



PROPOSAL TO CLOSE PORTION OF LACEPEDE DRIVE, SORRENTO
SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS FOLLOWING ADVERTISING
(CLOSED 27 AUGUST 2003)

| NO | SUBMISSION SUMMARY | COUNCIL'S RECOMMENDATION |
|----|--|--|
| 1. | <p>It won't visually affect me, but rules and guidelines are there for us to adhere to and rules shouldn't be changed to suit the applicant.</p> <p>The symmetry of the established street building line will be effected and I will be effected visually by the proposal when driving down the street.</p> <p>If you allow one owner to change the rules, how can you justify to the other owners they can't do it.</p> <p>Believe the applicant's justification is flawed. Cannot see any real justification behind the road verge closure request, and provides examples of other similar property in the locality that have made improvements to verges without the need for formal acquisition.</p> | <p>The City has are no specific 'rules' in place to deal with such road verge closure requests, however such requests need to be considered in accordance with Section 58 of the Land Administration Act 1997.</p> <p>The applicant has not advised the City of their intention to further develop the land sought to be acquired. This issue would need to be carefully assessed should any such application be made to the City for its approval in the future.</p> <p>Refer to comments above. Council needs to carefully look at road verge closure requests on individual merit.</p> <p>Noted. The applicant and other landowners within the City are able to undertake improvements to their road verges and have done so without the need for formal acquisition of verge land.</p> |
| 2. | <p>When the landowner purchased the property they should have been fully aware of the alignment of Lacepede Drive, its verge and the boundaries of the property.</p> <p>The proposal does not appear to be related to matters of safety or security. Narrowing of the verge could make the carriageway less safe.</p> <p>The proposal would benefit no one in the community other than the owner.</p> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>The proposal will not create an adverse impact upon traffic and pedestrian safety and manoeuvrability.</p> <p>Noted.</p> |
| 3. | <p>Establishment of a precedent whereby it may be difficult to refuse future claims of a similar nature. No changes should occur unless very strong evidence can be presented demonstrating that it is in the public interest, public safety and of benefit to the local community collectively.</p> <p>Traffic safety and vehicular sightline concerns. If the proposal is supported, any future building, fence, structure or landscaping (hedge) that could be erected in accordance with the revised alignments may reduce the warning</p> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>Refer to comments in 2 above.</p> |

**PROPOSAL TO CLOSE PORTION OF LACEPEDE DRIVE, SORRENTO
SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS FOLLOWING ADVERTISING
(CLOSED 27 AUGUST 2003)**

| | | |
|----|--|----------------------------|
| | time that a motorist would have in detecting a child running out from behind such structures towards the edge of Lacepede Drive. | |
| 4. | Same comments as contained in 3 above. | Refer comments in 3 above. |