

# APPENDIX D

**Proposed Closure of Laneway between 23 Edwards Street Reservoir and the Car Park behind the Reservoir Civic Centre**  
**Précis of written & verbal submissions**

Submitters	Submission / Grounds of Objection	Comments
<p><b>Red &amp; Danny Malaspina</b> <i>(Written)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of access to the rear of a double faced shop.</li> <li>• Laneway acts as a main hub to client access &amp; car parking.</li> <li>• 35m<sup>2</sup> of land will become unusable.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This property does not currently have on-site parking via the rear laneway. Accordingly, the proposal will not alter the current vehicular access arrangements.</li> <li>• There will be no loss of pedestrian access. Rather, it will be enhanced in terms of safety and amenity.</li> <li>• Whilst the 35m<sup>2</sup> of land at the rear will not be able to be developed in the future for on-site parking, a myriad of alternative uses remain.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Paul &amp; Lilly Mance</b> <i>(Written)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of access to the rear of a double faced shop.</li> <li>• Laneway acts as a main hub to client access &amp; car parking.</li> <li>• 45m<sup>2</sup> of land will become unusable.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This property has on-site parking for one vehicle via the laneway. Accordingly the proposal will prevent future vehicle access to this car space for both parking and deliveries. As stated in the review by Ratio this is considered a valid concern and in order to satisfactorily address this matter Council should compensate for loss of access to on-site parking by providing permanent access to dedicated parking spaces in the nearby Council car park for both staff and deliveries.</li> <li>• There will be no loss of pedestrian access. Rather, it will be enhanced in terms of safety and amenity.</li> <li>• Whilst the 45m<sup>2</sup> of land at the rear will no longer be able to be utilised for on-site parking, a myriad of alternative uses remain.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Dr Helen Cristernino</b> <i>(Written)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of access to the rear of a double faced shop.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This property has on-site parking for one vehicle via the laneway. Accordingly the proposal will prevent future vehicle access to this car space for both parking and deliveries. As stated in the review by Ratio this is considered a valid concern and in order to satisfactorily address this</li> </ul>

Submitters	Submission / Grounds of Objection	Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Laneway acts as a main hub to client access &amp; car parking.</li> <li>35m<sup>2</sup> of land will become unusable.</li> <li>Raised the issue of parking permits within the Council car park as a form of compensation.</li> </ul>	<p>matter Council should compensate for loss of access to on-site parking by providing permanent access to dedicated parking spaces in the nearby Council car park for both staff and deliveries.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There will be no loss of pedestrian access. Rather, it will be enhanced in terms of safety and amenity.</li> <li>Whilst the 35m<sup>2</sup> of land at the rear will no longer be able to be utilised for on-site parking, a myriad of alternative uses remain.</li> <li>Refer point 1 above.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Frank &amp; Maria Luzza (Written)</b></p> <p><b>Frank &amp; Sara Marafioti (Written)</b></p> <p><b>Phyllis &amp; Michele Vespucci (Written)</b></p> <p><b>Pasquale On behalf of Frank &amp; Maria Luzza (Verbal)</b></p> <p><b>Phyllis Vespucci On behalf of Phyllis &amp; Michele Vespucci (Verbal)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Loss of access to Council car park from Edwards Street for tenants and customers.</li> <li>Loss of access to laneway itself which provides access to car parking spaces at the rear of the premises which are used by the tenant for parking, deliveries and pickups.</li> <li>Loss of access will lower the lease value of the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Whilst the proposal will result in a loss of access to Council's car park from Edwards Street, the review by Ratio identified that there are suitable alternative routes available and motorists will quickly adapt to the available access points.</li> <li>The property at 275 Spring Street has on-site parking for two vehicles via the laneway. Accordingly, the proposal will prevent future vehicle access to these car spaces for both parking and deliveries. As stated in the review by Ratio this is considered a valid concern and in order to satisfactorily address this matter Council should compensate for loss of access to on-site parking by providing permanent access to dedicated parking spaces in the nearby Council car park for both staff and deliveries.</li> </ul> <p>The property at 273 Spring Street does not currently have on-site parking via the rear laneway. Accordingly, the proposal will not alter the current vehicular access arrangements.</p> <p>There will be no loss of pedestrian access. Rather, it will be enhanced in terms of safety and amenity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is arguable that the proposal will increase the lease value of the shops</li> </ul>

Submitters	Submission / Grounds of Objection	Comments
	<p>shop.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Given that delivery vehicles are unable to park in Spring or Edwards Streets, the existing Loading zones are poorly located inconvenient.</li> <li>• Rear entrance of restaurant lower than height of curb. If area paved the restaurant will, without extensive drainage works, be flooded.</li> <li>• Very little 'spin off' for pizza business from library patrons.</li> <li>• Council's proposal to pave up to the boundary of the privately owned buildings will require permission from owners</li> <li>• Tenants should be offered 2 parking permit spaces at the very least.</li> </ul>	<p>rather than decrease their values.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There will be no change to the existing loading zones within either Spring Street, Edwards Street or the Council car park. The existing loading zones are considered adequate. Recent alterations to the loading zones in the rear and main carpark are only temporary to accommodate the construction</li> <li>• Both the current and 'revitalised' laneway are lower than the adjoining retail premises. There is adequate drainage within the area at present and flooding is unlikely. There will be new drainage infrastructure as part of the Redevelopment.</li> <li>• It is reasonable to expect the adjoining retail food premises to benefit from the expected 11,000 visitor per month attracted to the Reservoir Community and Learning Centre Redevelopment.</li> <li>• Council will consult and seek approval for works within private property</li> <li>• Refer point 2 above.</li> </ul>
<p><b>John, Love &amp; Steven Lakovidis</b></p> <p><b>Veronica Khan (nee Lakovidis)</b></p> <p><b>J &amp; L Lakovidis Pty Ltd (Written)</b></p> <p><b>Veronica Khan</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact upon tenant's ability to use and trade from properties.</li> <li>• Decrease the value of the properties significantly due to loss of rear vehicular access.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposal is unlikely to have a negative impact upon the tenants' current use and trade from their premises as none of these premises currently have on-site parking via the laneway for deliveries or parking.</li> <li>• No supporting documentation has been provided to support this claim.</li> </ul>

<b>Submitters</b>	<b>Submission / Grounds of Objection</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<p><b>On behalf of all of the above (Verbal)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At the time when Council issued permits for the businesses to operate from the properties, the laneway was required for both access and loading zone purposes.</li>   <li>• The proposal will affect use of the Council car park and in turn affect viability of businesses.</li>   <li>• Proposal offers no community benefit and will lead to an increase in crime and antisocial behaviour.</li>   <li>• Suggested an alternative of widening the road for pedestrian and wheelchair/disabled access.</li> <li>• Redirected traffic will create chaos for residents in other streets.</li>   <li>• The submitters have amassed a “bundle” of properties with access via the subject road. The various leases for these properties have now been aligned to expire at the same time. The group intends to develop the properties in the future with a 4 to 5 storey building incorporating a retail and residential mix. If the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None of the premises currently have on-site parking or loading zones.</li>   <li>• Whilst the proposal will result in a loss of access to Council’s car park from Edwards Street, the review by Ratio identified that there are suitable alternative routes available to motorists. The use of the car park is not expected to change.</li> <li>• As identified by Ratio, the proposal will create potential for a significant enhancement in the visual and function role of this section of the ROW as a desirable space for the benefit of nearby community and commercial uses at the centre.</li>   <li>• The incidence of crime and antisocial behaviour are expected to decrease rather than increase as a result of increased pedestrian traffic and activated frontages to the proposed library and potential improved interfaces with the commercial properties on the eastern side.</li>   <li>• The suggested alternative of widening the existing pedestrian footpath is not considered practical or viable.</li> <li>• As identified by Ratio both Cleeland Street and Olive Street have spare traffic capacity to accommodate additional traffic in a safe and satisfactory manner.</li>   <li>• As identified by Ratio, the proposal will prevent future vehicle access to the ‘combined’ site via the ROW, with the only other options being via Edwards Street or Spring Street. Given that Road Zone Category of Spring Street (under the management of VicRoads) it is expected that VicRoads will require that access be via Edwards Street. The Edwards Street option has been assessed and it is considered that there is scope to</li> </ul>

Submitters	Submission / Grounds of Objection	Comments
	<p>laneway was closed, it is unclear where the entry to a basement car park for the</p> <p>development could be accommodated. If they develop, the loss of the laneway will dramatically decrease the value of their property. Accordingly, the owners would suffer significant loss and damage and they will seek compensation.</p>	<p>create a double width crossover to service in-site parking, located to the west of the existing Bus Stop.</p> <p>Council's Planning Department concurs that Edwards Street would, subject to appropriate traffic measurements, be an alternative vehicular access point to the laneway for any proposed development.</p>
<p><b>Giovanni Gallinaro</b> <i>(Written)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Laneway acts as a hub to customer access, deliveries and car parking.</li> <li>• Possible reduction in value of premises due to reduced access to premises and Council car park.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposal is not expected to adversely affect deliveries and car parking within the area generally or to the submitter's property itself.</li> <li>• The proposal, together with the redevelopment of the Reservoir Community and Leaning Centre are likely to enhance values rather than reduce them.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Larry De Cata</b> <i>(Written) &amp; (Verbal)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposal will add to traffic congestion and will force motorists to travel a further 800m.</li> <li>• This anti motorist proposal will add to pollution and will only be of benefit to the nearby businesses by allowing the land to be used for outdoor eating areas.</li> <li>• The proposal amounts to a land grab by Council alienating land set aside for roads for another purpose.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As identified by Ratio, the increased travel distances for motorists accessing Council's car park is considered to be insignificant. Those approaching from the north will have an increased travel distance of only 370 metres whilst motorist approaching from the west will have an increase of only 60 metres.</li> <li>• The proposal is considered to have significant community benefit and represents an effective and appropriate use of Council's assets.</li> </ul>