

## 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:	Officer Technical Comment:
<p><u>Car Parking Shortfall</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The car parking shortfall is justified</li> <li>Approve no conditions regarding cash-in-lieu</li> <li>Clause in car parking policy where no parking currently exists should have stayed in LPS2</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The car parking shortfall equates to 28 bays (27 bays for the proposed 'Small Bar' and 1 bay for the proposed 'Shop (Barber)').</li> <li>Cash-in-lieu would need to be imposed in lieu of no car parking being provided.</li> </ul>
<p><u>Proposed Use</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed use is acceptable in this proposed location and would contribute to the vibrancy of an otherwise empty tenancy.</li> <li>Would support dual usage of Shop/Small bar as it offers day time activity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed small bar use is classified as an 'A' use under LPS2, while the shop is a 'P' use. The small bar use requires Council's discretion to support the proposed use while the shop use can be supported.</li> <li>The dual usage of Shop/Small Bar is proposed.</li> </ul>
Comments Received in Objection:	Officer Technical Comment:
<p><u>Proposed Use</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Intensified use (small bar) in this location is a concern.</li> <li>Do not support additional bars in the area. Already well serviced to meet the community (bar) needs at the detrimental loss of a predominantly daytime activity of Shop.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The intensified use of a small bar is noted.</li> <li>The prevalence of small bars already within the area is noted. The daytime activity of a shop is proposed at the front of the subject property. The shop use is a 'barber'.</li> </ul>
<p><u>Car Parking Shortfall</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No parking is unacceptable. The area is already lacking in parking in the evening when the small bar would be open.</li> <li>Car parking shortfall is of concern but the City will, based on past experience, will ignore this requirement for cash-in-lieu, of which the residents are yet to see any funds spent on providing additional parking within the Mount Lawley Activity Centre.</li> <li>Parking has always been an issue. When the Astor has a show on an extra 1000 people descend on the area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The impact of the car parking shortfall further affecting the lack of parking in the area is noted.</li> <li>A cash-in-lieu requirement for the shortfall in bays would most likely be imposed as condition of approval.</li> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>

**Summary of Submissions:**

Comments Received in Objection:	Officer Technical Comment:
<p><u>Misrepresentation of facts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Frequent mention by applicant that there is no other venue in the area offering what they propose to offer is not true.<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ The Flying Scotsman offers a cocktail bar (Defectors Bar) upstairs, similar to what is proposed.</li><li>○ The Caboose Bar has just been voted No. 4 craft beer venue in Australia.</li></ul></li><li>• The applicant states that the pricing of drinks will denote a high standard of ambience and manner of trade but also mentions they will be having “happy hours” twice a day.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Noted.</li> <li>• Noted. The City cannot control the number of happy hours an establishment offers.</li></ul>
<p><u>Access</u></p> <p>The two entries into the venue would be difficult to police.</p>	<p>Access to the site requires separate emergency egress and ingress points.</p>

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