

**Appendix 4 – Response to Objections (Informal)**

<b>Objection</b>	<b>Comment</b>
<p>Objector 1: Erotique Adult Centre 2/85-91 High Street, Melton</p>	<p>This objector has raised the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noise Concerns</li> <li>• Parking provision is not enough to cater for the number of patrons using the proposed Place of Assembly.</li> <li>• Children are unsupervised and exposed to the business.</li> <li>• Excess rubbish dumped on site.</li> <li>• Suitability of proposed use in an industrial area.</li> </ul>
<p>Objector 2: SIGN Perfection 3/85-91 High Street, Melton 8/85-91 High Street, Melton</p>	<p>This objector has raised the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noise Concerns</li> <li>• Parking provision is not enough to cater for the number of patrons using the proposed Place of Assembly.</li> <li>• Children are unsupervised and exposed to the adjacent adult business.</li> <li>• Excess rubbish dumped on site.</li> <li>• Suitability of proposed use in an industrial area.</li> </ul>
<p>Objector 3: Big Fish Aquarium 1/85-91 High Street, Melton</p>	<p>This objector has raised the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noise Concerns</li> <li>• Parking provision is not enough to cater for the number of patrons using the proposed Place of Assembly.</li> <li>• Children are unsupervised and roaming around the subject land, unaware of the danger of the industrial roads and adjacent businesses operating hazardously (welding etc.)</li> <li>• Excess rubbish dumped on site.</li> <li>• Suitability of proposed use in an industrial area.</li> </ul>
<p>Objector 4: Michael Watson 1/85-91 High Street Melton</p>	<p>This objector has raised the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Similar concerns as above.</li> </ul>
<p>Objector 5: Universal Automotive 6/85-91 High Street, Melton</p>	<p>This objector has raised the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noise Concerns</li> <li>• Parking provision is not enough to cater for the number of patrons using the proposed Place of Assembly.</li> <li>• Children are unsupervised and roaming around the subject land, and on occasion inside the premises.</li> <li>• Excess rubbish dumped on site.</li> <li>• Suitability of proposed use in an industrial area.</li> <li>• Needs 24/7 access to entry for large vehicles including trucks and forklifts.</li> </ul>

<p>Objector 6: Bundy's Engineering and Welding Services 7/85-91 High Street, Melton</p>	<p>This objector has raised the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noise Concerns</li> <li>• Parking provision is not enough to cater for the number of patrons using the proposed Place of Assembly.</li> <li>• Children are unsupervised and roaming around the subject land, and on occasion inside the premises.</li> <li>• Excess rubbish dumped on site.</li> <li>• Suitability of proposed use in an industrial area.</li> <li>• Needs 24/7 access to entry for large vehicles including trucks and forklifts.</li> </ul>
<p>Objector 7: Michael &amp; Anne Smith 13 Dunvegan Drive, Kurunjang</p>	<p>The objector has raised the following concerns</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Probability of tenant vacating the property due to conflict with proposed use.</li> </ul>
<p>Objector 8: MBCM Strata Specialists Owners Corporation No. 32932Q 85-91 High Street, Melton</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parking provision is not enough to cater for the number of patrons using the proposed Place of Assembly.</li> <li>• Noise Concerns</li> <li>• OHS Risks and Public Liability Risks</li> <li>• Excess rubbish dumped on site.</li> <li>• Suitability of proposed use within an industrial area</li> </ul>

**Response to Noise Concerns**

A number of objectors have raised concerns about noise emanating from the subject land at the time of operation of the Place of Assembly. Objectors have stated that it is difficult to have face-to-face conversations and adversely affects the productivity of surrounding businesses, especially in those where careful operations are required (i.e. welding and mechanical work).

**Response to Rubbish Concerns**

A number of objectors have raised concerns about excess rubbish dumped outside of Warehouse 5, which has led to the presence of vermin such as mice that have been roaming in the common property of the parent lot.

**Response to Car Parking Provision**

A number of objectors have raised concerns over the provision of car parking. It is noted that the applicant has stated that there are approximately 45 patrons whom attend the subject land at any one time, however objector commentary has stated the contrary. It is stated that the amount of parked cars on the parent lot and in surrounding streets has limited the ability for other vehicles ancillary to adjacent businesses to enter and exit the site safely, and has on some occasions, totally restricted vehicle access whatsoever. Similarly, the amount of parked cars causes safety risks to employees and customers of other businesses, as many vehicles are entering and exiting the complex at the same time. Some objectors also operate

businesses which require the use of forklifts and trucks, and are restricted by the amount of cars parked on the common property.

**Response to suitability of the proposal in an Industrial area**

All objectors have raised concerns about the suitability of this proposal in the immediate industrial setting in which the subject land is located. It is evident that dozens of patrons are attending the subject land multiple times a week, and it is stated that a third of these attendees are generally comprised of children. Objectors have made commentary revealing that children are often left unattended and tend to roam around the subject land, into other tenancies and onto High Street. CCTV footage has confirmed multiple cases where unsupervised children have entered into mechanic and engineering tenancies where employees have been welding or operating other potentially hazardous equipment.

Similarly, one of the tenancies contains an adult sex store, and the objector from that tenancy is discomforted that many children are roaming around within meters of that store.

A number of objectors have also raised the concern that there is an underlying public liability issue, whereby no clear legal process has been accounted for if an unsupervised child happens to get injured by the operation of adjacent land uses within the confines of their premises.

Given the above, it is considered that the grounds of objection have genuine planning merit and support the decision to refuse the application.