No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
1	Cammany or Calamicolon		Recommendation
1	The Environmental Protection Authority (EPA) considers that the proposed scheme amendment should not be assessed under Part IV Division 3 of the <i>Environmental Protection Act 1986</i> (EP Act).	Nil.	Advice noted.
2	No response received.	Nil.	Nil.
3	No response received.	Nil.	Nil.
4	ATCO Gas do not have any objection to the proposed modification for the Local Planning Scheme subject to the Medium Pressure Gas Pipelines and Gas infrastructure being recognised and factored into any future designs for the areas where the ATCO Gas assets will be impacted.  Any impact on the gas infrastructure and network due to the redevelopment may require the gas infrastructure to be relocated. ATCO Gas requests the proponents contact Engineering Services if this is identified.  Atco Gas requests early consultation with proponents prior to any pre-construction field work studies being undertaken, any	ATCO's advice will be relevant to subsequent subdivision and development stages.	Submission noted.

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	ground truthing/disturbance occurring or		
	proposed crossing designs being finalised.		
5	No response received.	Nil.	Nil.
6	Some off-site water and sewerage	Water Corporation's advice will be	Submission noted.
	upgrades may be required, depending on	relevant to subsequent subdivision and	
	the final development density, but the	development stages.	
	servicing issues affecting the servicing of		
	the site are well summarised in the		
	engineering report attached to the		
	Structure Plan.		
	Some sections of the Water Corporation		
	water mains and gravity sewer and a		
	private wastewater pressure main traverse		
	the site and will need to be relocated out of		
	the site onto acceptable alignments with		
	existing or future road reserves.		
	The proponents will also need to undertake		
	upgrades of the existing undersized water		
	reticulation mains by replacing the 80mm		
	cast iron mains with a minimum of 100mm		
	along Flinders Drive frontage and along		
	Marine Terrace and Adelaide Crescent, as		
	depicted on the Wood & Grieve Engineers'		
	sketch plan attached to the servicing report.		
	The final details of the water main upgrades		

No	Commons of Cohmission	Officer Commont	Ctoff
No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	will be determined by the Water		
	Corporation at the subdivision and/or		
	development stages.		
7	No response received.	Nil.	Nil.
8	No response received.	Nil.	Nil.
9	All issues appear to be addressed and	Nil.	Submission noted.
	DFES Great Southern Region has no		
	further comment.		
10	No response received.	Nil.	Nil.
11	The proposed scheme amendment and	Tourism WA's comments regarding the	Submission noted.
	structure plan will enable the development	distribution of hotel/short-stay rooms	
	of an integrated precinct that recognises its	and permanent residential apartments	
	importance, providing scope for tourist	in any future hotel/mixed use	
	accommodation and an activity centre with	development will be relevant at the	
	supporting infrastructure including cafes	development stage.	
	and restaurants.		
		City staff note the recommendation to	
	The site, which previously included the	make 'small bar' a 'D' or discretionary	
	Esplanade Hotel, has been vacant since	land use, rather than an 'A' use, which	
	2007 when the hotel was demolished. This	would require public advertising prior to	
	has left a significant gap in the tourism	any approval being issued. However,	
	accommodation offer of the Great Southern	City staff consider that maintaining	
	region. The scheme amendment is	'small bar' as an 'A' use is consistent	
	considered by Tourism WA as a critical	with the zoning provisions that apply to	
	element in facilitating investment and	the surrounding area.	
	utilisation of this site to fill this gap, and the		

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	development of a high end hotel in this		
	location.		
	Tourism WA notes the creation of a Special		
	Use Zone that recognises the Middleton		
	Beach Activity Centre as a potential key		
	tourist node, and the development of a built		
	form and active beach front that reinforces		
	this position. In particular, Tourism WA		
	considers that the provision for additional		
	height requirements (up to 12 storeys) and		
	realignment of Flinders Parade to create		
	direct access to the beachfront are critical		
	elements of the hotel/mixed use		
	component of the precinct and scheme		
	amendment. The potential for Flinders		
	Parade to be significantly pedestrianised,		
	traffic calmed and potentially closed for		
	events such as markets and festivals is		
	recognised and supported.		
	The Special Use Zone will enable the		
	potential development of a landmark		
	building that corresponds to its locality, and		
	the creation of a precinct with a mix of uses and activities. However, it is noted that the		
	·		
	proposed zoning and land uses permit		
	multiple dwellings within the hotel/mixed		
	use precinct and that the Middleton Beach		

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
	-		Recommendation
	Activity Centre Structure Plan document		
	specifies that residential development can		
	occur at upper levels on this site (page 40).		
	Tourism WA recommends that to protect		
	the tourism integrity of this site, a condition		
	should be included in the schedule, which		
	requires the hotel/short stay rooms to be		
	located on the upper floors and/or the		
	component of the site with the highest		
	tourist amenity (e.g. facing the ocean). This		
	is consistent with the provisions of <i>Planning</i>		
	Bulletin 83 - Planning for Tourism and		
	ensuring that tourism is the key focus of the		
	development of this significant tourism site.		
	Tourism WA supports the creation of mixed		
	use precincts and the opportunities for		
	tourist facilities, restaurants, cafes and		
	short stay accommodation as outlined in		
	the amendment report. These will add to		
	the vibrancy of the location and its		
	attraction as a destination for visitors and		
	residents.		
	Significantly, these mixed use precincts will		
	also support the proposed hotel and		
	associated investment by providing		

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	complementary infrastructure and add		
	value to the overall development of this		
	area. In this regard, uses which encourage		
	activation and vibrancy both day and night		
	(primarily those focused on food and		
	beverage premises) should be facilitated,		
	including small bars and taverns.		
	It is noted that small bars are listed as an		
	'A' use in the proposed land use table (page		
	41). It is recommended that this be		
	amended to a 'D' use, requiring Council		
	discretion without the need to give special		
	notice to support this type of development.		
	The redevelopment of this site represents a		
	significant opportunity to create a popular,		
	vibrant destination for locals and visitors		
	alike. However, as with all mixed use		
	precincts which have an element of evening		
	and night time activity, careful management		
	is required to ensure that potential conflicts		
	are identified and addressed at an early		
	stage. In particular, appropriate		
	attenuation and mitigation measures to		
	manage noise is considered by Tourism		
	WA to be important in achieving the		

No.	Summary of Submission  envisaged tourism outcome and should be reflected in the Scheme Amendment.	Officer Comment	Staff Recommendation
12	No response received.	Nil.	Nil.
13	The Department of Water advises that it has no comment on the Scheme Amendment Report.  The Department has assessed and reviewed the Local Water Management Strategy prepared for Land Corp as part of the Middleton Beach Activity Centre Structure Plan (various consultants) and is satisfied with the document.  The strategies contained within the Local Water Management Strategy are considered the best outcome based on the constraints of the site. These strategies have been adopted in the stormwater management concept, in addition to retaining up to the 5yr ARI storm event.  Although the approach used within the Local Water Management Strategy is supported by the Department, the following additional advice should be noted:	The City of Albany and Landcorp are currently working to upgrade the stormwater management arrangements within the Activity Centre area.	Submission noted.

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
I NO.	Juninary of Jubinission	Onicer Comment	Recommendation
			Recommendation
	The Local Water Management Strategy		
	on HPRM was not complete and as		
	such Appendix 5 and 6 could not be		
	reviewed, which relate to the		
	Stormwater Management Plan and		
	Drainage Plan.		
	• Section 5 of the Local Water		
	Management Strategy outlines the		
	stormwater management proposed,		
	which based on the sites constraints		
	seems the most appropriate. However,		
	it was noted in Section 5.1 it was stated		
	that:		
	<ul> <li>First dot point, pre and post</li> </ul>		
	development flows would be		
	maintained. This is inconsistent with		
	the subsequent investigations by		
	WGE who put forward options of how		
	discharges could be reduced to avoid		
	impacting amenity on the beach.		
	o Third dot point said to retain and		
	infiltrate the 1yr ARI event. The		
	department recommends that this		
	rainfall event is managed as high in		
	the catchment as possible, it does		
	not need to be retained and		
	infiltrated. That said due to the very		
	high permeability of the underling		

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff	
	Calla.		Recommendation	
	sands the most appropriate management is infiltration.  Section 5.2 of the Local Water Management Strategy states that fill level may need to be raised to ensure soakwells remain above the maximum groundwater level. However, there are alternative shallower systems that could be used instead of soakwells such as Atlantis cells. This provides the ability to reduce fill requirements, where the controlling factor is not separation from flood.  WGE letter outlines that Landcorp intend to:  Reduce discharges to the beach and improve the drainage and area where possible, with the aim of retaining and infiltrating up to the 5yr ARI event. The approach include use of sub-surface infiltration devices within the beach foreshore area upstream of the discharge locations.  Maximise detention in the system with the use of vegetated swales in median strips and use of soakage		Recommendation	

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	The subject area is adjacent to Middleton Beach (Place No. 17520), which the Heritage Council's Register Committee has identified as a place warranting assessment for possible entry in the State Register of Heritage Places. One of the key values of this area is the group of Norfolk Island Pine Trees planted in the 1940s within the foreshore reserve.  We note the proposed structure plan proposes an area of public open space that incorporates and extends the foreshore area and retains the avenue of Norfolk Island Pines. A small number of trees are noted for removal or relocation; however, these are outside the area considered to		
	have heritage significance.  The proposed Scheme Amendment gives due regard to the Structure Plan and recognises the 'iconic location' of the public foreshore reserve.  Overall the amendment is not considered to negatively impact on identified heritage places and there is therefore no objection to the proposal.		

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
14	Asking if the City of Albany and LandCorp have consulted with the State Heritage Council regarding the Middleton Beach Development plan. The area from Ellen Cove to Flinders Parade is listed with the Heritage Council, with reference number; Heritage Place No. 17520 – Middleton Beach, – Middleton Beach Arising from nomination of P17771 Norfolk Pine Trees Albany Middleton Beach Landscape Arising from nomination of P17771 Norfolk Pine Trees Albany, and utilities Heritage List – YES on 30 December 1983 Constructed from 1940.	Item five of the key issues table addresses the matter of heritage in detail.	Submission noted.
15	Unsure if the City is aware that it is listed but had noticed there was no reference to heritage consultation in the plan.  Concerned that height will look out of place and degrade the unique low key attributes	Item one of the key issues table addresses the matter of building height	Submission noted.
16	of the beach. Suggests four to five storeys is a more appropriate limit.  Concerned regarding the height of the proposed Hotel/Mixed Use area. States that 12 storeys would be too high and would	in detail.  Item one of the key issues table addresses the matter of building height in detail.	Submission noted.

No.	Summary of Submission  spoil a beautiful area. A maximum of 3 storeys would be better.	Officer Comment	Staff Recommendation
17	In opinion that a building of six stories or above would not be in keeping with the glorious location of Ellen Cove. Low impact, low rise of not more than four stories would be more suitable for the location. The view through the trees to the sea and beyond belongs to everyone, not a few staying for a short while.	Item one of the key issues table addresses the matter of building height in detail.	Submission noted.
18	In opposition to proposed 12-storey development as she believes that it will destroy what they have there. The area is unique and unspoilt. Visitors to the area feel like they have discovered a well-kept secret. Doesn't think that [we] need development like this at the beach and there are many other places that would be more suited to it. She much prefer to have nothing than a massive building dominating the beachfront. Comments such as 'we need to be dragged kicking and screaming into the 21st Century' are stupid, as I am not ashamed of liking our town the way it is and hope to keep it that way.	Item one of the key issues table addresses the matter of building height in detail.	Submission noted.

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
	-		Recommendation
19	States that unless the multistorey	Items one and nine of the key issues	Submission noted.
	Hotel/Mixed Use precinct is removed from	table address the matters of building	
	the proposal we strongly oppose the	height and the location of the hotel	
	amendment on grounds of landscape	within the development area in detail.	
	considerations, loss of existing public		
	amenity near the 'Anchors precinct', visual	The development is not expected to	
	impact upon several thousand local	have a greater visual impact on the	
	residents (particularly Spencer Park, Mira	landscape than existing development	
	Mar, Mount Clarence, Middleton Beach)	at Checkers Walk, Morley Place, Hare	
	and the total lack of sympathy/sense of	Street and Wylie Crescent, when	
	place regarding some of Albany's finest	viewed from vantage points beyond the	
	assets, viz. Middleton Beach, Ellen Cove	immediate area. While it will possible	
	and their juxtaposition with a proposed	to distinguish any future building as	
	'world class walking trail area' in the	free-standing when viewed from Mira	
	adjacent Albany Heritage Park of Mounts	Mar, it is part of an established urban	
	Adelaide and Clarence. There will also be	area, albeit one that is presently	
	a visual landscape impact from Middleton	developed with single, double and	
	Bay and King George Sound as well as	three-storey buildings.	
	looking back from the Gull Rock/Mount		
	Martin reserves.		
	The proposal therefore has a fundamental		
	flaw in not taking into consideration the		
	visual impacts when any high-rise (greater		
	than four storeys) component of the		
	proposal is viewed from outside the		
	proposed development area, i.e. failure to		
	look 'outside the box' and genuinely think of		

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	the highly significant landscape blot to		
	residents and visitors alike.		
	Furthermore, the proposal as depicted will		
	result in significant reduction of the highly		
	popular grassy public foreshore near Ellen		
	Cove which is ideally suited to families with		
	children's playgrounds, public change		
	rooms, alfresco café, etc. Moreover, to be		
	towered over by a multi-storey		
	development irrespective of the number of		
	floors. Parking for locals and families will		
	no doubt be significantly compromised in		
	the Ellen Cove vicinity unless there is a		
	large set back retaining the current road		
	and car parking system. Multistorey		
	development above four floors should have		
	no place in Albany's future as the		
	community clearly demonstrated in the		
	Frederick Street multistorey proposals a		
	decade or so ago. Albany is attractive to		
	visitors largely because of its fine natural		
	setting and the lack of multistorey		
	development. The scars of Observation		
	City in Scarborough are a stark reminder of		
	poor planning decisions in the past. Please		
	don't try to take our beautiful and unique		
	natural setting away by such an		

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
	,		Recommendation
	inappropriate proposal grossly impacting upon our most valuable assets. The demolished Esplanade Hotel was sensitively designed within the setting and ambience of Middleton Beach. Put it back as it was! It had soft tones, sensibly scaled setbacks from public areas and a true 'sense of place'. It also became an extended community facility with its various bars and lounges across a range of styles to suit most tastes. The conceptual designs in the various reports on the new multistorey component of the proposal comprise stark unsympathetic design completely out of context with the valuable natural surroundings and appear to be devoid of community enhancement potential.		
20	Expresses complete support to the proposed redevelopment at Middleton Beach. The up to 12 Stories is fantastic and is an opportunity to show leadership and progress for our great City. This project gives us another opportunity to achieve an icon for the years to come.	Nil.	Submission noted.

	OCHEDOLE OF C		
No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
21	Expresses full support of the Middleton Beach proposal, including the proposed heights. It is obvious this is needed to attract developers. With the high side backing to the mount no-one should be affected or offended. If we do not let this proposal go ahead now we should be prepared to look at a vacant block for many years to come.	Nil.	Submission noted.
22	Believes that altering the parking will taking views away from residents, and that the proposed building too tall and too close to the beach. It is out of character of the area. The shadow will cast on the beach and on to the native vegetation. States that highrise is 'not Albany' and development should be on a hotel site, not public land with a three to four-storey maximum. People leave the city for a different experience and Albany is about beauty – it is special because it is not the city.	Items one, two, three and nine of the key issues table address the matters of building height, overshadowing, parking and the location of the hotel within the development area, in detail.	, ,
	Look at Scarborough; it is too busy on weekends and the '80s hotel looks terrible as the owner does not care about upkeep. You are selling the beach with this plan. It should be about the old hotel land.		

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	The amount of parking on the plan is under the requirement.		
	I am sure your buildings will have architectural merit at first, but in 20 or 30 years everyone will say 'what did we do?'		
23	In opinion that 12 storeys is out of context. Is there a shadow plan at 3pm in winter for a 12 storey building? That's a plan that that you would like to see. Sure it's up against a hill and reduces visual impact but will the jetty be in a shadow for half the day?  It says '5+' storeys in the concept so guessing that it stacks up commercially after five storeys.	Items one and two of the key issues table address the matters of building height and overshadowing in detail.	Submission noted.
24	The new 'footprint' extends well beyond the old hotel site but I believe any new development should not intrude on the beach and grassed area. Clearly road realignment will be considered, however, LandCorp needs to be aware of the 'sentiment' surrounding access to the present beach.	Items eight and nine of the key issues table address the matters of road alignment and the location of the hotel within the development area in detail.	Submission noted.

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	It is important that more car parking bays		
	are included in the development. Tourism		
	is an increasingly important industry in		
	Albany but 90% of tourists will come by car		
	so while we need to be a pedestrian friendly		
	city, developments also need to be car-		
	friendly. While we all understand that land		
	is very valuable and a resource which must		
	be fully utilized, overdevelopment that will		
	spoil the 'character' of the area must be		
	opposed. While several alternatives have		
	been suggested, it is important that		
	multistorey buildings are towards the rear of		
	the site and plot ratios are not pushed to		
	their limit. Catering for families at street		
	level at the front of the site will mean that		
	retail, food and beverage service will be		
	easily available and accessible.		
	Any improvements should include more		
	toilets and improved toilet blocks. Often the		
	number of toilets are decreased when in		
	fact they are an essential service.		
	While the above may come with a restract		
	While the above may seem minor matters I		
	believe they are important and should be		
	considered.		
<u>                                       </u>			

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
25	I wish to congratulate the City of Albany,	Nil.	Submission noted.
	LandCorp and the Government of WA on		
	preparing the Middleton Beach		
	development proposals. Having lived in the		
	Albany area since 1990 and witnessed the		
	very slow rate of progress in bringing the		
	City of Albany into the 21 <sup>st</sup> Century, I trust		
	that the future development will include the		
	12-storey hotel as this will be absolutely		
	essential in getting international tourists as		
	well as interstate visitors into our region.		
	Albany can no longer simply look at being		
	an old people's retirement village where a		
	minority want to restrict future growth and		
	development. It is now a growing business		
	centre that must attract people who will		
	invest their energies and resources here		
	and allow opportunities for our children and		
	grandchildren to remain here in Albany.		
	Don't allow a small group of 'NIMBY' types		
	to 'shanghai' the proposed new vision that		
	has been presented. Just like all the		
	minority vocal groups who tried to stop the		
	Albany Entertainment Centre happening		
	whilst I was a City of Albany councillor a few		
	years back, they eventually disappeared		
	and now are at the facility to enjoy what the		

No.	Entertainment Centre has brought to our community. I trust that the Mayor and Councillors will speak up and support the often silent majority who just want Albany to take its place as the best regional city in Australia.	Officer Comment	Staff Recommendation
26	In opinion that the proposed is a brilliant concept and that Albany cannot afford to 'lag' behind other towns such as Busselton or Esperance when it comes to attracting tourists.	Nil.	Submission noted.
27	Is in support of the proposed believing it will put Albany in a better light. Also believes that Albany needs to embrace change and to be more inviting to visitors, and states that to do so Albany needs outside, sophisticated investors with plans to make something an attraction in addition to what Albany already has. Believes this plan is exactly that.	Nil.	Submission noted.
28	Is delighted with the proposed plans, and thinks it important to ensure that development on the site is encouraged so the height of the hotel is reasonably high. He presumes that the 12-storey maximum	Nil.	Submission noted.

No.	is enough to entice developers. Believes it may be imposing, but Albany will become accustomed. Is not in support of the proposed planting of palms as it does not compliment the current climate.	Officer Comment	Staff Recommendation
29	Suggesting that the proposal should allow more than 12 storeys and should include penthouses that have underground parking and lockable storage units.	Item three of the key issues table addresses the matter of parking in detail.	Submission noted.
30	In opinion that the hotel should be a maximum of five storeys as the afternoon shadow cast by a 12-storey building will cover the beach. Also believes that not enough parking is provided for the increasing population.	Items one and three of the key issues table address the matters of building height and parking in detail.	Submission noted.
31	Requests that adequate and hassle-free parking be provided.	Item three of the key issues table addresses the matter of parking in detail.	Submission noted.
32	In opposition to the 12-storey hotel proposal as he believes that it will be a 'foot in the door' for other high-rise buildings to be developed within the Middleton Beach area, in turn minimising views of Ellen Cove.	1	Submission noted.

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
	•		Recommendation
33	Is in great support of the artist's impression	Nil.	Submission noted.
	of the proposal.		
34	Considers it important that a guideline be	Item three of the key issues table	Submission noted.
	created to preserve the ground floor of the	addresses the matter of parking in	
	hotel so that it may be a shared space for	detail.	
	all. Believes this to be a great opportunity		
	for Albany to expand the cycling facilities,	The provision of end-of-trip facilities for	
	including increase of bicycle parking.	cyclists will be a requirement at the	
	However, is concerned as to what	time of development.	
	'pedestrian priority access' means in		
	relation to crossing Marine Drive.	'Pedestrian priority access' essentially	
		means that the pedestrians will be	
		given priority over cars at this crossing	
		point.	
35	In opinion that this proposal is what Albany	Nil.	Submission noted.
	needs to attract investment and give		
	tourists incentive to visit and enjoy Albany.		
36	In concerned that the proposed height of	Extensive community consultation has	Submission noted.
	the hotel will look out of place against the	occurred prior to the lodgement of the	
	existing two-storey properties. Also	current proposals, in order to inform its	
	concerned regarding the shadow that a 12-	design, and further community	
	storey building will cast over the area and	consultation has taken place according	
	that it will deter visitors in the evening.	to statutory requirements.	
	Believes the reduced road access is		
	concerning given the population increase,	Items one, two and three of the key	
	and raised similar concerns regarding the	issues table address the matters of	

No.	1	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
NO.		Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Recommendation
		extra 20 car parking bays proposed.	building height, overshadowing and	Recommendation
		Believes that Albany needs development	parking, in detail.	
		but does support the proposal and	pariting, in dotain	
		suggests more community consultation.		
37		Raises concern stating that if the amenities	The proposed local planning scheme	Submission noted.
		are increased in the area then the car	amendment and Middleton Beach	
		parking provided needs to reviewed, with	Activity Centre Structure Plan would	
		direct concern regarding peak tourism	create a planning framework for the	
		seasons. Would also like to know how	Activity Centre area, which would	
		much control the City of Albany has over	guide its subsequent development.	
		Developers ensuring that they adhere to		
		this Structure Plan. Believes that the 12-	Items one and three of the key issues	
		storey proposed hotel development is not in	table address the matters of building	
		theme with Albany or Middleton Beach, but	height and parking in detail.	
		does like the proposed grassed areas		
		between the beach and the buildings.		
38		Deligues that populing will become an issue	Itama and three of the law issues	Cubmississ noted
38		Believes that parking will become an issue,	Items one and three of the key issues	Submission noted.
		and suggests that the hotel be situated in the middle of the whole site where the	table address the matters of building	
		apartments are located to be a central	height and parking in detail.	
		attraction. Also believes that the 12-storey		
		proposal is too large and the hotel footprint		
		too wide. Wishes to add a suggestion of		
		the hotel be made structurally sound so that		
		the developer will build to five storeys and		
		may add more storeys at a later date.		
		may add more storeys at a later date.		

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff Recommendation
39	Asks that all buildings are six-star rated.	Any future buildings would have to be constructed to meet the energy rating required by the Building code of Australia at the time of development.	
40	Is in complete favour of the proposal, including the 12-storey maximum. Of the opinion that it will not dramatically affect views of residents and can only improve the value of surrounding properties.	Nil.	Submission noted.
41	Of the opinion that not enough bicycle racks are provided in the proposal and that the more that can be installed, then the more traffic the area will generate. Asks that safety lockers be provided at the beachfront for the public to safely store personal belongings.	a component of new development by	
42	Admitted to signing a petition recently opposing the 12-storey proposal, but since viewing the artist's impression boards, he is now in favour of the proposal believing it to	Nil.	Submission noted.

No.	Summary of Submission  be magnificent, well thought out and well presented.	Officer Comment	Staff Recommendation
43	Requests that no more than three storeys be proposed on the grounds it will be visually destructive to the open, friendly area and that only the wealthy will be able to live in the area once developed.	Item one of the key issues table addresses the matter of building height in detail.	
44	Believes the proposal to be fantastic, and that it is important to cement Albany as a premier tourist destination.	Nil.	Submission noted.
45	Is enthusiastically in favour of the Structure Plan and believes it is long overdue for this part of Albany. Of the opinion that the proposed heights made both design and commercial sense, and it in favour to have the 12-storey proposed hotel as part of the development.	Nil.	Submission noted.
46	Believes that palms should be avoided as part of the vegetation plans, but all other detailed vegetation is appropriate.	Nil.	Submission noted.
47	States that six to eight storeys would be ideal and that the mixed use sites should allow for home office situations, as he believes that it would be good for non-locals to be able to set up a small office and have	Item one of the key issues table addresses the matter of building height in detail.	Submission noted.

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
	,		Recommendation
48	a place to stay a few days a week. Does not want the area to become exclusive to a particular demographic (i.e. retirement village) and that diversity needs to be encouraged in the area. Hopes that developers seize the opportunity.  Is in support of the proposals and hopes	development approval, provided that it is for the sole use of the occupier of the dwelling and is not open to the public.	Submission noted.
49	that it proceeds quickly.  Believes the proposal would constitute good planning if developed as presented, but is sceptical of whether or not the City of Albany and developers will adhere to the Plan. Is in opposition to any development being closer to the beach than shown, as this belongs to the community and not solely tourists. Also wishes that the proposed artwork not be used.	The proposed local planning scheme amendment and Middleton Beach Activity Centre Structure Plan would create a planning framework for the Activity Centre area, which would guide its subsequent development.  Item nine of the key issues table addresses the location of the hotel within the development area in detail.	
50	Is in favour of the proposal, and believes that Albany needs a new hotel and business outlets in the area. Only concern is that the height is above seven storeys, but if it is nestled into the Western side it should as to not impact on local residents if 12 storeys is approved.	Item one of the key issues table addresses the matter of building height in detail.	

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
51	All believe that the area will become too crowded with the proposal and that there will be adverse implications on traffic.	Middleton Beach is subject to a 40km/h speed limit and the proposals will result in additional traffic calming that will make the area more pedestrian-friendly.  Item three of the key issues table addresses the matter of parking in detail.	
52	Of the opinion that adequate car parking has not be allowed for and that the hotel site needs to go back to the bush and road as if it is against the mountain, then the height is not going to be an issue as it is tucked away in the corner. Also believes that the hotel site should be positioned where the current parking area is situated to open up the beach to the public because as the plans currently are, they encroach onto public areas, grassed area and beach.	Items one, three and nine of the key issues table addresses the matter of building height, parking and the location of the hotel within the development area, in detail.	
53	Believes that there is no reason that this proposal should not go ahead. States that it would be better than the site in its current state.	Nil.	Submission noted.

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
54	Of the opinion that the artist's impression	Item one of the key issues table	
	drawings look excellent, apart from the	addresses the matter of building height	
	proposed 12-storey hotel site. Believes	in detail.	
	that five storeys should be the limit to the		
	site and that the 12-storey maximum gives		
	a 'Gold Coast' look to the area. Concerned		
	that allowing 12 storeys would facilitate		
	further decisions for 12-storey and taller		
	buildings, which would detract from the		
	character of the area.		
55	Suggests that the hotel, residential and		
	commercial buildings indicated on the	addresses the matter of building height	
	proposal should be no higher than six	in detail.	
	storeys; that underground parking be		
	provided for the hotel site; that the colour of		
	the building should be accommodating of		
	the environment and 'fit in' (i.e. previous		
	colour scheme of the Esplanade Hotel);		
	and suggests to close vehicle access to		
	Flinders Parade and allow areas for		
	markets, music, etc.		
56	Is in opposition to the proposed 12-storey	Items one, two and six of the key	
	hotel site as it will cause shading across the	issues table address the matters of	
	café and playground area through winter	building height, overshadowing and	
	when the sun is low, which will affect the	wind, in detail.	
	amenity of the area and that the gap		
	between Mount Clarence and the hotel will		

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	create a wind tunnel effect onto the beach.		
	Believes that the other elements of the		
	proposal are good but the high-rise		
	component will impact the character of the		
	area.		
57	Is in favour of the low-rise aspects of the	Item one of the key issues table	Submission noted.
	proposal. Feels that a high-rise	addresses the matter of building height	
	development is out of character with	in detail.	
	Middleton Beach and strongly urges the		
	Council only consider low-rise proposals up		
	to a six-storey maximum.		
58	Believes that the City of Albany need to	Item one of the key issues table	Submission noted
	take more notice of the community over the	addresses the matter of building height	
	interest of private developers who do not	in detail.	
	reside in the area. Previous developments		
	in WA has cause the communities to live		
	with poor developments and visual		
	eyesores (i.e. Scarborough Beach		
	development). The hotel site and height is		
	inappropriate for the Middleton Beach area.		
	Believes that the development height		
	should be no more than five storeys.		
59	Is in support of the proposed 12-storey	Nil.	Submission noted.
	hotel site as she believes Albany needs		
	something of this nature. Also strongly		

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	believes that it will not impact on the		
	community's view over the area.		
60	Believes it is imperative to leave open	Items one, six and nine of the key	
	space on the foreshore to keep areas	issues table address the matters of	
	available for various activities. Will also still	building height, wind and the location	
	support what LandCorp indicates as the	of the hotel within the development	
	peoples' choice for low-rise buildings.	area, in detail.	
	Twelve storeys on the hotel site, insinuated		
	into the mix by progressively increasing the		
	height of the commercial/residential		
	buildings is unacceptable. Completely		
	disagrees with the proposed 12 storeys and		
	considers that eight storeys would even be		
	too much, and that six would be more agreeable. Does not accept the economic		
	viability argument that demands height.		
	And whoever put together the concept plan		
	took no account of the easterlies which		
	would make the main corridor a gigantic		
	wind tunnel. I am also suspicious of the		
	footprint of the hotel increasing towards the		
	foreshore and its design to changes		
	drastically to 'maximise return'.		
	alactically to maximize forall.		
61	Believes the proposal to be absolutely	Nil.	Submission noted.
	fantastic and that Albany needs a five-star		
	hotel. Loves the concept plans, including		

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	12 storeys if that's what the developer		
	needs to make it financially viable. Albany		
	is growing - we need accommodation to		
	encourage tourism and business		
	investment in our City as well as alternative		
	residential options which this proposed		
	development will provide.		
62	Is very impressed with the proposal plans	Nil.	Submission noted.
	and see good sense in the distribution of		
	building heights. This allows the		
	development to blend well into the current		
	landscape. Road re-alignment and		
	grassed areas at the waterfront is a benefit		
	to the community. Retaining the iconic		
	views between the Norfolk Island Pines and		
	out into the sound is a priority always.		
63	Does not like the footprint of the proposed	Items one and nine of the key issues	Submission noted.
	12-storey hotel. Understood the proposal	table address the matters of building	
	to be situated where the carpark near Three	height and the location of the hotel	
	Anchors is hard against the mountain. Is	within the development area in detail.	
	also in opposition to the actual 12-storey		
	height proposal, but is in favour of the re-		
	development. Suggests not planting Red		
	Flowering Gums as they are quite messy.		

<b>No.</b>	Summary of Submission  In favour of the proposed development and believes that the 12-storey hotel will become iconic only if a wise range of architectural designs, are considered.	Officer Comment Nil.	Staff Recommendation Submission noted.
65	architectural designs are considered. Suggest to make an Australia-wide competition for designs.	Nil.	Submission noted.
05	Suggests to increase the height of the structures along Adelaide Crescent – the backdrop to the hill is not really obscuring views and lessen the height of the structure freestanding near the roundabout (hotel site) avoiding wind tunnels. Otherwise believes that it will work except maybe restricted traffic through the area and make Marine Terrace a more commonly used thoroughfare. Suggests to keep the idea of public access to the lower levels.	INII.	Submission noted.
66	Thinks that the Plan is a great concept. Does not mind the five-storey building proposal but does think that more than five storeys is too much and will not reflect the other buildings around Middleton Beach. Would love to keep a good view of the whole mountain.	Item one of the key issues table addresses the matter of building height in detail.	Submission noted.

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
67	Does approve of the look of the proposal as it seems to fit a lot in. Would suggest moving the '6+' storey building even further back towards the mountain and putting the road in front of it. Would be in support of '6+' storeys if the site were located closer to the mountain.	Items one and nine of the key issues table address the matters of building height and the location of the hotel within the development area in detail.	Submission noted.
68	Hotel – 12 storeys is excessive. The height and bulk is out of place in the area and will not fit the 'village' concept of the rest of the development and surrounding area. The height should be no more than four storeys.  The streetscape created by the 12-storey height of the hotel is out of place. The architecture of the building should match the existing street scape along the adjoining streets.  The hotel must have dedicated sufficient parking within its footprint.  Public parking – apparently there will be approximately 30 additional public parking spaces. This appears to be inadequate due to the amount of additional traffic created by	Items one and three of the key issues table address the matters of building height and parking in detail.	Submission noted.

No.	Summary of Submission  the proposed restaurants, taverns and shops.	Officer Comment	Staff Recommendation
69	'You build it, they will come.'  Believes the proposal to be excellent, and suggests not to limit the number of storeys as developers need encouragement to come and build at Middleton Beach. Believes we should make Middleton Beach a worldwide icon, to go for it, and not let people who have lived in the area 'forever' to dampen spirits and put doubt into minds. Strongly believes this is 'our future' being a small local business owner and mother.	Nil.	Submission noted.
70	Believes the proposed 12-storey hotel height is too small to be viable and suggests increasing the number to 15. In favour of the proposal and states that people who are silent do want this and to not listen to a noisy minority.	Nil.	Submission noted.
71	This development will finally achieve a resolution to a problem that has been outstanding since the demolition of the hotel that once stood on this site. I am concerned about the 12-storey proposal	Item one of the key issues table addresses the matter of building height in detail.	Submission noted.

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	but would accept that height if there is no alternative.		
72	Suggests that the hotel site be a maximum of six storeys.	Item one of the key issues table addresses the matter of building height in detail.	Submission noted.
73	Suggests to lose the path between the buildings moving them forward creating usable parking and market place space between Bay Merchants and new buildings.	Item nine of the key issues table addresses the location of the hotel within the development area in detail.	Submission noted.
74	Is concerned that there will be an issue with the easterly winds and a 12-storey building. Suggests keeping a lower profile with five storeys, which should lessen the effect and deflecting around the building. Also believes there is another issue with regard to the movement of beach sand into Ellen Cove. The beach keeps getting higher and the Council has to keep taking sand away so that the storm water drains can flush. Sand will block these drains no matter where you put them. Is in support of the proposal, only if it is kept to five storeys.	Items one, four and six of the key issues table address the matters of building height, coastal planning and wind, in detail.	Submission noted.

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff Recommendation
75	States that she is not totally against the proposal, but feels that the hotel site and building should be further back against the hill where the carpark is across from Three Anchors so that it is not so imposing.	Item nine of the key issues table addresses the location of the hotel within the development area in detail.	
76	Is in favour of the concept and believes the hotel site with direct access to the beach is excellent. Suggests to not restrict the hotel site as it will not cause shading to anything important. States that the development must be economic and to be as high as it needs, with the only lack being that just 30 car parking bays are proposed. Suggests that LandCorp and the City of Albany seriously consider an underground public car park under the two lots facing Flinders Parade so that people can park and access the beach. Understands that to do so would be expensive and tricky as foundations would have to carry the proposed buildings, but having more car parking bays will be a bonus for business and the public in the future.	Nil.	Submission noted.
77	Believes the proposal to be fantastic for Albany and loves the concept plan. Of the opinion that this development will only enhance Albany's ability to secure a bigger	Nil.	Submission noted.

No.	Summary of Submission  share of the tourism industry. Has seen two Esplanade buildings in his lifetime and believes that they bring good fortune. Believes that Albany is moving in the right direction.	Officer Comment	Staff Recommendation
78	The concept looks great and thinks that the hotel is a perfect fit for the mountain corner, but believes that the 12 storeys could be imposing and would prefer eight to 10 storeys as a minor adjustment. With that said, maximum occupancy is required for the investment to pay off. Of the opinion that the concept looks a little clinical in design, and that it would be better to blend it in more.  Believes that parking and pedestrians must be elevated in importance for the area. All in all believes that the development would be an amazing upgrade to a very 'tired' area of Albany.	Items one and three of the key issues table address the matters of building height and parking in detail.	Submission noted.
79	Believes the proposal to be a great building on a great site, and that tidying at last the mess that has been the Esplanade for so long is good. Also believes that the development will bring jobs and revenue to	Nil.	Submission noted.

No.	approved?'	ow can this not be	Officer Comment	Staff Recommendation
80	up to 12 storeys would the character of the that a developer will easily be met by a more ground on the Use). The number of storey hotel would to 12 storey proposal.  At 12 storeys, it imparts the beach, as well as view which should rekey holiday feel it has lit would set a preced for more high-rise site.	alld impact adversely on a area. The argument ants a 'big' place can allowing the hotel site of plan (less for Mixed of rooms in a five to six then equal those in the exacts on everyone using a residents, spoiling the emain the relaxing, lowers always been.  The argument are area in a place of the exact	tem one of the key issues table addresses the matter of building height in detail.	Submission noted.
81	support for the propo Club in March 2016 area, showcase our vibrancy to the area	veridge express 100% Nosal as seen at the Surf S. It will enhance the wonderful beach, bring a, offer a huge tourism o residential properties	Nil.	Submission noted.

<u> </u>				
No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff	
			Recommendation	
	and some businesses nearby and it should			
	not dramatically effect residential views.			
	Both Mr & Mrs Loveridge like the			
	design/planning and believe that to an			
	extent it would look like a 'mini Noosa'.			
82	Believes the Middleton Beach Activity	Nil.	Submission noted.	
	Centre looks great, is very well planned and			
	likes the situation of the hotel. Believes it			
	will be lovely once again to have			
	somewhere nice to go on a Sunday by the			
	sea and to have a nice dinner.			
83	Mr Slattery objects to the expansion of the	Items one, three, eight and nine of the	Submission noted.	
	area available for development beyond the	key issues table address the matters of		
	immediate area and surrounds of the	building height, parking, road		
	former Esplanade Hotel site.	alignment and the location of the hotel		
		within the development area, in detail.		
	The site allocated for the Hotel/Mixed Use			
	extends way beyond the former Esplanade			
	boundary, across the current alignment of			
	Flinders Parade and into the current			
	grassed foreshore parkland.			
	The proposal brings built development			
	much closer to the coastline and will			
	destroy the amenity and continuity of a			
	broad grass/tree parkland along the full			

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	length of Middleton Beach. There will be a narrowing between the hotel and the foreshore, instead of the wide swath of green that would otherwise flow through to the Three Anchors Café and approach to Ellen Cove.  Furthermore, the approach down to Middleton Beach along Marine Drive, which now provides a spectacular outlook of the Beach will be lost. Drivers will instead be directed to a boring approach behind a Hotel, losing the view of the parkland and beach from the only elevated road in the precinct.		
	A re-alignment is desirable, but it could be done better without the Hotel site where it is shown.  An increase of 29 bays (22%) is not proportionate to the additional development proposed, given that the Activity Centre is designed to attract many more visitors to Middleton Beach's upgraded facilities and commercial outlets.		

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
	, <del>,</del>		Recommendation
	The provisions for up to 12 storeys on the Hotel/Mixed Use site is unnecessary and inappropriate. In discussions between authorities and stakeholders, the prospect of 12 storeys has not arisen and suddenly it is now considered necessary to attract the right developer or the community will be back to square one, which I think is not the case.		
	Things are different now as there is a plan for the whole precinct which can occur in stages. It may well be advantageous for others to be done earlier to bring more people to the area and demonstrate the new market to potential developers.		
	The large site in the corner of the bay would be able to produce great ocean views bother eastward and southward without the need for 12 storeys if it had good design. A more compact development would keep more within the 'village' feel of Albany.		
84	The community consultation with LandCorp has been welcome but are they holding the results? A recent survey resulted in 68% of the participating public wanting building	consultation to inform the design of the proposals. The City has advertised the	Submission noted.

L	No.   Cummons of Culturiation   Officer Commons   Ctaff				
No.		Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff	
				Recommendation	
		height restricted to five storeys. So going	to gauge community opinion and		
		to developers stating a maximum of 12	inform the final recommendation.		
		storeys would be deceiving the public and			
		unfair to developers knowing there is so	Items one and six of the key issues		
		much opposition. I prefer a five-storey	table address the matters of building		
		maximum on the hotel site, and a three-	height and wind in detail.		
		storey maximum on the old Esplanade site	· ·		
		to avoid wind tunnelling, shade			
		encroachment and future slums.			
85		Believes the proposal to be a stupid idea,	Nil.	Submission noted.	
		and states it should be re-considered.			
		States that Flinders Parade should not be			
		blocked off and that Albany should not be			
		modelled on Perth. Suggests using the old			
		Esplanade site only and not to build too			
		high.			
		riigii.			
86		States that this plan looks good as it is	Nil.	Submission noted.	
00		much better than a hole in the ground.	INII.	Submission noted.	
		•			
		Believes that consideration should be given			
		to moving the permanent accommodation			
		block to the Flinders Parade frontage to			
		afford a better view. States that too long			
		too little has happened in the area and so			
		believes that this proposal might revitalize			
		the area.			

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff Recommendation
87	The proposed amendment to the Local Planning Scheme allowing high-rise above five storeys in nothing short of abandonment of civil duty and is purely a matter of Council being 'in bed' with LandCorp with the aim of making profit. Development of high-rise to 12 storeys will adversely impact the amenity of the area.	Item one of the key issues table addresses the matter of building height in detail.	Submission noted.
88	I think the plans look fantastic are we are in favour of what is being proposed.	Nil.	Submission noted.
89	I believe that overdevelopment and inappropriate purposing of the fragile locale is indicated follows.  Large hotel on prominent location:  Twelve storeys is too high for the intended location close to the beach, whose current open, low-key and relaxed ambience is the most valuable feature to be preserved for	Items one, eight and nine of the key issues table address the matters of building height, road alignment and the location of the hotel within the development area, in detail.  The artist's impressions were prepared as a guide to provide the public with a sense how completed buildings could look and are not development	Submission noted.
	visiting holidaymakers and local residents.  There will be overshadowing at some times of the day and a blocked view of the sunset from Ellen Cove and its hillside timber tables and benches.	proposals.  The rerouting of Flinders Parade has been proposed in order to enhance the permeability of the Activity Centre area and public access to the beach from the proposed hotel/mixed use site.	

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		Recommendation
	Purpose and architecture of hotel and associated development on old Esplanade site:		
	The formal and expensive character of the hotel is not welcoming for holidaymakers and families with children seeking to casually picnic, play and swim at the popular location.		
	Combined with proposals for the adjacent vacant site left after demolition of the Esplanade Hotel, the project's stated purpose as a 'Tourism Precinct' – to include a wellness centre, tavern, consulting rooms and glass-fronted cafes – would appeal to well-heeled adults but, unfairly, not have broader appeal.		
	The style of any new buildings at Middleton Beach should complement existing structures in the area, some of which are heritage buildings.		
	Bulk of hotel footprint:		
	This extends too far east and north. The hotel would be alongside the most popular		

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	part of the grassed area of Middleton		
	Beach, i.e. near Three Anchors and		
	adjacent playground, and its depth and		
	breadth could deter families with children		
	from the area. It would impinge on the		
	above-cited, highly desirable openness		
	near the beach, and, importantly, the		
	parking bays closest to this area would be		
	eliminated and encroach on ease of		
	access. Additionally, it appears from one of		
	LandCorp's diagrams that part of Ellen		
	Cove Walk is at risk of being eliminated.		
	Downgrading of priority roads / re-routing of		
	Flinders Parade:		
	Priority roads are to be downgraded, which		
	again indicates that too much of the area		
	nearest Middleton Beach will be for guests,		
	owners or tenants of new commercial and		
	residential establishments, and		
	compromise public access and		
	amenity. To create 'adaptable space', it		
	has been proposed to re-route Flinders		
	Parade to create a 'village road' and have a		
	public parking area within the old		
	Esplanade site, which could be closed for		
	markets and cultural events. However, it is		

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
	, and the second		Recommendation
	unlikely that these spaces will be		
	considered for the activities as they are not		
	purpose-built for the same; there are other		
	suitable venues in Albany that can be used		
	for these.		
	Maximum height of five storeys for old		
	Esplanade site:		
	The Middleton Beach area is fragile and		
	could easily be spoiled by over-		
	development. I believe that its hillsides and		
	small suburban area do not accommodate		
	LandCorp's present concept. Most of the		
	suburban area of Middleton Beach is one		
	storey, with some buildings of two or three		
	storeys. The introduction of five storeys		
	would not be compatible with the average		
	height of existing buildings.		
	Suggestion for an Alternative :		
	Develop only vacant hotel site and do not		
	re-route Flinders Parade:		
	If a small to moderate-sized hotel is not a		
	viable option, develop high quality housing		
	of up to three storeys on the vacant site with		

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	several one-storey specialty food outlets along Flinders Parade, using transparent wind barriers for al fresco areas, as were used at the old Esplanade Hotel.  Food services could include: a confectionery shop selling fairy floss, sea salt taffy, ice cream and other sweet items; a bakery; and a cafe/bar, or solely cafe, providing a good standard of barista coffee, teas and moderately priced quality foods – dine-in or takeaway – that include items		
	associated with being near the ocean.  Shopping strips of this kind near the sea are highly successful in Bunbury, Mandurah and Rockingham.  In general:  There should be no construction on the site being considered for a new hotel, and an		
	absolute maximum building height of four storeys should be set, no matter the type and purpose of development that ensues at Middleton Beach.		

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	In regard to suggested suitable architecture for Middleton Beach, attached to my covering email is an extract from <i>The West Australian – Real Estate</i> of 26-27 March 2016.		
90	In my previous submissions to LandCorp I highlighted my concerns about the development favouring a high ratio of land use devoted to private dwellings threatening to displace opportunities for short term accommodation, retention of robust height limits — e.g. Maximum four stories plus semi-underground parking, sun shadows being cast over the community's amenity during prime visitation periods.  The Middleton Beach Scheme Amendment and Activity Centre Structure Plan appear to ignore or compromise best practice on these fundamental criterion.  As I understand it, the Western Australian community own the development site through the State Government and agency LandCorp. It is an understandable position that private dwellings within the site would seed fund the greater project. Sale of these	Items one, two and three of the key issues table address the matters of building height, overshadowing and parking, in detail.	Submission noted.

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff	
			Recommendation	
	dwellings would help to recoup some of the purchase price of the site. In some small part this would contribute to the alleviation of State Government debt levels. However, this is election term economics and comes at the price of the long term viability of a hotel development. A hotel with associated short stay accommodation relies absolutely, on an economy of scale to prosper. Private dwellings are already under-utilised in the Middleton Beach area. The problem presents itself as an absentee owner suburb with most vibrancy coming from outside visitors enjoying the amenity. More private dwellings will perpetuate this problem.			
	I support a four-storey development with dedicated parking beyond what you ever think you will need.  My opinion is just one of many and our community will ultimately get a development that Landcorp deems best. I was impressed with the extensive studies presented in the Middleton Beach Activity Centre Structure Plan. They will provide a useful knowledge base for any future			

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	development of the site. I am concerned		
	however, that shadow modelling of this		
	current proposal was for June when (a)		
	Visitation numbers to the beach amenity		
	are relatively low, and (b) due to the Winter		
	alignment of the sun, a very optimistic		
	shadow outcome is illustrated. So, let's see		
	some modelling for 1 January through to 1		
	April. How about you factor a real life		
	scenario - people who live and work in		
	Albany finish a hot day at work and knock		
	off at 5pm and rush to the beach to meet		
	the family for a swim or play. The shadow		
	modelling during my suggested period, of		
	this current proposal, would illustrate the		
	demise of the community's valuable		
	amenity. I thought the artist's impressions		
	were worthy, if not dominating of our iconic		
	Ellen Cove and majestic Mount Adelaide.		
	In your current concept, I would choose		
	your five-storey option over your 12-storey		
	one. If we got stuck with either, please		
	think about aligning the building axis more		
	east-west to minimise those prohibitive		
	shadows.		
91	Mr & Mrs Twentyman state their excitement	Nii	Submission noted.
	as something may finally progress with	INII.	Oubinission noted.
	as something may infanty progress with		

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	Middleton Beach. Believe that the proposed development appears great and in their view would be a tremendous opportunity for the City of Albany and the state.		
	Believe the proposed hotel site is well positioned and appreciate that it must be economically viable. Also believe the proposal would greatly support the efforts of City of Albany and other parties to promote tourism in the area.		
92	In general I am not too concerned about the development on the land that was previously occupied by 'the Esplanade Hotel'. However, I am concerned about the location, size and height of the hotel site.  Suggested overall priorities:	Items one, two, four and nine of the key issues table address the matters of building height, overshadowing, coastal planning and the location of the hotel within the development area, in detail.	
	<ul> <li>Preserve and enhance the natural environment and biodiversity, including the coastal reserves, open spaces, reserves and bushland.</li> <li>Reduce car dependency and traffic through improved walkways, cycle ways and public transport and bus routes.</li> </ul>	State Planning Policy 2.6 – State Coastal Planning is the relevant policy document when assessing coastal hazard risk management.  In accordance with State Planning Policy 2.6, a Coastal Hazard Risk	

	<del> </del>			
No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff	
			Recommendation	
	• Create a community friendly	been prepared for the Activity Centre		
	atmosphere.	area and deals with the following		
	• Important to create and maintain a	matters:		
	geographic buffer to absorb any natural			
	fluctuation in the coastline.	Establishment of the context;		
		Coastal hazard assessment;		
	Comments:	Risk analysis and evaluation;		
		Risk management and adaptation		
	General impression from looking at other	planning; and		
	local authorities especially those located	Monitoring and review.		
	along the Perth coastal strip i.e. Stirling &			
	Cottesloe is that the maximum height would	The Coastal Hazard Risk Management		
	be eight stories.	and Adaptation Plan identifies that the		
	Also noted mantion of impaging a minimum	Activity Centre area will be subject to		
	Also noted mention of imposing a minimum setback of 500 metres from high water	coastal risks, which will require		
	mark as means of reducing the risk of	management into the future.		
	damage caused by anticipated sea level	Two potential antique have been		
	rise.	Two potential options have been		
	noc.	identified for managing coastal risk to the site. The first of these is to restore		
	Current proposal appears to be	the level of the beach to the naturally		
	approximately 100 metres from the high	occurring higher level, while the		
	water mark. This of course could change	second is the construction of a seawall		
	dramatically by the end of the century.	along the length of the foreshore, or		
		solely around the proposed		
	Could the hotel rezoning expose the council	hotel/mixed use site.		
	and the government to future litigation by			
	dispossessed coastal landholders?			

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	Does the rezoning comply with the planned modifications to the shoreline law?	The final method for coastal risk mitigation will be determined later in the planning process. Before a final	
	Traffic and parking study needs to be undertaken. Over this Easter, car parks and verge areas were noted to be almost fully occupied.	decision is made on the preferred management option, additional studies will be required in order to determine the most effective long term measure.	
	Any future development should be able to provide all anticipated extra parking requirements generated by any future development.		
	The roundabout at foot of Marine Drive looks out of place. Does this need to be retained?		
	Global sea level rise has accelerated in response to warming of the atmosphere and the ocean, and melting of the cryosphere. We know that scientific projections indicate that a one metre rise by the end of this century is possible.		
	In the light of the damage caused by cyclone Alby in 1978, some 38 years ago, it could be deemed rather negligent to even		

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	contemplate placing a 12-storey hotel on		
	what is basically a beach site.		
93	I would like to object most strongly to the proposed hotel at Middleton Beach. Even a six storey height limit would be way too high. The area would be overwhelmed by visitors if filled, and visually the whole approach to Marine Parade would be spoiled. Taking it to 12 floors is ridiculous. Is the idea that we get so upset about 12, that the six seems good by comparison? Please don't allow this destruction of our lovely city.	Item one of the key issues table addresses the matter of building height in detail.	Submission noted.
94	I object to the proposed development at Middleton Beach on the following basis:  The mix of retail, office, tourism and permanent high density accommodation is a commercial hub not a community activity centre.	Nil.	Submission noted.
	A 12 storey structure would be a blight on the landscape. People reside and/or visit Middleton Beach to enjoy its natural beauty – the beach, Mount Clarence and the ocean views. The proposal to build up to 12 storeys (twice the height of the pine trees)		

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	is not in keeping with the current low-rise		
	residential and recreational nature of the		
	area. A structure marginally higher than the		
	pine trees would be suitable (3-4 storeys).		
	Although the plans include an increase in		
	public open space, a significant portion of		
	public open space will be limited in use by		
	shadows from the tower, making the area		
	cold. A lower structure which is stepped		
	back from the beach would be a better		
	option.		
	In a recent survey of the community, less		
	than 3% agreed with a seven plus storey		
	structure.		
	There has been no realistic and multi-		
	directional concept plans (views from the		
	beach, boardwalk, Middleton Road hill,		
	Emu Point) of the high-rise tower provided		
	to the community for comment. The visual		
	provided (The Weekender March 24 2016)		
	is an aerial view.		
	There is concern regarding the increase in		
	traffic on residential roads and parking		
	problems in the area due to high density		

No	T	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
No.		Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	
				Recommendation
		living (687 permanent residents), their		
		visitors, office/retail/hospitalities		
		employees, patrons and tourist		
		accommodation traffic. An estimation of		
		traffic and parking (I would estimate at least		
		400+ cars per day) would be a fair and		
		reasonable addition to the research based		
		information residents deserve.		
95		The scale of the four blocks of low rise	Items one, two and three of the key	Submission noted.
		development seem to be appropriate and	issues table address the matters of	
		suitable for the site. These four blocks	building height, overshadowing and	
		represent, I believe, what the public	parking, in detail.	
		understand as the development site. I		
		found the presentation very misleading.		
		When I saw that only 33% of the site was to		
		be developed I was greatly reassured only		
		to find that in truth nearly 100% of the site		
		(as the public will understand it behind the		
		old fencing) is to be developed together		
		with its dedicated access roads.		
		Will its dedicated access rodus.		
		The proposed hotel site seems much more		
		of a problem as it overlays part of the		
		existing car park and the green lawns now		
		enjoyed as public land and will probably		
		encroach further when decking and access		
		steps surround the proposed new buildings		

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	on the beach side. A building of this size		
	will completely dominate the southwest end		
	of Middleton beach and views from most		
	angles. The proposed site is far too close		
	to the beach not to destroy the existing use.		
	If a five-star hotel is built it may prove very		
	difficult to achieve a sufficient occupancy		
	rate throughout the year to make it viable.		
	A few high-spend guests will be attracted		
	but I fear not in sufficient quantities.		
	A better business model might be a four		
	star hotel with good conference facilities		
	with a maximum height of six stories. The		
	building costs would be reduced and the		
	occupancy rate improved.		
	Inevitably, 12 stories will become the datum		
	for future developments and may well		
	spread to other parts of this site. This would		
	be a disaster for Middleton Beach. One of		
	the main attractions of Albany is that it		
	represents a relaxed atmosphere and its		
	old-world charm which is more and more		
	sought-after by tourists from busy cities and		
	other resorts. My background is partly in		
	hotel development and I hope you will be		

No.	able to take these views into consideration when deciding on the final shape of this development.	Officer Comment	Staff Recommendation
96	I was pleasantly surprised by the Middleton Beach Scheme. I think 20 storeys of hotel complex is probably too much and perhaps 10 or 12 would be a good compromise.  My main concern is the lack of parking as at certain times parking space is extremely limited in the area. The plan states that parking will be increased by only 29 spaces which is not enough to cater for the added traffic the development will attract.	Item three of the key issues table addresses the matter of parking in detail.	
97	The proposal to cater for up to 12 storeys is against the environment of Middleton Beach. Any development should take into account all factors to protect this environment and prepare a reasonable proposal.  The public parking demand will increase and needs to be taken into account, and the use of underground private parking for residents needs to be a 'must', not a 'may be'.	Items one and three of the key issues table address the matters of building height and parking in detail.	Submission noted.

Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
		Recommendation
storeys within the development as she believes it would adversely affect the amenity if the area. Crowding buildings in this area will certainly have an adverse effect on the natural openness and bush ambiance of the area. Much of the land designated for 'Public Open Space' appears to be roads, parking and walkthrough areas. And the private residential areas would not be welcoming to general public use.  The extra parking spaces would be insufficient to cater for the patrons of the	Items one and three of the key issues table address the matters of building height and parking in detail.	Submission noted.
as the usual beach-goers. There needs to be underground parking for residents to take the pressure of public parking.  We need clever development, not overdevelopment.  Subsequent to my previous e-mail, I would	•	Submission noted.
	storeys within the development as she believes it would adversely affect the amenity if the area. Crowding buildings in this area will certainly have an adverse effect on the natural openness and bush ambiance of the area. Much of the land designated for 'Public Open Space' appears to be roads, parking and walkthrough areas. And the private residential areas would not be welcoming to general public use.  The extra parking spaces would be insufficient to cater for the patrons of the new retail facilities and restaurants as well as the usual beach-goers. There needs to be underground parking for residents to take the pressure of public parking.  We need clever development, not overdevelopment.	storeys within the development as she believes it would adversely affect the amenity if the area. Crowding buildings in this area will certainly have an adverse effect on the natural openness and bush ambiance of the area. Much of the land designated for 'Public Open Space' appears to be roads, parking and walkthrough areas. And the private residential areas would not be welcoming to general public use.  The extra parking spaces would be insufficient to cater for the patrons of the new retail facilities and restaurants as well as the usual beach-goers. There needs to be underground parking for residents to take the pressure of public parking.  We need clever development, not overdevelopment.  Subsequent to my previous e-mail, I would Item four of the key issues table

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff	
			Recommendation	
	Although I previously touched on the	State Planning Policy 2.6 - State		
	subject of Sea Level Rise (SLR), I have	Coastal Planning is the relevant policy		
	since managed to obtain a copy of the	document when assessing coastal		
	Government Report titled: Coastal	hazard risk management.		
	inundation modelling for Busselton,			
	Western Australia, under current and future	In accordance with State Planning		
	climate, which has made some quite	Policy 2.6, a Coastal Hazard Risk		
	startling conclusions, i.e. the 'model'	Management and Adaptation Plan has		
	prepared by Cowell and Barry (2012)	been prepared for the Activity Centre		
	identified coastal erosion to be within the	area and deals with the following		
	range of 263 metres and 537 metres	matters:		
	respectively for a 50% and 10% probability			
	of exceedance under a 1.1 metre SLR	<ul> <li>Establishment of the context;</li> </ul>		
	scenario.	<ul> <li>Coastal hazard assessment;</li> </ul>		
		<ul> <li>Risk analysis and evaluation;</li> </ul>		
	COMMENTS:	Risk management and adaptation		
		planning; and		
	An in-depth 'Risk Assessment' needs to	<ul> <li>Monitoring and review.</li> </ul>		
	be undertaken to evaluate the			
	seriousness of any future coastal	The Coastal Hazard Risk Management		
	hazards. Something on the scale of the	and Adaptation Plan identifies that the		
	Busselton study mentioned above is	Activity Centre area will be subject to		
	required at the very least before any	coastal risks, which will require		
	future rezoning can be considered.	management into the future.		
	Detailed modelling by someone such as	Two potential options have been		
	Cowell and Barry is essential to enable	•		
	Danish and Daniy to observation to original	identified for managing coastal risk to		
		the site. The first of these is to restore		

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	appropriate planning setbacks to be determined.  3. The section of coast between Emu Point and Ellen Cove is known to be dynamic and the coastal processes to be considered relevant to this location would include Winds, Waves. Water Levels (tides, storms, waves etc.,) shoreline stability, currents and ocean circulation.  4. It could be argued that an intensive development such as the Middleton Beach Activity Centre Structure Plan could prejudice the stability of surrounding structures which could	the level of the beach to the naturally occurring higher level, while the second is the construction of a seawall along the length of the foreshore, or solely around the proposed hotel/mixed use site.	
	therefore require the ultimate construction of some form of appropriate coastal protection works which might otherwise not have been required.  5. After reading some of the many reports available it would not seem unreasonable to consider using some if not all of the available vacant land to create some form of natural buffer and		

No.	potential wetlands. Such areas are considered by some as perhaps the best natural barriers against storms and rising sea levels that we can have.  6. The oceans will rise well into the future, so cities will eventually be forced to accommodate the extra water one way or another.	Officer Comment	Staff Recommendation
100	The proposal appears well designed but the hotel site up to 12 storeys would be acceptable only to make a viable commercial business. I hope that up to eight storeys would suit any business model. The areas marked landscape must have adequate wind protection.	addresses the matter of building height	Submission noted.
	Norfolk pines are too large and cast excessive shadows, making the beach unpleasant. A solution may be to remove a portion of the trees and replace with new young pines.		
101	I would like more emphasis on a hotel on the foreshore in close proximity to business, entertainment centres etc. Middleton Beach is more recreational	1	Submission noted.

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
	_		Recommendation
	based and wouldn't attract as many people on expense accounts, conventions, etc.  Parking is a major problem, especially with events. I hope any hotel developers are required to provide off-road parking for all guests and staff so that four-wheel drives or large vehicles (roof racks, trailers, etc.) are catered for.  Will it be a requirement for the hotel developer to provide sufficient public function space?  Will four/five-star Bed & Breakfasts be encouraged if no hotel goes ahead at first?	The specific facilities to be provided as part of any future hotel are outside the scope of these proposals.	
102	The following advice is provided in response to the deferral of a scheme amendment as set out under Section 79 of the <i>Planning and Development Act, 2005.</i> The subject area is adjacent to Middleton Beach (Place No. 17520), which the Heritage Council's Register Committee has identified as a place warranting assessment for possible entry in the State Register of Heritage Places. One of the key	Nil.	Submission noted.

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
	Canimary or Cashinocion		Recommendation
	values of this area is the group of Norfolk Island Pine Trees planted in the 1940s within the foreshore reserve.  We note the proposed structure plan proposed an area of public open space than incorporates and extends the foreshore area and retains the avenue of Norfolk Island Pines. A small number of trees are noted for removal or relocation; however, there are outside the area considered to have heritage significance.		
	The proposed Scheme Amendment gives due regard to the Structure Plan and recognises the 'iconic location' of the public foreshore reserve.		
	Overall the amendment is not considered to negatively impact on identified heritage places and there is therefore no objection to the proposal.		
103	After receiving the proposed change to Middleton Beach, I was pleased to note that it has been taken into account local concerns and provided a great plan for both residents and visitors.	Nil.	Submission noted.

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	There is a good mix of commercial and residential space and a responsible plan for height of constructions. It would be great to see some high-rise which attracts developers to the area with up to 15-20 storeys.  Businesses and jobs will be created for visitors, and leads alike in Albany's best		
104	visitors and locals alike in Albany's best spot.  I support the plan fully.  LandCorp and the City of Albany should be	Nil.	Submission noted.
	commended on their vision and proactive approach for the proposed. It's obvious what an underutilised area Middleton Beach has beach, as it is devoid of the required infrastructure and hospitality to make it a tourist destination. The locality would benefit enormously from the proposed development.		
	The view would be spectacular and the majority of the shadowing will be kept to the adjoining bushland. The overall focus of the development must be towards tourism		

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff Recommendation
	with plenty of accommodation, hospitality and retail.		
105	We approve the proposed development in general. The fine detail can be more important and more significant than the basic proposal, so we suggest consideration to the following:	Items one and nine of the key issues table address the matters of building height and the location of the hotel within the development area in detail.	Submission noted.
	<ul> <li>The multistorey hotel complex will be as far as is possible into the corner of the lot, out of sight of residents in the upper levels of Wylie Crescent.</li> <li>The same site should have a six-storey limit for the same reasons.</li> <li>As much hotel accommodation be</li> </ul>		
	provided as the developers will allow as Albany caters badly to accommodation for performers.		
106	Believes the proposal for Middleton Beach is brilliant as it will add urban life to the area while providing for an economically viable accommodation enterprise.	Design Guidelines are being prepared for the Activity Centre area, which should ensure that any development is appropriate to the locality.	Submission noted.
	Only suggestions is that the hotel blend into the mountain and harmonises with its surroundings. If the building is designed		

No.	Summary of Submission  correctly it could be a piece of art, and I fully support the plan.	Officer Comment	Staff Recommendation
107	Believes it will be a great space to see something done with the wasted area, and the concept plans look ideal. There can be no complaints regarding a high rise building as no views will be compromised because of its positioning.	Nil.	Submission noted.
108	Albany is in dire need of five-star accommodation and the Middleton Beach site is ideal. Restricting the height to six storeys will have no impediment. Currently Albany caters to backpackers and business travel, but not for fly-in, fly-out, high-end valued customers. Many wish to visit the Great Southern but do not as there is a lack of high-end accommodation.  I support the 12-storey development.	Nil.	Submission noted.
109	Believes that any development of the vacant site at Middleton Beach can only be a good thing. There is already plenty of holiday accommodation in the area along with dinning.	Nil.	Submission noted.

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
110	Is in full support of the concept plans provided by LandCorp for Middleton Beach, including the proposed 12-storey hotel development. Middleton Beach is currently underutilised and I believe the proposed concept plans will make it a vibrant area to	Nil.	Submission noted.
111	visit, eat and play.	Nil.	Submission noted.
112	Believes the concept looks great.  Believes the concept plans to be great and will allow the flexibility required to attract a suitable developer. Twelve storeys is not the 'Gold Coast' and will not cause any harm to the aesthetics of the area. If anything, it will significantly add to it.  As a local business owner, I see Albany progressively and believe this is a huge boost needed to move forward. Fully supports the proposed concept.	Nil.	Submission noted.
113	Believes it is about time Albany moved forward and provided substantial accommodation options for visitors that utilise our natural environment.  I support the proposal and hope that the City of Albany proceeds, and is not swayed by small lobby groups that protest against	Nil.	Submission noted.

No.	Summary of Submission  any change regardless of the scale, type or research that goes into it.	Officer Comment	Staff Recommendation
114	Is in total agreement with the Middleton Beach Activity Centre as it represents the necessary transition from a wasteland to a viable economic opportunity for a successful waterfront. The concept as suggested is modern, tasteful and exactly what Middleton Beach needs to move towards the forefront as a vibrant City.	Nil.	Submission noted.
115	Believes this is a fantastic proposal and is much needed for Albany and its future.	Nil.	Submission noted.
116	Believes the concept plans to look great. Albany is a thriving regional City and needs to increase the commercial development in order to cater for the population both in and around Albany, and its visitors. The proposed development is aesthetically pleasing and caters for the City's needs with regard for commercial and residential facilities.  Middleton Beach is 'crying-out' for a development of this nature and it will bring people down to enjoy the beautiful beach.	Nil.	Submission noted.

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
117	Believes the concept plans to look fantastic and in consultation with developers should make this project viable. Having diversity in the site allows a potential purchase choice to make it feasible.  The proposed 12-storey height is excellent with the potential mix of accommodation, commercial and residential very important. The proposal will create jobs, enhance	Nil.	Submission noted.
	growth and allow diverse businesses to operate which will in turn benefit the public, the region and the state.  Suggest that an economy feasibility report be prepared for potential developers to gain further insight into the economic benefits of the site.		
	I am in full support of the proposal and hope positive decisions are made in relation to this for the future of Albany.		
118	Believes the concept plans, including the heights, are a wonderful idea and supports any development on this site. Albany needs something of this nature to provide employment, a proper hotel, and offer the	Nil.	Submission noted.

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff		
			Recommendation		
	public different housing possibilities like				
	apartment living.				
119	The boundary creep onto the foreshore is	Items one, four, five and nine of the key	Submission noted.		
	not an issue unless the size of the land	issues table address the matters of			
	dictates the need for a 12-storey hotel	building height, coastal planning,			
	development.	heritage and the location of the hotel			
		within the development area, in detail.			
	The visual impact of any 12-storey hotel				
	would be permanent. It shows a lack of	State Planning Policy 2.6 - Coastal			
	sympathy for the highly significant	Planning contains the following policy			
	landscape of the area or for its heritage	measure:			
	value.	"Ensure that land use and			
		"Ensure that land use and development, including roads,			
	It is the uniqueness of Albany that visitors	adjacent to the coast is sited and			
	crave.	designed to complement and enhance			
		the coastal environment in terms of its			
	LOCATION AND SCALE OF PROPOSED	visual, amenity, social and ecological			
	HOTEL	values."			
		The development is not expected to			
	I have no objection in principle to the site of	have a greater visual impact on the			
	the proposed hotel. However, because the	landscape than existing development			
	footprint of the new hotel site does not	at Checkers Walk, Morley Place, Hare			
	include any land from the previous	Street and Wylie Crescent, when			
	Esplanade Hotel site, the City of Albany is	viewed from vantage points beyond the			
	now forced to consider an amendment to	immediate area. While it will possible to distinguish any future building as			
	the current Town Planning Scheme from	free-standing when viewed from Mira			
	currently five storeys to a 12-storey	Mar, it is part of an established urban			

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	maximum. This would not be necessary if more land was allocated to the proposed hotel development.	area, albeit one that is presently developed with single, double and three-storey buildings.	
	I object to a 12-storey hotel being built on any part of the Middleton Beach Activity Centre Structure Plan. This proposal has not taken into consideration the visual impact of a potential 12-storey hotel nor has it considered the natural environment and heritage value of this site.  Bringing the built environment closer to the	It is considered that the proposals will enhance the amenity and social values of the area and will have no minimal impact on ecological values as a brownfield redevelopment.  The proposals are also considered to be consistent with the following policy measures contained within <i>State Planning Policy 2.6</i> :	
	coastline would require even more stringent guidelines in relation to the visual impact on the amenity.	"(d) the amenity of the coastal foreshore is not detrimentally affected by any significant overshadowing of the foreshore;	
	The sub-division as shown in the Middleton Beach Activity Centre Structure Plan is so rigid that it would appear there is no opportunity for any amendment to either the size of the lots, the zoning of the lots or the placement of roads.	and  (e) there is overall visual permeability of the foreshore and ocean from nearby residential areas, roads and public spaces."	
	There has been no concrete justification for a change in the current Town Planning Scheme to allow a 12-storey hotel in the Middleton Beach Activity Centre, only to	and reducing the overall height of a hotel would be at odds with these policy measures as it may lead to overshadowing of a larger proportion of the foreshore area and would reduce	

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	say that any developer would need to make	visual permeability through the Activity	
	a return on the investment. The alteration	Centre area.	
	of the current Town Planning Scheme to		
	allow a possible 12-storey development	LandCorp undertook their own	
	goes against community feedback from a	consultation to inform the design of the	
	LandCorp survey where 67% of comments	proposals. The City has advertised the	
	indicated a preference for two to three	proposals for public comment in order	
	storeys.	to gauge community opinion and	
		inform the final recommendation.	
	IMPACT ON AMENITY, CHARACTER		
	AND HERITAGE	A visual impact assessment is only	
		required where there is a specific	
	The proposed location and scale of the		
	proposed development as shown on the	exist in this instance. However, it is	
	concept plan will have a significant impact	likely that a visual impact assessment	
	on the visual amenity of the area and the	would be submitted with any	
	character of Middleton Beach.	development application for a building	
		in excess of five stories or 21.5 metres	
	The juxtaposition of Middleton Beach and	in height.	
	Ellen Cove with the natural bush backdrop		
	of historic Mount Adelaide is rare and is one		
	of Albany's finest assets. A 12-storey hotel		
	would impact negatively on this panorama.		
	The character of Middleton Beach is largely		
	about its casual and natural residential and		
	tourism environment. Locals and tourists		
	alike come to Middleton Beach to		

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	experience the ambience and community		
	atmosphere provided by the natural		
	environment and its low key lifestyle.		
	Albany, is attractive to vicitors due to ite		
	Albany is attractive to visitors due to its		
	natural beauty and lack of multi-storey		
	developments. Albany should not even be		
	considering high rise developments in its overall vision for the future. Community		
	opinion regarding high rise development		
	was evident a few years ago during the		
	Frederick Street unit development protest.		
	The long term, hideous visual impact of		
	Observation City in Scarborough should		
	alert us to the consequences of poor and		
	short-sighted planning decisions.		
	A 12-storey hotel or apartment block would		
	not be authentic. Four hotels have graced		
	this site since the first one opened in 1892.		
	None have been more than three stories. A		
	historic precedent has been set. A 12-		
	storey hotel would destroy the casual,		
	coastal character of Middleton Beach and		
	be inconsistent with the heritage value of		
	the site.		

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
	-		Recommendation
	The visual impact of this proposal from Public Vantage Points such as the Boardwalk, Marine Drive, King George Sound, the Golf Club and Emu Point to name a few, has not undergone any formal assessment by the either the City of Albany nor the WA Planning Commission.  While I acknowledge the need for a development on this site after almost eight years as a vacant site, I would suggest that a 12-storey development would destroy Albany's competitive advantage. It is the uniqueness of Albany that visitors crave.  A high rise development is an easy option. Sensitive, sustainable developments require commitment to the community and its environment.		
120	Is in opposition to the proposed 12-storey hotel site and would prefer to a smaller three-storey building in its place. Believes that is should not be higher than the existing Norfolk Pines.	Item one of the key issues table addresses the matter of building height in detail.	Submission noted.

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
121	The 12-storey proposal is far too high and the structure is completely out of character in the proposed location. I value the natural beauty of the location, in particular the height and magnitude of the mountain as well as the parkland areas.  I urge plans for a 12-storey building be abandoned and all future buildings be limited to three storeys.	Item one of the key issues table addresses the matter of building height in detail.	
122	Expresses concern regarding the 12-storey hotel site as it will completely dominate the landscape and detract from the beachfront vista. It will also dominate the view when driving around Marine Drive to Middleton Beach. Strongly suggests a maximum height of five to six storeys.	Item one of the key issues table addresses the matter of building height in detail.	Submission noted.
123	I congratulate all parties for the progress made thus far on the redevelopment of the prime Middleton Beach site. I submit for you consultation on fine tuning the precise location of the hotel site and the ability to maximise the area for public open space adjacent to the beach.	Items three, seven and eight of the key issues table address the matters of parking, the public access way and road alignment, in detail.	Submission noted.

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	Marine Drive needs to be re-aligned from		
	the south east and located close to Mount		
	Adelaide reserve, taking the existing car		
	park with a further three to five metre verge		
	strip added on the south side.		
	The proposed located roundabout on		
	Flinders Parade - Adelaide Crescent be		
	moved a few meters further to the south to		
	accommodate the realignment.		
	The planned car park can be then relocated		
	on the opposite side of Marine Drive and		
	extended with further parking bays		
	adjacent Three Anchors and extending the		
	terraced Cove area.		
	The hotel can then be moved as close as		
	possible to this realignment and most		
	importantly should be angled		
	approximately 23 degrees towards the		
	northeast and directly facing the Emu Point		
	Channel.		
	The effect of this realignment will give a		
	minimum of 500m <sup>2</sup> of public beach space.		
	It will reduce the perceived impact of the		
	hotel height with its location closer to Mount		

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
	,		Recommendation
	Adelaide. The perceived fire risk from Mount Adelaide reserve will not be compromised in any way with Marine Drive and the new verge a further protection buffer. Further close parking to Three Anchors, the beach and hotel will be created. The impact of the summer solstice on the new hotel site will be advantageous to maximise shade.		
124	Believes that the original Federation style hotel was perfect and that it should be brought back as it would please most occupiers and visitors. Suggests that the new building not be higher than the tops of the Norfolk Pines (five storeys), that the style reflect Albany's history and heritage by not being another massive glass, concrete and steel monument with asymmetrical shapes. Also believes that the hotel must blend into its surroundings, and that the current proposal does not satisfy, hence why he is in opposition to the proposal. States that he would still like to a see a boutique hotel on the vacant site however.	Item one of the key issues table addresses the matter of building height in detail.	Submission noted.

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
125	I object to the amendment to allow a height of up to 12 storeys on the Hotel/Mixed Use site in the proposed Middleton Beach Scheme Amendment and Activity Centre Structure Plan. It seems to me that a maximum of five storeys would be much more desirable.  The building with a 12-storey height would forever ruin the view from the whole of the Middleton Beach stretch towards Mount Clarence.	Item one of the key issues table addresses the matter of building height in detail.	
	Surely a building of lesser storeys would be cheaper to build and therefore require less investment which in turn would still result in a satisfactory return on investment. Yes, less guests, but also less staff, less overheads, etc.		
	Why can't we have a really interesting boutique hotel that will blend in nicely and be a real drawcard for the region?		
126	I object to the expansion of the area available for development beyond the	Item nine of the key issues table addresses the location of the hotel within the development area in detail.	Submission noted.

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
	-		Recommendation
	immediate area and surrounds of the	The artist's impressions were prepared	
	former Esplanade Hotel site.	as a guide to provide the public with a	
		sense how completed buildings could	
	The location of the site allocated for the	look and are not development	
	Hotel/Mixed Use expands beyond the	proposals.	
	former Esplanade boundary. This proposal		
	brings built development much closer to the	A visual impact assessment is only	
	coastline and will destroy the amenity and	required where there is a specific	
	continuity of a broad grass/tree parkland	policy requirement, which does not	
	along the full length of Middleton Beach.	exist in this instance. However, it is	
		likely that a visual impact assessment	
	The Hotel/Mixed Use site has clearly been	would be submitted with any	
	placed in such a prominent location to	development application for a building	
	afford maximum ocean views. With good	in excess of five stories or 21.5 metres	
	design great views can still be achieved	in height.	
	without moving the site closer to the		
	beachfront.		
	The approach down to Middleton Beach		
	along Marine Drive, which now provides a		
	spectacular outlook of the Beach, will be		
	lost. Drivers will instead be directed to the		
	boring approach behind the Hotel and not		
	have opportunity to view the grassed		
	parkland and beach - from the only		
	elevated road. While acknowledging that		
	re-alignment of Flinders Parade is		
	desirable, it could be done better without		

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
	·		Recommendation
	the Hotel site where it is now shown. Why		
	should the public amenity of road and		
	public open space be lost to a Hotel		
	development, which could well have been		
	confined substantially to the former		
	Esplanade Hotel site.		
	I object to the height of up to 12 storeys on		
	the Hotel/Mixed Use site, the height should		
	be limited to five storeys and should include		
	stepping up of development away from the		
	foreshore. In discussions between		
	authorities and stakeholders, the prospect		
	of 12 storeys has not arisen. And suddenly,		
	it is now considered necessary to attract the		
	right Developer, or 'the community will be		
	back to square one'. The development of		
	the Middleton Beach precinct can occur in		
	stages over time.		
	Because the large site is at the corner of the		
	Bay, good design would produce a building		
	with great ocean views both eastwards and		
	southwards, without the need for 12		
	storeys. And a more compact development		
	would be far more in keeping with the		
	'village' feel of the rest of the Activity		
	Centre. The community accepted the		

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	investment by the State Government in the		
	Middleton Beach site as a genuine		
	measure to achieve an appropriate		
	development.		
	The challenge is to work with and		
	strengthen the wonderful natural landscape		
	and unique coastal identity of Middleton		
	Beach, that will attract people to live in and		
	visit Albany.		
	We need to allow sustainable levels of		
	development but we must avoid large scale		
	commercial development that damages the		
	character of the coastal area. Noosa has		
	rejected high-rise and has shown that		
	buildings over five storeys high are not		
	required in order to have a thriving tourist		
	economy. The maximum height for the		
	Cottesloe foreshore is eight storeys – and		
	this is considered very feasible to attract		
	developers. Why is Albany expected to		
	accept a 12-storey high-rise development		
	that was not even approved for a		
	metropolitan beach?		
	I object to the low number of public car		
	parking bays provided for. The 'Activity		

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
	·		Recommendation
	Centre' is being designed to attract more		
	people to Middleton Beach's facilities. The		
	public car parking near the foreshore/beach		
	should not be reduced, given the number of		
	local people who regularly visit the beach.		
	An increase of 29 bays (22%) is insufficient		
	for additional development proposed. I do		
	not agree with the proposal to delete the		
	current car parking requirements for visitor		
	and hotel users. I have seen similar		
	developments where bays intended for		
	public parking are occupied significantly		
	with visitors to the residential sections.		
	There is not enough parking allowed for		
	hotel/retail employees who will have to		
	drive to work, given the lack of public		
	transport to Middleton Beach.		
	I object to lack of a visual impact		
	assessment throughout the full period		
	when this proposal was made available.		
	The community has been unable to assess		
	the visual impact of the proposal including		
	height, bulk, over shadowing and changes		
	to public open space. This appears to be		
	deliberately misleading, particularly given		
	the extent of good will demonstrated by the		

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	Community to participate and engage in fruitful discussion with LandCorp and the City of Albany.		
127	The first priority is to recognise the effect of the future structure of the Hotel on the present owners and long term supporters of the Middleton beach residential and recreational area.  Every effort must be made to make to blend the hotel into the present landscape.  A building of 12 storeys in the present position as proposed will be unacceptable. Therefore, no to 12 storeys as proposed. The Council has been given the opportunity to work with the planning commission to change the use of Council-controlled land to multi-residential and have the new hotel backed right up to mount Adelaide where 12 storeys or even more may be acceptable, as there would be very little interruption to present views and it would enhance the presence of the hotel with Mount Adelaide as a backdrop – particularly when approaching from the east.	Items one and nine of the key issues table address the matters of building height and the location of the hotel within the development area in detail.  The proposals include a detailed bush fire risk assessment. This document ascertains that the development sites are sufficiently setback to allow the construction of buildings to Australian Standard 3959 – Construction of Buildings in Bushfire Prone Areas in order to manage bushfire risk.	

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
	, and the second		Recommendation
	The west wall of the hotel will not have a view in the proposed site, so siting it further back is the correct way to go.		
	Fire risk has to be considered and dealt with in the present proposal.		
	Housing is promoted on the Mountain Side. Fire risk must also be considered there.		
	The set of four complexes as mixed use are considered satisfactory.		
	Marine Drive giving access to the beach must be maintained. It is totally unacceptable for the hotel to control the beachfront. Only seven bays which may service Three Anchors is not enough.		
	My very considered recommendation is to push the Hotel back into the mountain.		
128	I agree with the basic concept plan and the positioning of the highest development backing onto Mount Adelaide. Suggests design elements of the hotel for preservation against ocean winds.	Item six of the key issues table addresses the matter of wind in detail.	Submission noted.

<u>.</u>				
No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff	
			Recommendation	
129	Rezoning Lot 8888 Flinders Parade from	Item one of the key issues table	Submission noted.	
	'Hotel/Motel' and 'Tourist Residential'	addresses the matter of building height		
	zones is acceptable that the site no longer	in detail.		
	be zoned 'hotel/motel' but it is essential for			
	preserving beachside accessibility for the	The hotel/mixed use site cannot be		
	public and local community that it not	moved closer to the side of Mount		
	become exclusive for residential purposes	Adelaide due to the implications that		
	only.	this would have from a bushfire risk		
		perspective.		
	This site must have some 'tourist			
	residential' and retail/specialty/bars/cafes.	While increasing parking numbers, the		
	This appears to be adequately covered by	inclusion of on-street parking is an		
	'Special Use Zone SU25' as listed in	urban design principle that is proven to		
	'conditions', so I am supportive of this.	have a 'calming' effect on through		
	However, it is imperative that the natural	traffic by forcing drivers to reduce their		
	environment, rich cultural and European	speed. This principle has recently		
	heritage, and the unique coastal character	been applied on Stirling Terrace and		
	of Middleton Beach be preserved. This	has resulted in a much more		
	means I strongly oppose high rise, six	pedestrian-friendly environment with		
	storeys at maximum and that it be designed	vehicles travelling at lesser speed.		
	in stepped up from the beach. Otherwise it			
	will erode the precious aspects of Middleton			
	Beach.			
	Similarly for Lots 660 and 661 Marine			
	Terrace, portions of Adelaide crescent,			
	Marine Terrace, Barnett Street, Flinders			
	Parade and Marine Drive, rezoning parts of			

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	the roads from 'Priority Road' to Local Road		
	reserves and Special Use Zone SU25 is		
	acceptable. As an aside, I wonder why		
	Adelaide Crescent isn't also re-aligned so		
	that the hotel motel can be close up against		
	the mountain side, thereby preserving the		
	beachfront. I am concerned at the proposal		
	to increase street-side parking, this would		
	reduce pedestrian and bike safety and		
	clutter the adjoining beachside area.		
	Parking needs to be diverted either to		
	underground on the existing site, north of		
	the surf club, or to additional parking zones		
	near the south end of the golf course or		
	east side of Eyre Park. Also increased		
	regular, frequent and reliable public		
	transport by 'mini-buses' not large		
	transporters, would be a preferred Council		
	priority.		
	I support the special use zone and applaud		
	the potential for more community		
	interaction and activity, public artworks and		
	recreational opportunities including cycle-		
	friendliness. A 'village' feel is my key wish		
	in all that is to be redesigned.		

No.	Drainage is my key concern and request that serious consideration be given to upgrading and rerouting the drainage away from the beachfront. Currently the drainage is an eyesore and it will not entice developers.	Officer Comment	Staff Recommendation
130	I grew up in Albany and regularly return with my husband and children to visit family and friends. I was shocked and disappointed at the design of the proposed hotel. It does not compliment the beautiful natural beach or hill environment. It looks like any standard high rise building seen on any street in any city centre in the world.  Middleton Beach and Albany are incredibly unique. We can only hope that this monstrosity does not go ahead and a classic, architecturally appropriate hotel in context with the natural surrounding is built instead.	The artist's impressions were prepared as a guide to provide the public with a sense how completed buildings could look and are not development proposals.  Design Guidelines are being prepared for the Activity Centre area, which should ensure that any development is appropriate to the locality.	Submission noted.
131	We object to the expansion of the area available for development outside the immediate area and surrounds of the former Esplanade Hotel site.	Items one and nine of the key issues table address the matters of building height and the location of the hotel within the development area in detail.	Submission noted.

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
	·		Recommendation
	We object to the height of up to 12 storeys	A visual impact assessment is only	
	on the Hotel/Mixed Use site. We object to	required where there is a specific	
	the lack of a visual impact assessment	policy requirement, which does not	
	through the full period when this proposal	exist in this instance. However, it is	
	was made available for public consultation.	likely that a visual impact assessment would be submitted with any	
	We regularly visit coastal centres on the	development application for a building	
	south coasts of South Australia and	in excess of five stories or 21.5 metres	
	Victoria. The communities in those cities	in height.	
	and towns seem to understand	in noight.	
	development and tourism in a way that it	LandCorp undertook their own	
	seems The City of Albany do not. The	consultation to inform the design of the	
	visual amenity of these coastal towns is	proposals. The City has advertised the	
	intact with no high-rise. Indeed Noosa does	proposals for public comment in order	
	not deem it necessary to have buildings	to gauge community opinion and	
	beyond five stories in order to attract tourists.	inform the final recommendation.	
		The proposal has been referred to the	
	We suggest that you immediately scrap	Environmental Protection Authority,	
	your proposed Middleton Beach Scheme	which determined that the proposal	
	Amendment and Activity Centre Structure	does not require assessment.	
	Plan and come up with something that will	·	
	only allow a development that is of five	The development sites are sufficiently	
	stories or less and is stepped back from the	setback to allow the construction of	
	beach, and does not involve any	buildings to Australian Standard 3959	
	encroachment on the existing foreshore	- Construction of Buildings in Bushfire	
	reserve.	Prone Areas in order to manage	

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	It should be noted that a significant outcome of your community consultation is that the top concern people expressed was that the height of any proposed building would exceed three to five storeys.	bushfire risk, without the need to clear vegetation within the reserve.	
	In fact, the majority (67%) of respondents in your 'Community Feedback Outcomes' stated a preference for no more than three storeys, while only 15% preferred three to five storeys, 8.2% preferred five to seven storeys and a mere 2.7% preferred higher. What is proposed shows no respect for community views and values.		
	An up to 12-storey scenario was never mentioned during the public consultation period. There is no doubt that this scenario would have been rejected outright.		
	The relationship of the built environment to its natural setting is one that is balanced and visually pleasing. By allowing up to a 12-storey building in such a natural setting would see the end of the visual amenity would set a precedent for this type of building to multiply.		

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	The dismissive manner in which the		
	document deals with the biodiversity and		
	natural area assets is disappointing. The		
	flora and fauna of the adjacent Mount		
	Adelaide will be adversely impacted by this		
	proposal. Significant overshadowing will		
	impact on the general growth and		
	regeneration of native flora and lead to		
	degradation. The vegetation is important		
	habitat for a range of species in this		
	conservation area. We note that some of		
	the avifauna mentioned are endangered		
	and will undoubtedly be adversely affected		
	by the proposed development and its		
	proximity to native vegetation.		
	Management of fire hazards related to a		
	building of the magnitude proposed is also		
	another risk to the retention of the adjacent		
	Mount Adelaide bushland.		
	We believe that the State Government and		
	its agencies should be working to conserve		
	and enhance the character and outstanding		
	natural beauty of Middleton Beach not		
	proposing to devalue and degrade it by		
	inappropriate development.		

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
132	I would like to see developers create a complex that is an example of green building design using ideas that reduce energy consumption, water usage and minimise waste. Suggestion of having a community space for gardens, encouraging a collaboration and sharing of ideas and common resources.  This is a brilliant site to showcase Albany as an innovative City leading the way with sustainable design.	Nil.	Submission noted.
133	Expresses concern to the proposal of a 12-storey hotel site as it would detract from the natural scenery of the area to which most locals and tourists find its main attraction. Also expresses concern regarding the overshadowing that would come from such a tall structure and the stability of building in close proximity to the beach. Believes that development is needed for the area, but asks that more consideration go into the preparation of the proposal.	Items one and two of the key issues table address the matters of building height and overshadowing in detail.	Submission noted.
134	We would like to advise the council that we are wholly in favour of the whole concept. We think a building of this height	Nil.	Submission noted.

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	will give a real touristy feel to this area. We		
	also believe that the proposal to have		
	mixed shops, restaurants, coffee houses		
	and accommodation is an excellent		
	idea. In fact it reminds us very much of the		
	water front in Cairns which has great		
	atmosphere.		
	We also think that private housing needs to		
	be included in this site. This will give a solid		
	base of people who are in that area using		
	the cafes, restaurants, etc. We also feel		
	that having private homes in the area will		
	increase the value of the land in that area.		
	Further the height of the building is		
	appropriate as it will give the occupants of		
	the motel a great view and will be a great		
	draw card in its own right. Without a doubt		
	the views will be amongst the best in		
	Western Australia if not the world. If we		
	want to be serious about tourism in Albany		
	we need to be serious about this plan.		
135	I object to the amendment to allow a height	Item one of the key issues table	Submission noted.
	of up to 12 storeys on the Hotel/Mixed Use	addresses the matter of building height	
	site in the proposed Middleton Beach	in detail.	
	Amendment and Activity Centre. The		

No.	Summary of Submission  maximum height should be limited to five storeys.	Officer Comment	Staff Recommendation
136	I am opposed to a development in excess of four to five storeys as anything higher than this is completely inappropriate with the current environment, confronting and out of proportion to the existing buildings. Tourists visit Albany for its unique natural environment and its sense of history and culture, which the development should embrace. Any new development should be modest in scale and height to compliment the environment, not overwhelm it.	Item one of the key issues table addresses the matter of building height in detail.	Submission noted.
137	I dread the thought of the character of the area being desecrated by such a high-rise proposal. I have seen the submission made by Pam Dolley and agree with her argument.	Nil.	Submission noted.
138	We do not believe that a building on this site should be any more than five storeys high.	Item one of the key issues table addresses the matter of building height in detail.	Submission noted.
139	Believes the proposal should go ahead as Albany is a major tourism destination. States the proposal will create employment for youth, an economic boost to Albany and	Nil.	Submission noted.

No.	to tourism. Comments that if it were up to those opposed the proposal, nothing would be approved.	Officer Comment	Staff Recommendation
140	Express their strong opposition to a 12-storey hotel as it would impact Ellen Cove.	Nil.	Submission noted
141	Believes the height of any building should not exceed the height of Norfolk Pines on the foreshore. Suggests the material used in the building should ensure that building fits into the landscape, rather than sticking out like a 'sore thumb'. Also suggest gardens around building be compatible with native flora and fit into the shore line aesthetic.  Believes it is very important that any building placed in this beautiful spot does not detract from the natural scene, rather enhances it.	Items one and nine of the key issues table address the matters of building height and the location of the hotel within the development area in detail.	Submission noted.
142	Although some aspects of the proposal appear sensible and could result in better amenities and use of the area, I am disappointed in the proposed hotel size and location. I firmly believe that a lower profile would be more in keeping with the existing beachfront area and ensure ongoing use of	Items one and three of the key issues table address the matters of building height and parking in detail.	Submission noted.

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	the area as a family and resident-friendly beach.		
	This could be a great opportunity for an aesthetic and environmental sensitivity to be included in the area and give Albany a uniquely southern coast design. Instead, the proposal (although conceptual) appears to have settled for maximising rooms at the cost of turning this beautiful area into a beachfront similar to ones found anywhere in the world.		
	I would like to see the height restricted to five stories maximum and the hotel set back further from the foreshore.		
	I would like to see stringent conditions on design and materials used to minimise the environmental footprint, and to encourage some creative design rather than a square box. Be ambitious in style, not size!		
	These comments also apply to the residential/commercial/activity centre parts of the proposal, although they seem to at least be more in keeping with the scale of the site.		

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	I remain unconvinced that parking has been adequately considered even though, as a local I often walk rather than drive to the beach. On long weekends or in holiday periods currently it is very difficult to get parking so I am concerned that needs have been underestimated and that the small public green spaces will end up being sacrificed for additional parking as soon as the re-development occurs.  I would like to see some measures in place to limit the potential for a beachfront hotel to end up as a place where loud drinking and music overwhelms the ambience for other beachfront users. I would hate to see the beachfront become a place where it is unpleasant to be because it caters more to drinkers than to swimmers, walkers and picnickers.		
143	I strongly object to a twelve storey hotel being built at Middleton Beach. I have seen the LandCorp pictures of what it would look like and find it an eyesore at our beautiful waterfront. Any development here should	Items one and nine of the key issues table address the matters of building height and the location of the hotel within the development area in detail.	Submission noted.

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff		
			Recommendation		
	be limited to the five storeys as originally				
	suggested.				
144	I am appalled at the obvious disregard that	Items one and nine of the key issues	Submission noted.		
	the design has for the environment. The	table address the matters of building			
	hotel site is oversized and dwarfs existing	height and the location of the hotel			
	buildings, so it should not be more than four	within the development area in detail.			
	storeys. The design is unsympathetic to				
	the existing style of buildings in the area.				
	The style and scale of the hotel is brash,				
	ugly and inappropriate for Albany. The				
	central plan is more modest.				
145	I object to the expansion of the area	Items one, three and nine of the key	Submisison noted.		
	available for development beyond the	issues table address the matters of			
	immediate area and surrounds of the	building height, parking and the			
	former Esplanade Hotel site. There is	location of the hotel within the			
	enviable beauty and amenity in the trees	development area, in detail.			
	and grasses along the foreshore. Why lose				
	it for commercial interests?	A visual impact assessment is only			
	Drivers will not have opportunity to	required where there is a specific			
	appreciate the wonderful view from Marine	policy requirement, which does not			
	Drive into the Middleton Beach area.	exist in this instance. However, it is			
		likely that a visual impact assessment			
	I object to the height of up to 12 storeys on	would be submitted with any			
	the Hotel/Mixed Use site.	development application for a building			
	The height should be limited to five storeys	in excess of five stories or 21.5 metres			
		in height.			

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	and should include stepping up of development away from the foreshore.  In discussions between authorities and stakeholders, the prospect of 12 storeys has not arisen. It should not even be considered. Why do we need a 12-storey development, apart from commercial viability?  Once one building is approved to 12 storeys, an argument will exist for others to follow, and our Middleton Beach will look like any other high-rise coastline.  If the hotel site was moved closer to the foot of Mount Adelaide, so that it was not creating a height silhouette, or blocking the wonderful vista, it may be less of a problem, but there should still be a limit of five storeys.  Buildings and development reflect fashions and commercial demands of the day. We are custodians, to care for our natural resources for future generations, not to	LandCorp undertook their own consultation to inform the design of the proposals. The City has advertised the proposals for public comment in order to gauge community opinion and inform the final recommendation.	Recommendation
	exploit them.  We need to allow sustainable levels of		

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
		I	Recommendation
	development. But we must also avoid large		
	scale commercial development that	I	
	damages the character of this beach and	I	
	coastal area forever. If high-rise is	I	
	necessary for commercial viability, could an	I	
	alternative mixed business/accommodation	I	
	model be considered?		
	I object to the low number of public car		
	parking bays provided for. The public car	I	
	parking near the foreshore/beach should	I	
	not be reduced as per the proposal, given	I	
	the number of local people who regularly	I	
	visit the beach. An increase of 29 bays	I	
	(22%) is insufficient for additional	I	
	development proposed. There is not	I	
	enough parking allowed for hotel/retail	I	
	employees who will have to drive to work,	I	
	given the lack of public transport to	I	
	Middleton Beach.	I	
	I object to the lack of a visual impact		
	assessment throughout the full period	I	
	when this proposal was made available for	I	
	public consultation. The community has	I	
	been unable to assess the visual impact of	I	
	the proposal including height, bulk,	I	

No.	Summary of Submission  overshadowing and changes to public open space.	Officer Comment	Staff Recommendation
146	I don't want anything under discussion to happen at the site. I don't want the view altered, listen to construction for two or more years, change my walk route each morning or walk in the shadow of tall buildings. But I am putting aside personal preferences and commenting on the greater good.  I think a hotel development would be better placed in town where visitors would support existing retail infrastructure which struggles outside prime tourism season.	Items one, two, three and nine of the key issues table address the matters of building height, overshadowing, parking and the location of the hotel within the development area, in detail.  The City of Albany and Landcorp are currently working to upgrade the stormwater management arrangements within the Activity Centre area.	Submission noted.
	I hope that there has been a full marketing plan that ensures the proposed hotel and retail spaces at Middleton Beach would be fully utilised and not become the dead heart of Middleton Beach.  I hope the development of a new hotel is not detrimental to existing businesses.  I do not think there is adequate parking in the new development. When we all head to the beachside pub for the Sunday		

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	session there will be more cars than		
	carparks.		
	I am concerned about the wastewater. I		
	read in the thick bound plan submission at		
	the City of Albany office that existing		
	systems would be utilised. I question that		
	existing systems can absorb the increase		
	outputs without environmentally detrimental overflows.		
	detrimental overnows.		
	Shade on the beach is a real issue for a 12-		
	storey building. The modelling of shadow		
	in the concept plan showed 21 June at		
	9am, noon and 3pm. We want to know		
	about 21 January 5pm when we get home		
	from work and want a quick swim.		
	There will be a significant increase in		
	vehicle numbers on Marine Drive/Burgoyne		
	Road, Middleton Road and possibly		
	Adelaide Crescent. I do not want to see		
	increased traffic on Adelaide Crescent as it		
	will spoil the main recreation area at Eyre Park. Adelaide Crescent should be for local		
	traffic.		
	trainc.		

No.	T	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
INO.		Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Recommendation
		I am concerned that 12 storeys is		Recommendation
		inappropriate for the hotel. However if 12		
		storeys allows for a smaller footprint than a		
		five storey hotel it may be acceptable.		
		Tive storey noter it may be acceptable.		
		I would like to congratulate the developer		
		on the thought they have put into the		
		proposal. I believe they have worked hard		
		to present a workable plan. I understand		
		that 12 storeys may make for a feasible		
		proposition but would prefer less height.		
147		Asks when Albany will get it right with the	Nil.	Submission noted.
		Esplanade hotels, as the previous two did		
		not work. Suggests to not name the		
		proposed hotel the Esplanade and to start		
		with a clean slate.		
1.10				
148		States he has no issue with a hotel being at	Items one and two of the key issues	Submission noted.
		Middleton Beach, but more concerns with	table address the matters of building	
		its shadow effect of the proposal in the	height and overshadowing in detail.	
		afternoons at Ellen Cove.		
		Believes 12 storeys to be too high a		
		proposal and that the site itself needs to be		
		set back from the beach front. Suggests		
		that the site be shifted more towards to hill		
		and tiered as in Noosa. Does not wish to		
		and herea do in recood. Bood not with to		

No.	Summary of Submission  see the 3pm shadows on the beach as seen in Surfer's Paradise.	Officer Comment	Staff Recommendation
149	I am generally supportive of the plan, including the incorporation of commercial and retail areas, public open space and road layout.  High density options need to be supported in Albany to make the most of high amenity locations. Therefore, I support the multistorey proposal to a degree. I also feel that developers need to be respectful to the existing amenity of the area and that a 12-storey hotel would be inappropriate. This has been confirmed by my inspection of the photo montages that have been prepared. I would support a maximum seven storey development for the hotel, with the other buildings in the precinct being up to five storeys. The current plan shows the buildings increasing in height as they get closer to Mount Adelaide, which I support.  I understand that having a residential component to the development will increase its viability. I am supportive of including a residential component as long	Nil.	Submission noted.

No.	as it is clear the proportion, number and location of residential versus short term accommodation and other commercial uses.	Officer Comment	Staff Recommendation
	I hope that local businesses will be given the opportunity to be involved in future planning for the site. I note that only one local consultant was used in the compilation of planning information for the Structure Plan, which is disappointing, when expertise exists in the Albany.		
150	States that she is glad that something is being done with the area. Would like to add that more access routes to the beach for both able-bodied and disabled, the height of the hotel is too high and needs to be screened better my trees, and that the hotel's footings need to be in granite as storm surges create inundation of water in the area.	Nil.	Submission noted.
151	I object to the amendment to allow a height of up to 12 storeys on the Hotel/Mixed use site in the proposed Middleton Beach Scheme Amendment. The maximum height should be limited to five storeys with a more	Nil.	Submission noted.

No.	Summary of Submission  compact development to be more suitable to the grassed areas and treed beach area.	Officer Comment	Staff Recommendation
	We have waited so long for this development, please don't spoil it now with a high-rise 12-storey building which will change the character of the Middleton Beach area.		
152	Expresses her strong disapproval of the development proposed as she cannot simply believe it.	Nil.	Submission noted.
153	Believes that the low-key ambience of Middleton Beach will be destroyed by the dominance of a 12-storey hotel. The ambience is what makes the area so attractive to tourists as they are seeking out smaller, boutique-style hotels and not the hotel shown in the concept plans. Suggests a five-storey hotel would blend into the area better.  States that a satisfactory return in investments can be make for a smaller hotel and that Middleton Beach mustn't be destroyed for high-rise.	addresses the matter of building height	Submission noted.

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
154	should have a maximum of five storeys,	Item one of the key issues table addresses the matter of building height in detail.	

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff Recommendation
	character, allowing the natural topography to continue to indelibly make lasting impressions. High-rise is everywhere globally, careful restraint is a rare attribute for tourist precincts.		
155	Expresses concern regarding the proposed hotel height of up to 12 storeys. Believes it should not exceed five storeys.	Item one of the key issues table addresses the matter of building height in detail.	Submission noted.
156	As a long term resident of Albany and 45 years' experience as a property developer and resort owner, the development at Middleton Beach must have:  a) A very strong upmarket residential component of at least 40 units of approximately 140m² each on the top 4-6 floors of the mixed development building. The developer should be able to justify if the market is deemed to be big enough for an additional two floors. Taking the building to 14 floors with 8 permanent residential floors would give the developer an income from sales of \$50 million. This then makes it attractive enough to persuade the right developer to participate.	Nil.	Submission noted.

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	b) Because of the seasonality the commercial businesses on the ground floor sections of the total area need to have permanent residents to maintain the viability during the winter months. This will attract high net worth retirees with an accommodation type currently unavailable in Albany.		
	c) Short term rentals and commercial areas of the total development will always go well during the summer periods and as a resort operator over the last 22 years in Denmark alone, the commercial area demise is the off-season which these permanent retirees will support.		
	d) As all developers now require at least 60% in presales before bank finance is available it may be necessary to give these selected developers opportunity to test the market before committal.		
	Finally, it is a unique opportunity in the best position on the south coast, so it is essential to make the proposal attractive enough to		

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	get the best result with a development up and running as soon as possible.		
157	The possibility of a 12-storey hotel on Middleton Beach does not suit the area. There is nothing near this height anywhere in the whole of Albany so a maximum of five or six storeys is desirable. Why put priority on the hotel above the local population and other visitors for use of the beach front land.  Place the hotel back on the original location of the old Esplanade hotel and keep the height to five to six storeys high as is already planned for that area. Allow the beach front grassland and Norfolk Pine trees to remain untouched and be accessible to all visitors. This would be preferable using up a finite piece of beachfront by putting the hotel next to the Three Anchors cafe.  The number of prospective apartment dwellers at a possible 687 people is far too many. That number of people will have a direct impact on the feel of the area. By putting the hotel here it also lessens the number of permanent residents.	Items one, three and nine of the key issues table address the matters of building height, parking and the location of the hotel within the development area, in detail.  The proposals do not seek to remove any of the Norfolk Island Pine trees located within the foreshore area.	

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
	·		Recommendation
	A total of 29 extra parking bays does not cover the number of people who would be attracted to this area and indeed would already being living there. I was told at the information session at the Albany Surf Lifesaving Club by a LandCorp employee that there will not even be dedicated visitors parking provided for the apartments. So they have to fit into the 29 extra parking bays when there is a possibility of 687 people having friends with cars visit them. Lastly the increased amount of traffic is of concern, no amount of traffic calming devices are going to make the road less busy.		
158	The multi-storied complex might look in place in a busy suburbia but negates the tranquillity of Albany. States that as a Bed & Breakfast owner, the thing that tourists love about Albany is the quiet lifestyle.	Item one and eight of the key issues table addresses the matter of building height in detail.	Submission noted.
159	The proposed Hotel/Mixed Use site should not exceed six storeys in height as the building will cast a shadow over Three Anchors. The concept plans show this hotel site outside the Esplanade block – why? Suggests that one parking bay for	Items one, two and nine of the key issues table address the matters of building height, overshadowing and the location of the hotel within the development area, in detail.	

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	each rental room within the hotel site		
	should be provided. Believes that the		
	proposal sets a bad precedent for years to		
	come.		
160	I do not support a 12-storey building in the	Items one and eight of the key issues	Submission noted.
	Hotel/Mixed Use precinct as it will impact	table address the matters of building	
	heavily on the natural environment of the	height and road alignment in detail.	
	area. I am in favour of development but 12		
	storeys will be most inappropriate.		
	Believes that through years of previous		
	workshops, it's clear that redevelopment is		
	strongly supported at the old Esplanade		
	site, but want to retain a low rise, low key		
	village.		
	I do not support something that contradicts		
	the community ideals.		
	I do not support the connection of Flinders		
	Parade and Barnett Street as cars will be		
	dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists.		
161	Believes we need to look at clever ways of	Item one of the key issues table	Submission noted.
	building tourism accommodation that does	addresses the matter of building height	
	not impinge on the unique landscape of the	in detail.	

No.	Summary of Submission  area. Also believes that 12 storeys is too high.	Officer Comment	Staff Recommendation
162	The proposed 12-storey building is not in keeping with the way Albany should be developed. We do not want to start looking like the Gold Coast. Our uniqueness would be severely compromised. A building of four storeys would be an acceptable option.	Item one of the key issues table addresses the matter of building height in detail.	Submission noted.
163	Albany's first hotel should not be built at Middleton Beach, it should be at the marina foreshore with the revamped Stirling Terrace, AEC, UWA and Queen Victoria Gardens, which is ideally the heart of Albany.  I still support the proposed tourist-residential development proposal for Middleton Beach as I envisage three-storey narrow frontage buildings to maximise potential development. I have concerns with the 10-12 storey hotel site as this is Albany's family orientated area and aesthetics should be retained. Also have concerns regarding the shadow of such a building is it will affect Three Anchors, the playground area and Ellen Cove in summer	LandCorp have been actively marketing the designated hotel site at the Albany Foreshore for a number of years now, without success. It has been indicated by prospective developers that the five-storey building height limit and restriction on permanent residential units that apply are too restrictive and that development is not commercially viable.  Items one and two of the key issues table address the matters of building height and overshadowing in detail.	Submission noted.

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	afternoons. I suggest and support a maximum of six storeys of commercial ground floors with upper storeys for residents.		
164	The proposed height of up to 12 storeys for a hotel is a major concern as images provided by LandCorp of numerous views show a building dominating and overpowering its surrounds. I suggest a height maximum of five-storeys stepped back from ground level. This would be just below the height of the Norfolk Pines.  Shadows cast by the proposed hotel will impact on the playgrounds, Three Anchors and Ellen Cove in summer/tourism seasons.  Middleton Beach is historically a casual, family orientated beach, and this character must be retained with a sympathetic, people friendly Activity Centre with commercial options. The retail outlets should exclude chains/franchises and include small shops.	Items one and two of the key issues table address the matters of building height and overshadowing in detail.  While the comments regarding the type of shop are noted. However, provided that a proposed use fits within the definition of a 'Shop' under Local Planning Scheme No.1, the City cannot make a distinction between independent operators and chain/franchise stores.	Submission noted.

No.	Summary of Submission  Traffic management has been well planned. Predicted parking shortage can be offset by using spaces at Eyre Park, etc. and frequent shuttle buses in summer.	Officer Comment	Staff Recommendation
165	Supports the development but wants to ensure that it be open to every socio-economic level, also supports the realignment of traffic for better beach access. Is in opposition to 12 storey hotel site, and suggests four to five storeys as a substitute.	Item one of the key issues table addresses the matter of building height in detail.	Submission noted.
166	I believe that the planned hotel site should have a variety of rooms suitable for conferences/seminars, etc. At least one such room needs to be for large gatherings which is better than what Albany currently provides. This would help support the hotel by bringing business functions, club and society functions, etc. to Albany.	Hotel facilities will become known at the development stage.	Submission noted.
167	States that it is a tremendous responsibility to make decisions for future development but believes that Council will continue to preserve the character of this great place. Surely five storey buildings in Ellen Cove is sure for congestion and is out of character.	Item one of the key issues table addresses the matter of building height in detail.	Submission noted.

No.	Summary of Submission  High-rise, traffic lights and congestion belong in places like Noosa but not on the foreshore of King George Sound.	Officer Comment	Staff Recommendation
168	We fully support the proposed changes to Middleton Beach as it is a great mix of hotel, private land ownership and business. Albany needs tourism to expand to provide jobs for youth to stay in the town. This proposal does not spoil Middleton Beach but enhance it.  Suggest a luge be created from the top of Mount Adelaide (ANZAC Centre) to Middleton Beach with a cable car as seen in New Zealand as it would stimulate visitation to major attractions.	Nil.	Submission noted.
169	LandCorp did not provide visual depictions of the proposed development, showing its visual impacts from popular vantage points such as the beach and boardwalk, until the 8th of April. This information was provided to several community members after they requested this several weeks before, but the general public has not had an	development from vantage points, such as the beach and boardwalk, were produced in response to early community comments. These depictions were then added to the	It is recommended that the proposed amendment to Schedule 4 – Special Use Zones is modified as

information. The community information session organised by LandCorp did not include these depictions, only aerial and overhead artist impressions. The website.  with 'D' (Discretionary) ag "Multiple Dwelling (up to storeys (21.5 metres)" in statement on the day after the Council "Special Use" column upon the storeys (21.5 metres)" in the minimum of the statement on the day after the Council "Special Use" column upon the statement of the statem	0.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
information. The community information session organised by LandCorp did not include these depictions, only aerial and overhead artist impressions. The website.  website.  with 'D' (Discretionary) ag  "Multiple Dwelling (up to statement on the day after the Council statement on the day after the Council "Special Use" column to statement on the day after the Council s				Recommendation
LandCorp's websites was incorrect and misleading.  For the majority of the consultation period the City of Albany's and LandCorp's websites showed a 'preferred development option' that was an out of date plan not now being proposed. This plan was provided to off from LandCorp's website believing it to of the consultation period advertising. However, the City was not in a position to advertise the amendment for a week following the meeting, due to newspaper advertising deadlines. It was during this period that the submitter first visited the City of Albany offices seeking information.  Insertion of a new notation against "Multiple Dwelling (abov storeys (21.5 metres)" to read advertising. However, the City was not in a position to advertise the amendment for a week following the meeting, due to newspaper advertising deadlines. It was during this period that the submitter first visited the City of Albany offices seeking information.		opportunity to see or comment on this information. The community information session organised by LandCorp did not include these depictions, only aerial and overhead artist impressions. The information on the City of Albany's and LandCorp's websites was incorrect and misleading.  For the majority of the consultation period the City of Albany's and LandCorp's websites showed a 'preferred development option' that was an out of date plan not now being proposed. This plan was provided to me by City of Albany officers, who printed it off from LandCorp's website believing it to be the valid plan for comment. The City of Albany's website contained no other information on the proposal other than the form for public comment, instead using a link to LandCorp's website. LandCorp's website contained 14 downloadable documents, with no advice on which documents needed to be referred to, or	hyperlinked from the City of Albany's website.  The Minister for Lands issued a media statement on the day after the Council meeting where it was resolved to adopt the local planning scheme amendment for the purpose of public advertising. However, the City was not in a position to advertise the amendment for a week following the meeting, due to newspaper advertising deadlines. It was during this period that the submitter first visited the City of Albany offices seeking information.  The City was expecting updated documentation from the proponent, incorporating some minor changes, prior to public advertising. In order to avoid confusion by circulating an incorrect Structure Plan, the submitter was given a copy of the 'preferred	<ul> <li>Recommendation</li> <li>Replacement of "P" (Permitted with 'D' (Discretionary) agains "Multiple Dwelling (up to storeys (21.5 metres)" in the "Special Use" column unde "Hotel / Mixed Use Precinct";</li> <li>Insertion of a new notation "2 against "Multiple Dwelling (up to 5 storeys (21.5 metres)" and "Multiple Dwelling (above storeys (21.5 metres)" to read a follows:         <ul> <li>(2) Means that the permissibility of the use shall be continged upon prior or concurred construction of a hotel.'; and</li> </ul> </li> <li>Renumbering existing notation</li> </ul>

COLIEDULE OL CODIMICOLOMO			
No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	study, master landscape plan, drainage	Structure Plan, but that the final draft	
	study and so on) are lengthy documents,	plan would be available during the	
	that the public would find difficult to	public advertising period that would	
	understand or comment, and would have	commence in a week's time.	
	put people off from making comment.		
	Effectively, the community were swamped	Upon commencement of the public	
	with lengthy and detailed studies, rather	advertising period, the documentation	
	than guided to the key documents on which	was made available on the LandCorp	
	comment was sought (the Amendment and	website, which was hyperlinked from	
	Precinct Plan).	an advertising notice on the City of	
		Albany website. The advertising	
	LandCorp has focused their engagement	notice clearly stated that the City was	
	on the 'Concept Plan', which has no	seeking comment on the local	
	statutory basis and is indicative only. Of	planning scheme amendment and	
	most concern is the lack of information on	Activity Centre Structure Plan. These	
	the visual impact of the proposal. Given the	documents were clearly labelled on	
	scheme amendment is seeking a dramatic	the LandCorp website, while the	
	increase in building height adjacent to a	supporting studies were labelled as	
	beach, the public deserved to be provided	appendices to the Activity Centre	
	with unbiased information to assist them in	Structure Plan. The intent of providing	
	making comment on the proposal.	the background studies was not to	
	LandCorp did not do this, but rather	confuse the public but to provide	
	provided artist's impressions from oblique	answers to any specific questions that	
	or aerial viewpoints (not public places).	arose, as the City has been criticised	
	They have not provided a model of the	in the past for not providing enough	
	development, despite advising they would	technical information to satisfy some	
	do this on their website some 12 months	members of the public.	
	ago. They have provided no scaled		

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	drawings of the development, showing	Furthermore, a date was set at the	
	cross sections from the foreshore despite	commencement of the public	
	being requested to do so from members of	advertising period for a public	
	the public. They refused to demarcate the	information session that was to be held	
	foreshore boundary on site, despite being	in order to provide an opportunity for	
	requested to do so from members of the	members of the public to ask questions	
	public. They refused to use a crane to	directly of LandCorp and City staff.	
	show the real height of the development,	City staff were also available to answer	
	even though there was a request to do so	questions for the duration of the public	
	and a willingness to pay for this from the	advertising period.	
	community. The development will be highly		
	visible and greatly alter the landscape, and	The concept plan was utilised by	
	so the lack of suitable visual impact	LandCorp to illustrate the intended	
	assessment information from the	development outcome, as it shows	
	consultation process until a few days before	landscaping and notional building	
	the end of the consultation period is a major	types, which are not included on the	
	concern. It also needs to be pointed out the	Activity Centre Structure Plan. It is	
	development will be subject to design	considered that the best type of	
	principles, that have also not been made	information has been provided to	
	public. There is a planning policy	illustrate the overall visual impact of	
	requirement that the community should be	the proposals.	
	provided with sufficient information so that	The proposed local planning scheme	
	they can make informed input to planning	amendment sets a number of land	
	development, particularly of this scale next	uses as 'A' uses, which means that	
	to the coast. This has not occurred in this	they are discretionary and require	
	case, and due to the scale of the	advertising for public comment, prior to	
	development and requirement for the	determination. This includes any	
	development to be approved by the State's	development on the hotel/mixed use	

	SCHEDOLL OF S		
No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	Development Assessment Panel, the local community is not likely to have a later input.	site in excess of five stories or 21.5 metres in height. Although any	
	I ask that the consultation period be	significant development may be	
	extended and include provision of the recently completed visual impact images,	determined by a Joint Development Assessment Panel, the public will have	
	as well as demarcation of the development	an opportunity to comment on certain	
	on site, and scaled drawings so that the community clearly is able to comprehend	proposals.	
	the scale and impact of the proposal. I would add that public comments from the	Items one, two and six of the issues table address the matters of building	
	Council's mayor, that the development will	height, overshadowing and wind, in	
	not be visible as it is positioned next to	detail.	
	Mount Adelaide are inappropriate and totally misleading.	State Planning Policy 2.6 – Coastal Planning contains the following policy	
	I support a development height restriction	measure:	
	of up to six storeys for the Hotel/Mixed Use Precinct. I do not support higher development given its adverse impacts on the visual amenity, landscape and public enjoyment of nearby areas, particularly Middleton Beach. There is a policy requirement that development takes into	"Ensure that land use and development, including roads, adjacent to the coast is sited and designed to complement and enhance the coastal environment in terms of its visual, amenity, social and ecological values."	
	account the topography and landscape character of the locality (e.g. State Coastal Planning Policy). Local studies (e.g. City of Albany 2015 Middleton Beach amenity study) showed users of the beach valued its	The development is not expected to have a greater visual impact on the landscape than existing development at Checkers Walk, Morley Place, Hare Street and Wylie Crescent, when viewed from vantage points beyond the	

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff	
			Recommendation	
	natural beauty. The green backdrop of Mt Adelaide dominates the view looking south along this iconic beach. The proposed building of up to 12 storeys in the Hotel/Mixed Use precinct is twice the height of the foreshore Norfolk Island Pine trees and, as shown by LandCorp images, will dominate views from popular public vantage points, including the boardwalk and beach. The building is totally out of character with the locality and will overpower the landscape, transforming it into an urban and City Centre landscape. This is exacerbated by both the proposed height of the development, and its close proximity to the beach. These impacts are contrary to the policies mentioned. The present planning restrictions on building height were introduced to protect public amenity, and no justification has been provided to amend the development height. The introduction of mixed uses, rather than purely Hotel/Motel will enable development to occur on the site, and it is incorrect to say an increased height restriction is required to enable development of the area.	immediate area. While it will possible to distinguish any future building as free-standing when viewed from Mira Mar, it is part of an established urban area, albeit one that is presently developed with single, double and three-storey buildings.  It is considered that the proposals will enhance the amenity and social values of the area and will have no minimal impact on ecological values as a brownfield redevelopment.  The proposals are also considered to be consistent with the following policy measures contained within State Planning Policy 2.6:  "(d) the amenity of the coastal foreshore is not detrimentally affected by any significant overshadowing of the foreshore; and  (e) there is overall visual permeability of the foreshore and ocean from nearby residential areas, roads and public spaces."  The proposals do not seek to remove any of the Norfolk Island Pine trees located within the foreshore area. At the time of development, a tree	Recommendation	

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff Recommendation
	A building of 12 storeys will clearly impact on the public's enjoyment of the adjacent public open space and beach. This is contrary to policy, such as the Coastal Planning Policy, and to the principles detailed in the Scheme Amendment. This amendment states development in the Hotel! Mixed Use precinct should ensure 'No adverse impacts on the locality are presented by overshadowing' and the development needs to 'Contributes positively to the public realm'. These two principles are not reflected in the Scheme Amendment's Precinct Plan or the structure plan's concept plan, which show 12 storeys located immediately adjacent to the foreshore reserve. Modelling of the shadowing (in the Structure Plan) shows shadows being cast over the public domain, existing trees, public children's play area and existing café. In summer, this shadowing would extend to the sea, across the beach, late each afternoon. The 'preferred development option' plan on the City of Albany's and LandCorp's websites (only taken off about a week ago) had a range of development height restrictions within the Hotel / Mixed Use precinct, to	protection plan can be required as a condition of any approval, which would be implemented to protect trees from damage during construction.  The Structure Plan report contains a preliminary survey plan that clearly indicates that the eastern boundary of the hotel/mixed use site will to the west of the canopy spread of the nearest Norfolk Island Pine trees.  City staff have identified that the Special Uses and Condition 11 of the Special Use zone proposed by the local planning scheme amendment do not preclude the development of the hotel/mixed use site for short-stay holiday accommodation or multiple dwellings, without a hotel. A modification to the Special Uses is recommended to address this issue.	

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	reduce impact and overshadowing on the		
	foreshore reserve. The latest Middleton		
	Beach Activity Centre Plan Structure Plan		
	and the Concept Plan now omit this, having		
	a blanket 12-storey height restriction. This		
	should be amended back to the previous		
	plan.		
	There is inconsistency between the policy		
	direction (State coastal planning policy and		
	Scheme Amendment text) and the		
	Middleton Beach Activity Centre Precinct		
	Plan and structure plan. In the latter two		
	plans building is permitted up to 12 storeys		
	immediately adjacent to the coastal		
	reserve, having impacts on the		
	environmental and social values of the		
	foreshore. This is contrary to State and		
	Local planning policy and the Activity		
	Centre Precinct Plan the concept plan need		
	amendment to reflect these policy		
	requirements, with development set back,		
	reduced in height and stepped up from the		
	foreshore. The Activity Centre Precinct		
	Plan needs to show reduced height		
	restrictions near the foreshore to reflect		
	these policies. Mixed Use precinct as the		
	development's impacts will be mitigated in		

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	part by the existing Norfolk Island Pine		
	trees, particularly from the boardwalk. It will		
	still be highly visible from the beach to Emu		
	Point, but there is more retention of the		
	green backdrop provided by Mount		
	Adelaide, and the top of the building will		
	align more with existing development that		
	can be seen from this location. It will impact		
	on the landscape, but still retain the main		
	components of the present natural		
	landscape.		
	I support a three storey height restriction for		
	the northern two precincts. I support a five-		
	storey height restriction for the two		
	southern mixed use precincts, on the		
	condition a three-storey restriction is placed		
	on the Adelaide Crescent road frontage and		
	pedestrian access way. Five-storey		
	development along Adelaide Crescent will		
	provide a tunnel effect, made worse by the		
	summer easterly winds. Travelling along		
	this road by car or on foot will be unpleasant		
	if development towers above you, and such		
	a height does not integrate with		
	development further west along Adelaide		
	Crescent. A three-storey development		
	height restriction along the southern side of		

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	the pedestrian access way will combine		
	with the same restriction on the north side		
	of the access way, making for a more		
	pleasant pedestrian experience.		
	The eastern development boundary of the		
	Mixed Use/Hotel precinct needs		
	realignment to protect the healthy growth of		
	the existing Norfolk Island Pine trees. This		
	is likely to require realignment of the		
	existing foreshore reserve boundary by		
	some five to 10 metres to the west. The		
	eastern boundary of the Hotel/Mixed Use		
	precinct has not been demarcated on site,		
	and is difficult to determine given it follows		
	no existing on-site features. It should be		
	surveyed so an assessment of its suitability can be made. The boundary is shown		
	differently in different plans, with the		
	Landscape Master Plan showing the		
	canopy of the existing Norfolk Island Pine		
	trees extending to this boundary, while the		
	Concept Plan shows the trees some 10		
	metres to the east of the development		
	boundary. As the Landscape Master Plan		
	is based on aerial photograph images, the		
	Concept Plan is presumably incorrect. The		
	inaccurate representation of the trees'		

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	location should be corrected, given public		
	comment is specifically being sought on the		
	Concept Plan. The foreshore reserve and		
	the Pine trees are heritage listed, and the		
	protection of the trees should be given a		
	high priority. Earthworks and any alteration		
	to natural ground level should not occur in		
	close proximity to the trees. The Foreshore		
	Reserve should be extended to include the		
	full extent of the trees canopy, when fully		
	mature. This is likely to require realignment		
	of the existing foreshore reserve boundary		
	by some five to 10 metres to the west. The		
	protection of foreshore heritage, social and		
	environmental values is a requirement of		
	planning policy, such as the State Coastal		
	Planning Policy. This policy justifies an		
	extension of the foreshore reserve to		
	include the full canopy of the existing trees		
	when mature. This is particularly important		
	when the Scheme Amendment is		
	requesting a nil development setback for		
	this boundary.		
	The Activity Control Dresingt Dies and		
	The Activity Centre Precinct Plan and		
	Structure Plan's Concept Plan need to be		
	amended to ensure the development will		
	integrate with the foreshore reserve, have a		

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	ground floor interface and built form step up		
	from the foreshore reserve, so as to reduce		
	adverse impacts on the foreshore such as		
	from overshadowing. The Precinct Plan		
	needs to show a Primary Active frontage on		
	the Hotel/Mixed Use and coastal reserve		
	interface, and the Hotel/Mixed Use Precinct		
	needs to contain stepped development		
	heights (as previously shown in the		
	'preferred development option' plan. The		
	Concept Plan needs amendment to step		
	built form up from the coast as required by		
	the Scheme Amendment text and Structure		
	Plans figures 18 and 19. The 'Preferred		
	development option' plan shown on both		
	the City of Albany's website and		
	LandCorp's website had a tiered		
	development height restriction within the		
	Hotel/Mixed Use precinct, but the proposed		
	Scheme Amendment's Precinct Plan now		
	only has a 12 storey height restriction. This		
	allows for 12 storey development to be built		
	immediately adjacent to the foreshore		
	reserve, with no development set back, no		
	stepping up of development or ground floor		
	interface for public purposes. The Scheme		
	Amendment states that in the Hotel / Mixed		
	Use precinct, a key principle will be that		

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
	-		Recommendation
	built form will step up from the beach. This		
	key principle in the Scheme Amendment is		
	supported by diagrams in the structure plan		
	- figs 18 and 19. These figures show a		
	development set back from the foreshore		
	and existing Norfolk Island Pines, a		
	permeable interface at ground level		
	between the foreshore and development,		
	and built form stepping from ground level,		
	to three storeys, then five storeys and then		
	to 12 storeys. I support all of these		
	principles, but they are not shown in the		
	proposed Scheme Amendment's Precinct		
	Plan or Structure Plan's Concept Plan,		
	which seem to have been completed		
	without regard for any of this guidance. The		
	Scheme Amendment's Precinct Plan does		
	not show a primary or secondary active		
	frontage along the coastal foreshore		
	reserve boundary closest to the beach.		
	There is no development set back		
	proposed. The Concept Plan shows		
	maximum height development within five		
	metres of the foreshore boundary, with no		
	stepping up of development from the		
	beach, or public interface. This is		
	inconsistent with the Scheme Amendment		
	and Structure Plan guidance. Effectively		

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	the Scheme Amendment and Structure		
	Plan's Concept Plan show development		
	turning its back onto the beach. These		
	plans will permit development that will have		
	major impacts on the public's use and		
	enjoyment of the adjacent reserve. Both		
	plans need changing to be more consistent		
	with the Scheme Amendment's principles		
	and figures within the Structure Plan.		
	A Foreshore Management Plan should be		
	prepared by LandCorp, as a condition of		
	subdivision that shows how the foreshore		
	within the Middleton Beach Activity Centre		
	will be developed and managed. The		
	proposed development will greatly impact		
	on the foreshore area, and new trails,		
	interpretation, art work and landscaping are		
	to be implemented on the foreshore. These		
	are broadly covered in the Landscape		
	Master Plan, but this plan cannot be		
	progressed until the Scheme Amendment		
	itself is finalised as this will determine the		
	P05 area and boundaries. There has been		
	no community engagement with the		
	Landscape Master Plan, other than its		
	provision as an attachment to the Structure		
	plan. No specific public comment has been		

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	sought on this plan. It is a key principle of		
	planning that the community is engaged in		
	coastal planning and management, and		
	foreshore management plans are a means		
	of gaining such public input. I recommend		
	such a plan is placed as a condition of		
	subdivision, so that the facilities with the		
	foreshore can be coordinated, and		
	agreement reached on their		
	implementation, with community		
	participation in the plan's preparation.		
	I do not support any increase in the		
	development height restriction for the sole		
	purpose of permanent residential. There		
	should be a requirement that tourism		
	accommodation and public use be provided		
	in the Hotel / Mixed Use and Mixed Use		
	precincts. With the change from Hotel /		
	Motel zoning to precincts with Mixed Use,		
	with no stipulation of specific uses, there is		
	the possibility tourism accommodation		
	might not be provided. If permanent		
	residential offers the greatest economic		
	return, possibly only permanent residential		
	use might be offered by developers, with		
	some token retail or tourism		
	accommodation. To guard against this, I		

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
	•		Recommendation
	ask that the structure plan or amendment contain some wording that expresses a preference that tourism accommodation is a major requirement.		
	People are supporting this development on the basis that a hotel or tourism use is being provided, and will be very concerned if higher development is allowed that only contains permanent residential. We don't want to have lose the tourism value of the site, or have adverse impacts on the locality for the sake of providing penthouses.		
170	The Middleton Beach Group is generally supportive of the proposed change in zoning from 'Hotel/Motel' to mixed use and hotel/mixed use precincts, on the condition that future use contains a tourism accommodation component. This should be included as a principle in the Structure Plan.  The Middleton Beach Group notes the proposed zoning of the hotel/mixed use precinct does not require a tourism accommodation component, and that as such sole use for residential is possible.	City staff have identified that the Special Uses and Condition 11 of the Special Use zone proposed by the local planning scheme amendment do not preclude the development of the hotel/mixed use site for short-stay holiday accommodation or multiple dwellings, without a hotel. A modification to the Special Uses is recommended to address this issue.  Items two and three of the key issues table address the matters of overshadowing and parking in detail.	Submission upheld in part.  It is recommended that the proposed amendment to Schedule 4 – Special Use Zones is modified as follows:  • Replacement of "P" (Permitted) with 'D' (Discretionary) against "Multiple Dwelling (up to 5 storeys (21.5 metres)" in the "Special Use" column under "Hotel / Mixed Use Precinct";

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	The Middleton Beach Group would not support increased development heights and density solely for the purpose of permanent residential use, given the tourism importance of the area. Of the opinion of the Middleton Beach Group, the required tourism component need not include a Hotel. Development with a mixed use and public benefit should occur, not 'development at any cost'.  The Middleton Beach Group is supportive of the public access way that traverses the site west-east, as it enables public access to the centre of the site and enhances public use of the area.  The public access way is consistent with	The City of Albany is also exploring the potential for nearby land to be utilised for overflow parking, particularly when events are held in the area.  The proposals do not seek to remove any of the Norfolk Island Pine trees located within the foreshore area. At the time of development, a tree protection plan can be required as a condition of any approval, which would be implemented to protect trees from damage during construction.  The City of Albany and Landcorp are currently working to upgrade the stormwater management arrangements within the Activity Centre area.	Insertion of a new notation "2" against "Multiple Dwelling (up to 5 storeys (21.5 metres)" and "Multiple Dwelling (above 5 storeys (21.5 metres)" to read as follows:  '(2) Means that the permissibility of the use shall be contingent upon prior or concurrent construction of a hotel.'; and

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	The Middleton Beach Group is concerned		
	the proposed maximum allowable height		
	(12 storeys/46 metres) will impact on the		
	amenity of the local and surrounding areas,		
	and is in general not supportive of this		
	allowable height, instead recommending a		
	five/six storey maximum allowable height		
	for the hotel/mixed use precinct to reduce		
	its impact.		
	The Middleton Beach Group inputted to the		
	City of Albany's study of the amenity values		
	of Middleton Beach in 2013, and notes the		
	natural attractiveness of the beach was a		
	major value highlighted by tourists and		
	residents alike in this study. LandCorp's community consultation in February –		
	March 2015 found that 67% of public		
	submissions on the preferred development		
	height supported a two/three storey		
	development height restriction. Only 2.7%		
	of submissions supported a height		
	restriction of seven storeys or over.		
	Middleton Beach Group's own submission		
	to LandCorp was consistent with this		
	sentiment.		

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	The most recent feedback from Middleton		
	Beach Group members is from a meeting		
	on April 5 <sup>th</sup> 2016 to generate input to this		
	submission, and the subsequent circulation		
	to them of additional LandCorp images		
	received on April 6 <sup>th</sup> 2016. The majority of		
	the 21 meeting attendees have now stated		
	a preferred height limit of five to seven		
	storeys in the hotel/mixed use precinct.		
	Only three people supported the 12-storey		
	limit, based on a perception the viability of		
	the project was dependent on such a height		
	requirement. It was felt by most that		
	viability could not be used as a means of		
	determining an appropriate development		
	height as no information had been provided		
	by LandCorp or the City on this issue and		
	specific land uses had not been determined		
	for the site.		
	The Middleton Beach Group requests that		
	information on 'viability' for development is		
	made available by LandCorp, given it Is		
	being used to justify proposed changes to		
	development height restrictions, and the		
	development height will have significant		
	impacts on public amenity.		
	impacts on public amenity.		

	COLIEDGEE OF CODIMICOTORIO			
No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff	
			Recommendation	
	The Middleton Beach Group supports the			
	stepping of development from the beach			
	and foreshore, to reduce adverse impacts			
	on the amenity values of these areas. The			
	Middleton Beach Group requests revision			
	of the scheme amendment's Precinct Plan			
	and Structure Plan's Concept Plan to show			
	a ground floor interface and stepping of			
	development from the foreshore to the east			
	of the hotel/mixed use precinct, to			
	accommodate the design principles as			
	outlined in the scheme amendment and			
	Structure Plan (figs 18 and 19).			
	The location of high rise development			
	immediately adjacent to the foreshore is a			
	concern, given impacts on use and			
	enjoyment of these areas. The scheme			
	amendment states the development of the			
	hotel/mixed use precinct should contribute			
	positively to the public realm, and also			
	contains the principle that 'the height of the			
	proposed development responds to the site			
	and its context and steps built form away			
	from the beach'. This stepping of			
	development from the foreshore and beach			
	is illustrated in the Structure Plan. These			
	documents also highlight the need for			

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	interaction between the development and		
	foreshore, at ground level.		
	The scheme amendment also states that		
	development within the hotel/mixed use		
	precinct should ensure 'no adverse impacts		
	on the locality are presented by		
	overshadowing' of the foreshore. The		
	Structure Plan's modelling clearly shows		
	the proposed development will overshadow		
	the adjacent reserve with adverse impacts		
	on the public open space. Modelling of		
	summer overshadowing is not shown, but		
	would show considerable impacts on the		
	beach to the east of the development. The		
	concept plan shows stepping of		
	development only to the north, not to the		
	existing coastal reserve and beach to the		
	east. The amendment's Precinct Plan and		
	Structure Plan's Concept Plan show five to		
	12 storeys immediately adjacent to the		
	reserve, with no ground floor interface.		
	These plans are considered inconsistent		
	with the scheme amendment and Structure		
	Plan policy direction, and should be		
	amended to include a ground floor public		
	use area, development set back, with the		
	built form stepped up gradually as shown in		

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	Figs 18 and 19 so as to not impact on the		
	amenity values of the beach and public		
	open space.		
	The Middleton Beach Group supports the		
	widening of the public open space in the		
	northern portion of the site, as shown in the		
	Precinct Plan. The coastal foreshore		
	reserve is considered an important public		
	area, and its public use and existing Norfolk		
	Island Pine trees need to be protected and		
	where possible enhanced. The Concept		
	Plan shows development occurring up to		
	the foreshore boundary in the southern		
	portion of the site. This is a concern, as the development could impact on the existing		
	Norfolk Island Pine trees. State policy,		
	such as the Coastal Planning policy,		
	requires the determination of coastal		
	foreshore boundaries to have regard for the		
	protection and enhancement of		
	environmental, cultural and heritage		
	considerations and the protection of these		
	trees would be justified under such policy.		
	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		
	The boundary of the foreshore reserve in		
	the southern portion of the site is not clearly		
	shown or identifiable on site, but from the		

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	Landscape Master Plan appears to be at		
	the edge of the present canopy of the		
	Norfolk Island Pines. Given there is no		
	development setback, and the Concept		
	Plan shows development within five metres		
	of the present canopy, the proposed		
	development, including building and		
	earthworks, could impact on the future		
	growth and health of these trees.		
	The Middleton Beach Group requests that		
	the foreshore reserve boundary be		
	surveyed and determined so that it includes		
	the present and future growth requirements		
	of the existing Norfolk Island Pine trees.		
	The boundary should be demarcated on		
	site, so that the community is informed that		
	this has been achieved. Based on the		
	Landscape Master Plan, this would likely		
	require the realignment of the foreshore		
	boundary some five to 10 metres to the		
	west of the present boundary.		
	The Middleton Beach Group supports the		
	proposed use of public open space for		
	trails, interpretation and public art, but		
	requests that the design and		
	implementation of these be coordinated		

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
	-		Recommendation
	through the preparation of a foreshore		
	management plan, as a condition of later		
	subdivision/development. Foreshore		
	management plans are commonly required		
	to achieve management of development		
	impacts on foreshore reserves, and are		
	promoted in State planning policy. They		
	also provide a means of assisting		
	community engagement in this process,		
	and the Middleton Beach Group would be		
	keen to be involved in the preparation of		
	such a plan. It is noted the Landscape		
	Master Plan provides some direction on this		
	matter, but is indicative at this stage of the		
	planning process and has not contained		
	input from the community, including		
	Middleton Beach Group.		
	The Structure Plan notes that it would be		
	desirable to redirect stormwater drainage		
	from the existing five outfalls onto to the		
	beach to an alternate location away from		
	beach users, and that infiltration at source		
	would be desirable within the existing		
	catchment of these drains. No details are		
	provided on this and it is noted these sites		
	are outside the development area. The		
	Structure Plan notes that considerable		

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	earthworks and engineering will be		
	undertaken within the Activity Centre area,		
	to provide for the development and		
	potentially a seawall. Raising of the beach		
	is also proposed as a means of protecting		
	the area from coastal processes. All of		
	these activities could impact on the		
	potential to redirect stormwater away from		
	the beach, or could provide opportunities to		
	do so. The Middleton Beach Group		
	recommends that LandCorp and the City of		
	Albany integrate the development needs of		
	the site with the goal of redirecting		
	stormwater away from Middleton Beach. It		
	is requested that a plan be provided by the		
	City of Albany detailing how drainage onto		
	the beach can be reduced, prior to any		
	development works on the Middleton		
	Beach Activity Centre so that opportunities		
	provided by these works are utilised.		
	The scheme amendment proposes to		
	reduce car parking requirements of the		
	present Local Planning Scheme in the		
	Middleton Beach Activity Area, by over 100		
	public car parking bays, by excluding		
	requirements for hotel, restaurant/café		
	visitors and residential dwelling visitors,		

Na	o. Summary of Submission Officer Comment Staff		
No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	
			Recommendation
	and reducing by half parking for retail users.		
	It is noted an additional 29 public car		
	parking bays is proposed, but that this does		
	not cover this shortfall. The Middleton		
	Beach Group is concerned the shortfall in		
	public car parking, combined with the		
	spreading of this parking over a larger area,		
	particularly further from the beach, will		
	cause increase use of adjacent residential		
	areas and impact on local residents.		
	·		
	The Middleton Beach Group recommends		
	the request by LandCorp to reduce public		
	car parking requirements for the Middleton		
	Beach Activity Centre be reviewed and		
	potentially increased, to reduce congestion		
	and increased car parking impacts on		
	nearby residential areas.		
	The Middleton Beach Group recommends		
	that the City of Albany consider the use of		
	adjacent public areas, such as Eyre Park,		
	and area north of Wollaston Road, as		
	potential spill over public car parking areas		
	when major events occur.		

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
171	Expresses her opposition to the proposed 12-storey height maximum for the hotel site as she does not believe that there would be a need for so many rooms nor it be a viable proposal. Also expresses concern regarding potential shadowing. Suggests instead a three to five storey hotel. Quotes Paul Lionetti's statement of "having the hotel along the side of the mountain, tucked in close, running East to West and North to South" as being a reasonable proposal.	Item one of the key issues table addresses the matter of building height in detail.	
172	Believes the proposal to be a fantastic idea as Albany needs a waterfront area like other seaside towns. Comments that creating jobs in Albany to encourage youth to move to Albany and keep people in the region is important and that Albany needs more local attractions. Believes the proposed hotel will look great, doesn't appear to impede any views and will enhance Middleton Beach.	Nil.	Submission noted.
173	Signed petition with 138 signatures expressing support for a height restriction of no more than six storeys.	Item one of the key issues table addresses the matter of building height in detail.	Submission noted.

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
	-		Recommendation
174	Expresses concern regarding the height of	Item one of the key issues table	Submission noted.
	the proposed hotel, that a restriction of six storeys would be more acceptable to the	addresses the matter of building height in detail.	
	beachfront environment.	iii detaii.	
175	Believes the proposal to be fantastic as Middleton Beach has had the 'eyesore' of the old site for a number of years. States	Nil.	Submission noted.
	that tourists have been deterred in the past as there is no five-star accommodation in Albany currently, so this proposal can only promote more visitors. Believes the hotel		
	concept is very appealing in height and position and supports the proposal.		
176	Whilst in favour of the hotel, she expresses opposition to the 12-storey height limit.  Believes it should be a maximum of four storeys.	Item one of the key issues table addresses the matter of building height in detail.	Submission noted.
177	Wishes to support the proposal to build a	Item one of the key issues table	Submission noted.
	hotel at Middleton Beach. Expresses a	addresses the matter of building height	Gubinission noted.
	preference that the height of the Hotel not	in detail.	
	exceed the height of Mount Adelaide (eight		
	to 10 storeys), and believes a culturally		
	sensitive building should be built on this		
	iconic site blending in with the landscape, not altering the skyline.		

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
	Canimary or Capinicolon	omeer comment	Recommendation
178	Objects to the amendment to allow a height of up to 12 storeys on the hotel/mixed use site in the proposed Middleton Beach scheme amendment and Activity Centre Structure Plan. Believes the maximum height should be five storeys and should include stepping up of development away from the foreshore.	Item one of the key issues table addresses the matter of building height in detail.	Submission noted.
179	Believes the development is good apart from the 12-storey hotel limit as it would be too high a structure so close to the beach.	Item one of the key issues table addresses the matter of building height in detail.	Submission noted.
180	Petition with 265 signatures in favour of a height limit of five storeys.	Item one of the key issues table addresses the matter of building height in detail.	Submission noted.
181	Comments that he is keen for progress to be finally made but objects to the amendment to allow a height of up to 12 storeys on the Hotel/Mixed Use site. Suggests the maximum height should be limited to five storeys. However, if five is not likely to attract interest/investment, eight may be tolerable.		Submission noted.
182	I object to the expansion of the area available for development beyond the	•	Submission noted.

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	immediate area and surrounds of the	building height, parking and the	
	former Esplanade Hotel site.	location of the hotel within the	
		development area, in detail.	
	The location of the site allocated for the		
	hotel/mixed use expands beyond the	The local planning scheme	
	•	amendment and Activity Centre	
	current alignment of Flinders Parade and	Structure Plan do not contain any	
	into the current grassed foreshore	staging requirements for the	
		development of the various sites within	
	development much closer to the coastline	the Activity Centre area.	
	and will destroy the amenity and continuity		
		A visual impact assessment is only	
		required where there is a specific	
	•	policy requirement, which does not	
	· ·	exist in this instance. However, it is	
		likely that a visual impact assessment	
	design great views can still be achieved	would be submitted with any	
	without moving the site closer to the	development application for a building	
	beachfront. There will be a narrowing	in excess of five stories or 21.5 metres	
	between the Hotel and foreshore, instead of	in height.	
	the wide swathe of green that would		
	otherwise flow through to the Three		
	Anchors café and the approach to Ellen		
	Cove.		
	While acknowledging that realignment of		
	Flinders Parade is desirable, it could be		
	done better without the Hotel site where it		

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
	-		Recommendation
	is now shown. Why should the public		
	amenity of road and public open space be		
	lost to a hotel development, which could		
	well have been confined substantially to the		
	former Esplanade Hotel site?		
	I object to the height of up to 12 storeys on		
	the hotel/mixed use site. The height should		
	be limited to five storeys and should include		
	stepping up of development away from the		
	foreshore.		
	In discussions between authorities and		
	stakeholders, the prospect of 12 storeys		
	has not arisen. And suddenly, it is now		
	considered necessary to attract the right		
	developer, or 'the community will be back to		
	square one'.		
	Would it matter if the hotel/mixed use site is		
	not the first developed? It may well be		
	advantageous for others to be done earlier		
	to bring more people to the area, and to		
	demonstrate to prospective developers the		
	nature of the new market.		
	Because the large site is at the corner of the		
	Bay, good design would be able to produce		

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
	-		Recommendation
	a building with great ocean views both eastwards and southwards, without the need for 12 storeys. And a more compact development would be far more in keeping with the 'village' feel of the rest of the Activity Centre.		
	The community accepted the investment by the State Government in the Middleton Beach site as a genuine measure to achieve an appropriate development for this important regional city. The challenge is to work with and strengthen the wonderful natural landscape and unique coastal identity of Middleton Beach that will attract people to live in and visit Albany.		
	We need to allow sustainable levels of development. But we must also avoid large scale commercial development that damages the character of this beach and coastal area forever.  I object to the low number of public car parking bays provided for.		
	The 'Activity Centre' is being designed to attract many more people to Middleton Beach's upgraded facilities, and the		

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	commercial outlets it will include. The		
	public car parking near the foreshore/beach		
	should not be reduced as per the proposal,		
	given the number of local people who		
	regularly visit the beach. An increase of 29		
	bays (22%) is insufficient for additional		
	development proposed. I do not agree with		
	the proposal to delete the current car		
	parking requirements for visitor and hotel		
	users. I have seen similar developments		
	elsewhere where bays intended for public		
	parking are occupied significantly with		
	visitors to the residential sections.		
	I object to lack of a visual impact		
	assessment throughout the full period		
	when this proposal was made available for		
	public consultation. The community has		
	been unable to assess the visual impact of		
	the proposal including height, bulk, over		
	shadowing and changes to public open		
	space. This appears to be deliberately		
	misleading.		
183	Believes the hotel/mixed use site should be	Nil.	Submission noted.
	supported at the proposed 12-storey height		
	limit.		

	COTIED CE OT CODINICOTORIO				
No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff Recommendation		
184	Suggests that he proposal should be another hotel and beer gardens, so that members of every socio-economic level can enjoy and afford the area and that a three-storey limit be placed on the area.	Item one of the key issues table addresses the matter of building height in detail.			
185	The proposal for a hotel of up to 12 storeys for Middleton Beach is counter not only to local wishes but also to common sense.  The Planning System in WA is undemocratic, with no rights of appeal by affected parties; and when LandCorp are involved it becomes dictatorial with their claims of 'community consultation' so much whitewash. There are no standards or guidelines as to what 'community consultation' is and when and how the wishes of the community might be followed. LandCorp does as it pleases and answers to the Planning Minister. Local people under this system are sidelined in preference of the current 'fashionable' economics.  The hotel height proposed is totally out of scale with Middleton Beach. LandCorp have repeatedly likened Albany to Cape	Item one of the key issues table addresses the matter of building height in detail.  LandCorp undertook their own consultation to inform the design of the proposals. The City has advertised the proposals for public comment in order to gauge community opinion and inform the final recommendation.			

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	Town, a city with a population of 3,740,025,		
	which is approximately 100 times the size		
	of this small town. I believe from		
	experience in regeneration of urban areas		
	and my understanding of places that		
	Albany cannot be compared with Cape		
	Town.		
	Albany has a large number of undeveloped		
	blocks of land and many empty houses		
	along with houses only utilised by seasonal		
	visitors. Albany is 'the end of the road' in		
	the most isolated State of Australia and as		
	such unlikely to reach the level of		
	development to support such a hotel. We		
	cannot build a reputation for excellence		
	overnight but we can start now by small		
	scale excellent developments.		
	It would be far better for the town if we had		
	fewer inflated egos in business and Council		
	and if we pursued development both at the		
	Harbour Foreshore and in Middleton Beach		
	in keeping with our capabilities and our		
	local character: i.e. small scale and top		
	quality – much on the line of developments		
	that have occurred at Hillarys Boat Harbour		
	in scale and character. I think the promoted		

No. 186	Summary of Submission  scale of development actively counters any interest in developing these sites from local finance and at a smaller scale suited to the inhabitants and regular visitors to the area.  Does not support the proposed 12 storey	Officer Comment  Item one of the key issues table	Staff Recommendation  Submission noted.
	hotel as it will be dominating and deface Middleton Beach.	addresses the matter of building height in detail.	Submission noted.
187	As a Middleton Beach resident and architect who specialises in heritage places, I strongly object to the following:  1. A height of more than three storeys at the proposed development on the urban block bounded by Flinders Parade/Adelaide Crescent/Barnet Street/Marine Terrace and any new block created adjacent to the public open space associated with Ellen Cove.  2. A new development site being created so close to the public open space of the grassed foreshore of Ellen Cove.  3. Increasing the height of the lawn area and the sea wall.	Items one, two, three, four, five, six and nine address the matters of building height, overshadowing, parking, coastal planning, heritage, wind and the location of the hotel within the development area, in detail.  State Planning Policy 2.6 – Coastal Planning contains the following policy measure:  "Ensure that land use and development, including roads, adjacent to the coast is sited and designed to complement and enhance the coastal environment in terms of its visual, amenity, social and ecological values."  The development is not expected to have a greater visual impact on the	Submission noted.

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
NO.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	
			Recommendation
	<ul><li>The grounds for objection</li><li>The height, bulk and appearance of the building.</li></ul>	landscape than existing development at Checkers Walk, Morley Place, Hare Street and Wylie Crescent, when viewed from vantage points beyond the immediate area. While it will possible to distinguish any future building as free-standing when viewed from Mira	
	Middleton Beach is a small seaside suburb which has traditionally been single storey with a small amount of two storey development.	Mar, it is part of an established urban area, albeit one that is presently developed with single, double and three-storey buildings.	
	The proposal of up to 12 storeys next to the 'Three Anchors' is totally out of scale with this area and its values.	It is considered that the proposals will enhance the amenity and social values of the area and will have no minimal impact on ecological values as a brownfield redevelopment.	
	A high or medium rise development would have a very high visual impact for a wide area, and from a number of important vantage points, including the beach itself, Emu Point, the board walk, Marine Drive,	The proposals are also considered to be consistent with the following policy measures contained within <i>State Planning Policy 2.6</i> :	
	Adelaide Crescent (the beach view would be obliterated) and Mira Mar.  2. The type of use proposed and its impact with regard to traffic, noise and other potential adverse effects to the environment.	<ul> <li>(d) the amenity of the coastal foreshore is not detrimentally affected by any significant overshadowing of the foreshore; and</li> <li>(e) there is overall visual permeability of the foreshore and ocean from nearby residential areas, roads and public spaces."</li> </ul>	

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	Access to the proposed new development site, if developed to the density illustrated by the proposal, would place undured pressure on Adelaide Crescent, a most residential street, and would encourage through traffic on that street.  3. Adverse effects on adjoining propertions such as overlooking overshadowing.	A visual impact assessment is only required where there is a specific policy requirement, which does not exist in this instance. However, it is likely that a visual impact assessment would be submitted with any	
	A multistorey development would overlook the whole of Middleton Beach itself, and most of the suburb that is 'on the flats creating privacy issues for users of the beach and residents of the suburb whose property it will overlook.	k The proposed local planning scheme amendment and Activity Centre Structure Plan are being developed in order to supersede the current policy	
	Overshadowing of the beach and public open space would occur from midday, with a very high degree after about middle afternoon in Summer. As we have a conclimate this is an issue for beach users.	c h H-	
	4. The effect on the amenity of the area  Amenity refers to the comfort are enjoyment of a place and extends to all the second of the area.	d	

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	the factors that people value in their locality.		
	Amenity may be affected by physical		
	factors such as noise, smell or light, but		
	also by the judgements in relation to the		
	appearance and design of the proposal,		
	which are often referred to as the		
	'aesthetics'.		
	The emenity of Middleton Beech is that of a		
	The amenity of Middleton Beach is that of a small sea side town beach. It is highly		
	valued by the population of the town, the		
	region and the state and also by interstate		
	and international tourists for its natural		
	beauty with a small mostly residential		
	development with some low key		
	commercial development in the form of		
	cafes and restaurants. Mostly, as has been		
	stated, single storey with some two storey		
	and very limited three storey.		
	Ellen Cove is an area enjoyed by a whole		
	spectrum of the population. For families		
	with children it is particularly enjoyable, as		
	there is a wide variety of interest and		
	activity for children, with a number of cafes		
	and restaurants close. The Three Anchors		
	is particularly popular. The proposed		
	development would radically impinge on		

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	this amenity by crowding out the site and		
	creating a wall of development close to the		
	cove, where at the present time the		
	development is planned to occur across the		
	road, giving a more open aspect to the		
	grassed area of the cove.		
	I sincerely believe that this development		
	would have an adverse impact on the		
	tourism to the town, as we would		
	considerably alter the aesthetic value of our		
	iconic beach, which at the present time is		
	valued by both residents and visitors for its		
	relaxed "away from it all" ambiance.		
	Overshadowing of the beach and Public		
	Open Space would be an issue.		
	The development next to the Three		
	Anchors would create a wind tunnel effect.		
	The sea wall is a natural place to sit and		
	watch the beach and supervise children. A		
	raised sea wall and grassed area would		
	have the psychological effect of preventing		
	visual and physical proximity to the beach.		
	5. The effect on the character of an area.		

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	The character of Middleton Beach has		
	already been discussed. This proposal is a		
	large scale commercial type development		
	that may be acceptable in a dense		
	metropolitan area but is totally out of		
	character with this low key beach suburb.		
	6. The heritage value of a building or		
	place.		
	Ellen Cove has exceptionally high heritage		
	values to the state – and indeed the nation.		
	These heritage values have not been		
	addressed in the proposal. The criteria that		
	are required to be addressed when		
	ascertaining the cultural heritage		
	significance of a place are listed at the end		
	of this submission. Ellen Cove/Middleton		
	Beach meets most if not all of these criteria.		
	The way these criteria are met by Middleton		
	Beach should guide appropriate development.		
	development.		
	Previous City of Albany town planning		
	schemes recognised the heritage value of		
	the place, but the present town planning		
	scheme does not.		

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	<ol> <li>The suitability of the land for the type of development proposed.</li> </ol>		
	Water Table: As underground car parking will be required I would question whether the water table would allow this to occur.		
	Rising sea levels: Engineers now accept that the effects of global warming will cause increase in sea levels. Middleton Beach has been affected by storms in the past that have breached the sea wall, and I therefore question the suitability of this site for such an intense development that will require underground parking and services.		
	<ul> <li>8. The access and egress arrangements for vehicles to and from the site, the space for loading, unloading, manoeuvring and parking.</li> <li>The value of this beach to the general population of Albany and tourist visitors is such that sufficient parking should be provided. Unfortunately this has not been</li> </ul>		
	provided. Unfortunately this has not been achieved.		

	CONEDULE OF CODMISCIONS				
No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff		
			Recommendation		
	Also see point 2 for impact on Adelaide				
	Crescent				
	9. Whether the proposal is consistent				
	with policies relevant to the area.				
	· ·				
	This proposal is not consistent with past				
	policies relevant to the area, which				
	previously stated a maximum of five storeys				
	with a height limit of 15 metres plus roof. In				
	fact, even five storeys is too high to retain				
	the cultural heritage values of the area.				
	10. Landscaping				
	Middleton Beach has high value to the				
	community as a mostly natural landscape,				
	with the backdrop of the natural bush of				
	Mount Adelaide. Other natural elements				
	are the dune vegetation, sand, water and				
	boulders. Introduced elements are the sea				
	wall and the grassed area behind it, the				
	Norfolk Island Pines, some paving and				
	other retained areas. This has a relative				
	simplicity that has unfortunately become				
	cluttered by a number of introduced				
	elements.				

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff	
			Recommendation	
	Residential development (mostly single storey) has occurred behind the dunes and along part of the lower flank of Mount Adelaide. Some low key commercial development has occurred along Flinders Parade and Adelaide Crescent, creating a low key beach-side suburb that is typical of many seaside towns. Ellen Cove is particularly special for the fact that it is one of a small number of coves in Western Australia, many of whose beaches are long flat western facing strips with very little shelter from the wind. It is also north facing, another unusual characteristic of a town		Recommendation	
	beach in Western Australia.  A five to 12 storey development would totally dominate this landscape with an urban character that is totally inappropriate to this place.  Ellen Cove/Middleton Beach Assessment Of Significance  The following values are required to be addressed when assessing a place for the Register of Heritage Places. Middleton			

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	these criteria, which could be specifically		
	developed to explain the cultural heritage		
	values of this particular site and would then		
	help to guide appropriate development.		
	Previous City of Albany town planning		
	schemes recognised the heritage value of		
	the place, but the present town planning		
	scheme does not.		
	Aesthetic		
	It is significant in exhibiting particular aesthetic characteristics valued by the		
	community.		
	Importance to a community for aesthetic		
	characteristics (Criterion 1.1)		
	Importance for its contribution to the		
	aesthetic values of the setting		
	demonstrated by a landmark quality or		
	having impact on important vistas.		
	(Criterion 1.3)		
	Importance for its contribution to the		
	aesthetic qualities of the cultural environs		
	or the natural landscape within which it is		
	located or Importance for its contribution to		

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		Recommendation
	the natural landscape as part of a cultural environment. (Criterion 1.3)		
	Importance for the aesthetic character created by the individual components that collectively form a significant precinct; that is, streetscape, townscape or cultural environment. (Criterion 1.4)		
	Historic		
	It is significant in the evolution or pattern of the history of Western Australia.		
	Importance for the density or diversity of cultural features illustrating the human occupation and evolution of the locality, region or the State. (Criterion 2.1)		
	Importance in relation to an event, phase or activity of historic importance in the locality, the region or the State. (Criterion 2.2)		
	Importance for close association with an individual or individuals whose life, works or activities have been significant within the history of the nation, State or region. (Criterion 2.3)		

Officer Comment	Staff
	Recommendation

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	Importance for information/archaeological material contributing to a wider understanding of natural or cultural history by virtue of its use as a research site, teaching site, type locality, reference or benchmark site. (Criterion 3.1)		
	Importance for its potential to yield information contributing to a wider understanding of the history of human occupation of the locality, region or the State. (Criterion 3.2) Importance in demonstrating technical innovation or achievement. (Criterion 3.3)		
	Rarity		
	Importance for rare, endangered or uncommon structures, landscapes, archaeological material/features or phenomena. (Criterion 5.1)		
	Importance in demonstrating a distinctive way of life, custom, process, land-use, function or design no longer practised in, or in danger of being lost from, or of exceptional interest to, the locality, region or the State. (Criterion 5.2)		

No. Summary of Submission Officer Comment Staff			Staff	
140.		Summary of Submission	Onicer Comment	Recommendation
				Recommendation
		• Representativeness  Importance in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a range of landscapes or environments, the attributes of which identify it as being characteristic of its class; for e.g. modernist architecture or, in the case of archaeological sites, being characteristic of a particular type of place/use. (Criterion 6.1)		
		Importance in demonstrating the principal characteristic of the range of human activities (including way of life, philosophy, custom, process, land-use, function, design or technique) in the environment of the locality, region or the State. (Criterion 6.2)		
188		Expresses great support for the current proposals to increase tourism potential and attraction to Middleton Beach. Additional accommodation, cafes and shopping options can only be good for the area. States the potential for a high-rise building as shown will not detract from the area as it will not be blocking views as it is placed close to the hill.	Nil.	Submission noted.

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff Recommendation
189	States that 12 storeys is too high for the Middleton Beach area, and makes a suggestion of having a larger ground floor for more rooms to make it viable.	Item one of the key issues table addresses the matter of building height in detail.	
190	Objects to the amendment to allow a height of up to 12 storeys on the hotel/mixed use site in the proposed Middleton Beach scheme amendment and Activity Centre Structure Plan and suggested the height needs to be restricted to five stories.  States she would be horrified to see this beautiful area compromised. The attraction for tourists and holiday-makers, as well as for the people of Albany, is to be able to enjoy the natural environment set in to a village-like feel and a sense of belonging to all users.  Also asks that consideration to all people who enjoy Albany before decisions are made that will be detrimental.	Item one of the key issues table addresses the matter of building height in detail.	
191	States that this plan does not provide to the community enough of an 'Activity Centre' for our community.	Item one of the key issues table addresses the matter of building height in detail.	

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	Disagrees with a large area being sold off	The artist's impressions were prepared	
	to private housing, as it will mean those	as a guide to provide the public with a	
	areas are lost to the community. A five to	sense how completed buildings could	
	12 story building is unnecessary and	look and are not development	
	inappropriate in the area proposed and may	proposals.	
	be unlikely to attract a developer.		
	The quality of design and architecture		
	proposed is uninspiring. The civic spaces		
	are mainly parking and roads rather than		
	activity areas. Private housing and		
	community activity areas will be in conflict		
	because of noise and movement issues. It		
	has been suggested that some of the area		
	will be used for professional offices, and		
	does not support this as the area needs to		
	be an activity area for all the community.		
	Suggests increasing the amount of		
	community activity areas as if the current		
	area was landscaped with picnic shelters		
	and a central activity area that would make		
	the area an activity area to be enjoyed into		
	the future when more appropriate and		
	imaginative ideas are created. A row of		
	shops, cafes and bars with short term		
	accommodation above could be an		
	extension of the current shops between		

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	Rats Bar and Three Anchors. States this would be a much lower cost development and undoubtedly more likely to happen as the example of the Foreshore on the Harbour demonstrates.  If Landcorp was to observe the example of many east coast towns, this is what happens in most places similar to Middleton Beach.		
192	Within the Middleton Beach environment, I believe we could carefully introduce some more holiday accommodation in the form of a low-rise, well-designed, modern resort which integrates with the natural landscape and contours. The outdoor as well as the indoor spaces of any such development should integrate. I note that the vision put forward by Landcorp includes a sparkling high rise that in no way appears to integrate with its surrounds. I disagree with allowing 12 storeys, four-storey would be the maximum.  I don't believe we should be developing the site for a multistorey structure in this well used community location.	Items one, six and nine of the key issues table address the matters of building height, wind and the location of the hotel within the development area in detail.	

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
	-		Recommendation
	If there is a large structure is to be built, I		
	believe it would be better placed near the		
	Forts. In that location it should likewise be		
	low-rise, but extensive. Or alternatively		
	near the Entertainment Centre.		
	The so-called 'active frontage' proposed, in		
	my view is misplaced. That area collects a		
	great degree of wind and if we are going to		
	encourage the public to occupy those		
	areas, we need to provide more than a few		
	shop and hotel frontages. Giving the		
	Albany people more restaurants to go to is		
	not creating community capital. In terms of		
	offering a 'visionary plan for Albany' the		
	current proposal is very light on. It seems		
	to be an 'off the shelf concept' and does not		
	appear to contain any original idea or		
	visionary plan that would unite our		
	community and provide any real amenity		
	that is useable, apart from a windy grassed		
	area (similar to what is there now) and a		
	road that can be used at times for markets,		
	and some shopfronts. However, it's great		
	that the road is to be re-directed to make		
	this a more people friendly place.		
	The state of the s		

	COLLEGE OF CODIMICOLORS				
No.		Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff	
				Recommendation	
		I suggest creating a village square with a centre piece, some community space, some landscaped undulating space with a small grassed and protected bowl/amphitheatre.  Adding short-stay holiday accommodation integrated with the village square and shops. I don't agree with putting corporates down there such as consultants and accountants, as I think this area is more suited for holiday and community uses. Of			
		course, commercial viability will dictate who			
		eventually leases/buys the spaces.			
193		I support the rezoning of the site to Special Use as the change to mixed use provides opportunities for a vibrant development that	Items one, two, three, seven, eight and nine of the key issues table address the matters of building height,	·	
		accommodates many of the public	overshadowing, parking, the public	proposed amendment to Schedule 4	
		amenities suggested by the community. The scheme amendment does not stipulate	access way, road alignment and the location of the hotel within the	– Special Use Zones is modified as follows:	
		that the hotel/mixed use precinct must include tourism accommodation. This	development area, in detail.	Poplacement of "P" (Permitted)	
		should be rectified, given that the site has	City staff have identified that the	<ul> <li>Replacement of "P" (Permitted) with 'D' (Discretionary) against</li> </ul>	
		been identified as one of Albany's most	Special Uses and Condition 11 of the	"Multiple Dwelling (up to 5	
		significant tourist accommodation sites.	Special Use zone proposed by the	storeys (21.5 metres)" in the	
		Unless the above change is made, it would be possible for permanent residential	local planning scheme amendment do not preclude the development of the	"Special Use" column under "Hotel / Mixed Use Precinct";	

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
No.	accommodation to occupy the whole precinct, which I definitely do not support. I do not support increasing the maximum permissible building height above five storeys in the hotel/mixed use precinct, for the following reasons:  More than five storeys is not in accord with the character of the area as Middleton Beach is of a low-key, family-friendly, seaside holiday nature and has a strong sense of place emanating from its beautiful natural environment. These values, and the community's aspirations for appropriate redevelopment of the old Esplanade site in tune with the natural and built environment, have been well documented over the last five years through workshops, surveys, Landscape Design Guidelines, public meetings and frequent communication with the City of Albany and LandCorp by the local community, the Middleton Beach Group.  The main concern expressed by the	hotel/mixed use site for short-stay holiday accommodation or multiple dwellings, without a hotel. A modification to the Special Uses is recommended to address this issue.  While policy measures from State Planning Policy 3 – Urban Growth and Settlement and the City of Albany's Activity Centre Planning Strategy (2012) have been referenced in the submission, State Planning is more pertinent in this instance. It is considered that the proposals are broadly consistent with the policy measures outlined in State Planning Policy 2.6.  The City of Albany and Landcorp are currently working to upgrade the stormwater management arrangements within the Activity Centre area.	<ul> <li>Insertion of a new notation "2" against "Multiple Dwelling (up to 5 storeys (21.5 metres)" and "Multiple Dwelling (above 5 storeys (21.5 metres)" to read as follows:         (2) Means that the permissibility of the use shall be contingent upon prior or concurrent construction of a hotel."; and</li> <li>Renumbering existing notation "(2)" as notation '3'.</li> </ul>
	community about the early concept plans	Design Guidelines are being prepared	
	was height above three to five storeys.  After LandCorp's Preferred Concept Plan	for the Activity Centre area, which	

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	was released, indications were that the hotel/mixed use precinct would be five storeys of tourist accommodation with the possibility of a further two storeys of 'penthouse' permanent residential. Release of the scheme amendment was the first indication the public had of a 12 storey maximum. More than five storeys does not align with Objectives and Development Principles contained in the Structure Plan:  'A landmark site that is reflective of the coastal character and scale of Middleton Beach' and 'Design is place-based and integrates with the foreshore, pines, Mount Adelaide and the existing built form and	should ensure that any development is appropriate to the locality.	Recommendation
	It is difficult to reconcile these views with the increased permissible height sought in the scheme amendment, given that there are currently no buildings in the area higher than three storeys, with most no higher than two.  A change in permitted maximum height does not align with State Planning Policy 3 – Urban Growth and Settlement – "To		

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	manage the growth and development of		
	urban areas in response to the social and	I	
	economic needs of the community and in	I	
	recognition of relevant climatic,	I	
	environmental, heritage and community	I	
	values and constraints" and the City of	I	
	Albany Activity Centre Planning Strategy	I	
	(2012) states: "Preserve and where	I	
	possible enhance the local character and	I	
	amenity of residential neighbourhoods."	I	
	Increasing the permitted height will have a	I	
	detrimental visual impact	I	
	which will be particularly noticeable from	I	
	the boardwalk and further along the beach	I	
	towards Emu Point, but also when walking	I	
	and driving along Adelaide Crescent. The	I	
	most recent images from LandCorp show	I	
	this impact very clearly and contradict the	I	
	perception that 12 storeys will 'nestle	I	
	against the hill'. Such comments have	I	
	misled the public and are simply not true.		
	I support the requirement for buildings in		
	the Hotel/Mixed Use precinct and the two	I	
	southern Mixed Use precincts to be	I	
	'stepped'.		
	This will reduce the visual impact in the		

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	Hotel/Mixed Use precinct and reduce the		
	'canyon' effect along the Public Access		
	Way, in the southern Mixed Use precincts.		
	I support the public access way through the		
	development, subject to the following:		
	Appropriate traffic calming and parking		
	arrangements should be devised to		
	optimise the potential for the public access		
	way to be the 'village green' along its full		
	extent, especially at its interface with the		
	internal laneway and Flinders Parade.		
	Wind mitigation measures should be		
	required.		
	The interface of the car park and the public		
	access way should take account of		
	potential use of the car park as an		
	occasional market.		
	Consideration should be given to accessing		
	the laneway on the north side of the public		
	access way via Barnett Street and on the		
	south side, from Adelaide Crescent, rather		
	than allowing vehicle to cross over the		
	public access way.		

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
	, and the second		Recommendation
	The amount of public open space at the southern end of the site should be increased, by adjusting the eastern boundary of the hotel/mixed use precinct. The present precinct boundary compromises public amenity and may adversely affect the western row of Norfolk pines.		
	Re-aligning the current 'dog leg' boundary in a straight line from the north east to the south east corners of the precinct should be considered, increasing the amount of public open space in a potentially busy area. At the moment it seems every effort has been made to ensure the hotel/mixed use precinct is as large and as 'beachfront' as possible, at the expense of public amenity.		
	Overshadowing diagrams should be provided for mid-summer to determine the effect on the beach, playground and Three Anchors. A diagram for 6pm should be included, as this is when many visit the beach, after work.		
	I support the relocation of piped outlets to locations that minimise impact on beach		

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
	-		Recommendation
	amenity. This is recommended in the		
	Stormwater Drainage report attached to the		
	Structure Plan.		
	Although the stormwater beach outfalls are		
	outside the development site, the		
	opportunity should be taken for the City and		
	LandCorp to address an ongoing, unsightly		
	and unhealthy problem. We cannot let this		
	outdated infrastructure diminish the visitor		
	experience of the new development.		
	I support the priority given to alternative		
	transport, provided an improved bus		
	services is available to/from the area and		
	the City developing and administering		
	Design Guidelines, as stated in the scheme		
	amendment. It is critical that developers are		
	required to conform to design guidelines		
	that ensure high quality development with		
	overall integrity and sympathy with the		
	surrounding natural and built environment.		
	Design midelines of the control of		
	Design guidelines should apply to all		
	precincts, not just the hotel/mixed use		
	precinct as stated in the scheme		
	amendment.		

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
194	I support development on the hotel site but	Items one, two and three of the key	Submission noted.
	do not support a height of 12 storeys for the	issues table address the matters of	
	hotel/mixed use site, as it would	building height, overshadowing and	
	significantly impinge on the visual aspect	parking, in detail.	
	from multiple areas.		
	I am aware of economic viability importance		
	as a local business owner but do not agree		
	with the arguments put forward by		
	Landcorp. We should encourage		
	development that recognises the 'triple		
	bottom line', not development at any cost. I		
	support a height increase to six storeys in		
	this area and do support the 'hotel/mixed use' for holiday accommodation in the		
	sense that it does not have to be a		
	traditional hotel but instead could be		
	serviced apartments.		
	I do not support any amendment that would		
	facilitate development which is residential		
	for the 'hotel/mixed use' lot.		
	I support mixed use and residential use for		
	the other four lots as identified, the up to		
	three to five-storey in the northern lots and		
	may support up to five storeys in the		
	southern lots if they were stepped back		

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff Recommendation
	development. I do not support up to five storeys in the southern lots as outlined.  Any development should complement the existing Norfolk pines. The Hames Sharley report on shadow impact shows only 3pm shadows in winter but this shadowing would progressively worsen as they day progresses, impacting on Three Anchors and the public areas around.  I do not support the extent of the parking proposed as regular daily demand would increase significantly.  Any amendments should build around the location's strengths and attractions (natural beauty, family friendly holiday destination) not a 'modern city style' precinct.		Recommendation
195	Believes that a 12-storey building is not suitable for the Middleton Beach area as it will detract from the current amenity of the area. Suggests a height of three to four storeys as a maximum instead.	Item one of the key issues table addresses the matter of building height in detail.	Submission noted.
196	Originally Mr Barnett said you will have a tavern. He forgot to mention that the tavern	Items one, four, six and nine of the key issues table address the matters of	Submission noted.

	CONEDULE OF CODMISCIONS				
No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff		
			Recommendation		
	would have an 11-storey roof above	to building height, coastal planning, wind			
	protect it from the rain. This is not wh	at and the location of the hotel within the			
	anybody asked for nor envisaged.	development area, in detail.			
	I favour a three-storey height restriction	,			
	order to retain the integrity of the location	_			
	and the current visual amenities offered	8			
	unrestricted vast views over our hinterla	9			
	from many vantage points. I believe three-storey development will allo Middleton Beach to provide the necessary support to still engage with Middleton Beach as a family friendly and adult friend venue.  Fundamentally the incentive offered to the store of the store	In accordance with State Planning Policy 2.6, a Coastal Hazard Risk Management and Adaptation Plan has been prepared for the Activity Centre area and deals with the following matters:			
	private developer is to give the	·			
	exceptional access to an iconic beachfro				
	property encroaching on public recreation	r tiert airiaily ete airia e t airiaileiri,			
	reserve with a height allowance of storeys. The Foreshore has a 12-store	rtion management and adaptation			
	height allowance and there is no develop there. To ensure profitability privation	er Monitoring and review.			
	residential units are essential to t	The Coastal Hazard Risk Management			
	developer making a profit. I do not see a	-   and / daptation i lan lacitines that the			
	formula of a ratio of residential to touris	Activity Octific area will be subject to			
	units as a benchmark of developme	nt coastal risks, which will require			
	requirement.	management into the future.			

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
	-		Recommendation
	A building of this magnitude will sit very nicely in the Little Grove area and provide magical night displays of light and form when looking back to the town site. Highlights of this vision would be the Albany Entertainment Centre and the port reflected into the waters of Princess Royal Harbour with the twinkle of the house and street lights floating up our precious mounts defining the outline of our beautiful city. Defining our assets and our aspirations and the heart of Albany. Add to that a ferry trip across a sheltered harbour to take them back and forth. And what will they be looking at in the night sky from Middleton? A big expanse of darkness from ocean and mountain maybe.  The emphasise that we must accept 12 storeys or forever be the poor second cousin is somewhat annoying as it is an option of destroying the iconic beach front and the unfettered vistas from the boardwalk, its view to openness and space or to stamp it with the forever target of overdevelopment on iconic locations.		Recommendation

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
	·		Recommendation
	A further statement is that the 12 storey		
	development may encourage someone to		
	develop the remaining areas. And if it		
	doesn't we are left with an unwieldy 12		
	storey building with ongoing coastline		
	control costs.		
	Given that this proposed 12-storey		
	development may meet the needs of		
	Albany for some time to come it may also		
	discourage developments in other areas.		
	Currently the Middleton foreshore area is		
	semi-protected by a retaining wall which		
	acts to hold back storm waves and controls		
	to a degree the sand drift. It has been		
	stated that an under earth sea wall will be		
	required and the beach front graduated to		
	meet current planning requirements to		
	support a 12-storey building. Given that		
	there is currently sufficient sand build up on		
	the beachfront to transport it to Emu Point		
	beach erosion areas what measures would		
	have to be taken to prevent sand drift		
	across the grassed area into the building		
	complex? Middleton beach experiences		
	heavy seasonal winds. And more		
	importantly - who is responsible for the		
	construction of this seawall and who is to		

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	pay for ongoing costs of maintenance for		
	the gradient of the beach front.		
	The expected 697 residents of the entire		
	complex is a significant impact on the fragility of this foreshore and with the added		
	anticipated influx of local users, possible		
	sand drift and overshadowing the grassed		
	areas may have little chance of survival -		
	particularly in the narrowed strip in front of		
	the proposed 12-storey development.		
	In conclusion I believe Albany must start		
	standing on its' own two feet – let us achieve the achievable and decrease		
	future maintenance costs that we as a low		
	monthly earning population cannot afford to		
	maintain and which the State Government		
	should not be requested to supply endless		
	cash to which they no longer have access.		
	Please consider the reduction of heights		
	and protect this area.		
197	Considers the proposed height of 12	Item one of the key issues table	Submission noted.
	storeys to be excessive and believes the hotel should not exceed the visual line of	address the matter of building height in detail.	
	Mount Adelaide when looking from the	uetaii.	
	foreshore. Suggests that the proposal		

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff Recommendation
	consider the natural location and historical nature of the site and town more. States that the scale of the proposal is beyond what Albany can accommodate, and additional holiday accommodation will impact on existing providers. The community does not support the scale of the development or its location beyond the original Esplanade site.		
198	I support the general objectives as outlined on page 12 of the Hames Sharley document March 2016. In particular I support the statement regarding community objectives to 'enhance the identity of Middleton Beach' and 'social interaction, including families'.  I also would endorse the Middleton Beach Activity Centre objective of 'a landmark site that is reflective of the coastal character and scale of Middleton Beach'.  I support the statement on page 17 'planning for liveable neighbourhoods including a sense of community and strong local identity' and the increase in public space and the west/east pedestrian	Items one, two, three and five of the key issues table address the matters of building height, overshadowing, parking and heritage, in detail.  City staff have identified that the Special Uses and Condition 11 of the Special Use zone proposed by the local planning scheme amendment do not preclude the development of the hotel/mixed use site for short-stay holiday accommodation or multiple dwellings, without a hotel. A modification to the Special Uses is recommended to address this issue.	It is recommended that the proposed amendment to Schedule 4 – Special Use Zones is modified as follows:  • Replacement of "P" (Permitted) with 'D' (Discretionary) against "Multiple Dwelling (up to 5 storeys (21.5 metres)" in the "Special Use" column under "Hotel / Mixed Use Precinct";

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	walkway - although I have reservations		storeys (21.5 metres)" to read as
	regarding the impact of the summer		follows:
	easterly winds.		'(2) Means that the permissibility
			of the use shall be contingent
	I support a mix of land use including		upon prior or concurrent
	residential; visitor accommodation,		construction of a hotel.'; and
	hospitality and retail, and public/community		Renumbering existing notation  "(0)"
	open space and development which will enhance Middleton Beach as an iconic		"(2)" as notation '3'.
	place to visit and a socially, active, vibrant		
	place to live and work.		
	process to the same treatment		
	However, I have reservations regarding		
	particular aspects of the amendment. The		
	amended structure plan does not appear to		
	follow the principles of context to local		
	character; place and surrounding scale.		
	The images provided at the information		
	session did not build confidence of the		
	development of a 'world class' precinct		
	which would enhance and strengthen the		
	distinctive competences of this special part		
	of Albany. The comments made by		
	LandCorp representatives and reiterated		
	by some, that we need 12 storeys to attract		
	developers, but that over seven to eight		
	storeys is more costly so may not happen,		

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	is in my view suggesting 'we accept this and		
	hope - and we need development at any		
	cost' to the detriment of the long term vision		
	for the area.		
	I do not support an increase in the height to		
	12-storey for the 'mixed/hotel' site. This		
	would dominate the environment. In		
	addition the structure plan appears to have		
	changed from a 'stepped' building to all 12-		
	storey. The recent images provided by		
	LandCorp (not presented at the information		
	session), show the negative visual impact		
	the amendment to allow up to 12 storeys		
	would have from the beach and boardwalk.		
	We have not been shown visual impact		
	from Adelaide Crescent. A 12-storey		
	structure would be highly visible from all of		
	these vantage points and detract from one		
	of our key characteristics of Albany and the		
	area and impinge on the ambience and		
	concept of a 'liveable neighbourhood'.		
	I do not support any amendment that could		
	provide the flexibility for the 'hotel/mixed		
	use' lot to be developed for solely		
	residential purposes. In discussion with		
	LandCorp at the information session, it was		

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	suggested the amendment to 12-storey		
	and 'mixed use' site is necessary to attract		
	developers and could allow a developer, for		
	viability reasons, to propose solely		
	residential use. I would like Council to		
	ensure this is not the case.		
	The statement on page 48 in the Hames		
	Sharley document which states		
	'development of the area into 'a high street'		
	environment' Middleton Beach is a holiday		
	destination and a 'liveable neighbourhood'.		
	This statement and images presented		
	provide a 'city/urban' ambiance when the		
	strength and attraction of Middleton Beach,		
	as identified by earlier community		
	feedback, is it's natural beauty and		
	attraction as a family holiday destination.		
	I do not support the extent of the reduction		
	in the commercial parking requirements as		
	outlined on the same page of the		
	document. Whilst we would not want the		
	area to look like a 'car park' a reduction of		
	50% will impact on local use and overflow		
	to residential areas.		

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	As recognised in the document, cars will be		
	the primary form of transport and we have		
	no meaningful public transport to this area		
	of Albany. I do recognise the importance of		
	economic viability but not at the expense of		
	social and environmental impact.		
	I would support a height increase to six-		
	storey in this hotel/mixed use area,		
	Adelaide Crescent area and other four		
	development lots. I have concerns re: the		
	proposed five storeys with no 'setback' on		
	the physical, visual and ambience of		
	Adelaide Crescent; which is the 'entry' to		
	Middleton Beach.		
	I would also support up to five-storey in		
	these southern lots if the plan included		
	'stepped back' development so that		
	Adelaide Crescent and the pedestrian		
	walkway were three-storey.		
	I am concerned re the traffic along Adelaide		
	Crescent and impact on the 'space' and		
	safety around Eyre Park.		
	durity dround Lyro r driv.		
	I disagree with the statement in Hames		
	Sharley report that the impact of shadowing		

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	in the proposed structural plan has no undue impact. The report clearly shows shadows to the street, play area by Three Anchors and this would increase later in the day.		
	I understand LandCorp and the City would not mark out the area of development which would have allowed the community to be more aware of the proposed impact.  The area has heritage values and the Norfolk pines are a landmark which should be respected.		
	I am disappointed that the information session did not present alternatives as LandCorp suggested they would.		
	As an Albany resident I do want to support this development, however I disagree with the argument that we need '12 storey or we'll get nothing'. There are examples around the world where communities celebrate their unique environment and don't accept 'development at any cost'.		

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
199	Objects to the amendment to allow a height of up to 12 storeys on the Hotel/Mixed Use site in the proposed Middleton Beach Scheme Amendment and Activity Centre Structure Plan. Believes a 12-storey Hotel at Middleton Beach would totally destroy the ambiance of the area and suggest a maximum height should be limited to five storeys.	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Submission noted.
200	Approval for development of the designated area of Middleton Beach is certain and would be welcomed by everybody. The only doubt surrounds the type of development that will be finally approved as everything seems to be weighted in favour of a 12-storey resort-style hotel being promoted to developers and forced through by local and state governing bodies.  All the statements in the Hames Sharley Executive Summary that seem to take into account the wishes of the local community amount to bland motherhood statements about 'a landmark site' or recognising 'the iconic location and significance of the site	-	Submission noted.

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
	·		Recommendation
NO.	to the community' or the need for a 'landmark building to respond to Mount Adelaide'.  Their Scheme Amendment Report prepared for LandCorp contains similar statements flavouring what they call the State Planning Context such as the need 'To build on existing communitiesand enhance the quality of life in those communities' or to have 'Good urban design which creates and enhances community identity, sense of place, liveability and social interaction'.  The Scheme Amendment Report also points out that the City of Albany Tourism Accommodation Planning Strategy (2010) claimed that 'based on the demand		
	analysis there does not appear to be a demand for higher return motels, hotels and/or additional resorts' and that 'the ( <i>City of Albany Local Planning</i> ) policy provides for a height limit of five storeys'.  However the Executive Summary also contains far more weighted and directed statements that allow for and even suggest		

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
	•		Recommendation
	the need for a 12-storey resort-style hotel.		
	The suggestion that 'the site will include		
	potential for development up to 12 storeys'		
	is followed by the Summary pointing out		
	that 'the (commercial) yield is based on the		
	development achieving the maximum		
	permitted development controls (Height up		
	to 12 storeys) and (yields) are likely to vary		
	and be notably less should a reduction in		
	height occur'.		
	The Executive Summary also points out		
	that the State's Western Australian		
	Planning Commission's Planning Bulletin		
	No. 83 and Improvement Plan No. 40 give		
	the Western Australian Planning		
	Commission the power to override Albany's		
	local planning policy in order to 'help		
	optimise the opportunity for successful		
	development' and 'to facilitate opportunities		
	for investment and development'.		
	The City of Albany Local Planning Scheme		
	No. 1, Amendment No. 1 has already caved		
	in to WAPC by requiring that 'opportunities		
	for investment and development are		
	facilitated'. The Key Principles for		
	Hotel/Mixed Use Precinct sound as if they		

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff Recommendation
	will safeguard treasured values of the site but they are littered with weasel words that can be interpreted in any way a developer's legal team wishes. Just what does 'Bulk and scale of the proposed development are effectively mitigated' mean?		Recommendation
	All the concept plans and computer renderings released to the public and the media by LandCorp show flattering views of a twelve storey hotel development at Ellen Cove. All the language used by LandCorp representatives at 'public consultations' has favoured a twelve story resort style hotel as the bait required to lure international developers. Clearly the		
	demands of a developer will be allowed take priority over the wishes of the local community. I am not at all optimistic about the outcome of this consultation process and the effectiveness of submissions from the public.		
201	It is encouraging to see community discussion continuing around the Middleton Beach development. I would like to raise two issues with the City concerning building scale and procurement process.	Item one of the submission table addresses the matter of building height in detail.	Submission noted.

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
		While the comments regarding 'human	
	Human scale is essential in any	scale' are acknowledged, the majority	
	consideration of building development. In	of buildings in central Copenhagen, as	
	great liveable cities such as Copenhagen,	in many older European cities, are of	
	scale is capped at around six stories.	no more than six storeys due to the	
		limits of building technology at the time	
	When you tilt your head you can connect to	of their construction. The requirement	
	the upper levels visually and physically,	for 'podium' style development on the	
	there is a sense the urban environment can	hotel/mixed use site would reduce the	
	flow up into these buildings, and in turn they	perceived bulk of any future building	
	can offer life back to the street and their	when viewed from the foreshore.	
	surrounds.		
		Copenhagen is also home to at least	
	A 12-storey building creates a very different	five hotels in excess of 18 storeys and	
	condition. It becomes an object,	in recent years, urban redevelopment	
	unrelatable in its height and disconnected	in various parts of the city, including	
	from its context. This is particularly	waterfront areas, has seen the	
	accentuated in an area where social and	construction of residential buildings of	
	natural amenity is central, and is deeply	between eight and 12 storeys tall.	
	connected to residents and visitors. This is		
	a place with very strong traditions.	Design Guidelines are being prepared	
		for the Activity Centre area, which	
	The argument put is that Mount Adelaide	should ensure that any development is	
	will serve as a balance to such a large	appropriate to the locality.	
	structure.		
		LandCorp also requires that	
	However, the hill has a gradient, and while	development proposals undergo a	
	the mass of this structure may appear to	rigorous assessment process, prior to	

	CONEDULE OF CODMICONO				
No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff		
			Recommendation		
	balance against Mount Adelaide in	the sale of development sites. A			
	visualisations taken from birds-eye-views,	component of this assessment process			
	these are vantage points that humans will	considers the quality of design.			
	not experience at ground level, and they				
	diminish the impact of the scale of a twelve				
	story structure on this site.				
	Thinking of site and human scale, it must				
	be remembered that beaches and				
	beachfronts such as Middleton Beach are				
	inherently horizontal places. Their expanse				
	stretches on for a great distance, and this				
	makes the visual and physical impact of				
	any vertical structures exceptionally strong.				
	The effect of a twelve story tower would be				
	a burden on this site.				
	There is a reason that developments such				
	as those recently undertaken at Leighton				
	Beach in North Fremantle (by Kerry Hill				
	Architects and Spaceagency) are capped				
	at five stories. They sit in their				
	environments at a medium scale, they do				
	not detract in form or weight from the				
	pristine coastal dunes, the vast horizontal				
	expanse of the Western Australian				
	coastline. They give back to their				
	surroundings.				

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff	Staff	
	, c.		Recommendation		
	I think I speak for many residents of Albany and visitors who hold this place dear, when I say that such a vision is fundamentally inappropriate for this community.  Development is essential on this site. A hotel and hundreds of new dwellings is exactly what Albany needs at Middleton Beach to foster and strengthen a vibrant community, and limit the sprawl of the town. However, the scale of the hotel is of significant issue here.  The second point I make is around procurement process. It is essential that the design of this project be taken very seriously. The process of tendering and selection should strengthen the design outcome. The schematic proposal put by Silver Thomas Hanley is clearly only an initial suggestion, it is concerning that many in the community believe this to be a final proposal. The architecture here needs to be approached with absolute attention to site, ecological credentials and design quality.		Recommendation		

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff Recommendation
	The Office of the Victorian Government Architect refers to principles in 'Government as Smart Client'. These offer procurement processes and strategies to enable good design.		
	Following these, could a competition be launched for the design of this project? Community consolation on a variety of design outcomes in the procurement process would be essential in addressing both community and site, and a great way to bring the community on board in the design process and foster ownership of the place into the future.		
202	Construction of buildings with underground carparks will cause more extensive soil disturbance than previous buildings at Middleton Beach, so hence asks if there any legal requirements for Aboriginal Heritage site surveys. Subject to any legal requirements, there may be an opportunity for archaeological projects at the site which could contribute to eventual cultural interpretation installations.	Item one of the key issues table addresses the matter of building height in detail.  There are no identified Aboriginal Heritage sites within the Activity Centre area. However, developers would have to fulfil relevant obligations under the Aboriginal Heritage Act 1972, should any Aboriginal Heritage interest be identified on-site.	

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	In relation to the proposed hotel site, anything above five storeys will visually dwarf all the aspects of Middleton Beach. Instead of the current intersection of vegetated Mount Adelaide, ocean, sky and beach which makes Middleton Beach appealing, a hotel greater than five storeys will 'hot the eye' and reduce the positive view.  A study says that a hotel up to five storeys may need a shallow floating foundation, but		
	no mention is made of foundation requirements for a higher building, so I ask would these foundations disturb acid sulphate soils.		
	If the hotel is to be higher than five storeys, there could be long-term adverse impact on the adjacent mountain vegetation from over-shadowing. If this did happen, it would impact on the Western Ringtailed Possum. There also does not appear to have been a serious attempt to study the potential impact of overshadowing.		

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
203	As a permanent resident of Albany and a regular user of Middleton Beach and its amenities, I feel strongly about maintaining the space and beauty that attracts people to the area. I object to the expansion of the area available for development beyond the immediate area and surrounds of the former Esplanade Hotel site. I also object to the height of up to 12 storeys on the hotel/mixed use site. The height should be limited to five storeys and should include stepping up of development away from the foreshore. I also object to the low number of public car parking bays provided for.	addresses the matter of building height	Submission noted.
204	Believes the plan for more public space on the beachside is excellent and the potential for more apartment type residents is attractive to the increasing number of elderly retirees. Also comments that the hotel is an interesting concept, however suggests that eight storeys would be more attractive and hopefully viable.	addresses the matter of building height	Submission noted.
205	We strongly object to aspects if the Middleton Beach Scheme Amendment and Activity Centre Structure Plan.	1	Submission noted.

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	Primarily, the proposed 'hotel/mixed use' precinct with the potential to be 12 storeys high and with its proposed footprint, is completely out of character with the local architecture, landscape and amenity.  To build a structure like this in a small popular beachside suburb, where the buildings are not higher than three storeys with the public area mainly used for seaside activities, would constitute something similar to Scarborough Beach which is an		
	eyesore.  In the case of this proposal, little consideration seems to have been given to the public use of space and access to the beach.  I ask that intelligence, creativity and sensitivity be used when finally approving the development. Perhaps the development of a luxury and large hotel can be considered for the foreshore which would be more in keeping with the amenities of the area.		

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
110.	odiffinary of oddiffication	Officer Comment	Recommendation
	The Middleton Beach development needs to be sensitive to the primary users of the area, including ease of traffic movement and adequate parking, viable opportunities for small businesses, and more residential/holiday accommodation designed along the current theme of the area.  The more immediately serious issues with the proposal are congestion, lack of adequate parking, wind tunnels, shadowing and a large obstacle to beach access.		Recommendation
206	Expresses that he is pleased with the overall plan for the Middleton Beach area, especially the position of the proposed 12-storey hotel being placed in the south east corner of the site. Placement will also not impinge on any residential views and any shadowing cast will also be towards the reserve. Believes it is a great concept plans and deserves to be accepted by the community to make a step forward.	Nil.	Submission noted.
207	I am totally opposed to granting permission for the 'hotel/mixed use' to be five to 12 storeys high as this is out of character for	Item one of the key issues table addresses the matter of building height in detail.	Submission noted.

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
	Cummary of Custimosion	omoci comment	Recommendation
	Albany, will create shadowing problems for the playground area and no matter the design, it will be unattractive. I am also opposed any development in Middleton Beach being over three storeys.  The city of Albany should not be trying to meet developers' requirements over local ones. Albany is a small regional centre with the major attractions of natural environment and culture.		
208	Comments that 12 storeys in the proposed position would be a mistake.	Item one of the key issues table addresses the matter of building height in detail.	Submission noted.
209	Is in wholehearted support of the proposal as the extra public space is great. Would like to comment that available parking should not be reduced in any way as this will become an important social hub. States it would be great to see development occur as per the concept plans and increase opportunity for work for the youth of the community.	Nil.	Submission noted.
210	Believes that buildings over five storeys will adversely impact the character of the area, that an additional 29 car parking bays is	Items one and three of the key issues table address the matters of building height and parking in detail.	Submission noted.

	SCHEDULE OF SUDIVISSIONS				
No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff		
			Recommendation		
	inadequate for the proposed additions to				
	the area as current parking is not sufficient,				
	and the appearance of the buildings should				
	be compatible with the environment and				
	surroundings.				
211	Asks that no more than five storeys be	Item one of the key issues table	Submission noted.		
	approved for the area.	addresses the matter of building height			
		in detail.			
212	We welcome progress towards	Items one and two of the key issues	Submission upheld in part.		
	development of this iconic site, LandCorp's	table address the matters of building			
	vision for a 'vibrant, mixed use	height and overshadowing in detail.	It is recommended that the		
	development' and their aim to 'deliver		proposed amendment to Schedule 4		
	social, economic and liveability benefits for	City staff have identified that the	l •		
	the people of Albany as well as the many	Special Uses and Condition 11 of the	follows:		
	tourists who visit the area every year'.	Special Use zone proposed by the			
		local planning scheme amendment do	,		
	Given the enormous importance of the	not preclude the development of the	with 'D' (Discretionary) against		
	unique character, landscape, heritage and	hotel/mixed use site for short-stay			
	identity of Middleton Beach, any future	holiday accommodation or multiple	storeys (21.5 metres)" in the		
	development must fit in with the area's	dwellings, without a hotel. A	ļ .		
	natural and cultural environment without	modification to the Special Uses is	·		
	impacting adversely on its inherent charm.	recommended to address this issue.	Insertion of a new notation "2"		
	While a significant period of time has	LandCorp undertook their own	against "Multiple Dwelling (up to		
	passed since the former Esplanade Hotel	•	5 storeys (21.5 metres)" and		
	was demolished and the community has been feeling a sense of frustration with the	consultation to inform the design of the proposals. The City has advertised the	"Multiple Dwelling (above 5		
	been reening a sense or trustration with the	proposais. The City has advertised the			

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	lack of activity in the area, we believe that it	proposals for public comment in order	storeys (21.5 metres)" to read as
	is more important to get the new	to gauge community opinion and	follows:
	development right than to accept	inform the final recommendation.	'(2) Means that the permissibility
	development at any cost.		of the use shall be contingent
		The development is not expected to	upon prior or concurrent
	We support mixed use of site, the priority	have a greater visual impact on the	construction of a hotel.'; and
	pedestrian access east to west and the	landscape than existing development	<ul> <li>Renumbering existing notation</li> </ul>
	increased public open space connecting	at Checkers Walk, Morley Place, Hare	"(2)" as notation '3'.
	with the existing foreshore.	Street and Wylie Crescent, when	
		viewed from vantage points beyond the	
	We support the inclusion of a hotel,	immediate area. While it will possible	
	however, we note that a hotel is not a	to distinguish any future building as	
	required component of the hotel/mixed use	free-standing when viewed from Mira	
	precinct. Given the importance of tourism	Mar, it is part of an established urban	
	in this location and the lack of a five-star	area, albeit one that is presently	
	hotel in Albany, we would like to see the	developed with single, double and	
	hotel stated as a required, and not an	three-storey buildings.	
	optional component.		
		A visual impact assessment is only	
	We do not support a 12-storey	required where there is a specific	
	development for any building in any form on	policy requirement, which does not	
	this site. It would cause significant		
	shadowing, particularly across the	likely that a visual impact assessment	
	foreshore reserve, public access areas and	would be submitted with any	
	beach during the second half of the day and	development application for a building	
	evening, impacting significantly on the	in excess of five stories or 21.5 metres	
	ambience of the area and its recreational	in height.	
	amenities. It would be highly visible from		

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	key public view points such as Middleton	The proposals do not seek to remove	
	Beach, Emu Point, Mira Mar, King George	any of the Norfolk Island Pine trees	
	Sound, the Albany Golf Links and from the	located within the foreshore area. At	
	beach itself. A recent visit to the Duxton	the time of development, a tree	
	Hotel in Perth made it clear to us what 12	protection plan can be required as a	
	storeys would look like from the ground and	condition of any approval, which would	
	we consider this entirely inappropriate not	be implemented to protect trees from	
	only for this site, but for anywhere in Albany.	damage during construction.	
		The City of Albany and Landcorp are	
	We would not support a hotel greater than	currently working to upgrade the	
	five storeys in height, consistent with the	stormwater management	
	current Local Planning Scheme's maximum	arrangements within the Activity	
	height limit. We would like to see the height	Centre area.	
	limit for the remainder of the whole		
	development kept at two to three storeys.		
	Previous community input sought by		
	LandCorp on approximate height		
	restrictions for the Middleton Beach site		
	resulted in 220 public submissions, with		
	only 3% supporting a height restriction		
	above seven storeys, while 67% supported		
	a two to three storey maximum height, 15%		
	a three to five storey height and only 8% a		
	five to seven storey height.		
	, ,		

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	Visual impact assessments are a normal		
	requirement of significant developments on		
	sites next to the coast and these have been		
	used in the past to inform the Council and		
	the community of likely impacts of		
	developments, such as Barry Court near		
	the golf course. We therefore find it		
	unacceptable that on this occasion, there		
	has been no specific visual impact		
	assessment of the proposed development		
	from high-use public amenity areas and		
	vantage points. The visual displays made		
	available to the public are not to scale, and		
	do not give an accurate picture of the		
	heights in the proposed development and		
	how they relate to the existing adjacent		
	areas, including the foreshore, beach and		
	residential housing.		
	We recommend that a visual assessment		
	of the proposed development be		
	undertaken from important public locations		
	(such as the Ellen Cove Boardwalk, Eyre		
	Park, Middleton Road), depicting several		
	options (12 storeys, eight storeys, six		
	storeys), that the visuals be represented in		
	three-dimensional format, and the period		
	for submissions be extended to enable		

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff Recommendation
No.	more informed community comment on the visual impact of the Middleton Beach Activity Centre.  While we support the emphasis on high quality design to enhance public use of the foreshore area with plantings, pathways, seating and public art, we are concerned about the development boundary where the hotel/mixed use precinct meets the reserve. Specifically, the various plans in the documents show the location of the existing Norfolk Island Pine trees slightly differently, making it difficult to determine the actual boundary of the site and whether the natural growth of these trees will be adversely impacted. This boundary needs to be assessed to ensure that the healthy growth of these established and popular trees is not compromised by the development.  We request that a foreshore management plan be undertaken in consultation with the community to address the impacts on the	Officer Comment	Staff Recommendation
	foreshore reserve and adjacent public open space in more detail.		

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
NO.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Recommendation
	We understand that there is a historical issue of stormwater drains and pollution in this area and are concerned about the potential of associated health risks. We note that stormwater drainage is given only a brief mention in the Structure Plan and attached drainage plans. We therefore request that the City of Albany and LandCorp develop a stormwater drainage plan to reduce stormwater discharge points to the beach, and make use of the Middleton Beach Activity Centre development and associated earthworks to implement this plan.		Recommendation
213	Believes that a 12-storey building will spothe beach and streetscape of the seasided precinct and suggests a development of six storeys instead.	addresses the matter of building height	Submission noted.
214	Expresses that she is in favour of redevelopment of the area but not at the expense of local access and parking.  The higher building leads to more people and more vehicles in the area Underground parking would need to be provided to accommodate this as most	issues table address the matters of building height, parking and the location of the hotel within the development area, in detail.	Submission noted.

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	bays would be taken up my residents,		
	leaving no available bays for visitors.		
	Suggests implementing time restricted		
	parking and limiting the hotel height to eight		
	storeys and the residential buildings to two		
	storeys to reduce the amount of traffic it		
	would attract.		
	Wishes to add that people travel to Emu		
	Point as it is considered less busy than		
	Middleton Beach, and so with an increase		
	to Middleton Beach's popularity, Emu Point		
	will become pressured and crowded.		
	States that the need for a hotel to be		
	commercially viable but comments that it		
	must also fit into Albany's existing culture.		
	Suggests positioning the hotel closer to the		
	mountain. Also suggests that parking be		
	increased along Adelaide Crescent as this road will become more commonly used.		
	Toad will become more commonly used.		
	Also wishes to express concern regarding		
	the proposed planting of palm trees as she		
	believes that they do not suit the local		
	scenery as they are a tropical plant.		

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
215	We have no reason to change our initial	Item one, two and three of the key	Submission noted.
	comments dated 12 March 2016. Whilst we	issues table address the matters of	
	have noted some new images of the high	building height, overshadowing and	
	rise proposal provided by LandCorp, these	parking, in detail.	
	still omit the highly significant wider		
	landscape issues. The bottom line is that	The artist's impressions were prepared	
	any structure over four storeys will	as a guide to provide the public with a	
	inevitably impact on the site, the site's	sense how completed buildings could	
	immediate surroundings, and the full	look and are not development	
	landscape/seascape setting of the area.	proposals.	
	There will also be unavoidable loss of		
	existing public and open space.	The development is not expected to	
	We have also noted the recent issue (The	have a greater visual impact on the	
	Extra 25 March 2016) regarding circus	landscape than existing development	
	advertising with banning such short term	at Checkers Walk, Morley Place, Hare	
	colourful trailer displays on the basis of the	Street and Wylie Crescent, when	
	following reported quotes from a senior City	viewed from vantage points beyond the	
	officer "a visual eyesore" and "the visual	immediate area. While it will possible	
	amenity of our city needs to be maintained	to distinguish any future building as	
	and preserved, and everyone needs to do	free-standing when viewed from Mira	
	their part to ensure Albany presents as well	Mar, it is part of an established urban	
	as it can, not only for residents but also	area, albeit one that is presently	
	tourists and potential investors."	developed with single, double and	
		three-storey buildings.	
	We find it bizarre that the City considers		
	small scale temporary advertising to be an	The comparison of unapproved	
	eyesore whereas the permanent landscape	signage to the potential development	
		of a 12-storey hotel, which will be	

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	scale impact from inappropriate multistorey	subject to design guidelines and	
	development is apparently endorsed.	extensive statutory requirements, is	
		not considered relevant.	
	This proposal remains of great concern to		
	us and is not supported.	The proposals do no impinge on the	
		existing foreshore parkland and will, in	
	Unless the multistorey hotel/mixed use	fact, lead to the creation of a larger	
	precinct is removed from the proposal we	area of consolidated public open	
	strongly oppose the amendment on	space.	
	grounds of landscape considerations, loss of existing public amenity near the 'Anchors		
	precinct', visual impact upon several		
	thousand local residents (particularly		
	Spencer Park, Mira Mar, Mount Clarence,		
	Middleton Beach) and the total lack of		
	sympathy/sense of place regarding some		
	of Albany's finest assets, viz. Middleton		
	Beach, Ellen Cove and their juxtaposition		
	with a proposed 'world class walking trail		
	area' in the adjacent Albany Heritage Park		
	of Mounts Adelaide and Clarence. There		
	will also be a visual landscape impact from		
	Middleton Bay and King George Sound as		
	well as looking back from the Gull		
	Rock/Mount Martin reserves.		
	The managed therefore has a first described		
	The proposal therefore has a fundamental		
	flaw in not properly taking into		

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	consideration the visual impacts when any high rise (greater than four storeys) component of the proposal is viewed from outside the proposed development area – i.e. failure to look 'outside the box' and genuinely think of the highly significant landscape blot to residents and visitors alike.		
	Furthermore, the proposal as depicted will result in significant reduction of the highly popular grassed public foreshore near Ellen Cove which is ideally suited to families, with children's playgrounds, public change rooms, alfresco café, etc. This family-friendly, largely natural public space should not be towered over by a multistorey development, irrespective of the number of floors.		
	Parking for locals and families will no doubt be significantly compromised in the Ellen Cove vicinity unless there is a large setback retaining the current road and car parking system.		
	Multistorey development above four floors should have no place in Albany's future as		

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
	, i		Recommendation
	the community clearly demonstrated in the		
	Frederick Street multistorey proposals a		
	decade or so ago.		
	Albany is attractive to visitors largely		
	because of its fine natural setting and the		
	lack of multistorey development. The scars		
	of Observation City in Scarborough are a		
	stark reminder of poor planning decisions in		
	the pastplease don't try to take our		
	beautiful and unique natural setting away		
	by an inappropriate structure which will		
	grossly impact upon our most valuable		
	assets.		
	The demolished Esplanade Hotel was		
	sensitively designed within the setting and		
	ambience of Middleton Beach. Put it back		
	as it was! It had soft tones, sensibly scaled		
	setbacks from public areas and a true		
	'sense of place'. It also became an		
	extended community facility with its various		
	bars and lounges across a range of styles		
	to suit most tastes. The conceptual designs		
	in the various reports on the new		
	multistorey component of the proposal		
	comprise stark, unsympathetic designs		
	completely out of context with the valuable		

N <sub>1</sub>	T	Commence of Codemicalan	Officer Comment	Ctaff
No.		Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
				Recommendation
		natural surroundings, and appear to be		
		devoid of community enhancement		
		potential.		
216		Is in support of the proposed development,	Item one of the key issues table	Submission noted.
		however states that the height of the	addresses the matter of building height	
		buildings should be no more than five	in detail.	
		storeys.		
217		Express their opposition to high rise	Item one of the key issues table	Submission noted.
		development above three storeys in	addresses the matter of building height	
		Albany, as they are concerned that	in detail.	
		anything above three storeys would allow		
		for the height to be normalised and promote		
		more high-rise development in Albany.		
218		Believes that the proposed structures will	•	Submission noted.
		not fit the historical ambience of the	addresses the matter of building height	
		foreshore, and that the height of the	in detail.	
		buildings dot not complement the natural		
		space and surroundings as it is far too tall.		
		Does believe that it is great the site is being		
		developed but wishes that it be kept		
		appropriate for Albany and its historical		
		links. Comments that there is risk that the		
		hotel will set a precedent for the Middleton		
		Beach area becoming similar to the Gold		

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
	•		Recommendation
	Coast, which is a mistake as it will push		
	regular holiday makers to other areas.		
219	Suggests a height restriction of six storeys for the proposed buildings, that the selected colours blend in with the Norfolk Pines, and adequate parking be provided for the public.	Item one of the key issues table addresses the matter of building height in detail.	Submission noted.
220	Believe the concept plan presented by LandCorp for Middleton Beach for two to 12 storey hotel and mixed use looks excellent, and would recommend the hotel includes a minimum of 12 storeys as the future commercial use of this would be significant (world class and demand for international conferences). Comment that the positioning will have no impact on residents, that the views from the hotel will be magnificent and the facilities and landscaping will enhance the area. Also comment that the orientation of the hotel suits Albany's climate with protection from winds.	Nil.	Submission noted.
221	Comment that Albany does not need high rise buildings as visitors come to the region	Item one of the key issues table addresses the matter of building height	Submission noted.
	for the low key feel. Believes the hotel	in detail.	

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
NO.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	
			Recommendation
	should be limited to six storeys in height		
	and blend in with the existing surroundings.		
222	Believes that the area needs to be	Item one of the key issues table	Submission noted.
	developed, but not to the height indication	addresses the matter of building height	
	by the proposal and instead all	in detail.	
	development restricted to four storeys.		
	Comments that the 'commercial' feel the		
	proposal has may attract guests but will for		
	the most part deter visitors, and that		
	existing accommodation providers will be		
	negatively impacted.		
223	Expresses support for the development	Item one of the key issues table	Submission noted.
	proposal but believes the height of all	addresses the matter of building height	
	buildings should be restricted to five	in detail.	
	storeys.		
	,		
224	Expresses grave concern that the	Items one and two of the key issues	Submission noted.
	proposed 12-storey maximum will have	table addresses the matters of building	
	genitive repercussions by visual	height and overshadowing in detail.	
	impediment of a standalone 12-storey	g that a state of	
	building, increased shadowing over public		
	areas and decreased enjoyment of visitors		
	as there will be a feeling of 'being watched'		
	by the high rise hotel. Believes that this		
	proposal is not in accordance with Albany		
	proposal to flot in accordance with Albany		

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	and Middleton Beach as it creates a profit for developers at the expense of locals.		
225	Believes that if the proposal can be taken up by private developers it will create a boost for Middleton Beach, but expresses concern regarding the proposed height limit of 12 storeys will drastically alter the amenity of the area and over shadow public areas. Is also of the opinion that the current position of the hotel site will be ugly in appearance and there are no other buildings of a similar height in the area. Suggests a maximum of five storeys instead.	Item one of the key issues table addresses the matter of building height in detail.	Submission noted.
226	Of the opinion that 12 storeys is an eyesore and is out of character for Middleton Beach. Suggests a maximum of four storeys.	Item one of the key issues table addresses the matter of building height in detail.	Submission noted.
227	Believes the proposal to be a great idea to incorporate mixed use as it will be very good for Albany as it will represent it as modern. Suggests that more public friendly area like playgrounds, space for outdoor cinemas, etc. should be put in the design.	Nil.	Submission noted.

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff Recommendation
228	Suggests that a height limit of two to five storeys should apply to the whole site.	Item one of the key issues table addresses the matter of building height in detail.	Submission noted.
229	Believes that the look of the proposal is appealing, but suggests for area to cater for the youth of Albany, with an example of a stage for entertainment.	Nil.	Submission noted.
230	Believes that the proposed development looks fantastic and will be great for future development of Albany as a National and International tourist destination.	Nil.	Submission noted.
231	Believes that if a developer thinks the 12-storey limit be viable then the proposal will be a great addition to the area as Albany has been waiting for a development in Middleton Beach for some time. Believes the proposal to be forward thinking and a great tourism destination.	Nil.	Submission noted.
232	Believes that the proposed five to 12 storey height limit is too high and even five to seven storeys is not suited to Albany or the area.	addresses the matter of building height	Submission noted.
233	Believes the proposal would attract a number of tourists to the area but asks if the	Item four of the key issues table addresses the matter of coastal planning in detail.	Submission noted.

No.	Summary of Submission  erosion of the beach will be addressed as part of development.	Officer Comment	Staff Recommendation
234	Comments that the proposal appears to be a great space and will be fully utilised, but expresses concern that the height limit of 12 storeys is too large for what the area can support.	Item one of the key issues table addresses the matter of building height in detail.	Submission noted.
235	Expresses concern regarding traffic redirection once road re-alignments are completed, car parking provisions and believes that the proposed 12-storey height limit should be lessened to four to eight storeys. States that overall, the proposal looks good, offers 'hang-out' areas and will benefit Albany.	Items one, three and eight of the key issues table address the matters of building height, parking and road alignment, in detail.	Submission noted.
236	Is in favour of the general concept of the proposal as he welcomes development in the area, but believes that the proposed 12 storey height limit is too much and should be restricted to seven to eight storeys as such a height would not distract from the existing landscape and would not take business away from local accommodation providers. Comments also that the proposed development will instil a lot of pride in Albany locals once complete.	Item one of the key issues table addresses the matter of building height in detail.	Submission noted.

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
	-		Recommendation
237	Believes that the proposal looks great and hopes the development is allowed to proceed as it will be a welcomed venue for both locals and tourists.	Nil.	Submission noted.
238	Is in opposition to the proposal as it does not fit in with the existing, low level and relaxed Middleton Beach area. Believes that as the building is too tall and will creating overlooking issues, it will take away from the natural vista of the area.	-	
239	Believes that the proposal would be great for the area as it is not being utilised currently.	Nil.	Submission noted.
240	Believes that the proposal would benefit Albany as currently there are no eyecatching buildings.	Nil.	Submission noted.
241	Believes the proposal to be a good idea if it includes areas for children to utilise.	Nil.	Submission noted.
242	Suggests to include a park in the south- eastern corner of the mixed use area.	Nil.	Submission noted.
243	Suggests the proposal include park land adjacent to the beach to attract families.	Nil.	Submission noted.

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff Recommendation
244	Is in favour of the proposed development as the increased accommodation will attract more tourists.	Nil.	Submission noted.
245	Of the opinion that the height restriction should be three storeys as the site is already large enough to be economically viable without making Middleton Beach similar to the Gold Coast.	Item one of the key issues table addresses the matter of building height in detail.	Submission noted.
246	Believes the proposed 12-storey height limit should be reduced to a five-storey maximum.	Item one of the key issues table addresses the matter of building height in detail.	Submission noted.
247	Expresses congratulation that development is moving forward for the Esplanade site and that the proposal looks great.	Nil.	Submission noted.
248	Comments then the artists impression of the proposal is appealing, but suggests that the 12-storey hotel should be designed with staggered floors so that only 50% of the footprint be at 12 storeys. Also suggests that the rest of the proposal be restricted to a four-storey maximum.	Item one of the key issues table addresses the matter of building height in detail.	Submission noted.

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff Recommendation
249	Believes that the proposed 12-storey hotel will obscure views from residents in the Mount Clarence area and that the hotel should be restricted to five storeys instead of 12. Asks if the residents in the Mount Clarence area will experience property value decreases and that these residents should be personally consulted.	addresses the matter of building height	Submission noted.
250	Suggest that the hotel site be restricted to four storeys and that all other mixed use areas be restricted to two storeys. States that the importance should be on keeping Albany an attractive tourist destination as visitors come to the region to 'escape' high density cities. Suggests that the design material of the structures be sympathetic to the natural environment, with examples of rammed earth or limestone.	addresses the matter of building height in detail.  Design Guidelines are being prepared for the Activity Centre area, which	Submission noted.
251	Is in opposition to a proposed hotel in excess of five storeys.	Item one of the key issues table addresses the matter of building height in detail.	Submission noted.
252	Expresses opposition regarding the scale of the proposed development as she believes that a six-storey hotel on the proposed site would be excessive, and that the proposed will overwhelm the Middleton	addresses the matter of building height	Submission noted.

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	Beach area as the increase in attraction will make the area loud and be unpleasant for families.		
253	Believe that the proposed heights are too large and should be restricted to the previous height limit of the Esplanade. Comment that the proposed heights will increase the already existing shadowing, and that the proposal detracts from the appeal of Albany as a holiday destination of natural beauty and historic value of a small city.	Items one and two of the key issues table address the matters of building height and overshadowing in detail.	Submission noted.
254	The Albany Ratepayers and Residents Association Inc. does not believe that the general community is aware of the hotel position. The development should be within the confines of the original site and should not be extended out to the public open space.  The hotel should be three levels including ground level in the proposed location. If it was within the confines of the original site then maybe five levels including ground level would be more acceptable. All the	Items one, five and nine of the key issues table address the matters of building height, heritage and the location of the hotel within the development area, in detail.  A mix of tourist accommodation and permanent residential uses is consistent with current planning policy, as confirmed by Tourism WA.	Submission noted.

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	other accommodation should not be more		
	than three levels including ground level.		
	The area is a tourist area and as such		
	should have no permanent residential as		
	part of it. It should be 100% tourist.		
	This Association believes that while there is		
	a need for tourist accommodation and even		
	a hotel that it should not be at the expense		
	of the public open space which is what		
	attracts people to the area. This is a public		
	area and should be kept as is. Leaving the		
	area open will be a bigger tourist asset in		
	the future because we have preserved the		
	natural beauty of the beachfront.		
	The area from Ellen Cove to Flinders		
	Parade is currently part of assessment by		
	the Heritage Council. Has the City		
	consulted the Heritage Council? The		
	following is the Heritage Council reference.		
	Heritage information needs to add to the		
	plan for future reference and consultation.		
	Heritage Place No. 17520 - Middleton		
	Beach, - Middleton Beach Arising from		
	nomination of P17771 Norfolk Pine Trees		

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	Albany Middleton Beach Landscape		
	Arising from nomination of P17771 Norfolk		
	Pine Trees Albany, & utilities Heritage List		
	- YES on 30 Dec 1983 Constructed from		
	1940.		
	Heritage Place No. 15477 - Ellen Cove		
	Jetty & Norfolk Island Pine Trees, – Ellen		
	Cove Jetty & Norfolk Island Pine Trees		
	Flinders Parade Middleton Beach Ellen		
	Cove Jetty & Norfolk Island Pine Trees		
	Other Built Type Flinders, - Adopted on 30		
	Jun 2001 Constructed from 1899 Ellen		
	Cove jetty has played a significant role,		
	users. Ellen Cove Jetty has played a		
	significant role in the transport of goods and		
	people in Albany.		
	In conclusion the Albany Ratepayers and		
	Residents Association Inc. would like to see		
	the vacant land that was formerly the		
	Esplanade Hotel site utilised and should be		
	used for a hotel and tourist		
	accommodation. There should be no		
	development outside this site as the area is		
	for the general public and should stay that		
	way. There are many environmental issues		

No.	Summary of Submission  that is hoped the council will take into consideration.	Officer Comment	Staff Recommendation
255	Harley Dykstra is a development consultancy firm of Town Planners and Surveyors, established in Albany in 1954. Over the past 60 years we have been involved in many key developments in Albany and witnessed evolution of the land development industry responding to economic, planning and consumer changes over time. We have a pertinent interest in the planning, environmental, economic and ongoing sustainability of Albany and the wider Great Southern region.  We commend the proponents of the Middleton Beach Scheme Amendment and Structure Plan Activity Centre and support changes proposed to this key tourist node. We believe key tourist nodes such as Middleton Beach require a more fluid approach to permit residential and tourism elements to co-exist within the same development, and that in doing so will result in a better and more sustainable outcome for these localities. Furthermore, this	Design Guidelines are being prepared for the Activity Centre area, which should ensure that any development is appropriate to the locality.	Submission noted.

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
	·		Recommendation
	flexible arrangement allows the		
	development to respond to seasonal and		
	global fluctuations, and avoid high vacancy		
	rates and a lack of activity and activation		
	outside of peak season.		
	Due consideration has been given to the		
	built form scale and location with the siting		
	of the hotel development adjacent Mount		
	Adelaide providing high amenity and		
	potentially some shelter from south-		
	westerly winds. The indicative built form		
	responds well to the locality and		
	surroundings, and we encourage adoption		
	of a high quality outcome through future		
	design guidelines. The gradual increase to		
	building heights towards Mount Adelaide is		
	respectful to the surroundings and will		
	provide flexibility and certainty to future		
	developers to viably develop the land.		
	An increased focus towards more		
	sustainable forms of transport including		
	walking and cycling is encouraging,		
	however separation of these two modes		
	may require further consideration to avoid		
	future conflict. Suitable consideration has		
	been given to private motor vehicle		

No.	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment	Staff
			Recommendation
	movements and parking, which are appropriately reflected in the proposed Structure Plan and Scheme Amendment provisions.  We support the proposed Middleton Beach Scheme Amendment and Structure Plan, and anticipate it will enable viable development of the land, whilst still respecting the locality and surrounding land uses. We respectively encourage the City of Albany to approve the Scheme Amendment and Structure Plan when next presented to Council for consideration.		