

	SUPPORT/OBJECT/COMMENT	SUBMISSION	ADMINISTRATION COMMENT
1	Support (Wattle Grove)	In general I support the efficient delivery of Council services and this appears to make inroads towards that objective. However, I also support a process that allows matters that are of community interest to be pulled aside and dealt with by having full council consideration. The exact mechanism for this ability needs consideration should the City desire it.	The Administration notes the submission. The Administration notes the focus on matters of community interest having an ‘escalation-point’. This has been reflected in a modification to the draft Policy, where a note has been added that where an application is minor, but related to an element of community interest which was considered as part of a more significant application such as a Development Assessment Panel, or a Development Application considered by Council – the Administration will not take an ‘inform’ level of engagement, and will seek regulatory engagement with the community – as much as the planning framework allows.
2	Object (Wattle Grove)	I object to the draft Policy in its current form. My primary concern relates to the implications for the role of elected Councillors. Councillors are elected to represent the interests and concerns of their communities and to provide democratic oversight of significant decisions affecting the places in which people live. Substantial development assessment decisions should not be delegated to City administration,	The Administration notes the submission and theme of objection. The Administration notes references to delegations, and to consultation. The draft Policy does not propose any changes to delegation.

with Councillors having little or no meaningful voting power over those decisions.

Decisions that have significant consequences for the community or environment should be made by elected representatives who are directly accountable to residents, rather than by the administration alone.

I am also concerned that the draft Policy, as proposed, would confer significant additional decision-making authority on City administration, reduce opportunities for meaningful community participation, and fail to provide adequate or substantive commitments to environmental protection and planning and developments affecting residents.

Efficiency should not come at the expense of democratic accountability. Delegating decision-making may streamline processes, but it should not effectively remove elected representatives from decisions that have significant planning, environmental and community consequences. There must be an appropriate balance between administrative efficiency and the role of elected Councillors in providing oversight, accountability and representation.

The draft Policy does not propose any changes to already established consultation conventions for significant planning proposals – what are subject to the City's Local Planning Policy 11 – Public Notification of Planning Proposals.

The draft Policy provides clarity on the consultation conventions for minor development proposals, which are not likely to meaningfully benefit from engagement with neighbours.

I therefore request that the draft Policy not be adopted in its current form. Appropriate amendments should be made to ensure that elected Councillors retain a meaningful role in significant development decisions, that community participation is properly protected, and that environmental and planning considerations are given appropriate weight in the assessment and determination of development proposals.

I further request that this submission, together with all other submissions received during the public consultation period, be presented to Council in full before Council makes any decision on the adoption of the Policy.

3 Object (Kalamunda)

I believe the current draft of LPP 1.0 has several serious failures and shortcomings which need to be amended. for example lack of sufficient input from councillors, lack of proper detailed definitions of certain elements and lack of sufficient scope for public / community input about processes that will have a potential direct impact upon them.

The concerns I have raised have all been detailed in the submissions made by [name] and [name] and I want in noted that this submission is in full support of all the elements,

The Administration notes the submission and theme of objection.

The submission largely refers to another submission which questions delegation and engagement principles.

The process followed has facilitated Councillor review prior to advertising, community consideration, and through a future Council report another round of Councillor review.

		objections and amendments proposed in those submissions.	
4	Object (Wattle Grove)	I object to the City's draft Local Planning Policy 1.0, Development Assessment (LPP1), in its current form. The Policy would let City officers alone decide whether an application is advertised for public comment, with no guarantee that applications attracting community objections are determined by Council rather than under staff delegation. It contains no meaningful commitment to environmental protection, and clause 5 is drafted so this Policy would override any future local planning policy dealing with tree retention or environmental protection. I ask that LPP1 not be adopted until these matters are addressed, and that this objection be reported to Council prior to any decision on adoption.	The Administration notes the submission and theme of objection. As noted earlier in this table, significant development applications will be subject to consultation in accordance with Local Planning Policy 11 – Public Notification of Planning Proposals. The draft Policy does not place bias towards any specific planning consideration, which is why the environment is not specifically mentioned. The draft Policy provides clarity on process, not priority of planning matters such as the environment.
5	Comment (Forrestfield)	I would like to see all of the old residential areas have their power put underground and a reduction in the quantity of infill housing on land without consideration to networking pedestrian ways and green space.....if we want Ellenbrook or wattle grove we would go and live there.	The Administration notes the submission. The matters raised are not related to the draft Policy, as it does not deal with infrastructure provision, or pedestrian connectivity, or green spaces.

			These are matters most commonly dealt with through the subdivision stage of development, and relate to design standards.
6	Support (Kalamunda)	I support the proposed modifications to the R-Codes; I believe that they are reasonable and will result in fewer development applications of a minor nature, decreasing administrative burden. I also generally support the clear communication of expectations surrounding processes for applicants.	The Administration notes the submission. The comments align with the intent of the draft Policy – specifically the purpose of the exempt development table, and the procedural clarity to applicants – which combine to deliver faster planning decisions.