

Submission Comments	Officers Comments
<p>Support the proposal great idea the more the merrier</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>Completely object to the proposal on the basis of an existing site at CNR of Griffiths St and Goodwood Pde offering same as proposed and adequate for the area and a suitable located distance centred to existing residential.</p> <p>The proposal put forward suggesting end of lease is factually incorrect as they have chosen not to renew at the current site in collusion for development with owner of Lot 106 CNR Stiles Ave & Griffiths ST. The current area has significant problems with crime, football traffic, drug use and alcohol infused abuse directed at and within proximity to established residential sites and any such consideration by council should consider the existing residents considerations and comfort.</p> <p>There are other businesses in the area which will be directly impacted by loss of trade, traffic, increased or unchecked crime and property damage as is the case now.</p>	<p>The proximity of an existing development is not a consideration that is able to dictate the determination of a proposed development application.</p>
<p>Thank-you for your letter of 23 May regarding the restaurant/café brewery development application at the above location. We offer the following comments;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We endorse overall the proposed use of the site for restaurant, café & brewery. It will be a huge improvement for this rundown area. • Car-parking: We are concerned that the parking proposed is inadequate for a development of this scale, tipping patrons and their cars onto the street. I'm of the view 64 bays be required i.e. 33% of the 198 required bays. 	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The number of car parking bays that has been provided is considered adequate for reasons detailed in the analysis section of the report namely that the redevelopment of the precinct as transit-oriented-development (TOD) and proximity to the Burswood Train Station as well as the potential introduction of an interim parking minimum for the precinct which would deem the number of bays compliant.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Landscaping: The 6.9% landscaping proposed is inadequate however, the 25% required landscaping of the site is extreme and I expect will threaten the viability of the planned development. This needs a practical compromise by all sides to enable the best presentation of the site. Any new development should not resemble a factory crammed on the site. 	<p>Whilst the landscaping does not comply with the prescribed amount, Council Officers have considered the provision of landscaping by the development to be adequate. A condition of development approval is included which requires a detailed landscaping plan to be provided in addition to further landscaping measures to be incorporated on the alfresco area adjacent to Griffiths Stiles Reserve.</p>
<p>Your letter dated 23.5.22 causes me concern. The shortage of on site car bays is a huge concern. Where will people park? There is already a shortage of parking on east section of Stiles Ave. I suppose the developer will say that all their customers will come by rail ! Griffiths St already poses danger when turning left or right from east part of Stiles Ave. The lack of landscaping is also of concern. While I am not directly against this development I would like to know how the issues raised will be confronted, especially the huge lack of parking! Will people park on the green area shown on your map north and south of the proposal? More thought is clearly required. Further to the above development. I have read the plans/details on the Towns website. The traffic consultant states that " theoretical parking requirement is considered to be conservative and unrealistic". That is a paid for opinion and should not be taken for granted. There is a reason that the Town sets parking requirements and a small shortfall of 132 is hardly a conservative shortfall. That is a huge shortfall! The consultant proposes that patrons be " encouraged to use public transport and</p>	<p>The number of car parking bays that has been provided is considered adequate for reasons detailed in the analysis section of the report namely that the redevelopment of the precinct as transit-oriented development (TOD) and proximity to the Burswood Train Station as well as the potential introduction of an interim parking minimum for the precinct which would deem the number of bays compliant.</p> <p>The Traffic Impact Statement that has been submitted indicates that the number of vehicle movements can be accommodated by the existing road network. Moreover, the provision of less parking bays may result in less road congestion particularly as patrons may be accessing the development via alternative transport options.</p>

use ride share like uber/taxi" Encouraged! How? By offering a free hot dog or a free alcoholic drink? Big difference between being encouraged and being mandated.

Parking, or more so, the lack off, is a HUGE issue here.

Goodwood Pde may be proposed as being the main thorough fare for ingress and egress of vehicular traffic but once patrons realize how long they need to wait to get onto Gt Eastern Hwy from Goodwood Pde, they will soon learn to use Griffiths St. Ask these learned traffic consultants to attempt a left hand turn or a right hand turn onto Griffiths St from the eastern side of Stiles Av, now. Good luck on that one guys. With the proposed increase in traffic, extra good luck guys!

Noise will be an issue. 600 proposed patrons for the Bistro and Beer Hall on a Sunday between 11.30 to 3.00pm. Come on, this is the only quite time in this area and now you want to change this. 600 potential patrons on a Sunday! The proponents state that to mitigate the noise" music to be played at a background level only". What does this mean? Too late when ACDC gets on the stage and are told to keep it at background level only. What will happen if further residential developments are put forward at a latter date, the noise consultant state that non are proposed at this stage. What about the future? The noise consultant agrees that noise may be an issue but not now simply because no residential is proposed FOR NOW.

The supporting letter from the owners of the land state on page10, section 2a that on the issue of the shortfall in parking[which the traffic consultant states is theoretical and unrealistic] is not an issue because " considerable public parking is available at these locations..... Stiles Avenue....." No. No.No. You try getting public parking on Stiles Avenue during the week. You try it! And then to make this ludicrous claim that public parking is available on other

The Acoustic Report provided by the applicant has undergone assessment and peer review. The noise amelioration measures proposed will result in the development complying with the noise requirements. Furthermore, a condition of development approval has been included to ensure a noise management plan is submitted incorporating all the recommendations from the consultants report and that noise modelling once the development is operational is done and submitted to the Town.

<p>streets. It is not. Nor should it be made available to those developments that fail to provide for their own.</p> <p>As stated in my earlier email, I am not against this development but I do not think enough practical consideration has been given to the major issue of parking and the Town of Victoria Park needs to acknowledge this issue.</p>	
<p>Whilst I recognise the development would provide employment and the applicant's desire to keep their business in the same vicinity, I oppose it for the following reasons:</p> <p>The proposed DA is a much larger scale than their existing venue on the corner of Goodwood Pde and Griffiths St, taking up almost 2/3 of the Goodwood Pde between Stiles Av and Griffiths St.</p> <p>The DA covering letter and report makes no mention if the proposed licensed premises will have security staff (ie: a bouncer at the door/trained crowd control staff) during operating hours but particularly at night. But even if there was on site security, there will still be crime related impacts on the surrounding area which fall outside the jurisdiction of crowd control staff. According to the Crime Pattern Theory, licensed premises such as pubs and hotels fall into the category of 'crime generators', and there are countless Australian studies showing the correlation between alcohol and crime particularly in the night time economy.</p> <p>Noting the above, and from a design out crime perspective, the surrounding Burswood industrial area would be considered vulnerable, as lacking guardianship especially outside of business hours when the predominantly industrial/commercial businesses are</p>	<p>The operation of the development is to occur in accordance with the approved plans and the accompanying reports submitted. The generation of crime is of a relevant concern however, cannot be considered as a reason not to approve the proposed development.</p> <p>However, it should be noted that the applicant may be required to satisfy the public interest test in the application and granting of a liquor licence and the licencing authority may take into account:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The harm or ill-health that might be caused to people, or any group of people, due to the use of liquor. • Whether the amenity, quiet or good order of the locality in which the licensed premises or proposed licensed premises are, or are to be, situated might in some manner be lessened. • Whether offence, annoyance, disturbance or inconvenience might be caused to people who reside or work in the vicinity of the licensed premises or proposed licensed premises. • Any effect the granting of the application might have in relation to tourism, or community or cultural matters. • Any other matter stipulated in the <i>Liquor Control Regulations 1988</i>

closed. This is compounded with the fact that the area is already poorly lit and quite desolate especially at night, and there is the potential for property damage and antisocial behaviour with potentially intoxicated patrons walking through the area especially late at night between the licensed premises, and 24/7 outlets on Great Eastern Hwy.

The issue of patrons street drinking in the surrounding area before entering the licensed premises (pre-loading on takeaway alcohol) is a common occurrence, and one only has to look at the amount of discarded alcohol bottles and cans in close proximity to licensed premises. Looking at the vicinity, patrons street drinking in parked cars, the Stiles Av park and ROW the DA backs onto, and/or vacant blocks will become an issue. Littering of takeaway alcohol cans and bottles will become worse than it currently is with 'customers' from the nearby shops on Great Eastern Hwy discarding their cans, bottles, wrappers, and even syringes on nearby properties on the way to the train station and Crown Casino, leaving owners with the damage and clean up.

If the council requirement is for 198 carbays which seems logical for a development of this size, that will attract crowds, this DA cannot be approved if only 32 bays are proposed. The applicant states that the beer hall and alfresco will be "predominantly full restaurant/cafe type setting" and not a bar stool or standing bar service arrangement. It is likely that the patrons will stay at the venue longer noting that its business model is to offer 'restaurant' service, and serving alcohol with meals etc, rather than a typical 'pub' with vertical drinking and a higher turnover of patrons during trading hours, or a fast food outlet having customers staying from 5-30 mins. Therefore there will be less

turnover of carparking bays and it will exacerbate parking issues particularly during peak times ie: lunch, dinner, during events at Optus Stadium etc.

Patrons attending the venue are unlikely to drive their cars home if they are intoxicated especially after large events ie: Melbourne Cup, Grand Final, NYE etc, leaving their cars parked in the vicinity overnight - one has to look at all the parked cars left overnight near Ascot Racecourse after the Melbourne Cup.

Whilst the applicant claims that staff and patrons will likely use Burswood Train Station, taxi/rideshare, and park on the street and railway reserve, in reality there are parking shortages affecting the area as evident from a site visit or even Google streetview. If cars parked on both sides of Stiles Av and Goodwood Pde it would reduce these streets to one lane respectively.

There would barely be enough room to overtake in a standard passenger car if party buses parked up outside the proposed DA on Goodwood Parade or on neighbouring Stiles Av.

If patrons used taxi/rideshare, it would likely result in 4 vehicle trips through the precinct (driver drops passenger at Goodwood Pde, leaves area, returns to Goodwood Pde to pick up passenger, drives passenger home) rather than 2 vehicle trips if they used their personal vehicle and parked, although there are enough parking issues in the area. However rideshare/taxi vehicles are also known to create their own 'defacto ranks' and illegally park outside licensed premises waiting for fares even in no parking/stopping zones which will just contribute to parking issues in the Burswood Triangle.

The Traffic Impact Statement that has been submitted indicates that the number of vehicle movements can be accommodated by the existing road network. Moreover, the provision of less parking bays may result in less road congestion particularly as patrons may be accessing the development via alternative transport options.

Whilst there was mention of utes delivering kegs from the microbrewery, there was no mention if the proposed bistro will offer takeaway service and engage food delivery services ie: Uber Eats or their own. This will likely increase traffic movements to and from the premises especially during peak times (dinner time) and result in illegal parking on the footpath, driveway or double parking on the street if there are no bays available.

The Planning Services team at Town of Victoria Park are well aware of the limited road and traffic capacity to the Burswood Triangle, with the only way out being the traffic light intersection on Griffiths St, or the 2 lane bridge at Riversdale Road, and they take this into consideration when assessing developments.

Whilst I think that the 25% landscaping requirement is totally excessive, this large DA proposing 6.9% is a bit light on for a project of this size, with the development taking a substantial section (almost 2/3rds) of Goodwood Pde between Stiles and Griffiths St.

	<p>Whilst the landscaping does not comply with the prescribed amount, Council Officers have considered the provision of landscaping by the development to be adequate. A condition of development approval is included which requires a detailed landscaping plan to be provided in addition to further landscaping measures to be incorporated on the alfresco area adjacent to Griffiths Stiles Reserve.</p>
<p>This would be a great development. 110% support it and think it would be amazing for the area. Make it happen!</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>My concerns regarding this development is as follows: Car spaces - we as residents already struggle to park on the road when there are any functions happening in the area including sports at Optus which is the worst! I'm also aware that Blasta currently does not have enough parking spaces as is.</p> <p>Construction- not only will there be noise from the construction but dust and dirt as well as less parking due to trucks etc having to move in and out of the area.</p> <p>Crime - are we trying to create another Northbridge? We live here as it's close to the casino and city for entertainment. By having the brewery, crime will increase and it will become unsafe to walk around in the evenings due to intoxicated people. We have a lot of retirees living here with dogs that they walk and I'd hate to think of any of them getting hurt. We already had an incident this month where a BMW had all its windows smashed. This will continue to happen if you approve this development. All of this being said, I believe there are future plans to build another apartment complex behind our building so if you approve this</p>	<p>The number of car parking bays that has been provided is considered adequate for reasons detailed in the analysis section of the report namely that the redevelopment of the precinct as transit-oriented development (TOD) and proximity to the Burswood Train Station as well as the potential introduction of an interim parking minimum for the precinct which would deem the number of bays compliant.</p> <p>The operation of the development is to occur in accordance with the approved plans and the accompanying reports submitted. The generation of crime is of a relevant concern however, cannot be considered as a reason not to approve the proposed development. Note comments above with regards to factors considered when considering a liquor licence application for the premises.</p>

brewery then how will we allow for any parking in the area? I don't see this being good for our area at all.