

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

Scheme Amendment No. 86

| Submitter's Comments | Position | Officer's Response |
|--|-----------------|--|
| <p>The Water Corporation has no objections to the proposed rezoning. At the building stage, the proponents will need to adequately protect and set the buildings back from the 150mm diameter gravity sewer that runs inside the south-eastern boundary of the site (see attached image). At the eastern corner of the site the sewer is located approximately 6.5m inside the property.</p> <p>The existing water reticulation that runs along the Temple Street frontage of the site is only a 75mm diameter cast iron main. This water main may not be adequate to service proposed medium to high density residential development on the site. Depending on the hydraulic demands of the development and the need for a domestic fire service, the proponents may be required to upgrade the water main at the building stage with a larger 100mm diameter water main back to the distribution main on Albany Highway.</p> | No objection | Note. These matters will be considered as part of any future development application |

| | | |
|--|---------------|---|
| <p>I disagree with the approach taken. At a minimum, the site needs to be rezoned for residential AND commercial to enable commercial on the ground floor.</p> <p>Furthermore, I fear that following rezoning the Town will sell of the land to a developer. I wish to note that I fundamentally disagree with the Town selling of this land. This is a community asset and needs to remain as such.</p> | <p>Oppose</p> | <p>The Town’s property development manager has commenced discussions with the Dental Clinic who have agreed to a relocation to their service. The rezoning of the land would serve to progress this process and the Dental Clinic could then seek funding to facilitate a relocation.</p> <p>The Town would like to and aims to continue working with these services to retain the uses within the Town of Victoria Park. ‘Community Purpose’ is however a discretionary land use within the ‘Residential’ zone in which case the existing uses could continue to operate even if the land is rezoned to Residential until a suitable arrangement is made.</p> <p>There is no immediate requirement to relocate these service, so they will not be moving until an alternative has been found. There is no decommissioning planned.</p> <p>In the event that the land was rezoned and the services on site did relocate, under the current Town Planning Scheme, there are a number of land zones where a ‘Community Purpose’ use is a permitted or discretionary use and therefore does not rely on land which is reserved for under the Scheme for Public Purposes.</p> <p>Following any rezoning, a business case will be prepared and presented to Council providing various options for the future of the land. The proposed scheme amendment does not propose</p> |
|--|---------------|---|

| | | |
|--|---------------|--|
| | | <p>any development of the site which would be subject to future applications.</p> <p>Whilst a business case will be prepared for Council to determine the future of the landholdings, the rezoning of the land would facilitate redevelopment of the site for residential purposes at a density of R60 as well as being able to accommodate land uses which are either 'P' (permitted) or 'AA' (discretionary) uses within the Residential Zone.</p> |
| <p>I am concerned that the land is currently used and zoned for civic/community purposes and that rezoning to residential may be a precursor to it being sold off to private interests without proper consideration of current and long term community needs. As the Town population increases access to land for community purposes will be even more important and there is a danger that community services will not be able to operate in close proximity to Town residents if land is only available on commercial terms or already built out with housing.</p> | <p>Oppose</p> | <p>Refer to comments above.</p> |
| <p>Having a local Child Health Centre has been essential to me as a resident of ToVP. I have utilised this Service when my daughter was born late last year and then had issues with birth weight. It was so convenient to be able to access a service close to me during this stressful time. Already the service is severely strained due to budget and appointments are booked out well in advance. Losing this site would have a detrimental effect on me, my family</p> | <p>Oppose</p> | <p>Refer to comments above.</p> |

| | | |
|---|---------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <p>and the local ToVP community. I strongly object to this site being sold off for more housing.</p> | | |
| <p>While I have no objection to the proposed rezoning as such, I would like to point out that the existing Child Health Centre and Dental Clinic are vital to the Victoria Park community and need to remain accessible and not be pushed out away from public transport and other existing medical and shopping facilities in the area.</p> <p>Also, with regard the proposal being rezoned residential R60 I think it would be prudent to put some pressure on owners/developers of the several currently vacant lots along Albany Highway to develop their sites before a push is made to build units in side Streets. There are three such sites in the near vicinity of the proposed amendment, being Cnr Albany Highway/Temple Street, Albany Highway/Rathay Street, Albany Highway/State street. Some of these have been vacant for years and are very unsightly. There are also many vacant car yards that need to have their future use reassessed. Many years ago there was a vision for Albany Highway to be a vibrant inner city strip resembling those in many Melbourne inner suburbs. This will never happen while we have large vacant lots and unsustainable second hand car yards, which close one week only to open again under another banner a short time later.</p> | <p>No position stated</p> | <p>Refer to comments above.</p> |
| <p>I'm happy for the rezoning to occur however as a mother of an 11 month old that utilises these</p> | <p>No position stated</p> | <p>Refer to comments above.</p> |

| | | |
|---|---------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <p>facilities, I would like confirmation that the CHN will be relocated to a better location within Vic Park.</p> | | |
| <p>Currently this location houses a critical community service. If the development is supported it is essential the town work with the appropriate Health Service to find alternate, subsidised accommodation for the child health clinic and community medical service. If the services are not rehoused within suitable accommodation in the Town families will be forced to travel outside of the town for these services. This is not feasible for all families due to access to transport, disability, time, and difficulty (and stress) associated with traveling with infants. For parents in particular who might be suffering from post natal depression or anxiety, having to travel to essential medical appointments currently provided by the child health clinic can be very challenging and can lead to people avoiding their appointments which is detrimental to the child's and parents health and wellbeing . It is important the Town understand how critical it is for these services to be local within each community and not centralised. I hope the Town is able to work with the appropriate Health Service to find alternate, affordable accommodation within the Town for these services.</p> | <p>No position stated</p> | <p>Refer to comments above.</p> |
| <p>Support the proposal effective use of the land. It will have a positive impact on the street</p> | <p>Support</p> | <p>Noted.</p> |
| <p>I think this is a good step forward. The sooner we can join the EVP and VP strips by removing the car yards</p> | <p>Support</p> | <p>Noted.</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| etc to replace with residential and cafes/restaurants the better! | | |
|--|--|--|