.
- Plot ratio of 2.0:1 i.e. (3,000m<sup>2</sup>) can be developed on ~750m<sup>2</sup> and does not include floor space of Hotel.

### **Vehicle parking** (explained in detail on page xx of the Officer's Report dated 7.8.19)

- Vehicle parking clauses deleted from the Council's Amendment.
- 'Commercial Zone' parking requirements apply in respect of non-residential development and a decision maker may consider reducing car parking requirements by a maximum of 20% where certain criteria are satisfied. This could be varied to a greater concession by a decision maker.
- No clause which specifically applies any parking standards to the residential component of development.
- Modifications assumed that the new R-Codes for apartments would apply to the residential development. Most likely not the case because the application of the new R-Codes states that the R-Codes only apply to the development of multiple dwellings in areas coded R40 and above. The Special Zone does not have an R-Coding.

### **Residential development** (explained in detail on page xx of the Officer's Report dated 7.8.19)

- Removal of Council's provision results in ambiguity as to what controls apply to residential development and residential parking. The same development controls as for all other residential development in WA should apply.

### **Heritage conservation** (explained in detail on page xx of the Officer's Report dated 7.8.19)

- Council's provisions deleted.
- Council's provisions required restoration of the Hotel to be completed prior to use of the buildings and/or land or legal agreement to be entered into requiring staging of restorations works with new development.

### **General** (explained in detail on page xx of the Officer's Report dated 7.8.19)

- Clause 5.6 (Variation to Site and Development Standards and Requirements) of the Town's Planning Scheme has not been disapplied in relation to building height. Allows a decision maker to vary the building height and other development controls not specified.