

Hopkins Street

D16/26097

Summary of submissions responding to Council's 20 January 2016 "Intention to declare" resolution.

### Objections

Reason/s	Number of properties commenting	Comment/Response
Apportionment is inequitable. Scheme boundary should be expanded to include all properties within the precinct/area	3	Benefit to wider community is acknowledged by substantial Council contribution. Scheme boundary was difficult to define and after due consideration restricted to properties that depend upon Hopkins St for access. Expansion of the scheme boundary to include these properties would: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Reduce the chance that a majority of the contributors would support the scheme</li><li>• Make apportionment of any future road extension complex &amp; difficult</li><li>• Not reduce the costs apportioned to properties currently within the scheme boundary.</li></ul>
Would be more equitable if project cost was funded by rates	1	Council Special Charge Scheme Policy indicates that financing some of the cost of infrastructure works, utilising the LGA provisions, is an equitable approach.
Prefer street to remain unsealed	1	Noted
2008 Citizen Jury determined that roads should not be sealed	1	Noted
Standard of work is inappropriate. Unnecessary expense. Use alternative surface treatments.	1	Noted
No benefit to property. Apportionment is excessive.	1	Access benefit has been apportioned equally to all properties that are dependent upon Hopkins for access.
Traffic volumes, and therefore dust nuisance, are unchanged in over 10 years. Dust could be reduced by introducing speed controls and then road sealing is unnecessary.	2	Comment is accurate, however the feedback to Council indicates that many owners would like street constructed to reduce dust nuisance
Strategic Land use planning documents support maintenance of local character and informal appearance	1	Proposed works aim to retain informal appearance by retaining open table drains and not constructing a separate pathway
Council should not be swayed by a minority	1	Noted

## Supporting submissions

Comments	Number of properties commenting	Response
Fully supportive of scope of works	2	Noted
Why are properties which will gain improved access benefit, (located outside the scheme boundary), excluded from the Scheme	2	<p>Benefit to these properties is acknowledged by substantial Council financial contribution to reflect the wider community benefit. Scheme boundary was difficult to define and after due consideration restricted to properties that depend upon Hopkins St for access. Expansion of the scheme boundary to include these properties would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Reduce the chance that a majority of the contributors would support the scheme</li><li>• Make apportionment of any future road extension complex &amp; difficult</li><li>• Not reduce the costs apportioned to properties currently within the scheme boundary.</li></ul>
Suggests signage improvement to minimise inadvertent use of street	1	Council will investigate improved signage as part of the project