

32 Oswald Street, Victoria Park – Proposed additions and increase to approved student numbers – 5.2020.704.1 – Consultation Results

Submission No.	Comment (approval/objection)	Additional comments	Officer response
1.	Object to the proposal	<p>It has already been established by the Town that the development of Victoria Park Christian School (VPCS) has a shortfall of 16 car bays. The areas around Oswald, Hordern, Washington, Armagh, Geddes and Colombo Streets is already massively impacted by commuters and workers in the Monadelphous building and surrounding businesses by parking all day on these streets. The Town only needs to check their records on how many times the residents in this area have called to have the parking inspectors attend the area as these vehicles will park all day in a two-hour zone. These vehicles will regularly move their cars from one side of the street to the other to avoid incurring an infringement. It has also been advised by rangers on occasion that they were, during one period last year, instructed by the Town NOT to infringe cars in Oswald Street. We were also told by the Town that there is a lookout in the Monadelphous building and as soon as a ranger's car is sighted, an email goes out advising people to move their cars. I have myself advised the Town to be a little more covert with where they park their car when marking the cars in the area to avoid detection however this request is ignored which then allows workers to continue to flaunt the two hour parking zone.</p> <p>As with workers and commuters parking all day, Regent College has already undergone a major expansion and the roads, especially Washington Street and Geddes Streets around drop off and pick up time is full and chaotic. In particular, Geddes Street has parking on both sides of the street, rendering this street a one-way street from 2.50pm. This hampers bus and vehicular access as the cars turning into Hordern St to the kiss and drop zone block the entire road waiting to turn into this area. Residents on Washington Street have consistently had parents blocking their driveways during these drop off and pick up times and their pleas for assistance from the Town have been ignored (see attached photos). Having another school undergo the same type of expansion will only make this already unbearable issue worse. I really cannot see how or where the parents of VPCS are going to park during the drop off and pick up times as the parents from Regent already fill this area. I understand that the VPCS have a school bus and claim that parents will use this method of travel together with push bikes and public transport however as we have seen from the parking and road issues with Regent and indeed Victoria Park Primary School, this is not the case. The parents will invariably choose to drive to collect their children. It is all well and good stating in their application that they provide bike racks, a school bus, a kiss and drop zone and have access to public transport however they cannot force parents who choose to drive to use these methods.</p> <p>The increase in students and teachers (and lack of allocated parking in the planning) at the school will only mean an increase in traffic and parking issues for this already severely affected and ignored area, which will only be to the detriment of its residents who already during the working week, have lost the quiet enjoyment of their properties, which is why I fully object to the proposal.</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that the car parking in the area is difficult to manage due to the competing non-residential land uses that are in close proximity of residences in this particular area of Victoria Park.</p> <p>It is considered that due to the revision to maximum student numbers from 180 to 150 and the addition of 10 more car parking bays on site, in conjunction with the traffic management strategies to be employed by the landowner, it is considered that the proposal has mitigated the impact of car parking to the best of their abilities.</p> <p>The proposal satisfies the minimum car parking requirements prescribed under LPP23 – Car Parking.</p>
2.	Object to the proposal	<p>I am appalled by the audacity of those involved that they have not really taken into account the ratepayers that live in the streets that border the school. I have had numerous run ins with people that continually park in my driveway or block my driveway entrance. If I have appointments to attend, I have to park my car on the street. I find this very inconvenient. I dread to think what it will be like with a lot more vehicles cruising down my street trying to find somewhere to park. It is bedlam here in the morning and afternoons.</p>	<p>The proposed refurbishment to the existing car parking area and traffic management strategies are considered sufficient to mitigate the impact of increased vehicle movements to and from the subject site.</p>

		I do hope that common sense prevails and that we ratepayers are looked after and not be taken advantage of.	After receiving amended plans on 16 June 2021, the proposal satisfies the minimum car parking requirements prescribed under LPP23 – Car Parking. A total of 30 bays are required and 31 bays are provided on-site.
3.	Object to the proposal	<p>I object to this development proposal due to the main reason of the lack of parking. The council has indicated in their correspondence received last week that the proposal has a shortfall of 16 car bays.</p> <p>Due to the expansion of Regent College, commuters and staff from surrounding businesses already taking up a majority of the parking in the areas, there really is very little parking left for anyone visiting the area or indeed the residents.</p> <p>Drop off and pick up times are already a nightmare because of the extra students now attending Regent College. I am aware of the residents in the area complaining about parents blocking driveways, driving erratically as well as children running across the roads etc. so to have a further expansion of school is just going to exacerbate the issues that have already been created by Regent, commuters and businesses parking in the area.</p> <p>We have lost the ability to park in front of our own homes, which we should have a right to. The developments is just going to worsen the aesthetic of the area further and the safety of our own children in our street. This is why I fully object to this proposed development.</p>	After receiving amended plans on 16 June 2021, the proposal satisfies the minimum car parking requirements prescribed under LPP23 – Car Parking. A total of 30 bays are required and 31 bays are provided on-site.
4.	Object to the proposal	<p>The proposal indicates a shortfall of onsite parking requirements and suggests that there will be sufficient parking located in nearby street. There is not the case. Parking within the Raphael Park residential area is at a premium and the existing restrictions are not adhered to by many of the daily visitors to the area, nor by existing parents dropping off children at the 3 schools in the area, nor by any of the many people attending work in the area.</p> <p>Both schools are bang in the middle of the 2 Hour Parking Zone which is under pressure daily by workers coming into the area. This is currently exacerbated by Western Power underground line installation. The traffic is added to by the Subaru dealership not honouring the Memorandum of Understanding that they do not test drive vehicles in the area. The Parking control by the ToVP is random. The available parking in Oswald, Hordern, Armagh is taken up by workers and visitors attending 55 Albany Hwy businesses. There are parking meters at the Albany Hwy end of Oswald and Armagh streets so that area is completely taken by 8am. Parking at nearby Taylor Reserve is similarly taken by workers at 55 Albany Hwy. The Park, Lock parking area at Raphael Park is taken by 8am every day.</p> <p>There is already overflow of parking into Washington and Gloucester streets. Colombo St is basically one way every morning and afternoon with school pickups already. The overflow for the pickup area from Regents school goes around from Horden street into Geddes St back to the Washington roundabout. Cars are frequently parked all along Washington street despite this being no standing.</p> <p>The ToVP has always refused residents parking permits and it is the residents who suffer from the daily traffic mess that is generated by the poor parking management (who "lost" \$750k of parking revenue a couple years ago). The area does not need more vehicles jockeying for parking spaces.</p>	<p>The proposed refurbishment to the existing car parking area and traffic management strategies are considered sufficient to mitigate the impact of increased vehicle movements to and from the subject site.</p> <p>After receiving amended plans on 16 June 2021, the proposal satisfies the minimum car parking requirements prescribed under LPP23 – Car Parking. A total of 30 bays are required and 31 bays are provided on-site.</p>

		<p>While I do not oppose the additional building for more students. I am against the proposal simply because there is no on site alternative suggested and it is the local residents who, again, will suffer. There is already an early childhood learning facility being built in Oswald St despite not advertising the change of use to residents which will also impact parking and traffic in the area shortly. In this area there are at least six 40kph school zones, 5 roads that are, in peak times, single lane traffic. Adding additional vehicles who in all likelihood will park in side streets past Geddes St are going to further impact residents in a broader are. The school must have sufficient onsite parking.</p>	
5.	Object to the proposal	<p>The residents will be impacted because of the shortfall of parking bays provided in the proposal. Residents should receive a parking permit to allow resident cars to be allowed to park un-timed, at any time in front of their houses. This can easily be implemented with controls to make sure it is not abused by residents in the form of 'gifting or on selling permits' to others.</p> <p>Already our street is being used for commercial parking and is getting out of control, and now with this proposal the impact on street parking will be way too high. It is likely to cause resentment by both commuters and residents, which may lead to unsociable behaviour during peak periods.</p> <p>The current notion of me as a homeowner, being fined by our local council for parking in front of my own house during a weekday is pathetic.</p> <p>This a residential area and the street parking in a residential area should primarily be for the convenience of households and not for commercial or other business.</p> <p>Council has encouraged residential infill high density, already with this comes more traffic activity in the form of resident's cars, visitors, services etc. It is overwhelming to our streets and likely unsafe, to increasingly add high traffic and parking pressure during business and school hours. The Development should not proceed without onsite parking to facilitate all requirements for the proposal including on site "drop off" for parents, service bays, visitors' bays.</p>	<p>The proposed refurbishment to the existing car parking area and traffic management strategies are considered sufficient to mitigate the impact of increased vehicle movements to and from the subject site.</p> <p>After receiving amended plans on 16 June 2021, the proposal satisfies the minimum car parking requirements prescribed under LPP23 – Car Parking. A total of 30 bays are required and 31 bays are provided on-site.</p>
6.	Object to the proposal	<p>The car chaos of both mornings drop off and afternoon pick up for the 2 Colombo Street Schools is evident and extremely annoying. Allowing the increase at the smaller school to 180 with a 16 bay parking shortfall cannot be allowed. As it is the extra students and staff will make the immediate surrounding streets even worse than they are now - I object to this proposal - thank you for listening to my whinge!</p>	<p>The proposed refurbishment to the existing car parking area and traffic management strategies are considered sufficient to mitigate the impact of increased vehicle movements to and from the subject site.</p> <p>The maximum number of students has been revised to 150 from the originally proposed 180 students which reduces the required number of car parking bays required on site for students and staff.</p> <p>After receiving amended plans on 16 June 2021, the proposal satisfies the minimum car parking requirements prescribed under LPP23 – Car Parking for 150 students and associated staff. A total of 30 bays are required and 31 bays are provided on-site.</p>
7.	Object to the proposal	<p>Already with Monadelphous at the end of the street it is very difficult to get parking outside our house. This development will put further pressure on parking within our and surrounding streets. Additionally, the 2 hour parking restriction is a burden for when we have visitors or tradespeople to</p>	Noted.

		<p>the property. I propose that at least one permit be issued to households in the street to allow for a car to be parked outside the property for the day. Without solving the parking issue with the issuing of permits, I would not be in support of the development.</p>	<p>After receiving amended plans on 16 June 2021, the proposal satisfies the minimum car parking requirements prescribed under LPP23 – Car Parking for 150 students and associated staff. A total of 30 bays are required and 31 bays are provided on-site.</p>
8.	Object to the proposal	<p>I have been living at the above property since around September 1995 and since the construction of the Monadelphous building at the end of my street the traffic and parking has become appalling. I cannot have friends and relatives park outside my house during the week at all as there is no spare car bays as the employees of this building take up every bay in the street all day, every day, despite the two hour restriction. I rarely see the ranger patrolling and issuing tickets and I work from home.</p> <p>I have read the planning documents and note along with the Town that there is a shortfall of 16 car bays. With parking and traffic at a premium in this area at the moment, I don't see how this proposal can go ahead. If it does go head, where will these 16 car bays be found. Oswald St is full all day, every day. Washington St is full on both sides every day at drop off and pick up times. Geddes St becomes a one way street every afternoon at pick up times. I have noticed buses not being able to get through Geddes Street because of the congestion caused by Regent and Victoria Park Christian School. This situation became worse when Regent expanded. More students at the Victoria Park Christian School and lack of parking for the extra teachers is going to make this situation dire for the residents in the area. We should be allowed to park, and our visitors should be able to park, in front of our homes but at the moment this is only possible on the weekends as everyone takes these bays every day when they go to work.</p> <p>I fully object to this development.</p>	<p>After receiving amended plans on 16 June 2021, the proposal satisfies the minimum car parking requirements prescribed under LPP23 – Car Parking for 150 students and associated staff. A total of 30 bays are required and 31 bays are provided on-site.</p>
9.	Object to the proposal	<p>I feel I will be impacted negatively by the planned proposal. While I support the school wanting to have new classrooms catering for more students in theory, I do not think that the car parking is sufficient and if they wish to have these additions they need to make provision for all the car bays they require without relying on parking in the surrounding streets.</p> <p>The car parking assessment states - "Based on the statutory requirements, there will be a shortfall of 12 parking bays. However, the availability of on-street parking is also available on all nearby local road within the surrounding area with varying time limits and fees."</p> <p>This is simply incorrect, there is not enough on street parking to cater for all the businesses, schools and commuters that currently use the streets as a car park, day in and day out. Also, there is a two hour time limit on most of the surrounding streets during the day so is this going to result in a car "shuffle" at certain times of the day to avoid getting a parking ticket? As a resident this makes me extremely concerned/angry as I, or a visitor to my home, cannot park outside my own home without risk of getting a ticket if there for longer than two hours, yet even more people will be able to abuse the system you have in place and park for free for the day, turning our local sought after residential area into a car park.</p> <p>I see the solution as being providing the parking required on site.</p>	<p>After receiving amended plans on 16 June 2021, the proposal satisfies the minimum car parking requirements prescribed under LPP23 – Car Parking for 150 students and associated staff. A total of 30 bays are required and 31 bays are provided on-site.</p>

		<p>Alternatively, as a resident being able to have a parking permit per household so we can at least park our own car outside our own home, un-timed, during weekdays.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p>	
10.	Object to the proposal	<p>I strongly object to this proposal. The parking issue is out of control already especially at school pick up and drop off times. I have witnessed two incidents when little children came very close to being hit by a car due to the mayhem. It is only a matter of time until there is an accident. I suggest before any more expansion occurs that the current parking issue is dealt with first.</p>	<p>After receiving amended plans on 16 June 2021, the proposal satisfies the minimum car parking requirements prescribed under LPP23 – Car Parking for 150 students and associated staff. A total of 30 bays are required and 31 bays are provided on-site.</p>
11.	Object to the proposal	<p>There is not enough parking provided. The ages K-1 all require parents to walk them to the classroom. There may be some bussed or otherwise, but most parents will be walking the kids in. There is absolutely no way there is enough parking. verge parking is ugly and unacceptable. The pictures in the development proposal show the problems with verge parking.</p> <p>I'm happy with development here but please address the serious issues of parking.</p>	<p>After receiving amended plans on 16 June 2021, the proposal satisfies the minimum car parking requirements prescribed under LPP23 – Car Parking for 150 students and associated staff. A total of 30 bays are required and 31 bays are provided on-site.</p>
12.	Object to the proposal	<p>We have been neighbours of the school since 1989, when we were still part of the Heirisson Ward of the City of Perth. In almost a third of a century, we have seen many changes in traffic behaviour, density, routes taken, rat runs through streets past our 3 nearby schools and parking problems. Most of these issues were noted and addressed with co-operation between residents, council, businesses, schools, main roads, police, State Government and other interested parties. During this time, I have been an active member of the Heirisson Action Group, the Causeway Action Group, Victoria Park Community Association, Vic Park Residents and Ratepayers Assn, been on the Slip Road Committee from Shepperton Road to Canning Highway and other traffic and planning initiatives. including traffic calming.</p> <p>Having witnessed the enormous increase in traffic and parking problems that log jam the streets around our 3 nearby schools now - particularly at pick up and drop off times, we fear the chaos that would engulf us if a shortfall of 16 parking spaces be granted as proposed by the applicant. The vehicles will no doubt need to park in Oswald st and surrounds.</p> <p>Along with the other Childcare Development under construction now at 10 - 14 Oswald St, the daily traffic movements and congestion, at Drop Off and Pick Up times would be ridiculous. It is not unreasonable to assume that the 94 Day Care children and however many staff are employed, will result in at least 100 morning and 100 afternoon vehicle movements in the street. Add to that 84 more children and staff at the same times for the proposed Early Childhood Block, gives us $2 \times 84 = 168$ more. $168 + 200 = 368$.</p> <p>368 vehicle movements concentrated at a time when parents need to make contact with staff to hand over and pick up children would surely be very disruptive for all.</p> <p>Currently, residents are entertained by the "2 hour parking" phony war between the feared ToVP Parking Officers and workers from the high rise offices, whereby staff emerge in pairs at 10am, 12pm, and 2pm to swap parking spots around surrounding streets, lest they be "pinged".</p>	<p>Referring to the submitted Traffic Impact Assessment which refers to a maximum student number of 180, the maximum number of vehicle movements would be approximately 96 during the AM and PM peak hours.</p> <p>It should be noted that traffic mitigation strategies such as the private school bus service and use of other transport modes (cycling, public transport, walking) is likely to lower the total number of private personal vehicles accessing the subject site.</p> <p>In regards to the level of consultation, LPP37 required adjacent property owners and occupiers to be consulted at a minimum.</p> <p>The consultation area extended down the entire length of Colombo and Oswald Street in addition to the residential development on Hordern Street which exceeded the minimum requirements of properties to be consulted on in regards to this particular type of development.</p>

		<p>I have always had a wonderful friendship with Victoria Park Christian Primary School (staff and birdlife) and long may it continue to flourish. I also know that car parks don't grow on trees. Had the same design incorporated the required parking bays as an undercroft in the proposal, the shortfall would be addressed.</p> <p>From conversations we been having with neighbours, people feel the consultation period is too short and should be extended, as very few affected people are consulted and will therefore not have input.</p>	
13.	Object to the proposal	<p>After the recent approval of a significant increase in student numbers at Regent College, despite a number of objections from local residents, I am taken back that another significant increase in student numbers is proposed. This time for Victoria Park Christian School. My main concerns relate to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The impact of increased vehicle numbers that will inevitably cause increased traffic congestion. This will also be exacerbated by the proposal for another drop off zone (kiss & go) in the very narrow Colombo Street. I would have thought that the proposed Oswald Street drop off zone for access to Victoria Park Christian School should be the sole new drop off zone as Oswald Street's width is much more able to handle an increase in traffic volume. 2. The increase in volume of traffic in Colombo Street since the expansion of Regent College a couple of years ago has made it increasingly difficult for me to negotiate when I leave for work in my motor vehicle between 0800 and 0830 during weekdays. Added traffic will make it even more difficult and should not be the case for a residential zone. 3. The proposal that verge parking is to be continued in Colombo Street outside both Regent College and Victoria Park Christian School is flawed. Of note, prior to the expansion of Regent College student numbers a couple of years ago, most of the verge parking was taken up by staff. However, now that staff have been allocated onsite parking off Geddes Street, the verge parking has been commandeered mainly for student drop off by their parents. This has created additional traffic problems with parents swinging to opposite side of road to negotiate 90 degrees parking on the verge, along with parents backing onto the road and obstructing traffic endeavouring to clear the kiss and go drop off in Horden Street (as they drive south on Colombo Street). Verge parking for student drop-off should not be permitted as student-drop off should focus on the parallel drop off zone as per Horden Street outside Regent College. My suggestion here is not 'rocket science', just plain common sense to any observer of the current traffic chaos caused by using verge parking for drop-off purposes. Apart from ceasing verge parking altogether, perhaps it should be strictly limited for longer-term purposes, such as parking for professional visitors to school etc. In fact, I have a friend who services both these schools as a professional and she often asks me if she can park in my driveway as there are no places available outside the school at the peak drop off time. She carries a lot of equipment as part of her work and would struggle to lug it all the way from parking further away. <p>I believe there should be consideration for making Colombo Street one way (south) between Horden and Washington Streets (or entirely one way south). Having two way traffic, plus parking in this section of a narrow street like Colombo Street is a major contribution to ongoing traffic chaos.</p>	<p>After receiving amended plans on 16 June 2021, the proposal satisfies the minimum car parking requirements prescribed under LPP23 – Car Parking for 150 students and associated staff. A total of 30 bays are required and 31 bays are provided on-site.</p> <p>Referring to the submitted Traffic Impact Assessment which refers to a maximum student number of 180, the maximum number of vehicle movements would be approximately 96 during the AM and PM peak hours.</p> <p>It should be noted that traffic mitigation strategies such as the private school bus service and use of other transport modes (cycling, public transport, walking) is likely to lower the total number of private personal vehicles accessing the subject site</p>

		<p>At least residents living in this highly congested section of Colombo Street would only have to negotiate a one-way stream of traffic, rather than a two-way stream along with trying to peer over parked vehicles to negotiate exit from their driveways each morning.</p> <p>I trust that my views will be taken to heart as I have been an objective observer of traffic conditions in Colombo Street since 1992. While I no longer work in the profession, I am also a trained educator and supportive of the principle of providing good quality education to our children. Nonetheless, I believe educational institutions should be cognisant to the fact that their facilities are located within a broader community. Therefore, the views of neighbours should be taken into consideration. In respect to Christian schools, the principle of 'preferring other to ourselves' might also be pertinent.</p>	
14.	Object to the proposal	<p>I have serious concerns about this development.</p> <p>Since the expansion of Regent college, the traffic congestion along with driver / parent behaviour has created a unsafe environment.</p> <p>Constant / daily parking violations and the complete disrespect for the residents of the area especially in blocking driveways is a constant frustration. To the size of another school in such close proximity will only exacerbate the situation.</p> <p>Recently I received information with the follow excerpt: " There can be significant and ongoing costs to the painting of lines, the Town would usually consider the amount of illegal parking and volume of requests from residents per property, in this case a review of available data within the last 12 months shows;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 customer requests from different addresses have been received for blocked driveways. • Due to regular patrols the Town issued approx. 42 infringements (~3per month) for the entirety of Washington St." <p>Using logged infringements as a metric to judge an areas parking issues is seriously flawed.</p>	<p>After receiving amended plans on 16 June 2021, the proposal satisfies the minimum car parking requirements prescribed under LPP23 – Car Parking for 150 students and associated staff. A total of 30 bays are required and 31 bays are provided on-site.</p> <p>Comments regarding the general car parking situation in the area are noted.</p>