

Summary of Submissions:

The tables below summarise the comments received during the advertising period of the proposal, together with the City's response to each comment.

Comments Received in Support:	Applicant's Comment:
<p><u>Land Use</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Perth can only benefit from a well-run accommodation sources that gives travellers options in regards to cost, location and accommodation types. Supports the diversity in accommodation types in the City of Vincent, which is not heavily invested with hotels, but offers many attractions for tourists. Experienced short-stay managers should be supported to assist Vincent to diversify accommodation options and economic activation by tourist expenditure. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As an active member of the Holiday Rental Industry Association (HRIA) I am aware of the positive impacts that a well ran short-term rental can have on a city and its economy.
<p>Comments Received in Objection:</p> <p><u>Land Use</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter alleges that the proposal has been in operation since circa October 2017 without any approval. The proposal has been advertise to host up to eight people however, the units is designed to sleep two adults and two to three children at most. 	<p>Applicant's Comment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I commenced short-term leasing in October and have run a very well operated property while I am away at work. This is also my home I live in while I am not away working. During this time, I have never created any disturbance to anyone from the strata or neighbouring real estate. The property is 203m2, the number of guests is relevant to the amount of beds within my 3 bedrooms.
<p><u>Advertising</u></p> <p>The applicant was required to erect a sign notifying surrounding landowners of the proposal during the community consultation and this sign was not erected.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The advertising requirements were met, and received by the City of Vincent.
<p><u>Car Parking and Traffic</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is one car parking bay for the unit and this causes parking issues when there are multiple adults with more than one vehicle staying the premises. On-going parking issues causing obstruction to the footpath and common property. Previous issues have occurred whereby the access to the complex was obstructed from cars and residents not being able to enter the complex. There are existing car parking issues on the road network surrounding the subject site. The management plan states that there are two car parking bays however, the submitter alleges that there is only one bay as the garage remains locked for security. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> My unit is a two car bay unit, however I have only ever had bookings with 1 vehicle so far. Any other vehicles have not been associated with my bookings at my property. There has only been 1 complaint made and that was of a parking obstruction. I hosted a guest for her wedding day and they had a wedding vehicle parked in a position that partially obstructed the driveway for 10 minutes, while the mature group of people took wedding day pictures at the front of the house and around vehicle before heading to the wedding. This was a Saturday morning and does not class as a "disturbance or loitering". Existing issues of parking on road ways in the City of Vincent have no relevance to my proposal.

Summary of Submissions:

Comments Received in Objection:	Applicant's Comment:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal will result in increased traffic in the locality. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The garage is locked when not in use. As previously stated I have not had anyone book the property with 2 vehicles and have always offered the front bay to these guests with 1 car. This proposal will obviously have no effect on local traffic. It is just a home like any other residence in the City of Vincent.
<p><u>Noise</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are on-going noise issues from the short term dwelling as a result of too many people at one time. On-going issues with noise as a result of parties on weekends. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No complaint of noise has ever been made. Noise levels do not differ to those of any other home in the City of Vincent. There has never been anything remotely close to a party in my property. It's quite clear that these neighbours concerned would have lodged complaints instantly if this was ever the case. My house rules stipulate "no parties" and have been followed.
<p><u>Safety</u></p> <p>As long as someone is able break a code of conduct, there will be threats to the security of residents, and having a digital keypad is not fail-proof. Losing a bond after an event is not a guaranteed deterrent, and other people finding out a code is always a possibility. The fact that there is a wall at the rear of the property which can easily be climbed over to give access to the complex, is of concern.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> My front door lock is a high-end secure device. The deadbolt security lock is operated by a 7-digit code changed on a fortnightly basis. My choice of door lock on my home is of no concern or business to any of my neighbours. No cases of anything remotely close to a security threat has ever occurred or been reported by these neighbours. The lay out of my home is perfect for short-term leasing as it has absolutely no effect on neighbours, no shared facilities and only one exit and entry straight onto the streets of Northbridge.
<p><u>Rubbish</u></p> <p>Concerns raised regarding the storage and disposal of rubbish as the owner of the property does not frequently visit the unit and the bins are not being put out for collection.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I am a FIFO worker so of course I am not always home to put my bins out every week. In conjunction with my cleaner, I manage my own rubbish just like any of my neighbours manage theirs. My bins live inside my garage and I have full control over my own waste management.
<p><u>On-Going Breaches, Issues and Complaint Management</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The landowners contact number has not been made available to the strata. Submitter alleges that there have been a number of breaches and non-compliances with the proposed management plan including: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> More than six guests have been permitted to stay at the unit; Smokers at the front of the unit on the weekend; and Use of the courtyard area late at night 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I have supplied my number to the strata at a strata meeting in 2017. We have been in contact numerous times. I also have a nominated 24/7 caretaker while I am away at work. The number of guests has been dictated by the number of beds in my property. I have never had a booking exceeding 6 persons. Strata by-laws dictates that smoking is not permitted inside the building complex so as requested have instructed all guests to smoke outside the front of the property and has zero impact on the complex this way. I'm pleased to see the guests are following my effective code of conduct and the "no smoking" sign on display in my courtyard. No complaints have ever been raised to me regarding any form of noise since commencing short-term leasing in October, including noise from my courtyard. There are no strata by-laws about using your own courtyard at night, nor is there any opposing short-term leasing.

Summary of Submissions:

Comments Received in Objection:	Applicant's Comment:
<p><u>Complaints Management</u></p> <p>Strata does not have the applicant's mobile phone number. This was the applicant's initial offer as a suggestion for if/when a disturbance should.</p>	<p>- Stata was supplied with my phone number in 2017 at the strata meeting. I have had discussions with neighbours on the phone regarding the internet and other business since moving in back in July 2017.</p>
<p><u>Strata Approval</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“Strata allowed the applicant to continue the operation on the provisos that his application with the CoV be lodged immediately (which did not occur for a lengthy period), and that if there was a reported disturbance, it would be immediately discontinued. No approval has been given by the CoV as it's obviously still in the public comment stage, and at the time of writing this submission, the applicant will be requested in accordance with the Strata's proviso, to immediately discontinue the operation due to the above-mentioned complaints being received.”</i> • <i>“It was also discussed at this meeting that the members of the Council of Owners were not in support of him running the business in the complex, however we were prepared to support him for a trial period if he ceased advertising for 8 guests and changed his advertisement to 6 guests. This number is in keeping with the CoV's guidelines. Again he was aware of the stipulated number of guests by CoV and immediately made the change. However, in January it was brought to the attention of the Council of Owners that he had reverted his number of guests back to 8, breaking our agreement and the CoV guidelines. It is still currently advertised as accommodating 8.”</i> 	<p>- As the City of Vincent is aware, this lengthy process involves a lot of research, planning and interaction from both myself and the council. I have been working hard on achieving this approval since it was initially raised to me at the strata meeting.</p> <p>- The number of guests that my property is advertised for is stipulated by the number of beds in my property. I have never accepted a booking of greater than 6 persons.</p>
<p><u>Loitering</u></p> <p>The submitter alleges that there have been instances of loitering in front of the premises and the entrance.</p>	<p>- The alleged isolated incident of “loitering” was a group photo of a wedding party in the middle of the day on a Saturday. Given the time of day and the Northbridge location, this is far from a disruptive event.</p>

Summary of Submissions:

Comments Received in Objection:	Applicant's Comment:
<p><u>Impact on Strata Complex</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The proposal will adversely impact on the harmonious environment within the complex.• The layout of the unit results in windows to living area being opened into the main common area of the complex.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- This proposal or anything that happens in my home is of no concern or issue to any residents of the City of Vincent.- In alignment with any house in the City of Vincent, my home does have windows and doors. The neighbours making these statements also have the exact same layout and we all live in a "harmonious" environment.- In summary I would like to advise the council that absolutely no complaints were ever raised to myself or the council prior to the neighbours receiving the letter from City of Vincent providing them with an opportunity to comment on my proposal. The neighbours have taken this opportunity and then fabricated a back dated "complaint" about the wedding day "disturbance" that occurred some weeks before. It's a perfect circumstance for vindictive neighbours with no real grounds for complaint to contact the council in a last-minute bid to hinder my application. Given the unsubstantial nature of this isolated complaint, it is quite clear that if any real instances of disturbance ever did occur, the neighbours would have certainly generated complaints to myself and the City of Vincent.

Note: Submissions are considered and assessed by issue rather than by individual submitter.