

Summary of Submissions:

The tables below summarise the comments received during the advertising period of the proposal, together with the applicant's response to each comment.

Comments Received in Support:	Applicant's Comment:
Nil.	
Comments Received in Objection:	Applicant's Comment:
<p>Issue: Visual Amenity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The existing tower does not comply with the WA Planning Commission Guidelines for the Location, Siting and Design of Telecommunications Infrastructure. It doesn't appear to be a compact design.• The additional height of the structure will make it more prominent and not minimise the impact on the visual amenity of the area and does not meet the Development Criteria of Clause 9 Visual Amenity and Facility Design of the City's Telecommunications Facilities Policy.• Consideration should be given to a more compact redesign for the whole tower, or alternatively, find less visually intrusive locations on existing buildings for the additional capacity. With taller apartments being constructed in the area, I would like to know that these options have been considered.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The proposed extension and associated equipment is a compact design. The antennas and associated equipment have been located as close to the monopole structure as possible without the potential for interference. The existing Carrier equipment on the structure is not a compact design however is not the subject of this development application. The proposal is also to clear the existing Optus headframe currently at 14m which will reduce the bulk of the structure from street level.• In order for Optus to improve their coverage in the area, there is a requirement to increase the height of the Optus equipment on the structure. This will allow for the signal to propagate further in the area. Upgrading and extending the existing structure will have a better visual outcome than the deployment of a new site would. This would be required if the proposed height cannot be achieved.• As stated above, the proposal is for the extension of the structure to accommodate Optus equipment and does not include the other carrier equipment. The upgrade is required to cater for the growing community and the deployment of a new facility is not considered to be more suitable than upgrading the existing. It is also noted that Optus cannot anticipate deploying on a structure which is not yet built.
<p>Issue: Location</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The mobile phone tower is located within 300m of land zoned for Residential purposes which is considered a sensitive use and therefore does not meet the Development Criteria of Clause 7 Protection of Sensitive Uses of the City's Telecommunications Facilities Policy.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The structure is existing and therefore the question of the tower's proximity to residential areas is difficult to address. The tower has been in operation for over 15 years. The proposal is for the extension of the existing site, it is considered that any new site in the area would be within 300m of a residential area as the area is largely residential. As a result it is considered that the extension of the existing site is a more suitable solution.

Note: Submissions are considered and assessed by issue rather than by individual submitter.