

### Attachment 3: Schedule of Submissions

Submission:	Support or Object:	Comments:	Response:
1	Object	<p>This proposal continues to be non-compliant with the streetscape requirements for the area. Like other owners, I have put considerable effort and expense into complying with the requirements of the streetscape policy for the weatherboard precinct. The information contained in this application is misleading and deceptive. The expectation that using weatherboard as cladding makes it compliant with street scape policy is completely unsatisfactory. The 3D graphic appears to depict compressed fibre cement sheeting rather than weatherboard on the front elevation. Regardless, cladding in weatherboard is not the only requirement of the policy. The proposed cabins do not comply with the 30 deg roof pitch. A minor 30 deg section of the roof is provided but the main part of the roof is 15 degrees. The verandahs are not characteristic of the area. To state that they are a "contemporary" interpretation does not mean that they comply with the policy. The eaves are not exposed. The roof designs are not complaint and are misleading drawn so that it is not clear how the front edge of the roof is designed. Regardless, it is not compliant with streetscape requirements. The windows and doors bear no relationship to the streetscape types identified in the policy.</p> <p>Given the expense other owners spend to comply with the policy, it is deeply unfair that such development would not be compliant with the streetscape code.</p> <p>The development proposes 5 cabins that bear no relationship to the housing in the neighbourhood. They appear entirely temporary and out of character for the area. It is objectionable</p>	<p>The proposed single bedrooms dwellings are temporary in nature, meaning that they will only exist on the site for a maximum period of 15 years, or until such time as the land is required for road widening. Based on this, the strict adherence with the Town's Local Planning Policy has not been imposed. Further comments regarding the building design is contained within the body of the report.</p> <p>Refer comments above.</p> <p>The proposed five single bedroom dwellings are temporary in nature. The dwellings will provide temporary accommodation for people experiencing homelessness which is not currently easily available. The</p>

		<p>that these 5 cabins are imposed on the neighbourhood and will significantly reduce the urban amenity of the area.</p> <p>(Please also see attached written submission)</p>	<p>dwellings are located on site that is predominately reserved Other Regional Roads, with the dwellings being on the site for a maximum period of 15 years.</p>
2	Object	<p>Additional traffic very close to entrance of property and very close to busy traffic lights.</p>	<p>Only four car bays are proposed at the rear of the site. Due to the nature of the dwellings, a significant amount of additional traffic is not anticipated, and therefore will be unlikely to have an impact on the road network.</p>
3	Object	<p>I strongly object to this proposal as this decision will impact the future valuation of my property.</p>	<p>Property values are not a valid planning submission.</p>
4	Object	<p>I write as one of the owners of As Council's planning records will indicate, my family and I are currently building a family home that has been carefully designed to reflect the character of the area and the streetscape policy.</p> <p>The above application for 5 cabins is entirely out of character for the area.</p> <p>The structures appear entirely like temporary structures, have no meaningful compliance with the streetscape policy and will diminish the amenity of the neighbourhood.</p> <p>Given that other owners are required to comply with the streetscape and other policies, it would be manifestly unfair if the application was approved to proceed.</p> <p>Temporary cabin structures are out of character for the P12 precinct;</p> <p>The draft Local Planning Strategy, which is currently seeking community comment, identifies the 257 Berwick Street as part of Neighbourhood 5 Residential Character Area.</p> <p>This policy identifies that this area a containing the bulk of the Town's character dwellings and streetscapes. The policy also identifies that Local Planning Policy No.25 has retained character homes and streetscapes and the community have recently</p>	<p>The proposed single bedrooms dwellings are temporary in nature, meaning that they will only exist on the site for a maximum period of 15 years, or until such time as the land is required for road widening. Based on this, the strict adherence with the Town's Local Planning Policy has not been imposed. Further comments regarding the building design is contained within the body of the report.</p> <p>The subject site is largely reserved Other Regional Roads, meaning that at some point in the future, the site will be relied on for road widening. No permanent development would ever be permitted on this site due its road reservation.</p>

		<p>reiterated their support for conservation through the review of this policy.</p> <p>This is consistent with the existing objectives of Precinct 12 East Victoria Park Precinct in the Local Planning Scheme, that "redevelopment shall be consistent with existing style, character and scale of dwellings throughout the precinct".</p> <p>Application does not comply with Streetscape Policy.</p> <p>Despite statements in the application, the proposal does not comply with Local Planning Policy No 25 Streetscapes.</p> <p>Other owners go to considerable effort and expense in complying with this policy and would be manifestly unfair if the policy does not apply to this application.</p> <p>The application does not comply with the following requirements for new developments in weatherboard precincts.</p> <p>The application makes statements that the proposal is "expressed in contemporary style".</p> <p>Such statements as are not meaningful. The proposals simply do not comply.</p> <p>As above, it would be entirely unfair that other owners go to considerable effort and expense to comply with the policy and this application be approved building structures completely out of character and not complying with streetscape policy.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Other dwellings constructed within the immediate vicinity of the site and within the Weatherboard precinct are for permanent developments. The dwellings proposed are temporary in nature, and only permitted on the site until such time as the reserve is required for road widening.</p>
5	Object	<p>I think the property is an eye sore as it doesn't match anything else in the neighbourhood and there are still too many dwellings in a small area. A homeless shelter will also attract the wrong crowd to the area and I completely object to having this next door to our property. It will not enhance the appeal of the community. Also it is on the corner of a busy intersection which would also provide further significant traffic issues/accidents.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The dwellings will be managed by a registered Community Housing Provider. The dwellings will be allocated to individuals who will not have a negative impact on themselves or the wider community. Refer above regarding traffic and access comments.</p>
6	Object	<p>I am strongly opposed to this development and do not want to be living next to it.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

		<p>Even at the revised 5 dwellings - it's too many "houses" on the one block. There is not enough parking and access to the road is poor.</p> <p>This proposed development is near a busy intersection and within the last year I have observed at least one car accident which resulted in a vehicle careening into this block of land, and the original dwelling on this site years ago was struck by an out of control vehicle.</p> <p>I am concerned that this proposed development will create further congestion at an already very busy intersection.</p> <p>I believe housing 5 at risk individuals in such close quarters creates a high chance of antisocial behaviour affecting everyone's wellbeing, including myself as a neighbour.</p> <p>This location is close to the high school and local residential college and is not an ideal location for housing people at risk.</p> <p>The revised dwellings are unattractive, look like dongas on a camp site and I fail to see how they are sympathetic to the TOVP aesthetics.</p> <p>This type of short term accommodation does not promote community engagement, as I feel the transient nature of this project doesn't encourage people to put down roots and care for their neighbours and communities. Jamming homeless people in temporary, cramped and cheap dongas is not a positive initiative in my opinion.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Refer above regarding traffic and access comments.</p> <p>Refer above regarding management of the dwellings.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
7	General comments	<p>I own the property at XXX and have concerns with the proposed use of development, I have previously lived near a similar arrangement and aware of the complexities it brings to the local neighborhood. As I am unfamiliar with the planning process could you let me know what is required from myself to have input on the development or preferably an alternative use for the land?</p> <p>A few immediate questions I have to present;</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Will the town of Victoria Park substitute local home owners for the loss or reduction of rental income and capital value of their properties</li> <li>•Will 'My Home' provide security surveillance, my previous dealings involved vehicle damage, property damage and general loitering in the surrounding area</li> <li>•Is the vegetation a sufficient boundary, as I do not believe it will provide visual screening of the development</li> <li>•In Ben Martins Letter Item 6. 'Who are the tenants' it states that the homeless women over 55 have been identified as appropriate tenants, if the development proceeds could this become a conditional item of the approval not just a statement contradicted by 'all walks of life, many socio-economic backgrounds and all demographics'</li> </ul> <p>I definitely understand the need for homeless shelters but do not believe a 5 bedroom facility that does not have onsite management is the right solution.</p>	<p>Rental income and property values are not a valid planning consideration.</p> <p>Insufficient evidence to support this statement.</p> <p>There is no planning requirement for the development to be screened.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
--	---	--