

**PROPOSED SINGLE BEDROOM DWELLINGS
SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS FOLLOWING ADVERTISING**

NO	NAME OF SUBMITTER	DESCRIPTION OF AFFECTED PROPERTY	SUBMISSION SUMMARY	OFFICER OR COUNCIL'S RECOMMENDATION
1	Allen Lavis	9 Yatala Close, Currambine	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A building covenant of a minimum house area of 125m² applies to this block. • Four extra cars in this short cul-de-sac is a safety hazard for the kids who use this street as a playground. • My house would lose value. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The building covenants have expired and no longer apply. • The proposed development satisfies R-codes requirements for density and parking. • This is not a planning consideration.
2	Gilbert & Carol Rhodes	15 Yatala Close, Currambine	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building covenants previously applied to this lot and have resulted in larger developments – this development will be inconsistent with surrounding residential development. • Concerns regarding increase in traffic and where all cars are going to park 'only one visitor space is provided'. • We face a lack of privacy with three of the four units looking into our property. • Concerns regarding potential anti-social behaviour by tenants. • Devaluation of property. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The building covenants have expired and no longer apply. The proposal is consistent with the Residential R-40 provisions of the R-Codes. • No visitor parking spaces are required by the R-Codes, however one is provided, all units have their own parking space. • The units are all single storey and overlooking should be prevented by the dividing fence between the properties. • This is not a planning consideration. • This is not a planning consideration.
3	Guy Longthorn	75 Caledonia Ave, Currambine	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The value of my property will be reduced. • The noise increase will be excessive. • There will be a parking problem • This level of housing density is excessive for the area. • There will be a child safety issue because of the additional traffic. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is not a planning consideration. • This is unable to be assessed. • Adequate parking is provided. • The proposal complies with the Residential R-40 requirements of the R-Codes. • The proposed development satisfies R-codes requirements for density and parking.

**PROPOSED SINGLE BEDROOM DWELLINGS
SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS FOLLOWING ADVERTISING**

NO	NAME OF SUBMITTER	DESCRIPTION OF AFFECTED PROPERTY	SUBMISSION SUMMARY	OFFICER OR COUNCIL'S RECOMMENDATION
4	Carmelo & Cheryl Allia	17 Yatala Close, Currambine	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns regarding restrictive covenant. The location of the proposed unit development is in a cul de sac, which would affect matters such as access, parking for tenants and visitors, location of bins and traffic congestion. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The building covenants have expired and no longer apply. Access should not be affected. All parking for tenants and visitors is contained within the subject site. The proposed development complies with the R-40 R-Codes requirements.
5	Francis McKeown & Gillian*	6 Straitsman Way, Currambine	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We consider that a single lot with 4 single bedroom units would be an eyesore. The increase in traffic would cause us great concern for our children's safety. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The majority of the development will not be visible from the street. The proposed development satisfies R-codes requirements for density and parking.
6	Liz & Greg Jackson	5 Yatala Close, Currambine	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We were told these blocks were to be single dwelling lots when we moved here 10 years ago. We have young children and already the traffic volume is heavy to the extreme. There is also excessive noise due to traffic volume and with the proposal the problem will be exacerbated. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The building covenants have expired and no longer apply. The proposed development satisfies R-codes requirements for density and parking.
7	Martin & Sheree Walker	8 Yatala Close, Currambine	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I am concerned about our children who play in the street. This development will mean extra cars in and out. Also, not being normal house frontage will affect our outlook and maybe our property values. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed development satisfies R-codes requirements for density and parking. The proposed development complies with the Residential R-40 requirements of the R-Codes. Property values are not a planning consideration.
8	Marie Bouquet & Laurie Williams	3/2 Straitsman Way, Currambine	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This will devalue our property. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is not a planning consideration

**PROPOSED SINGLE BEDROOM DWELLINGS
SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS FOLLOWING ADVERTISING**

NO	NAME OF SUBMITTER	DESCRIPTION OF AFFECTED PROPERTY	SUBMISSION SUMMARY	OFFICER OR COUNCIL'S RECOMMENDATION
9	Stuart & Doris Buck	4 Arabella Mews, Currambine	No Objection with no comments	Nil