

SUMMARY OF WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS
POSSIBLE DISCONTINUANCE AND POSSIBLE SALE OF PART OF ANDREW FAIRLEY AVENUE, SHEPPARTON (“Road”)

No	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER	FOR/ AGAINST PROPOSAL	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	REQUEST TO BE HEARD YES/NO
Folder 1, Tab 1				
1.1		Against	<p>Concerned that SPC Ardmona Limited (“SPCA”) has not provided details or plans justifying why the Road needs to close.</p> <p>Disappointed that Council proceeded with the proposal without conducting its own investigations first.</p> <p>Council’s submissions process was problematic as submissions were due on a public holiday, namely Easter Monday.</p> <p>In view of the traffic management problems, SPCA will need to provide detailed information before Council makes a decision.</p>	No
1.2		Against	As per 1.1 above.	No
1.3		Against	As per 1.1 above.	No
1.4		Against	As per 1.1 above.	No
1.5		Against	As per 1.1 above.	No
Folder 1, Tab 2				
2.1		Against	<p>Strongly opposes the discontinuance.</p> <p>The Road is an integral part of the west-east city bypass, and an increasingly popular route for residents and visitors.</p> <p>Industrial and residential development in the east depends on good access roads and the closure of the Road will limit and more likely cut off future planning options.</p> <p>As a community we must not plan for the future in one business, but ensure road and traffic conditions are effective for all residents and businesses.</p>	No
2.2		Against	As per 2.1 above.	No
2.3		Against	As per 2.1 above.	No
2.4		Against	As per 2.1 above.	No
2.5		Against	As per 2.1 above.	No

No	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER	FOR/ AGAINST PROPOSAL	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	REQUEST TO BE HEARD YES/NO
2.6		Against	As per 2.1 above.	No
2.7		Against	As per 2.1 above.	No
2.8		Against	As per 2.1 above. The Road is the daily route to and from work.	No
2.9		Against	As per 2.1 above.	No
2.10		Against	As per 2.1 above. The Road is the daily route to and from work.	No
2.11		Against	As per 2.1 above.	No
2.12		Against	As per 2.1 above.	No
2.13		Against	As per 2.1 above.	No
2.14		Against	As per 2.1 above.	No
2.15		Against	As per 2.1 above.	No
2.16		Against	As per 2.1 above.	No
2.17		Against	As per 2.1 above.	No
2.18		Against	As per 2.1 above.	No
2.19		Against	As per 2.1 above.	No
2.20		Against	As per 2.1 above.	No
2.21		Against	As per 2.1 above.	No
2.22		Against	As per 2.1 above.	No
2.23		Against	As per 2.1 above.	No
2.24		Against	As per 2.1 above.	No
2.25		Against	As per 2.1 above.	No
2.26		Against	As per 2.1 above.	No
2.27		Against	As per 2.1 above	No
Folder 1, Tab 3				
3.1		Against	Totally opposed to the discontinuance. The discontinuance makes no sense given current traffic flows. The Road is easily accessed from the west and provides reasonable flow around the city and to the residential and business areas to the east.	No

No	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER	FOR/ AGAINST PROPOSAL	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	REQUEST TO BE HEARD YES/NO
			<p>The closure of the Road will result in an estimated 6,500 to 7,000 more vehicles on other east-west crossing roads that are already experiencing traffic delays.</p> <p>An alternative solution should be found. The Council should maintain its 1996 position, that the closure of the Road is not on the agenda.</p>	
3.2		Against	As per 3.1 above.	No
3.3		Against	As per 3.1 above.	No
3.4		Against	As per 3.1 above.	No
3.5		Against	As per 3.1 above.	No
3.6		Against	As per 3.1 above.	No
3.7		Against	As per 3.1 above.	No
3.8		Against	As per 3.1 above.	No
3.9		Against	As per 3.1 above.	No
3.10		Against	As per 3.1 above	No
Folder 1, Tab 4				
4.1		Against	<p>Roads are for traffic and to close a road and sell it the Council would need to consider that road to be no longer required for traffic.</p> <p>The Road is traversed by 7000 vehicles per day and clearly is needed even more now than in 1996.</p> <p>Keep the Road open.</p>	No
4.2		Against	As per 4.1 above.	No
4.3		Against	As per 4.1 above.	No
4.4		Against	As per 4.1 above.	No
Folder 1, Tab 5				
5.1		Against	<p>Strongly object, with extreme displeasure, to the proposed discontinuance of the Road.</p> <p>The closure of the Road is contrary to, and inconsistent with, Council's policies and strategies.</p>	No
5.2		Against	As per 5.1 above.	No

No	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER	FOR/ AGAINST PROPOSAL	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	REQUEST TO BE HEARD YES/NO
5.3		Against	As per 5.1 above.	No
5.4		Against	As per 5.1 above.	No
5.5		Against	As per 5.1 above.	No
5.6		Against	As per 5.1 above.	No
5.7		Against	As per 5.1 above.	No
5.8		Against	As per 5.1 above.	No
5.9		Against	As per 5.1 above.	No
5.10		Against	As per 5.1 above.	No
5.11		Against	As per 5.1 above.	No
5.12		Against	As per 5.1 above.	No
5.13		Against	As per 5.1 above.	No
5.14		Against	As per 5.1 above.	No
5.15		Against	As per 5.1 above.	No
5.16		Against	As per 5.1 above.	No
5.17		Against	As per 5.1 above.	No
5.18		Against	As per 5.1 above.	No
5.19		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.20		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.21		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.22		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.23		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.24		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.25		Against	<p>As per 5.1 above.</p> <p>There are alternatives that have not been seriously considered and a good engineer could solve the problem. Some alternative include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SPCA could go under the Road; • A conveyor belt or rollers with cables pulling the bins could go over or under the Road. <p>What the Council has done is legally defective and invalid. Council must stop the process to close the Road.</p>	Yes

No	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER	FOR/ AGAINST PROPOSAL	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	REQUEST TO BE HEARD YES/NO
5.26		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.27		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.28		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.29		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.30		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.31		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.32		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.33		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.34		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.35		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.36		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.37		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.38		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.39		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.40		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.41		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.42		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.43		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.44		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.45		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.46		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.47		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.48		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.49		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.50		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.51		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.52		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.53		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.54		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes

No	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER	FOR/ AGAINST PROPOSAL	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	REQUEST TO BE HEARD YES/NO
5.55		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.56		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.57		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.58		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.59		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.60		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.61		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.62		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.63		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.64		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.65		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.66		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.67		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.68		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.69		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.70		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.71		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.72		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.73		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.74		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.75		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.76		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.77		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.78		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.79		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.80		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.81		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.82		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.83		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes

No	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER	FOR/ AGAINST PROPOSAL	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	REQUEST TO BE HEARD YES/NO
5.84		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.85		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.86		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.87		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.88		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.89		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.90		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.91		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.92		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.93		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.94		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.95		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.96		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.97		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.98		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.99		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.100		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.101		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.102		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.103		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.104		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.105		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.106		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.107		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.108		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.109		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.110		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.111		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.112		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes

No	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER	FOR/ AGAINST PROPOSAL	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	REQUEST TO BE HEARD YES/NO
5.113		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.114		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.115		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.116		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.117		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.118		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.119		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.120		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.121		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.122		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.123		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.124		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.125		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.126		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.127		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.128		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.129		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.130		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.131		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.132		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.133		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.134		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.135		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.136		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.137		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.138		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.139		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.140		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.141		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes

No	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER	FOR/ AGAINST PROPOSAL	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	REQUEST TO BE HEARD YES/NO
5.142		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.143		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.144		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.145		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.146		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.147		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.148		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.149		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.150		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.151		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.152		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.153		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.154		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.155		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.156		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.157		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.158		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.159		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.160		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.161		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.162		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.163		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.164		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.165		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.166		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.167		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.168		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.169		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
5.170		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes

No	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER	FOR/ AGAINST PROPOSAL	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	REQUEST TO BE HEARD YES/NO
5.171		Against	As per 5.1 above.	Yes
Folder 1, Tab 6				
6.1		Against	<p>Strongly oppose the closure of the Road.</p> <p>The Road is an integral west-east inner bypass that has become increasingly popular in recent times.</p> <p>The closure of the Road will result in an estimated 6,500 to 7,000 more vehicles on other east-west crossing roads that are already experiencing traffic delays.</p> <p>If the Road is closed it will be permanent. It is imperative that long term planning is not undermined by a short term 'fix'.</p> <p>This is a very serious decision for the Council. However, there is little information from SPCA and the Council has not carried out its own investigation on the effects of the Road closure.</p> <p>Keep the Road open.</p>	No
6.2		Against	As per 6.1 above	Yes
6.3		Against	As per 6.1 above	No
6.4		Against	As per 6.1 above	No
6.5		Against	As per 6.1 above	No
Folder 2, Tab 7				
7.1		Against	Strongly object, with extreme displeasure, to the Council adopting a motion of intent to close the Road and sell it to SPCA.	No
7.2		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.3		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.4		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.5		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.6		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.7		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.8		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.9		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.10		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No

No	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER	FOR/ AGAINST PROPOSAL	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	REQUEST TO BE HEARD YES/NO
7.11		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.12		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.13		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.14		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.15		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.16		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.17		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.18		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.19		Against	As per 7.1 above.	
7.20		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.21		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.22		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.23		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.24		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.25		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.26		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.27		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.28		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.29		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.30		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.31		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.32		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.33		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.34		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.35		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.36		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.37		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.38		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.39		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No

No	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER	FOR/ AGAINST PROPOSAL	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	REQUEST TO BE HEARD YES/NO
7.40		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.41		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.42		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.43		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.44		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.45		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.46		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.47		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.48		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.49		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.50		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.51		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.52		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.53		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.54		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.55		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.56		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.57		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.58		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.59		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.60		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.61		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.62		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.63		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.64		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.65		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.66		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.67		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.68		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No

No	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER	FOR/ AGAINST PROPOSAL	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	REQUEST TO BE HEARD YES/NO
7.69		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.70		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.71		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.72		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.73		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.74		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.75		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.76		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.77		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.78		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.79		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.80		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.81		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.82		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.83		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.84		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.85		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.86		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.87		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.88		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.89		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.90		Against	As per 7.1 above. It's not the councils road to close its ratepayers' road. This will effect a number of business in the area that could potentially close. This will also cause major traffic congestion.	No
7.91		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.92		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.93		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.94		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.95		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No

No	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER	FOR/ AGAINST PROPOSAL	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	REQUEST TO BE HEARD YES/NO
7.96		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.97		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.98		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.99		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.100		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.101		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.102		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.103		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.104		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.105		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.106		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.107		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.108		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.109		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.110		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.111		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.112		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.113		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.114		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.115		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.116		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.117		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.118		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.119		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.120		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.121		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.122		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.123		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.124		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No

No	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER	FOR/ AGAINST PROPOSAL	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	REQUEST TO BE HEARD YES/NO
7.125		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.126		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.127		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.128		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.129		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.130		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.131		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.132		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.133		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.134		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.135		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.136		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.137		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.138		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.139		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.140		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.141		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.142		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.143		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.144		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.145		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.146		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.147		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.148		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.149		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.150		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.151		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.152		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.153		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes

No	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER	FOR/ AGAINST PROPOSAL	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	REQUEST TO BE HEARD YES/NO
7.154		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.155		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.156		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.157		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.158		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.159		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.160		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.161		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.162		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.163		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.164		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.165		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.166		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.167		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.168		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.169		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.170		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.171		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.172		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.173		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.174		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.175		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.176		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.177		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.178		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.179		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.180		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.181		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.182		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes

No	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER	FOR/ AGAINST PROPOSAL	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	REQUEST TO BE HEARD YES/NO
7.183		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.184		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.185		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.186		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.187		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.188		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.189		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.190		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.191		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.192		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.193		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.194		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.195		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.196		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.197		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.198		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.199		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.200		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.201		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.202		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.203		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.204		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.205		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.206		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.207		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.208		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.209		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.210		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.211		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes

No	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER	FOR/ AGAINST PROPOSAL	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	REQUEST TO BE HEARD YES/NO
7.212		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.213		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.214		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.215		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.216		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.217		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.218		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.219		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.220		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.221		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.222		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.223		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.224		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.225		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.226		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.227		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.228		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.229		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.230		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.231		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.232		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.233		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.234		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.235		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.236		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.237		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.238		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.239		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.240		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes

No	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER	FOR/ AGAINST PROPOSAL	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	REQUEST TO BE HEARD YES/NO
7.241		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.242		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.243		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.244		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.245		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.246		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.247		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.248		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.249		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.250		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.251		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.252		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.253		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.254		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.255		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.256		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.257		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.258		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.259		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.260		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.261		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.262		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.263		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.264		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.265		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.266		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.267		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.268		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.269		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes

No	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER	FOR/ AGAINST PROPOSAL	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	REQUEST TO BE HEARD YES/NO
7.270		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.271		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.272		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.273		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.274		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.275		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.276		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.277		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.278		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.279		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.280		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.281		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.282		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.283		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.284		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.285		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.286		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.287		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.288		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.289		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.290		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.291		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.292		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.293		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.294		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.295		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.296		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.297		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.298		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes

No	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER	FOR/ AGAINST PROPOSAL	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	REQUEST TO BE HEARD YES/NO
7.299		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.300		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.301		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.302		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.303		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.304		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.305		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.306		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.307		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.308		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.309		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.310		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.311		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.312		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.313		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.314		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.315		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.316		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.317		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.318		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.319		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.320		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.321		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.322		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.323		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.324		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.325		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.326		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.327		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes

No	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER	FOR/ AGAINST PROPOSAL	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	REQUEST TO BE HEARD YES/NO
7.328		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.329		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.330		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.331		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.332		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.333		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.334		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.335		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.336		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.337		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.338		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.339		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.340		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.341		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.342		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.343		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.344		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.345		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.346		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.347		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.348		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.349		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.350		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.351		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.352		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.353		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.354		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.355		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.356		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes

No	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER	FOR/ AGAINST PROPOSAL	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	REQUEST TO BE HEARD YES/NO
7.357		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.358		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.359		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.360		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.361		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.362		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.363		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.364		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.365		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.366		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.367		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.368		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.369		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.370		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.371		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.372		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.373		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.374		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.375		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.376		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.377		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.378		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.379		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.380		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.381		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.382		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.383		Against	As per 7.1 above. Was in charge of capital projects for SPC and thinks there is other and better options!	Yes
7.384		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes

No	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER	FOR/ AGAINST PROPOSAL	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	REQUEST TO BE HEARD YES/NO
7.385		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.386		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.387		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.388		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.389		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.390		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.391		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.392		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.393		Against	As per 7.1 above.	yes
7.394		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.395		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.396		Against	As per 7.1 above.	
7.397		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.398		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.399		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.400		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.401		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.402		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.403		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.404		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.405		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.406		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.407		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.408		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.409		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.410		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.411		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.412		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.413		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes

No	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER	FOR/ AGAINST PROPOSAL	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	REQUEST TO BE HEARD YES/NO
7.414		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.415		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.416		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.417		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.418		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.419		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.420		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.421		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.422		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.423		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.424		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.425		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.426		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.427		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.428		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.429		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.430		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.431		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.432		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.433		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.434		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.435		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.436		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.437		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.438		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.439		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.440		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.441		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.442		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes

No	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER	FOR/ AGAINST PROPOSAL	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	REQUEST TO BE HEARD YES/NO
7.443		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.444		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.445		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.446		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.447		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.448		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.449		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.450		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.451		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.452		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.453		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.454		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.455		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.456		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.457		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.458		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes (to speak on behalf)
7.459		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.460		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.461		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.462		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.463		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.464		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.465		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.466		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.467		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.468		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.469		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.470		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.471		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes

No	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER	FOR/ AGAINST PROPOSAL	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	REQUEST TO BE HEARD YES/NO
7.472		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.473		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.474		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.475		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.476		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.477		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.478		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.479		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.480		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.481		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.482		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.483		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.484		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.485		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.486		Against	As per 7.1 above.	Yes
7.487		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.488		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.489		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.490		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.491		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.492		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.493		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.494		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.495		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.496		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.497		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.498		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.499		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.500		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No

No	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER	FOR/ AGAINST PROPOSAL	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	REQUEST TO BE HEARD YES/NO
7.501		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.502		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.503		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.504		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.505		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.506		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.507		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.508		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.509		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
7.510		Against	As per 7.1 above.	No
Folder 3, Tab 8				
8.1		Against	The Road is an important traffic link. The Council has not done sufficient investigations and should reconsider the proposal.	No
8.2		Against	The discontinuance is a backwards step. There is insufficient information for the Council to make an informed decision. The Council is ignoring the community and the proposal should be abandoned.	No
8.3		Against	The Road is a major access route. The land to the east continues to develop and long term planning principles require the retention of the Road. Strongly object to the discontinuance. An alternative solution should be found.	No
8.4		Against	The Road is an important connection for the community, including emergency services and businesses. The impact of the discontinuance would be significant, including traffic congestion and gridlock. Other routes are prone to flooding. Trade waste incidents along the train line will create further issues. The discontinuance will starve off business and growth..	No
8.5		Against	SPCA is not an efficient business and should look for solutions internally, that	No

No	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER	FOR/ AGAINST PROPOSAL	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	REQUEST TO BE HEARD YES/NO
			do not require the discontinuance. The Road is required by the community for access. SPCA should find its own solutions.	
8.6		Against	There are only three east-west connectors. The discontinuance of the Road would cause traffic havoc. The discontinuance could create delays that could cost a life by delaying emergency services. It will also delay business. SPCA should not be given this opportunity, they have other alternative land to use.	No
8.7		Against	As per 8.2 above.	No
8.8		Against	No plans have been provided of the impact on traffic flows. The discontinuance will cause traffic congestion. The submission poses a number of questions about the impact on particular roads and emergency services.	No
8.9		Against	As per 8.8 above. Please do not close the Road.	No
8.10		Against	The Road is used to travel to and from work and it would be extremely inconvenient if the Road is closed. There will also be life threatening delays to emergency services. If the Road is closed the Council will be directly responsible for any deaths that might have otherwise been avoided.	No
8.11		Against	The Council should look at the 1996 documents. The Council should confirm whether a promise has been made to SPCA to fast track the discontinuance.	Yes
8.12		Against	The Road is a vital piece of infrastructure. The proposal is detrimental to business and growth in Lockwood Road. The outcome in 1996 was the correct one. SPCA should find an alternative engineering solution.	Yes
8.13		Against	The Road is required for traffic, up to 7000 movements per day. SPCA are not the only users of the Road and should not have exclusive use of the Road. The impact of closing the Road will be significant and cause	No

No	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER	FOR/ AGAINST PROPOSAL	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	REQUEST TO BE HEARD YES/NO
			congestion and increased risk on other Roads.	
8.14		Against	The canning industry struggles to maintain profitability. The discontinuance of the Road will not save SPCA. SPCA fails to utilise existing buildings. A tunnel is an alternative. The Council should retain the Road as a thoroughfare for all.	No
8.15		Against	Strong objection to the closure of the Road. The Council does not appear to be having due regard to the impact of the discontinuance on local businesses and residents. SPCA should find an alternative solution. We, and our customers, use the Road every day. Keep the Road open.	No
8.16		Against	I use the Road up to 6 to 10 times per day. The discontinuance will force traffic on to other roads that are already congested with traffic. Wheeler Street does not have footpaths and it is not a safe alternative route for pedestrians and cyclists.	No
8.17		Against	I use the Road to get to and from school. I do not want to have to go a longer and less safe alternative route, which would be the case if the Road is closed.	No
8.18		Against	The Road is an important east-west link. If the Road is closed the traffic will be forced onto the other east-west links that are already congested with traffic. The closure of the Road will have detrimental impact on the surrounding residents and businesses. The community interests should be more important than the interests of SPCA that has alternative options to improve the efficiency of its operations.	No
8.19		Against	SPCA are an important industry, however, they are using goodwill to renew an old request to discontinue the Road. Land to the east continues to develop and grow. Transport to this area is an important issue and closing the Road will put pressure on other routes. SPCA have not planned and developed their sites well. SPCA would be better served applying the funding to purposes other than closing and developing public roads.	No

No	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER	FOR/ AGAINST PROPOSAL	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	REQUEST TO BE HEARD YES/NO
8.20		Against	As per 8.18 above.	No
8.21		Against	As per 8.18 above.	No
8.22		Against	<p>The whole community will be affected by the closure of the Road. The Road is an important bypass and east-west connector.</p> <p>The closure of the Road will cause more traffic congestion on other roads.</p> <p>This is an opportunistic attempt by SPCA. SPCA should pursue other alternatives.</p> <p>This proposal will bring more large trucks into Shepparton.</p> <p>SPCA will not be in Shepparton forever. The closure of the Road will be permanent.</p> <p>The Road should not be sold to SPCA. If so, it should be conditional upon the Road being returned to the Council within 3 years.</p>	No
8.23		Against	<p>The proposal is extremely displeasing and inconsistent with Council's policies and strategies.</p> <p>The traffic that would result on Williams Road if the Road is closed would be dangerous. Amongst other things, Williams Road has a bus route and on-street parking. Drainage and flooding is also an issue in this area.</p> <p>SPCA should solve their problems on the existing site.</p> <p>Emergency services would be affected and response times will increase.</p> <p>A conveyer system (or equivalent) should be used instead.</p>	No
8.24		Against	The closure of the Road will increase our business costs and may put my father and I out of work.	No
8.25		Against	<p>The closure of the Road will put extra strain on other roads. The Road is a major link road from the city to the eastern land.</p> <p>The Road should not be closed and the Council should help SPCA in another way.</p>	No
8.26		Against	<p>The Road should not be closed. The Road belongs to the community and the Council should listen to the community.</p> <p>I support SPCA but do not believe that SPCA cannot survive without the Road.</p>	No
8.27		Against	<p>The Road is a major link road across the railway. The other link roads are already congested with traffic, especially in peak times.</p> <p>There will be safety concerns for the other link roads if the Road is closed,</p>	No

No	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER	FOR/ AGAINST PROPOSAL	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	REQUEST TO BE HEARD YES/NO
			<p>due to congestion. The community's safety must be paramount. Emergency services will be delayed putting lives at risk.</p> <p>Other alternatives should be looked at to help SPCA, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Constructing an overpass; • Constructing an underpass or tunnel; • Request SPCA to submit alternative development plans; • Lease the Road to SPCA to the Road can be reopened in the future. 	
8.28		Against	<p>Some of the history of the Road is described.</p> <p>SPCA have a lot of land across the Road. Surely SPCA can utilise that land.</p> <p>School traffic is especially problematic.</p> <p>What will happen if the railways are shunting at High Street and at Fryers Street?</p>	No
8.29		Against	<p>It is a big claim that the discontinuance will make SPCA 3-5% more efficient.</p> <p>The closure of the Road will make many other businesses less efficient. The Road is a main thoroughfare to get across the railway.</p> <p>The Chamber of Commerce does not represent all businesses.</p> <p>SPCA should look at other options and alternatives.</p> <p>The Road must remain open.</p>	No
8.30		Against	<p>Strongly object to the discontinuance.</p> <p>The closure of the Road will detrimentally affect my business.</p> <p>My business trying to grow and I will pick up less business with less through traffic along the Road.</p> <p>SPCA are not the only ones at stake. The cumulative impact on the smaller businesses is significant.</p> <p>The Road belongs to the community and SPCA should not be allowed to buy the Road with public funding.</p>	No
8.31		Against	<p>A lot of traffic uses the Road and the Road is already a nightmare at certain times.</p> <p>The other east-west links will perform worse if the Road is closed.</p> <p>SPCA should pursue an alternative option that will be fairer to the community.</p> <p>SPCA have already received enough charity.</p>	No
8.32		Against	Opposes the proposal. The Road provides direct access to our property for	No

No	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER	FOR/ AGAINST PROPOSAL	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	REQUEST TO BE HEARD YES/NO
			<p>residents and visitors.</p> <p>Tourism is an important economic driver and if the Road is closed there will detrimental financial consequences for parts of the Shepparton economy.</p>	
8.33		Against	<p>Deeply concerned by the proposal.</p> <p>The proposal is extremely short-sighted and would result in much traffic chaos.</p> <p>The Council should make travelling around Shepparton easier for the community.</p> <p>The proposal by SPCA should be refused.</p>	No
8.34		Against	<p>The Road involves a railway crossing and alternative east-west routes are busy enough already.</p> <p>A simple bridge or underpass would be alternative solutions, or the roadway could travel straight to the roundabout at Old Dookie Road from the railway.</p> <p>The Road could be closed for the construction period to facilitate this.</p>	No
8.35		Against	<p>An alternative "win-win" solution is to construct an underpass or overpass (or both). This design option must be explored. Any solution must improve traffic flow, not make it more difficult.</p> <p>Traffic analysis must be undertaken during school term.</p>	No
8.36		Against	<p>The traffic that would result on Byass Street if the Road is closed would detrimentally affect our business.</p> <p>It would be equivalent to an extra 2500 vehicle movements travelling along Byass Street per day.</p> <p>This would make accessing our site difficult for trades customers.</p> <p>Closing the Road will bring more heavy vehicles into Shepparton causing safety concerns. The Road is a vital east-west link and emergency services will be delayed if the Road is closed.</p>	No
8.37		Against	<p>The discontinuance would cause traffic congestion and have other detrimental impacts.</p> <p>The Council has only received preliminary plans from SPCA. Further traffic impact assessment is required to enable the Council to make an informed decision.</p> <p>It is uncertain if submitters will be provided with access to the documents that have informed the process to date.</p> <p>It suggests that 28 notice is inadequate given the importance of the issue to</p>	No

No	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER	FOR/ AGAINST PROPOSAL	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	REQUEST TO BE HEARD YES/NO
			<p>the community.</p> <p>The Council is requested to recommence the process providing 3 months for submissions to be lodged.</p>	
8.38		Against	<p>The estimate by SPCA of 3-5% efficiency gains are considered to be optimistic.</p> <p>The fruit handling area could be redesigned so that no part of the Road is required for fruit handling.</p> <p>There are likely to be some inefficiencies if the boom gates remain, but challenge that the increase in efficiency will be anything close to 3-5%.</p> <p>Alternative designs, such as an overpass or underpass, should be explored.</p> <p>The Road is complicated by the location of the high pressure water pipeline in the Road reserve.</p> <p>SPCA should work through alternative solutions in consultation with other community members.</p>	No
8.39		Against	<p>The closure of the Road would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jeopardise the safety of workers and residents located in the land to the east of the Road; • Create dangerous congestion on other roads; • Force school children to travel further; • Detrimentially impact small businesses; • Inconvenience the community. <p>The closure of the Road will not guarantee SPCA. This is a short-sighted proposal. SPCA should consider moving its operations</p> <p>Alternative options should be considered, including tunnel and conveyor belt systems.</p>	No
8.40		Against	<p>Strongly opposed to the proposal.</p> <p>We frequently use the Road for our small business. The closure of the Road will cause us delay and will increase operating costs of our business.</p> <p>The Council should improve road access around Shepparton, not reduce it making our business less viable.</p> <p>An alternative solution is required from SPCA.</p> <p>It is unfair to close the Road.</p>	Yes
8.41		Against	It is wrong to close the Road for SPCA as SPCA is not viable in the long	No

No	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER	FOR/ AGAINST PROPOSAL	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	REQUEST TO BE HEARD YES/NO
			<p>term.</p> <p>If the Road is closed, the Council will need to install a new east-west link over the railway line. There is currently only one real alternative east-west link as Byass Street is prone to flooding.</p> <p>What are the costs of the upgrade works required to other roads that will be required if the Road is closed?</p> <p>The Council should get its own house in order, before considering such an important issue.</p>	
8.42		Against	<p>Our small business is situated in Lockwood Road and we need the Road to stay open for our business to survive and grow.</p> <p>The Road is extremely important to us as it provides our business exposure to passing traffic. If the Road is closed we will lose potential customers and devalue our investment.</p> <p>Please do not let our business suffer by closing the Road. Small business is extremely important to Shepparton.</p> <p>We plead for the Council and SPCA to find an alternative solution.</p>	No
8.43		Against	<p>Benalla Road and High Street are already congested. The Road is a vital east-west connection and should not be closed. The Road is required by residents who will likely outlast SPCA.</p>	No
8.44		Against	<p>Many of the alternative streets are already congested. More traffic must not be diverted onto these streets adjacent to three schools and the saleyards.</p> <p>The Road is a vital public east-west arterial.</p> <p>Let SPCA put a better plan on the agenda.</p>	No
8.45		Against	<p>The Council has done little to investigate the ramifications of the closure.</p> <p>The Road currently accommodates around 7,000 vehicle movements per day. Requiring this traffic to use alternative routes will add approximately 15 to 20 minutes time.</p> <p>Is the Council going to upgrade the alternative routes to accommodate the extra traffic flow that will use these roads and, if so, at whose cost?</p> <p>Will the Council guarantee that emergency services will be able to perform appropriately if the Road is closed?</p> <p>I strongly oppose the closure of the Road.</p>	No
8.46		Against	<p>I am disappointed with the manner the Council has notified the community about the proposal.</p>	No

No	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER	FOR/ AGAINST PROPOSAL	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	REQUEST TO BE HEARD YES/NO
			<p>The proposed expansion of SPCA in Shepparton is logistically flawed as it will bring more heavy vehicles into town.</p> <p>The Council should have the confidence to say no to SPCA.</p> <p>The current situation is undesirable both for the Council, SPCA and the community.</p>	
8.47		Against	<p>Strongly opposed to the discontinuance and sale of the Road.</p> <p>SPCA should be supported as a viable and vibrant processor but not to this extent.</p> <p>The Road is an important connection in central Shepparton.</p> <p>The closure of the Road would be diabolical for Railway Parade and surrounding streets in the area.</p> <p>Traffic congestion not and into the future requires the Road to stay open.</p>	No
8.48		Against	<p>We lost half the showgrounds to SPCA. The Road should not be sold to SPCA too.</p> <p>Lease or 'lend' the Road to SPCA, but do not sell it to SPCA.</p>	No
8.49		Against	<p>As a paramedic, I believe that the closure of the Road would have a detrimental impact on response times, both now and in the future.</p> <p>In my opinion, an ambulance responding along Knight Street would incur an extra 2 minutes to attend to a patient in Old Dookie Road.</p> <p>Extra traffic congestion will on other roads if the Road is closed, especially during peak hours.</p> <p>There is no guarantee for the future existence of SPCA, even with the funding, whereas the closure of the Road will be permanent.</p> <p>My personal belief is that emergency services will require the Road to access the existing and future development of land to the east.</p>	No
8.50		Against	<p>The Road is required for public safety purposes, including ambulances, fire vehicles, police, powercor, as well as residents and the community.</p> <p>The land to the east continues to develop and will require services and access.</p> <p>There is insufficient investigation into traffic flow, emergency services and safety issues. The Council needs to look deeper and carry out more research before considering the closure proposal.</p> <p>SPCA has an alternative site in Mooroopna with access to heavy transport.</p>	No

No	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER	FOR/ AGAINST PROPOSAL	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	REQUEST TO BE HEARD YES/NO
8.51		Against	<p>The Road is utilised by a large number of road users as an access to the industrial areas in Lockwood Road and Old Dookie Road etc and the residential areas in Dobson Estate.</p> <p>The closure of the Road will divert traffic congestion. There is no positive purpose achieved by closing the Road.</p>	No
8.52		Against	<p>I am against the sale of the Road as the Road is an important east-west link and its closure will have significant repercussions for already congested local streets.</p> <p>A large number of industrial businesses are situated near the Road.</p> <p>Alternative routes are problematic for a range of reasons, including existing traffic congestion and safety issues.</p>	No
8.53		Against	<p>The closure of the Road will force more traffic onto Williams Road which is already congested. Other options are also problematic.</p> <p>The immediate area requires all current access routes open as it is currently to avoid more traffic being diverted to busy narrow streets and congested intersections.</p>	No
8.54		Against	<p>I regularly use the Road, as do many others. The Road allows for smooth traffic flow. Alternatives are hazardous due to their design and congestion.</p> <p>The Road is an important route for emergency vehicles. It must not be closed.</p>	No
8.55		Against	<p>I regularly use the Road and object to it being closed.</p> <p>SPCA can temporarily close the Road to traffic, but if the Road is closed permanently there will be significant traffic increases on other roads.</p>	No
8.56		Against	<p>The Road is a community asset and should not be put to private use.</p> <p>There are also practical reasons why the Road should not be closed. The Road is required to service the local businesses and residents.</p> <p>SPCA should find an alternative solution.</p> <p>The benefit of keeping the Road for the community outweighs any benefit that would be gained by closing it.</p>	No
8.57		Against	<p>We object on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inadequate consultation; • SPCA have not proposed to purchase land on the north side of Old Dookie Road for expansion in that area; 	No

No	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER	FOR/ AGAINST PROPOSAL	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	REQUEST TO BE HEARD YES/NO
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How will Council compensate us for our limited access to our properties and devaluation of our land; • Will our rates reduce; • Part of our land was already taken to widen Old Dookie Road. 	
8.58		Against	<p>We object for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The consequences have not been thoroughly considered; • SPCA has other options; • If you sell of the Road how will you improve and widen Lockwood Road; • Insufficient consultation; • Emergency services will be delayed; • The right decision was made in 1996. 	No
8.59		Against	<p>I use the Road several times most working days and as a cyclist I use the Road 5 to 6 days per week.</p> <p>I can see advantages to SPCA, which I support.</p> <p>However, there are complex traffic issues associated with the closure of the Road. Until such time as comprehensive traffic is produced I am opposed to the closure of the Road.</p>	Yes
8.60		Against	<p>I strongly oppose the closure of the Road. I use the Road 3 times per day and would be disadvantaged if the Road is closed. A lot of traffic uses the Road and I believe that many small businesses and emergency services would be impacted if the Road is closed.</p>	
8.61		Against	<p>Strongly oppose the closure of the Road.</p> <p>Council has put resources towards widening Old Dookie Road. If the Road is closed all traffic will be forced onto Byass Street. When Byass Street is closed due to the local show, the only other crossings are New Dookie Road and High Street.</p> <p>Many School children use the Road and they would require a longer trip if the Road is closed.</p> <p>The Council does not have the authority to close a public road.</p>	No
8.62		Against	<p>Strong opposition to the proposal.</p> <p>I support SPCA but they should not the benefit of the Road for their private use.</p>	No

No	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER	FOR/ AGAINST PROPOSAL	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	REQUEST TO BE HEARD YES/NO
			<p>Public safety will be compromised as emergency services will be delayed with longer response times.</p> <p>The Road is currently used by many road users.</p> <p>Surrounding streets will be detrimentally impacted by the increased congestion.</p> <p>Local business will be impacted by reduced access.</p> <p>SPCA have other options that should be explored.</p> <p>The whole issue requires further, more detailed, consideration.</p>	
8.63		Against	<p>The Road carries a large amount of traffic and other streets will be congested if the Road is closed. We all support SPCA, but thousands of motorists should not be inconvenienced on a daily basis.</p> <p>SPCA has other options that should be pursued.</p>	No
8.64		Against	<p>We object to the proposal. The proposal has not be properly considered. SPCA have only committed to operate for 3 to 5 years. What traffic studies have been conducted? The Council has not properly considered the consequences the closure will have on businesses.</p> <p>The basis of the decision in 1996 is still correct.</p> <p>If the Road is closed we may have to put workers off from our wholesale and retail bakery.</p>	No
8.65		Against	<p>I use the Road on a regular basis. The traffic is progressively getting busier with increased development. The closure of the Road is very short-sighted.</p> <p>I am a supporter of SPCA but not to the detriment of creating an impossible traffic situation for the community.</p>	No
8.66		Against	<p>I totally oppose the proposal.</p> <p>I use the Road daily. It seems SPCA has given no consideration to its commercial and residential neighbours. Where will the 7,000 daily traffic movements go to if the Road is closed?</p> <p>How will the increased congestion on other roads be managed? The proposal is very short-sighted. This matter needs to be given extremely careful consideration.</p>	No
8.67		Against	<p>I object to the closure of the Road. I use the Road daily. My alternative route is poorly lit with no footpaths. Many small businesses rely on the Road and heavy traffic conditions will be caused to other roads if the Road is closed.</p>	No

No	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER	FOR/ AGAINST PROPOSAL	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	REQUEST TO BE HEARD YES/NO
8.68		Against	The decision to close the Road is being made with too much haste. There is not sufficient time to conduct a thorough traffic impact analysis. SPCA is an important business, however, its request must not be at the expense of other businesses and residents in the area who use the Road daily.	No
8.69		Against	The traffic flow in the area has multiplied over time and the Road is now a main route for me to travel east. I use the Road at least once a day. The closure of the Road would put pressure on other roads in the area.	No
8.70		Against	The Road should not be closed. We support SPCA, but the community has already given SPCA enough land. However, the Road is required for the community, including businesses and residents. Wheeler Street does not have footpaths and school children from the east will have to contend with the heavy vehicles along Wheeler Street.	No
8.71		Against	I go to school at Notre Dame College. I strongly disagree with the closure of the Road. I need the Road to arrive safely to school on time.	No
8.72		Against	The Road should be realigned to the north, to enable the proposed new building and the retention of the accessway. Only staff car parking would be affected, which could be moved to other parts of the site.	No
8.73		Against	The Road should not be closed. The closure of the Road would be detrimental to property values in the area. The proposal has caused potential lessors to withdraw from leasing my property.	No
8.74		Against	The closure of the Road is inconsistent with Council's policies and strategies.	Yes
8.75		Against	The Road is an important link for many businesses, residents and services. The Road is not some obscure road or laneway. It is an important piece of infrastructure with substantial daily traffic. The closure of the Road will impact on traffic flow on other streets. There are also safety issues as emergency services will be delayed. SPCA purchased the land to the north of the Road, with knowledge of the Road. No rationale has been provided to substantiate SPCA's suggested efficiency gains. The benefit of keeping the Road far outweighs the benefit of closing the	No

No	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER	FOR/ AGAINST PROPOSAL	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	REQUEST TO BE HEARD YES/NO
			<p>Road. SPCA has previously benefitted from other road closures. Surely what it has acquired in the past is enough.</p> <p>Common sense dictates that the Road needs to be kept open. The Council needs to consider what is best for the community and not what it best for SPCA.</p>	
8.76		Against	<p>It is unfair to favour one large business over numerous smaller businesses. SPCA should consider alternatives, such as a tunnel or overpass.</p> <p>If the Road is closed the Council will need to spend significant money to correct traffic congestion on other roads.</p> <p>If legal to do so, if the Road is closed, SPCA should be required to provide a guarantee. We don't think SPCA is viable in the longer term.</p>	No
8.77		Against	<p>SPCA cannot guarantee it will operate for more than 5 years if the Road is closed. This is not a sound basis for the Council to close the Road.</p> <p>SPCA has not provided detailed plans of what is proposed. There are a lot of unanswered questions.</p> <p>Closing the Road will cause more traffic to other roads. It will be city changing with lasting repercussions. Don't be bullied into this decision.</p>	No
8.78		Against	<p>The closure of the Road would have disastrous consequences for the community and local businesses. There are several commonsense alternative solutions.</p> <p>The closure of Thompson Street, south of SPCA, and the extension of Fryers Street through to Archer Street would allow SPCA to purchase part of the showgrounds.</p>	No
8.79		Against	<p>The closure of the Road will be a great inconvenience. It will also allow a public road to be used by a private company.</p>	No
8.80		Against	<p>The Road is an increasingly important east-west traffic link.</p> <p>SPCA have enough room to construct the buildings without needing the Road. There are other options that SPCA should consider.</p> <p>Shepparton needs east-west links and there are few enough as it is. There will be severe traffic impacts caused by the closure of the Road. Local businesses employ many locals all year round. This needs to be remembered by the Council.</p>	No
8.81		Against	<p>Strongly object to the proposal.</p> <p>The process appears to be dishonest and misleading.</p>	No

No	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER	FOR/ AGAINST PROPOSAL	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	REQUEST TO BE HEARD YES/NO
			The Road is a vital east-west link. SPCA should concentrate on Mooroopna. There is plenty of room on the present SPCA land.	
8.82		Against	The Road is a vital east-west link to the busy developing area to the east.	No
8.83		Against	SPCA should use Mooroopna instead of extending the Shepparton site. The closure of the Road will cause traffic congestion on other roads. The closure of the Road will be extremely inconvenient for those residents and businesses that use it daily. Students who use Road will be forced to find alternative routes and the bus company will have to redesign the bus timetable. Shepparton wants SPCA jam not traffic jam.	No
8.84		Against	The Road is a vital east-west link. If the Road is closed it will disrupt access between areas of the city making already poorly designed roads worse. The Road should be made wider and safer, not closed. The Road may be realigned around the proposed new factory, but it cannot be closed. I support SPCA, but Shepparton needs to focus on life without them if they cannot guarantee being here in years to come.	No
8.85		Against	The Road is an important east-west link from Mooroopna to east of Shepparton. The closure of the Road will generate extra traffic to streets that are already choked. The closure of the Road will be detrimental to residents and surrounding businesses. The Council should use commonsense to refuse the proposal.	No
8.86		Against	The closure of the Road would result in increased traffic and congestion on surrounding alternative routes that are already accident prone. Emergency services will be delayed if the Road is closed. The proposal should be rejected.	No
8.87		Against	We are totally opposed to the closure of the Road. The Road is a major connection in Shepparton. School traffic will be affected, as will local businesses and residents. SPCA use less staff now and cannot be guaranteed to be there for very long, for example in 2025.	No
8.88		Against	The Road is the most important link to the areas to the east of Shepparton. The Council has not done the elementary work such as traffic counts of the	No

No	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER	FOR/ AGAINST PROPOSAL	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	REQUEST TO BE HEARD YES/NO
			Road and other roads. Council has put the cart before the horse and it should withdraw its notice of intention. Council should not be pushed by SPCA to make a premature decision.	
8.89		Against	I have used the Road to travel to work everyday for the past 21 years. Apart of obvious inconvenience, the closure of the Road has potentially life threatening implications due to delay caused to emergency services. If the Road is closed I will hold responsible for deaths that would have been avoided if the Road had been available for use by emergency services.	No
8.90		Against	We object for the following grounds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of information from SPCA about claimed reduced production costs; • Lack of information from the Council as to how the resulting traffic flow changes will be managed. The Road is a major access way used by hundreds of businesses and residents to the east of Shepparton. There are no suitable alternative access ways if the Road is closed; • Council needs to undertake a proper study of the likely impacts and such studies need to be made publicly available prior to public submission; • The reasons for the 1996 decision remain valid. 	No
8.91		Against	Strongly object to the closure of the Road. The inconvenience to the community will be immense and the bottlenecks caused will be extreme. Other roads are already congested at peak hours. The closure of the Road will compromise public safety. SPCA should not waste money on new products and concentrate on business that they know. Council should not sell a public road to a private company. Council should not give in to SPCA.	No
8.92		Against	The Road is an important east-west link. The Council has not done the elementary work and is putting the cart before the horse. The Road belongs to the community and should not be closed.	No
8.93		Against	I am against the closure of the Road.	No

No	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER	FOR/ AGAINST PROPOSAL	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	REQUEST TO BE HEARD YES/NO
			<p>The Road is heavily used and I use the Road every day to go to work.</p> <p>The Council is not allowing enough time to properly consider the proposal and ascertain the ramifications that the closure of the Road may have.</p> <p>The closure of the Road will have long term, structural implications for the infrastructure of the city.</p> <p>There are a number of other reasons, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Splitting Shepparton north of Benalla Road to east and west of the railway; • Additional traffic past schools; • Delayed emergency services and reduced access; • Only advantage is to SPCA. <p>SPCA must have an alternative option. Council must consider the big picture and not be blindsided by SPCA.</p>	
8.94		Against	<p>The closure of the Road will affect emergency services to Dobson Estate.</p> <p>Alternative routes add approximately 10 minutes travel time.</p> <p>SPCA could better utilise the existing land to improve production. Other options may be to build a overpass. The current situation is also appropriate and doesn't really need to change.</p> <p>Don't close the Road.</p>	No
8.95		Against	<p>A public road should only be closed if it is surplus and no longer required by the public. This is not the case with the Road.</p> <p>The Road is heavily used and the closure of the Road will cause delays and congestion for other roads.</p> <p>SPCA appear to be seeking to benefit with disregard for the general public and they should seek alternative options. The Road is a vital connection and is required.</p>	No
8.96		Against	<p>We oppose the proposal.</p> <p>The Road offers direct and convenient access to our property.</p> <p>Our customers and suppliers will be greatly inconvenienced if the Road is closed. This is highly undesirable and should be avoided. The profitability of our business will be affected. We urge the Council to seriously consider all Shepparton businesses together with farmers and outer lying districts.</p>	No
8.97		Against	The Road is used by us and our customers for access and the closure of the	No

No	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER	FOR/ AGAINST PROPOSAL	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	REQUEST TO BE HEARD YES/NO
			<p>Road would cause costly delays.</p> <p>The development of the eastern land will mean the continued importance of the Road into the future.</p> <p>SPCA should be required to solve their logistical problems in other ways.</p>	
8.98		Against	<p>Many of my tenants use the Road to access my storage facility.</p> <p>I use the Road to avoid traffic congestion along High Street.</p> <p>SPCA had knowledge of the Road when it purchased. The eastern land continues to develop and this would be disadvantaged by the closure of the Road.</p>	No
8.99		Against	Request to be heard.	Yes
8.100		Against	<p>The Road is important to businesses and residents as it is a safer route compared to the alternatives.</p> <p>The closure of the Road will create congestion on other roads that are already very busy. Emergency services will be delayed if the Road is closed.</p>	No
8.101		Against	<p>Strongly opposed to the closure of the Road. The Road is a very busy road and a short cut for emergency vehicles. The use of the Road for traffic outweighs any gain to SPCA.</p>	No
8.102		Against	<p>The Closure of the Road for SPCA is unreasonable. SPCA may not be there in six years' time. The Road is quite a busy road and I use it regularly to avoid traffic in central Shepparton. The Road is for the community. The Council should rethink the proposal.</p>	No
8.103		Against	<p>What not lease the Road to SPCA instead of selling the Road. Consideration should be given to the supply and discharge of water at the SPCA plant. The increase in operations at SPCA would put pressure on the waste water system. Perhaps a different site should be considered by SPCA in Mooroopna.</p>	No
8.104		Against	<p>It is going too far to close the Road for SPCA to use.</p> <p>The closure of the Road will cut off an east-west link. Shepparton should go ahead not backwards.</p> <p>SPCA is not efficient and the funding won't make it last. The Road should stay open to the community.</p>	No
8.105		Against	<p>Object to the closure of the Road. The closure of the Road would have a terrible effect on small business in the area many of whom have only recently set up in the area.</p>	No

No	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER	FOR/ AGAINST PROPOSAL	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	REQUEST TO BE HEARD YES/NO
8.106		Against	I use the Road on a daily basis and I am appalled that the Council intends to sell the Road to SPCA. This is a terrible idea.	No
8.107		Against	The closure of the Road would be detrimental to the community. As an employee of SPCA, my opinion is that there is a lack of feasibility inside the plant already. If SPCA was run efficiently now I would have a different view. My thoughts are with local business and schools that would be affected if the Road is closed as well as the dangerous road conditions that would be created.	No
8.108		Against	I oppose the proposal as it is short-sighted and would cause a myriad of problems for Shepparton and its community. The Council should reconsider the proposal.	No
8.109		Against	Don't close the Road. There are more people in Shepparton than in SPCA.	No
8.110		Against	Request to be heard.	Yes
8.111		Against	This proposal is insulting to the community. The Council has already been generous to SPCA by providing them land previously. SPCA should have a tunnel, but the current SPCA site is probably not fit for purpose and SPCA should probably relocate its operations as others have done.	Yes
8.112		Against	I object to the proposal and wish to be heard.	Yes
8.113		Against	There is a simple solution. Instead of separating traffic flows, separate the bins. The bins could go under the Road using a tunnel. The bins could go over the Road. If the new building has to go where the Road is, move the Road to the north around the building.	No
8.114		Against	I am opposed to the closure of the Road. The Road is heavily used by traffic daily. The Council has already been generous to SPCA with the showgrounds. Coca-Cola don't care about maintenance staff who were made redundant.	No
8.115		Against	I am against the closure of the Road. The Road is vital to other businesses and local residents. The economic important of SPCA is overstated. The closure of the Road will cause traffic to increase on other roads.	No
8.116		Against	I am against the closure of the Road. Other roads will increase with too much traffic, especially at peak hours.	No
8.117		Against	I am total opposed to the closure of the Road.	No
8.118		Against	I object to the closure of the Road. Other roads are already congested.	No

No	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER	FOR/ AGAINST PROPOSAL	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	REQUEST TO BE HEARD YES/NO
8.119		Against	Strongly object to the closure of the Road.	No
8.120		Against	I object to the closure of the Road.	No
8.121		Against	I protest against the closure of the Road. Students that use the Road will be forced onto other roads with increased travel times and less safety. Don't close the Road.	No
8.122		Against	As a long time user of the Road, along with thousands of others, I oppose the closure of the Road. Do not close the Road.	No
8.123		Against	We oppose the closure of the Road. We use the Road daily and it is a vital link across the railway. SPCA has other land that it should utilise.	No
8.124		Against	I strongly oppose the closure of the Road. It is a necessary access to avoid other busy roads.	No
8.125		Against	My family opposes the closure of the Road. Commonsense requires the Road to stay open given the number of people that use it. A cannery does not justify the closure of the Road.	No
8.126		Against	I am against the closure of the Road. Congestion is bad enough now, it would be bedlam if the Road is closed.	No
8.127		Against	I am against the closure of the Road. Many landowners in the area and people in the community use the Road. Congestion would be caused to other roads. SPCA should use other existing buildings at Ardmona.	No
8.128		Against	We are against the proposed discontinuation of Andrew Fairley Avenue. We live in Dobson Estate and have used this road for over 30 years to access the main area of Shepparton. The closure will add cost to local businesses and add congestion in New Dookie Road and Fryers Street. No consideration has been given to the impacts of the closure on future development or proposals to accommodate traffic on other roads.	No
8.129		Against	Strongly opposed to the closure of the Road. Many people will be inconvenienced on a day to day basis – adding extra time and cost by people travelling to school and work. Extra traffic will be placed on alternative routes, the closure will divide Shepparton.	No
8.130		Against	Proposal was turned down 18 years ago on the basis of due consideration. There is more traffic using the road now.. The proposal will be permanent.	No

No	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER	FOR/ AGAINST PROPOSAL	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	REQUEST TO BE HEARD YES/NO
			<p>Don't be seduced by SPCA. There are three options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leave the Road as it is; • Lease the Road to SPCA; • Without taking any sensible precautions, go ahead and sell the Road. <p>We cannot rely on SPCA.</p>	
8.131		Against	<p>The Road is a vital access that provides businesses to the east access to the Central Business District and to the Mooroopna Causeway. Closure will incur daily travel expenses to businesses. SPCA will only benefit 3-5% compared to the cost it will affect local businesses. Closure will congest already busy alternate routes. Traffic count conducted did not include samples during peak periods. I have concerns about poor governance and poor process.</p>	Yes
8.132		Against	<p>Strongly object. Council has encouraged business to the east and now seeks to close the Road. Compensation should be provided to these businesses. Clients of our childcare centre have already suggested that the closure will result in increased travel time of up to 10 minutes, as a result our service may not be of convenience to them anymore. Knight Street incurred much traffic when the road was closed as a trial, this could be a major factor when parents are selecting service for their children.</p>	Yes
8.133		Against	<p>As a resident of Balaclava Road, traffic along this road will be twice as bad. Traffic is already problematic and congested. The closure will be of benefit to SPCA but how do we know they will be open in the next 5-10 years? Emergency services will be delayed, which is a real concern.</p>	No
8.134		Against	<p>The Council will regret the decision to close the Road. The traffic count is not accurate and should not be relied upon. This process was properly decided in 1996. We naturally support SPCA but not at the expense and inconvenience of the community. SPCA should be able to identify alternative solutions within their existing land. The decision will be permanent. SPCA's figures are hard to believe and should not be relied upon. Will SPCA guarantee they will be open in 2,3 or 5 years? Is SPCA viable and profitable on the world stage? Lease the Road to SPCA but don't sell it. SPCA should pay for any associated costs.</p>	No
8.135		Against	<p>I use Knight Street, the Road, Old Dookie Road and surrounding streets daily as a car user and cyclist. I am adamant many complex issues that will arise from the closure must be addressed and agreed by the community.</p> <p>The Road is not just a street, it is an important connector road.</p>	Yes

No	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER	FOR/ AGAINST PROPOSAL	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	REQUEST TO BE HEARD YES/NO
			<p>Surrounding roads are already congested, there is a concern of where this added traffic will go. If the Road is to close the decision must recognise remedial traffic works to ensure existing traffic flow is not affected and SPCA are to meet the full costs of associated work with no cost borne on rate payers.</p> <p>There is no meaningful traffic assessment or study that has been completed.</p>	
8.136		Against	<p>Council has acted in haste to the request of SPCA without proper consideration of the impact it would have to the community.</p> <p>The traffic study conducted merely confirms that the Road is a highly trafficked road and therefore must remain open as a roadway for public use.</p> <p>Council needs to consider long term planning to improve the city's traffic flow.</p> <p>The Council is biased towards SPCA.</p> <p>Other contentions include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shepparton already has a poor road network; • The Council does not have sufficient information to make the decision; • SPCA is poorly managed and have developed their business operating both north and south of the Road; • There is a Goulburn Valley water main in the Road which will be duplicated in around 2030, the closure of the Road will prevent the water main from being managed and duplicated; • Sewers will need to be relocated; • Other services may be affected; • There will be wide financial repercussions for the community if the Road is closed; • The Council has predetermined the matter. 	Yes (on behalf of)
8.137		Against	<p>The closure of the Road will have a long term impact on his businesses and the Shepparton public and business community.</p> <p>My employees will be affected by the closure. No proper traffic plan has been carried out to see what effects the closure will entail.</p> <p>The public has not been truly informed as to what the intentions of SPCA are re the closure and how it will benefit them. The Road closure was attempted previously and did not proceed; the Road carries more traffic now compared</p>	Yes

No	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER	FOR/ AGAINST PROPOSAL	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	REQUEST TO BE HEARD YES/NO
			to then. The Council process is flawed. SPCA has other alternatives.	
8.138		Against	We have run public meetings, protest marches, car protest rallies, attended council meetings, attended traffic meetings, lobby individual councillors, contacted Local Government Ministers etc. We believe the issue has divided the community. We have been dismayed by the process that the council has put to the ratepayers, as they have demonstrated incompetence to provide timely information, changed the submission closing date three times, offered a substandard traffic information session and totally belittled the process of community consultation to suit their own agenda of supporting SPCA.	Yes (and wish to be heard)
8.139		Against	This is the compiled petition that opposes the closure of Andrew Fairley Avenue	
8.140		Against	I am the proprietor of Fords Shepparton Bus Service Pty Ltd and Fords Coach Travel. We oppose to the closure because of the extra costs to be imposed on our bus company, the changes to School bus routes and travel times, the increased bus safety risk around school bus interchanges, it will devalue our own business land, the potential risk to my staff with delayed access of emergency services to our work premises at 19 Wheeler Street and the welfare of my staff, the extra traffic congestion around this precinct and the difficulty of getting out of Wheeler Street, the prospect of clearways being installed on Wheeler Street, Avenue should not be closed as it is our most direct business route to the CBD of Shepparton and the extra burden it has placed on our business to fight this proposal to close it.	Yes
8.141		Against	I am opposed to the closure for the following reasons: the road is much needed as an alternative to High Street and Balaclava Road, these roads and other surrounding roads have high traffic and I come to a standstill early morning and after school, if the road does close heavy trucks and vehicles will be directed down Wheeler Street for entrance to SPCA, the roundabout is busy with school traffic from surrounding schools, Fryers Street railway crossing is also very busy at times, SPCA has no commitment as to how long they will be a viable company in Shepparton and we need to think about whether the Chinese may become involved in this fruit preserving company, the traffic surveys recently done by SPCA and Council are irrelevant as they do not give a true picture of the traffic pattern.	Yes
8.142		Against	We would like to object to the council's intent to close Andrew Fairley Avenue for the following reasons: it would cause more congestion in surrounding roads, both residential and industrial areas would suffer high delays in traffic in these areas, there will be further ongoing government cost, there is already	Yes

No	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER	FOR/ AGAINST PROPOSAL	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	REQUEST TO BE HEARD YES/NO
			abundant amount of land already owned, SCPA were to bring in new technology, the showgrounds will be affected, SCPA have a 5 year contract, what happens after then? SCPA have committed to 500 jobs in the future so will they need more land? There needs to be a feasibility study done on traffic flows on all roads leading to SCPA, who will pay for road repairs other routes will entail in future, are there official reports from Vic Roads etc to hand, SCPA are to gain only 2-5%, what would it be if the road was to stay open, the community would be better off if the road was made bigger and upgraded.	
8.143		Against	This was brought up 18 years ago and traffic is worse now. The existing 8000 using this road will have to use alternate routes which already hold high traffic volumes, some of the traffic points will be Hawdon Street and Balaclava Road etc.	Yes
8.144		Against	We believe Council should abandon their advertised intention to close Andrew Fairley Avenue, he wishes to present a verbal submission re: the irregularities of the Council's actions in their dealing, the inconsistencies that the closing of the road has with Council's adopted policies, the inconsistencies between what council has told the ratepayers of Shepparton with what CCA has told the ASX.	Yes
8.145		Against	One of my concerns is the precedent this will set, if Coles were to ask the same thing would they be given the same favour? The second of my thoughts is the lack of procedure that has been displayed by council.	Yes
8.146		Against	The closure of the Road will cause hardship to, and be problematic for, school children. Tomatoes smell and are a nuisance and SCPA causes both odour and noise issues for residents. The closure of the Road will add to the costs of required road improvements. The legal costs will also be expensive.	Yes
8.147		Against	The Road is a vital east-west link and carries are large amount of traffic. The inconvenience is an important consideration. The proposal will bring more heavy vehicles into Shepparton. It is in the interests of Shepparton to keep the Road.	Yes
8.148		Against	The Road is an important access route. It is used by many sectors of the community including emergency vehicles. SCPA will not necessarily remain in Shepparton even if the Road is closed. The community is more important that SCPA.	Yes
8.149		Against	Strongly opposed the closure of the Road. The Road is a vital roadway. The	Yes

No	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER	FOR/ AGAINST PROPOSAL	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	REQUEST TO BE HEARD YES/NO
			Road is critical for school children. The Road is used by local businesses.	
8.150		Against	I oppose the closure of the Road. I do not believe the funding to SPCA was based on the Road closure. The proposal will bring more heavy vehicles to Shepparton. SPCA should reconsider its operations and strategic direction.	Yes
8.151		Against	We oppose the closure of the Road. Many staff and customers use the Road. The alternative routes taken longer and will add costs to run our business. The Road is a vital link. The Road is the most direct route for us and many others, including emergency vehicles.	No
8.152		Against	The closure of the Road will be at a huge cost to the community. It is not necessary for SPCA.	Yes
8.153		Against	The Road should not be closed. Upgrade of other roads will be delayed. No funding is guaranteed to pay for the infrastructure costs. Council's traffic report is flawed. Traffic outcomes for other roads will be unreasonable. Emergency response times will be delayed. Council should not support SPCA. The Road is for the community.	No
8.154		Against	The Road is important and I use it regularly. The intersection of Fryers/Railway/Thompson is difficult to negotiate at peak times.	No
8.155		Against	It is not good planning to close the Road. It is not economically justified. It is not fair.	No
8.156		Against	The closure of the Road will not benefit Shepparton, despite any benefit to SPCA.	No
8.157		Against	The Road is important to allow traffic access to parts of Shepparton. There are alternatives that should be pursued. The Road will not prevent SPCA from closing down. The Road is need for local businesses.	No
8.158		Against	The closure of the Road has no merit whatsoever. It will damage Shepparton and local businesses. It won't guarantee SPCA.	No
8.159		Against	The live and operate a business near the Road. It is a vital link in our daily life and we use it most days. There are no suitable alternatives. SPCA will be ok without the Road. Who will pay for the road upgrades to other roads?	No
8.160		Against	The Road carries major traffic. You don't know what cost the closure of the Road will have to other businesses. We love SPCA but this won't fix SPCA. I object to the proposal.	No

No	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER	FOR/ AGAINST PROPOSAL	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	REQUEST TO BE HEARD YES/NO
8.161		Against	The Road should be kept open. Even SPCA employees know that.	No
Folder 2, Tab 9				
9.1		Against	Andrew Fairley Avenue is a major linking road from the inner city to the industrial and business area east of the SPCA cannery. It must not be closed for any reason, let alone for a private use. Once closed it will never be available for the public who currently own it. Please use common-sense and help SPCA in some other way.	No
9.2		Against	As per 9.1 above.	No
9.3		Against	As per 9.1 above.	No
9.4		Against	As per 9.1 above.	No
9.5		Against	As per 9.1 above.	No
9.6		Against	As per 9.1 above.	No
9.7		Against	As per 9.1 above.	No
9.8		Against	As per 9.1 above.	No
9.9		Against	As per 9.1 above.	No
9.10		Against	As per 9.1 above.	No
9.11		Against	As per 9.1 above.	No
9.12		Against	As per 9.1 above.	No
9.13		Against	As per 9.1 above.	No
9.14		Against	As per 9.1 above.	No
9.15		Against	As per 9.1 above.	No
9.16		Against	As per 9.1 above.	No
9.17		Against	As per 9.1 above.	No
9.18		Against	As per 9.1 above.	No
9.19		Against	As per 9.1 above.	No
9.20		Against	As per 9.1 above.	No
9.21		Against	As per 9.1 above.	No
9.22		Against	As per 9.1 above.	No
9.23		Against	As per 9.1 above.	No

No	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER	FOR/ AGAINST PROPOSAL	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	REQUEST TO BE HEARD YES/NO
9.24		Against	As per 9.1 above.	No
9.25		Against	As per 9.1 above.	No
9.26		Against	As per 9.1 above.	No
9.27		Against	As per 9.1 above.	No
9.28		Against	As per 9.1 above.	No
9.29		Against	As per 9.1 above.	No
9.30		Against	As per 9.1 above.	No
9.31		Against	As per 9.1 above.	No
9.32		Against	As per 9.1 above.	No
9.33		Against	As per 9.1 above.	No
9.34		Against	As per 9.1 above.	No
9.35		Against	As per 9.1 above.	No
9.36		Against	As per 9.1 above.	No
9.37		Against	As per 9.1 above.	No
9.38		Against	As per 9.1 above.	No
9.39		Against	As per 9.1 above.	No
9.40		Against	As per 9.1 above.	No
9.41		Against	As per 9.1 above.	No
9.42		Against	As per 9.1 above.	No
9.43		Against	As per 9.1 above.	No
9.44		Against	As per 9.1 above.	No
9.45		Against	As per 9.1 above.	No
9.46		Against	As per 9.1 above.	No
9.47		Against	As per 9.1 above.	No
9.48		Against	As per 9.1 above.	No
9.49		Against	As per 9.1 above.	No
9.50		Against	As per 9.1 above.	No
9.51		Against	As per 9.1 above.	No
9.52		Against	As per 9.1 above.	No

No	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER	FOR/ AGAINST PROPOSAL	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	REQUEST TO BE HEARD YES/NO
9.53		Against	As per 9.1 above.	No
9.54		Against	As per 9.1 above.	No
9.55		Against	As per 9.1 above.	No
9.56		Against	As per 9.1 above.	No
9.57		Against	As per 9.1 above.	No
9.58		Against	As per 9.1 above.	No
Folder 2, Tab 10				
10.1		Against	<p>I would like to record my strong objection to the proposed closure of Andrew Fairley Avenue.</p> <p>I currently work in this industrial estate that will be affected directly with this road closure. I will find it harder to access my employment on a daily basis. My duties also require me to drive around this area and it will more difficult to do so.</p> <p>I cannot understand why the council would consider this proposal to make everyone's daily lives more stressful and risky, with a greater chance of having an accident with more local traffic being pushed onto the existing roads. This area will become grid locked at certain hours of the day.</p> <p>It also concerns me that the emergency services will take longer to get to my place of employment.</p> <p>Show some common sense please and KEEP ANDREW FAIRLEY OPEN.</p>	No
10.2		Against	As per 10.1 above	No
10.3		Against	As per 10.1 above	No
10.4		Against	As per 10.1 above	No
10.5		Against	As per 10.1 above	No
10.6		Against	As per 10.1 above	No
10.7		Against	As per 10.1 above	No
10.8		Against	As per 10.1 above	No
10.9		Against	As per 10.1 above	No
10.10		Against	As per 10.1 above	No
10.11		Against	As per 10.1 above	No
10.12		Against	As per 10.1 above	No

No	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER	FOR/ AGAINST PROPOSAL	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	REQUEST TO BE HEARD YES/NO
10.13		Against	As per 10.1 above	No
10.14		Against	As per 10.1 above	No
10.15		Against	As per 10.1 above	No
10.16		Against	As per 10.1 above	No
10.17		Against	As per 10.1 above	No
10.18		Against	As per 10.1 above	No
10.19		Against	As per 10.1 above	No
10.20		Against	As per 10.1 above	No
10.21		Against	As per 10.1 above	No
10.22		Against	As per 10.1 above	No
10.23		Against	As per 10.1 above	No
10.24		Against	As per 10.1 above	No
10.25		Against	As per 10.1 above	No
10.26		Against	As per 10.1 above	No
10.27		Against	As per 10.1 above	No
10.28		Against	As per 10.1 above	No
10.29		Against	As per 10.1 above	No
10.30		Against	As per 10.1 above	No
10.31		Against	As per 10.1 above	No
10.32		Against	As per 10.1 above	No
10.33		Against	As per 10.1 above	No
10.34		Against	As per 10.1 above	No
10.35		Against	As per 10.1 above	No
10.36		Against	As per 10.1 above	No
10.37		Against	As per 10.1 above	No
10.38		Against	As per 10.1 above	No
10.39		Against	As per 10.1 above	No
10.40		Against	As per 10.1 above	No
10.41		Against	As per 10.1 above	No

No	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER	FOR/ AGAINST PROPOSAL	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	REQUEST TO BE HEARD YES/NO
Folder 3, Tab 11				
11.1		Against	<p>I am hereby lodging my objections to the proposed closure of Andrew Fairley Avenue.</p> <p>This is a major busy thoroughfare used regularly by the people of Shepparton especially the businesses and residences situated to the east of SPCA.</p> <p>This closure will require major infrastructure cost with the upgrading of other roads expected to carry additional vehicles.</p> <p>This must remain a road for everyone to use.</p> <p>Do not close Andrew Fairley Avenue.</p>	No
11.2		Against	As per 11.1 above	No
11.3		Against	As per 11.1 above	No
11.4		Against	As per 11.1 above	No
11.5		Against	As per 11.1 above	No
11.6		Against	As per 11.1 above	No
11.7		Against	As per 11.1 above	No
11.8		Against	As per 11.1 above	No
11.9		Against	As per 11.1 above	No
11.10		Against	As per 11.1 above	No
11.11		Against	As per 11.1 above	No
11.12		Against	As per 11.1 above	No
Folder 3, Tab 12				
12.1		Against	<p>I wish to submit that I object strongly to any attempt to close Andrew Fairley Avenue which is an important arterial road in an increasingly congested Shepparton traffic network.</p> <p>Closure would result in nightmare delays for business and simple commuter trips around the city.</p> <p>Please find other solutions to private problems.</p>	No
12.2		Against	As per 12.1 above	No
12.3		Against	As per 12.1 above	No
12.4		Against	As per 12.1 above	No

No	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER	FOR/ AGAINST PROPOSAL	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	REQUEST TO BE HEARD YES/NO
12.5		Against	As per 12.1 above	No
12.6		Against	As per 12.1 above	No
12.7		Against	As per 12.1 above	No
12.8		Against	As per 12.1 above	No
12.9		Against	As per 12.1 above	No
12.10		Against	As per 12.1 above	No
12.11		Against	As per 12.1 above	No
12.12		Against	As per 12.1 above	No
12.13		Against	As per 12.1 above	No
12.14		Against	As per 12.1 above	No
12.15		Against	As per 12.1 above	No
12.16		Against	As per 12.1 above	No
12.17		Against	As per 12.1 above	No
Folder 4, Tab 13				
13.1		Against	Please take note that I strongly protest against the closing of Andrew Fairley Avenue which I and my family regularly use to get to the heart of the city. Further I am amazed that the council would start this closing without first conducting an independent professional traffic count and study. The road is essential now and will be even more essential as time goes on.	No
13.2		Against	As per 13.1 above	No
13.3		Against	As per 13.1 above	No
13.4		Against	As per 13.1 above	No
13.5		Against	As per 13.1 above	No
13.6		Against	I would like to record my strong opposition to council's intention to close Andrew Fairley Avenue, a short but greatly-used vehicle thoroughfare joining residential Shepparton with industrial Shepparton. Please let logic determine that closing this road adds costly inconvenience to all current users of that strategically placed rail crossing. Don't close it.	No

No	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER	FOR/ AGAINST PROPOSAL	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	REQUEST TO BE HEARD YES/NO
13.7		Against	As per 13.6 above	No
13.8		Against	As per 13.6 above	No
13.9		Against	As per 13.6 above	No
13.10		Against	As per 13.6 above	No
13.11		Against	As per 13.6 above	No
13.12		Against	As per 13.6 above	No
13.13		Against	As per 13.6 above	No
13.14		Against	As per 13.6 above	No
13.15		Against	As per 13.6 above	No
13.16		Against	As per 13.6 above	No
13.17		Against	As per 13.6 above	No
13.18		Against	I do not support this. Do not let SPCA bluff you. 50% of SPCA workers support the retention of the Road.	No
13.19		Against	As per 13.18 above	No
13.20		Against	This will divide Shepparton from east to west.	No
13.21		Against	Don't close the Road.	No
13.22		Against	We are alarmed to think that council is considering closing Andrew Fairley Avenue which is our main route into Shepparton. It will cause us enormous amounts of inconvenience wasting fuel and time and will cause extra bottlenecks at the other rail crossings. Please leave Andrew Fairley Avenue just as it is.	No
13.23		Against	As per 13.22 above	No
13.24		Against	As per 13.22 above	No
13.25		Against	As per 13.22 above	No
13.26		Against	As per 13.22 above	No
13.27		Against	As per 13.22 above	No
13.28		Against	As per 13.22 above	No
13.29		Against	As per 13.22 above	No
13.30		Against	As per 13.22 above	No

No	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER	FOR/ AGAINST PROPOSAL	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	REQUEST TO BE HEARD YES/NO
13.31		Against	I am AGAINST the proposal to close Andrew Fairley Drive. Andrew Fairley Drive is one of three very busy and vital east west routes to the busy developing commercial, business and residential area east of the railway line. All these routes have heavy traffic flows and have current and increasing congestion problems. One less vital route will increase the problems in the remaining two.	No
13.32		Against	As per 13.31 above	No
13.33		Against	As per 13.31 above	No
13.34		Against	It's extremely hard to follow why council would embark on a scheme to close Andrew Fairley Avenue without requiring the applicant to commission a thorough independent expert consultant's study to determine the affects of diverting 7000 vehicles each day to nearby different routes and intersections. Can I register this letter as an objection to the Andrew Fairley Avenue closure and urge councillors if they wish to pursue this fanciful course of action to start the process again.	No
13.35		Against	As per 13.34 above	No
13.36		Against	As per 13.34 above	No
13.37		Against	Andrew Fairley Ave must not be closed/ sold . It is a major public road to a developing busy commercial, industrial and residential area.	No
13.38		Against	As per 13.37 above	No
13.39		Against	As per 13.37 above	No
13.40		Against	As per 13.37 above	No
13.41		Against	As per 13.37 above	No
13.42		Against	As per 13.37 above	No
13.43		Against	As per 13.22 above	No
13.44		Against	As per 13.06 above	No
Folder 4, Tab 14				
14.1		Against	I am against the closure of this vital east-west link. Busy throughfare! I am a regular user of the inner city bypass route to the industrial, business	No

No	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER	FOR/ AGAINST PROPOSAL	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	REQUEST TO BE HEARD YES/NO
			and residential areas to the developing eastern side of the railway line. I am also aware of the congestion on other roads in the adjacent area. These congested traffic arteries cannot be subject to additional traffic that the closure of the Road would force on to them.	
14.2		Against	As per 14.1 above	No
14.3		Against	As per 14.1 above	No
14.4		Against	As per 14.1 above	No
14.5		Against	I wish to express my extreme displeasure and strongly object to the proposal. This action of Council is contrary and inconsistent with Council's policies and strategies.	No
14.6		Against	As per 14.5 above	No
14.7		Against	It is a vital roadway to the developing commercial, industrial and residential areas east of the railway line, with increasing usage. Balaclava Road to New Dookie Road has a heavy traffic load and at school times is very congested. High Street being the major east/west route for traffic in transit through Shepparton plus an integral part of Shepparton's CBD must not be considered as a diversion route.	No
14.8		Against	As per 14.7 above	No
14.9		Against	As per 14.7 above	No
14.10		Against	As per 14.7 above	No
14.11		Against	As a regular user of Andrew Fairley Avenue I wish to state my disappointment that my Council would ever consider its closure for any reason whatsoever. The Road is in constant use and is essential to so many individuals and families. Please encourage a commonsense approach to traffic in our city, particularly in this instance.	No
14.12		Against	As per 14.11 above	No
14.13		Against	As per 14.11 above	No
14.14		Against	As per 14.11 above	No
14.15		Against	As per 14.11 above	No

No	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER	FOR/ AGAINST PROPOSAL	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	REQUEST TO BE HEARD YES/NO
14.16		Against	<p>We wish to object to the proposal.</p> <p>It is absurd that a major residential and business area is to have one of its major access routes cut off for public use. Proper long term planning principles must be considered.</p> <p>The area to the east of SPCA contains many businesses, residents and people.</p> <p>The Council encouraged the development of the light industrial area along with the residential developments of Dobson and Redburn Estates. These areas are likely to expand and the nearby roads will become more important.</p> <p>I strongly object to the proposal. SPCA should find an alternative solution.</p>	No
14.17		Against	As per 14.16 above	No
14.18		Against	As per 14.16 above	No
14.19		Against	As per 14.16 above	No
14.20		Against	<p>I am a regular user of the Road and wish to express my displeasure that the Council would even consider closing the Road.</p> <p>The Road is a major thoroughfare and is essential for business and all residents of east of Shepparton.</p> <p>I urge you to keep the Road open.</p>	No
14.21		Against	As per 14.20 above	No
14.22		Against	As per 14.20 above	No
14.23		Against	As per 14.20 above	No
14.24		Against	<p>Please note my strongest objection to the proposal.</p> <p>Commonsense tells me that you should only close a road if it is not used and never likely to be.</p> <p>7000 vehicles a day indicates the road is being used.</p> <p>Leave the Road open.</p>	No
14.25		Against	As per 14.24 above	No
14.26		Against	As per 14.24 above	No
14.27		Against	<p>I protest against the closure of the Road.</p> <p>I reside in Dobsons estate and this is our main route into the city.</p> <p>I am extremely concerned that the closure of the Road will increase congestion, reduce safety and affect anyone who lives out this end of town.</p>	No

No	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER	FOR/ AGAINST PROPOSAL	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	REQUEST TO BE HEARD YES/NO
			The closure of the Road will also mean longer for emergency response times. The Council should think of all of its residents, not just one corporate resident.	
14.28		Against	As Per 14.27 above	No
14.29		Against	As Per 14.27 above	No
14.30		Against	As per 14.27 above	No
14.31		Against	<p>I oppose the proposal.</p> <p>The closure of the Road would dramatically impact industrial estates around the area. Other roads are already congested.</p> <p>It is unfair the Council is prepared to consider one business proposal over the wellbeing of other businesses. The increased traffic congestion around this industrial estate will not only affect our daily movements, but will also affect our staff and customers.</p> <p>It will devalue our land and reduce safety due to increasing emergency response times.</p> <p>The Council should not agree to this proposal. The Road must stay open.</p>	No
14.32		Against	As per 14.31 above	No
14.33		Against	As per 14.31 above	No
14.34		Against	As per 14.31 above	No
14.35		Against	As per 14.31 above	No
14.36		Against	Don't close the Road.	No
14.37		Against	As per 14.36 above	No
14.38		Against	As per 14.36 above	No
14.39		Against	As per 14.36 above	No
14.40		Against	As per 14.11 above	No
Folder 4, Tab 15				
15.1		For	<p>As a resident of Shepparton I would like to record my support for closing Andrew Fairley Avenue.</p> <p>SPCA has survived an extraordinarily difficult period over recent years/months. The negative impact of their closure would have been dramatic and far-reaching had it occurred, but thankfully with the help of the State</p>	No

No	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER	FOR/ AGAINST PROPOSAL	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	REQUEST TO BE HEARD YES/NO
			<p>Government and parent company Coca Cola Amatil, their future has been assured for some time.</p> <p>SPCAA must remain competitive with overseas manufacturers and continue to improve efficiencies that are sustainable.</p> <p>The closure of Andrew Fairley Avenue would obviously be of great benefit to the company and would be seen by the community as Council's part in underlining that future and in turn, that of the wider community.</p>	
15.2		For	As per 15.1 above	No
15.3		For	As per 15.1 above	No
15.4		For	As per 15.1 above	No
15.5		For	As per 15.1 above	No
15.6		For	As per 15.1 above	No
15.7		For	As per 15.1 above	No
15.8		For	As per 15.1 above	No
15.9		For	As per 15.1 above	No
15.10		For	As per 15.1 above	No
15.11		For	As per 15.1 above	No
15.12		For	As per 15.1 above	No
15.13		For	As per 15.1 above	No
15.14		For	As per 15.1 above	No
15.15		For	As per 15.1 above	No
15.16		For	As per 15.1 above	No
15.17		For	As per 15.1 above	No
15.18		For	As per 15.1 above	No
15.19		For	As per 15.1 above	No
15.20		For	As per 15.1 above	No
15.21		For	As per 15.1 above	No
15.22		For	As per 15.1 above	No
15.23		For	As per 15.1 above	No
15.24		For	As per 15.1 above	No
15.25		For	As per 15.1 above	No

No	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER	FOR/ AGAINST PROPOSAL	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	REQUEST TO BE HEARD YES/NO
15.26		For	As per 15.1 above	No
15.27		For	As per 15.1 above	No
15.28		For	As per 15.1 above	No
15.29		For	As per 15.1 above	No
15.30		For	As per 15.1 above	No
15.31		For	As per 15.1 above	No
15.32		For	As per 15.1 above	No
15.33		For	As per 15.1 above	No
15.34		For	As per 15.1 above	No
15.35		For	As per 15.1 above	No
15.36		For	As per 15.1 above	No
15.37		For	As per 15.1 above	No
15.38		For	As per 15.1 above	No
15.39		For	As per 15.1 above	No
15.40		For	As per 15.1 above	No
15.41		For	As per 15.1 above	No
15.42		For	As per 15.1 above	No
15.43		For	As per 15.1 above	No
15.44		For	As per 15.1 above	No
15.45		For	As per 15.1 above	No
15.46		For	As per 15.1 above	No
15.47		For	As per 15.1 above	No
15.48		For	As per 15.1 above	No
15.49		For	As per 15.1 above	No
15.50		For	As per 15.1 above	No
15.51		For	As per 15.1 above	No
15.52		For	As per 15.1 above	No
15.53		For	As per 15.1 above	No
15.54		For	As per 15.1 above	No

No	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER	FOR/ AGAINST PROPOSAL	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	REQUEST TO BE HEARD YES/NO
15.55		For	As per 15.1 above	No
15.56		For	As per 15.1 above	No
15.57		For	As per 15.1 above	No
15.58		For	As per 15.1 above	No
15.59		For	As per 15.1 above	No
15.60		For	As per 15.1 above	No
15.61		For	As per 15.1 above	No
15.62		For	As per 15.1 above	No
15.63		For	As per 15.1 above	No
15.64		For	As per 15.1 above	No
15.65		For	As per 15.1 above	No
15.66		For	As per 15.1 above	No
15.67		For	As per 15.1 above	No
15.68		For	As per 15.1 above	No
15.69		For	As per 15.1 above	No
15.70		For	As per 15.1 above	No
15.71		For	As per 15.1 above	No
15.72		For	As per 15.1 above	No
Folder 4, Tab 16				
16.1		For	<p>As a Grower of Fruit in the Shepparton area, I would like to record my support for closing Andrew Fairley Avenue.</p> <p>SPCA has survived an extraordinarily difficult period over recent years/months. The negative impact of their closure would have been dramatic and far-reaching had it occurred, but thankfully with the help of the State Government and parent company Coca Cola Amatil, their future has been assured for some time.</p> <p>SPCAA must remain competitive with overseas manufacturers and continue to improve efficiencies that are sustainable.</p> <p>The closure of Andrew Fairley Avenue would obviously be of great benefit to the company and would be seen by the community as Council's part in underlining the future and in turn, that of the wider community.</p>	No

No	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER	FOR/ AGAINST PROPOSAL	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	REQUEST TO BE HEARD YES/NO
16.2		For	As per 16.1 above	No
16.3		For	As per 16.1 above	No
16.4		For	As per 16.1 above	No
16.5		For	As per 16.1 above	No
16.6		For	As per 16.1 above	No
16.7		For	As per 16.1 above	No
16.8		For	As per 16.1 above	No
16.9		For	As per 16.1 above	No
16.10		For	As per 16.1 above	No
16.11		For	As per 16.1 above	No
16.12		For	As per 16.1 above	No
16.13		For	As per 16.1 above	No
16.14		For	As per 16.1 above	No
16.15		For	As per 16.1 above	No
16.16		For	As per 16.1 above	No
16.17		For	As per 16.1 above	No
16.18		For	As per 16.1 above	No
16.19		For	As per 16.1 above	No
16.20		For	As per 16.1 above	No
16.21		For	As per 16.1 above	No
16.22		For	As per 16.1 above	No
16.23		For	As per 16.1 above	No
16.24		For	As per 16.1 above	No
16.25		For	As per 16.1 above	No
16.26		For	As per 16.1 above	No
16.27		For	As per 16.1 above	No
16.28		For	As per 16.1 above	No
16.29		For	As per 16.1 above.	No

No	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER	FOR/ AGAINST PROPOSAL	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	REQUEST TO BE HEARD YES/NO
17.1		For	<p>The submission is on behalf of Fruit Growers Victoria.</p> <p>We support the proposal.</p> <p>We are aware that the proposal will slightly inconvenience road users. Our investigations indicate that alternative routes will be an extra 125 metres. While this distance is not significant it will cause traffic flow issues that will need to be addressed. We consider this can be managed.</p> <p>A strong SPCA means a strong Shepparton and a good trading environment for all traders.</p> <p>The closure of SPCA would have dramatic far reaching detrimental consequences for Shepparton and our community.</p> <p>SPCA is yet to be permanently saved and it needs to be globally competitive to do this. It must obtain every efficiency it can to do this.</p> <p>The purpose of the proposal is to make SPCA more efficient. The closure of the Road will benefit SPCA, but it will also benefit the entire community.</p> <p>On balance, the appropriate decision is to close the Road.</p>	Yes
17.2		For	<p>This is a serious decision that will impact the community.</p> <p>SPCA plays a vital role in our community through the employment and other support it provides to the community.</p> <p>I regularly use the Road and believe that the surrounding business will continue to be supported by the community if the Road is closed. I won't stop supporting them because the Road is not there.</p> <p>SPCA has a strategy to consolidate at the Shepparton site to achieve efficiency gains.</p> <p>The current arrangement is difficult and some motorists and pedestrians try to beat the red light when the boom gates close. This is not ideal, especially given the large amount of traffic that uses the Road now.</p> <p>We support the closure of the Road to preserve many of our permanent and seasonal jobs.</p> <p>We hope this tough decision will see SPCA continue its operations and employment in the Goulburn Valley</p>	No
17.3		For	<p>As a fruit grower and resident of the greater Shepparton area, I recognise the necessity of a strong SPCA.</p> <p>Prior to the State Government announcement the future of SPCA looked shaky and business confidence in the area reflected this.</p>	No

No	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER	FOR/ AGAINST PROPOSAL	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	REQUEST TO BE HEARD YES/NO
			<p>Any disadvantage to a few trades in the immediate vicinity of the Road would be outweighed by the benefits to the great majority of trades in the Goulburn Valley brought about by a strong SPCA.</p> <p>SPCA has a strong business case and considerable savings will be made by the closure of the Road.</p>	
17.4		For	<p>I urge Council to support SPCA.</p> <p>The closure of the Road may appear to be an extraordinary move, but this is a time that calls for extraordinary measures.</p> <p>We have lately seen a downturn for SPCA, but we have witnessed a strong community rely behind SPCA.</p> <p>We need to capitalise on the investment into SPCA.</p> <p>Please support the proposal to secure a future for local fruit growers, SPCA workers and the Shepparton community.</p>	No
17.5		For	<p>I fully support the proposal.</p> <p>SPCA is a critical player in the success of the Goulburn Valley.</p> <p>The funding has not yet been secured, as it is not a done deal. Coca Cola will continue to put pressure on SPCA. An unsatisfactory outcome in relation to the closure of the Road will force Coca Cola to review the position of SPCA.</p> <p>The closure of the Road will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve efficiency of SPCA; • Secure medium term employment of up to 3,000 employees; • Secure medium term prosperity for over 560 business within the Goulburn Valley; • Ensure the Goulburn Valley is cemented as the fruit bowl of Victoria. <p>I understand the sensitivity of the issue in the wider community. However, I believe the Councillors must weigh the community's needs in front of the community's desires.</p>	Yes
17.6		N/A	WITHDRAWN	N/A
17.7		For	<p>I am the owner of a small business Drives For Industry situated on Old Dookie Road. I acknowledge that the closure may affect businesses in the area but believe the closure will have a minimal impact on DFI. The alternate routes should be upgraded as part of the sale agreement. Retaining the last</p>	Yes

No	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER	FOR/ AGAINST PROPOSAL	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	REQUEST TO BE HEARD YES/NO
			remaining fruit canner in Australia as a major employer in the area should be high on everyone's list of priorities.	
17.8		For	As per 17.5 above.	Yes
17.9		For	SPC is a critical player in the success of the Goulburn Valley, including future prosperity. Growing pressures on CCA in its primary business of carbonated drinks, will continue to put pressure on the company as a whole. The closure of Andrew Fairley will: assist SPCA to implement its efficiency plans to return to profitability, assist in securing the medium term employment of up to 3000 employees directly and indirectly, assist in securing the medium term prosperity of over 560 businesses within the Goulburn Valley and ensure the Goulburn Valley is cemented as the fruit bowl of our state.	No
17.10		For	It is of great concern that if SPCA were to close it would have a monumental effect on the entire Shepparton region and community. I feel a number of Shepparton residents are not aware of some of the facts and have spread a number of inaccuracies in recent weeks. Businesses located to and use Andrew Fairley Avenue will be affected, but we need to do everything we can to keep SPC running,	Yes
17.11		For	Visy wholeheartedly supports SPC Ardmoma's submission for the closure of Andrew Fairley Avenue. Australian companies such as SPC need to be able to achieve efficiencies and be as productive as they possibly can to provide Australian-made innovative products at affordable prices. The closure of Andrew Fairley Avenue is vital to ensure the company's future competitiveness is secured. If SPC were to close in future, Andrew Fairley Avenue would be open to the public again.	No
17.12		For	SPC Ardmoma is a critical player in the success of the Goulburn Valley, including our future prosperity. The closure of Andrew Fairley Avenue will assist SPC Ardmoma to implement its efficiency plans to return to profitability, assist in securing the medium term employment of up to 3000 employees directly and indirectly, assist in securing the medium term prosperity of over 560 businesses within the Goulburn Valley and ensure the Goulburn Valley is cemented as the fruit bowl of our state.	No
Folder 4, Tab 18				
18.1		For	I am writing in support of Andrew Fairley Avenue's closure so SPC can consolidate on one site and make its required factory improvements. SPC has survived an extraordinarily difficult period over recent times. The	No

No	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER	FOR/ AGAINST PROPOSAL	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	REQUEST TO BE HEARD YES/NO
			<p>negative impact of the company's closure would have been dramatic and far-reaching had it occurred.</p> <p>In order for SPC to prevail against intensifying global competition, the company must be as efficient and productive as it possibly can.</p> <p>The closure of Andrew Fairley Avenue is vital for SPC to deliver its required efficiencies and ensure the company's future competitiveness is secured.</p> <p>SPC is making every attempt to improve efficiency and work on its productivity so I support them in these efforts and in the company's request for unconstrained access across Andrew Fairley Avenue.</p>	
18.2		For	As per 18.1 above	No
18.3		For	As per 18.1 above	No
18.4		For	As per 18.1 above	No
18.5		For	As per 18.1 above	No
18.6		For	As per 18.1 above	No
18.7		For	As per 18.1 above	No
18.8		For	As per 18.1 above	No
18.9		For	As per 18.1 above	No
18.10		For	As per 18.1 above	No
18.11		For	As per 18.1 above	No
18.12		For	As per 18.1 above	No
18.13		For	As per 18.1 above	No
18.14		For	As per 18.1 above	No
18.15		For	As per 18.1 above	No
18.16		For	As per 18.1 above	No
18.17		For	As per 18.1 above	No
18.18		For	As per 18.1 above	No
18.19		For	As per 18.1 above	No
18.20		For	As per 18.1 above	No
18.21		For	As per 18.1 above	No
18.22		For	As per 18.1 above	No
18.23		For	As per 18.1 above	No

No	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER	FOR/ AGAINST PROPOSAL	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	REQUEST TO BE HEARD YES/NO
18.24		For	As per 18.1 above	No
18.25		For	As per 18.1 above	No
18.26		For	As per 18.1 above	No
18.27		For	As per 18.1 above	No
18.28		For	As per 18.1 above	No
18.29		For	As per 18.1 above	No
18.30		For	As per 18.1 above	No
18.31		For	As per 18.1 above	No
18.32		For	As per 18.1 above	No
18.33		For	As per 18.1 above	No
18.34		For	As per 18.1 above	No
18.35		For	As per 18.1 above	No
18.36		For	As per 18.1 above	No
18.37		For	As per 18.1 above	No
18.38		For	As per 18.1 above	No
18.39		For	As per 18.1 above	No
18.40		For	As per 18.1 above	No
18.41		For	As per 18.1 above	No
18.42		For	As per 18.1 above	No
18.43		For	As per 18.1 above	No
18.44		For	As per 18.1 above	No
18.45		For	As per 18.1 above	No
18.46		For	As per 18.1 above	No
18.47		For	As per 18.1 above	No
18.48		For	As per 18.1 above	No
18.49		For	As per 18.1 above	No
18.50		For	As per 18.1 above	No
18.51		For	As per 18.1 above	No
18.52		For	As per 18.1 above	No

No	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER	FOR/ AGAINST PROPOSAL	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	REQUEST TO BE HEARD YES/NO
18.53		For	As per 18.1 above	No
18.54		For	As per 18.1 above	No
18.55		For	As per 18.1 above	No
18.56		For	As per 18.1 above	No
18.57		For	As per 18.1 above	No
18.58		For	As per 18.1 above	No
18.59		For	As per 18.1 above	No
18.60		For	As per 18.1 above	No
18.61		For	As per 18.1 above	No
18.62		For	As per 18.1 above	No
18.63		For	As per 18.1 above	No
Folder 4, Tab 19				
19.1		Against	Requests that Fords Shepparton Bus Service Pty Ltd be provided the opportunity to purchase the Road on behalf of the community to make the Road available to all motorists to use at all times including SPCA traffic.	No
19.2		Against	I use this Road daily. To close this Road and direct traffic either north or south direction would be detrimental to the traffic flow in this area. It's disappointing that spc laid off all it's maintenance staff recently. Suggestion, have a trial closure for a few days/week of Andrew fairley avenue. See what the feedback is then!	No
19.3		Against	The Road is one of four major East/West links in Shepparton. This has become even more evident with the growth in the eastern industrial area, housing developments further out Old Dookie Road and the increased need for emergency vehicles to access these areas. The process is hypocritical and illegal.	Yes
19.4		Against	I am a small business owner in the region of Andrew Fairley Avenue (Telford Drive) and wish to officially voice my views against the closure of this public road. I am opposed to the process that has been adopted to this point. It is simply more than inconvenient to the 7000 plus road users, not to mention 1000? School children, who use the public space daily, it is wrong. It is not a public acquisition for benefit the community, it is the opposite. I believe it will be detrimental to my business. I object strongly to the sale of the public	No

No	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER	FOR/ AGAINST PROPOSAL	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	REQUEST TO BE HEARD YES/NO
			space and the closure that will result from the sale.	
19.5		Against	<p>The submission requests the abandonment of the proposal. The submission makes a number of points in relation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety; • History and previous road closures; • City expansion and future planning; • Trouble spots; • Shepparton agricultural show; • SPCA; • value of the Road; and • cost to the community. 	Yes
19.6		Against	<p>Opposes the Road closure as it would only be of benefit to SPCA and not all the other businesses & residents that use the Road.</p> <p>Should it be found closing the road is the only option (which I seriously doubt) to improve efficiency by such a small amount it should not be sold it should be leased.</p> <p>If SPCA is serious about efficiency & not just looking for land to make one large parcel of land they should be happy to lease the land from Council & foot the bill for all the upgrades to fix the traffic problems caused by the closure.</p>	No
19.7		Against	<p>Recent statistics have reported thousands of vehicles using that route for daily travel. It is obvious how crucial the road is to maintain the regular flow of traffic throughout the area.</p> <p>It makes absolutely no sense for council to “give” a public road to a private multi-million dollar corporation and in essence, divide a town.</p> <p>There has been an overwhelming response from the people of the City of Greater Shepparton objecting to the suggestion of closing the road, council should therefore respect and listen to the people of Shepparton and keep Andrew Fairley Avenue open.</p>	No
19.8		Against	<p>Council has been incompetent in its approach and has put public perception of Council back several years, we are not mushrooms please don't treat us like we are.</p> <p>The traffic study may not be accurate. The Road should not be closes for</p>	No

No	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER	FOR/ AGAINST PROPOSAL	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	REQUEST TO BE HEARD YES/NO
			safety reasons, traffic congestion reasons, economic reasons, environmental reasons.	
19.9		Against	Request to be heard	Yes
19.10		Against	<p>The Council should be required to be satisfied that the Road is no longer reasonably required for public use before proposing to discontinue and sell the Road.</p> <p>I urge Council to now urgently call a Special Meeting to address the simple issue of whether it considers whether Andrew Fairley Avenue is “no longer reasonably required for public use” or not.</p> <p>It is my wish to appear in support of my brief submission and present supporting related argument. I vehemently oppose the possible discontinuance of Andrew Fairley Avenue.</p>	Yes
19.11		Against	<p>The Road is a vital thoroughfare of this fair city and I truly question the suggested savings by SPCA as they will still have the cool stores and their fruit receival in the same place .i.e., a long way away from production. I suggest that they should have to submit building plans for public/council approval demonstrating their savings. As an ex-employee I understand that there is still plenty of land available on the current site and it would only take a small amount of lateral thinking and minor traffic changes to satisfy both the public and the Company. Why couldn't the trucks be given a turn off point into the factory site prior to the roundabout on Railway Parade.</p> <p>I would be happy to further discuss this idea with someone prepared to listen and evaluate it as legitimate. Trucks currently enter that side of the factory and could tip tomatoes right at the site of the juice plant. Truly I can't see why they even asked for it.</p>	No
19.12		Against	<p>Redirecting 8000 cars a day would require significant costs in design, planning and infrastructure capital works to accommodate any traffic flow changes. There are many unanswered questions about the process and the costs and risks associated with the closure of the Road.</p> <p>Please do not rush this process. Whatever decision Council makes, this must be an informed decision that considers the social and economic impact to the Shepparton Community.</p>	No
19.13		Against	The closure of the Road would be detrimental to Shepparton and its residents and businesses. As a resident and business owner I object.	No
19.14		Against	I do not believe the interests of an individual high profile manufacturer, override the interests of the many, many other businesses in the vicinity, who	No

No	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER	FOR/ AGAINST PROPOSAL	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	REQUEST TO BE HEARD YES/NO
			<p>depend on having reasonable access to use Andrew Fairley Avenue, in the course of their day to day business operations.</p> <p>SPCA can give no guarantee the Company would still continue to operate in Shepparton.</p> <p>There are already far to few rail crossings, to a railway line that divides the City of Shepparton. To consider adding to that anomaly, seems just plain bad decision making.</p>	
19.15		For	<p>To me the matter is a no brainer – support SPCA and their request to close the Road means millions of dollars in investment, creation and continuation of jobs, and millions of extra dollars to the Shepparton economy each year.</p> <p>The inconvenience of the Road closure would soon be forgotten as residents and businesses in that area get used to using alternative routes. As a resident of North Shepparton, I find I have the choice to use New Dookie Road/Wheeler Street or the Bypass Road when accessing the Lockwood Road/Old Dookie Road area, and I would use all three access routes roughly equally at present. Also, the potential closure of SPCA should Andrew Fairley Avenue would be a disaster for Shepparton – businesses and residents all over the area would be affected.</p>	No
19.16		Against	NOT in favour of proposed closure of the Road	No
19.17		Against	<p>We object. Many businesses also use this road and would find it inconvenient and an added cost to access other roads not to mention the added congestion this proposal would bring about on New Dookie Road and Fryers Street. Land is still to be developed east of Shepparton near the Alternate Bypass Road yet no consideration has been given to accommodate this future traffic if part of the Andrew Fairley Avenue is discontinued. No proposals have been presented by council to accommodate the added traffic on other roads. Rate payers should not be expected to pay for a specific business' increase in productivity. That needs to come from within the business. Council needs to consider all the businesses and community members in this area who will be affected not just one particular business.</p>	No
19.18		Against	<p>As the new logistics manager of SPC Ardmona said to me on Tuesday night there are many other ways to move the Product over the road.</p> <p>Just look at the conveyers that move coal for long distances, a modification of such a scheme would fix the problem without closing the street.</p> <p>Please think before we destroy all the credibility of our Greater City of Shepparton.</p>	No

No	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER	FOR/ AGAINST PROPOSAL	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	REQUEST TO BE HEARD YES/NO
19.19		Against	<p>I am not in favour of the road closure!</p> <p>It will cause stressful traffic chaos at peak times. The money that will be spent on restructuring intersections should be spent on developing an underpass, which would allow SPC Ardmona to continue with their utilised improvements without wreaking havoc on local commuters and businesses.</p>	No
19.20		Against	<p>The closure of the Road will cause hardship to, and be problematic for, school children.</p> <p>Tomatoes smell and are a nuisance and SPCA causes both odour and noise issues for residents.</p> <p>The closure of the Road will add to the costs of required road improvements. The legal costs will also be expensive.</p>	Yes
19.21		Against	<p>Our staff and clients regularly use the Road. There will be huge inconvenience and added costs if the Road is closed.</p> <p>There is not many times when we are inconvenienced by the boom gates in the avenue and hence we cannot understand why it is so important for SPCA to close this road.</p> <p>Having been raised on an orchard, we have full support for SPCA, as does much of the community, but this support should not be used to abuse the rights (re: take advantage) of other businesses / citizens in Shepparton.</p>	No
19.22		Against	<p>I object to the closure of the public road Andrew Fairly Avenue to through traffic.</p> <p>Mainly I am concerned about intersections at Verney Road-Hawdon Street & Balaclava Road-New Dookie Road, New Dookie Road & Wheeler Street, Byass-Williams Street & Archer Street, Thompson Street & Williams Street.</p> <p>The case has not been made to demonstrate that this closure is imperative to SPCA. We have heard that the road needs to be closed to facilitate more efficient movement of fruit from the receivals area to processing factory. This would easily be achieved by an elevated conveyor belt over the road within an enclosed bridge.</p>	No
19.23		Against	<p>While the loss of AFA would not greatly interrupt our direct access, the resulting traffic congestion on the Fryers Street crossing and Wheeler Street/New Dookie Road concerns us. The proposed closure divides the eastern and western parts of the city even more. SPCA will not commit to long term occupation of the site.</p> <p>SPCA has already benefitted from the closure of a neighbouring street, and</p>	No

No	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER	FOR/ AGAINST PROPOSAL	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	REQUEST TO BE HEARD YES/NO
			<p>acquiring part of the showgrounds. Generally, this was accepted by the community. However, the Road is required, and Council should not simply acquiesce to SPCA's demand.</p> <p>Please listen to what would appear to be a majority of the Shepparton community.</p>	
19.24		Against	The submission is detailed and extensive in its objection to the process and the Road closure.	
19.25		For	<p>SPC is planning major efficiencies to prevail against intensifying global competition. To implement SPCA's \$100 million modernisation program and achieve our efficiencies, be as productive as we possibly can and provide Australian made innovative products at affordable prices, the closure of the Road is critical.</p> <p>For almost a century, SPCA has played a vital economic role in Shepparton. Approving our application will create a \$100 million stimulus for the region, allow the 560 businesses currently trading with SPCA to continue to do so, provide the opportunity for SPCA to grow and most importantly, it will safeguard the \$165 million economic activity currently generated by SPCA in the region.</p> <p>SPCA therefore urges Council to consider the far reaching economic and community benefits outlined in our submission. These are benefits that we believe, on balance, are significant and will ensure that SPCA remains a long term part of the community.</p>	Yes
19.26		Against	The traffic upgrades will need to be carried out before the Road is closed and given to SPCA at an estimated cost of \$2.5m for high priority works and \$0.8m for moderate priority works.	Yes
19.27		Against	<p>I both live and work in the area and closure of this road would affect me.</p> <p>While I am writing to lodge an official submission against the road closure plan, my comments are centred around the engagement process undertaken by Greater Shepparton City Council and SPC Ardmona over recent months.</p> <p>Community members can be passionate to the point of irrational, and sometimes are unable to recognise that there are several sides to one story – however I also wish to state my dissatisfaction with the Council and SPCA in this instance, and the process (or not) undertaken to engage effectively with the community about this issue.</p> <p>So while I would like to express my understanding of your situation and I acknowledge the struggles you probably would have broached regardless of</p>	No

No	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER	FOR/ AGAINST PROPOSAL	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	REQUEST TO BE HEARD YES/NO
			<p>the effectiveness of the engagement process, I do want to make my opinion clear that the process undertaken has been poor and a longer, more transparent and inclusive engagement process would have been appreciated by many residents affected by this issue, including myself and my family.</p> <p>I am against the Road closure.</p>	
19.28		Against	<p>As a local and a shareholder I fully support SPCA in its endeavours to minimise costs (which may or may not eventuate from this proposal) which in turn will hopefully result in the company continuing to operate, expand and generate employment for the community into the future and also provide a cash flow into the economy of Shepparton. But my support stops there.</p> <p>From a personal point of view as a regular user of the Avenue travelling from north Shepparton to the east and south of Shepparton and return on a daily basis and on most days more than once I believe it would be an inconvenience and time consuming to go an alternative way should the avenue be closed.</p>	No
19.29		Against	<p>I was the Crossing Supervisor on Balaclava Road at Bouchier Street School ten years ago and the amount of traffic that used the road back then was heavy. The traffic would have increased in those ten years and now you are wanting to divert more traffic down Balaclava Road. I fear that you are putting the lives of the children and the supervisor in danger with the extra traffic.</p> <p>In the Traffic Report it states that nearly 11000 vehicles use New Dookie Road each day but I could not find the amount for Balaclava Road, so even if three quarters of that amount use it now, which is approximately 9700 vehicles, and then you are wanting to increase that by 30-40% with the closing of Andrew Fairley Avenue.</p> <p>Have you even thought about what would happen if there was an accident at the roundabout at Hawdon Street or along Balaclava Road near the school? Have you thought about how impatient drivers get when they get held up for any reason and the risks they take?</p> <p>I am hoping that the Council will use some common sense and leave Andrew Fairley Avenue open for all to use.</p>	No
19.30		Against	<p>I object for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • this is a public road • this road is well utilised by Shepparton residents 	No

No	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER	FOR/ AGAINST PROPOSAL	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	REQUEST TO BE HEARD YES/NO
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • there is no justification for selling land containing Shepparton public roads to companies • there are other solutions available to SPC, including an underpass or relocating the main site to Ardmona in Mooroopna • given that there was a proposal some years ago to close Andrew Fairley Avenue which was defeated, why has this issue been raised again? • why does the council consider it has a responsibility to resolve SPC's traffic problems rather than managing Shepparton's infrastructure for the benefit of Shepparton residents? • even industrial areas contribute to the urban 'landscape' and therefore residents have a right of access to these areas • closure of Andrew Fairley Avenue will result in increased traffic in other streets, creating congestion particularly during peak traffic times. 	
19.31		Against	I use the Road up to 8 times a day with getting to & from work, and also getting to & from the work areas I need to attend. I see the amount of traffic this road moves every day and I cannot believe that the council will see fit to close this road. I am adding my protest to this decision and applaud the protest that took place yesterday even though I was caught up in the traffic jam because it clearly shows the daily traffic jams I will be dealing with on Balaclava Rd if Andrew Fairly Ave is closed.	No
19.32		Against	As per 19.31 above	No
19.33		Against	<p>As a regular user of Andrew Fairley Avenue (min of 4 time a day, up to 10 per day) I plead with you not to close this piece of road. It is a vital communications link for this greater city as your own figures clearly show with huge vehicle movement numbers per day, not to mention pedestrian traffic.</p> <p>If this council make the massively stupid decision to close this vital piece of road I would like to propose an alternative to selling the land to CCA/SPCA. The council has sold roads off to SPC at least twice in past history with the loss of publicly owned infrastructure, so please, please, please do not sell it this time but lease it to them and retain council ownership to the road. This will allow reopening of the road when SPCA finally go out of business, which I think everyone realises will eventually happen with CCA as owners.</p> <p>This piece of vital infrastructure has been paid for by past and current rate</p>	No

No	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER	FOR/ AGAINST PROPOSAL	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	REQUEST TO BE HEARD YES/NO
			payers of this city and we are owed the right to have it for our use not for some multi-billion dollar overseas company to eventually sell off and make a profit.	
19.34		Against	<p>Members of the Shepparton Fire Brigade voted at a recent meeting to write objecting to the closure of Andrew Fairley Avenue.</p> <p>We are extremely concerned that the closure of Andrew Fairley Avenue will adversely affect our ability to arrive at incidents in a timely manner to protect lives and properties.</p> <p>The avenue is used by firefighters to reach businesses, residents and motor vehicle accidents in their time of need in the areas around Lockwood Road, Old Dookie Road, Wheeler Road and beyond.</p> <p>Members of the public would be clearly disadvantaged if the Avenue was closed. We have been called to attend workplace accidents, motor vehicle accidents, hazardous incidents and fires at locations in and around Andrew Fairley Avenue and any delay in reaching the location could be the difference between life, death, quality of life or loss of home and / or livelihood for those involved.</p> <p>We request that any decision in relation the closure considers the implications of delay by members of the Shepparton Fire Brigade to attend incidents and the affects of this on the citizens of the Shepparton.</p>	No
19.35		Against	Would it be possible to shut the Road for one week just to see what havoc it will cause to the surrounding roads maybe then we can all work out what best solution would be. I think after one week you might see it is a bad idea, with the added cost of fixing up the roads around the area would be.	No
19.36		Against	<p>This submission is in three parts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objection from a Risk Management and Disaster Planning/Implication base • Objection from the perspective of traffic flow complications. • Objections by way of general comment. 	No
19.37		Against	<p>We strongly oppose the closure of the Road. Since 1996, volume of traffic has increased and the proposed closure of the Road would contribute to congestion on alternative routes.</p> <p>Major upgrades would be necessary to accommodate increased volumes of traffic.</p> <p>Any survey of current traffic would need to be undertaken during school hours</p>	No

No	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER	FOR/ AGAINST PROPOSAL	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	REQUEST TO BE HEARD YES/NO
			to obtain an accurate assessment to provide credible data. Apart from the above concerns we experienced a catastrophic medical crisis (at our home) resulting in cardiac arrest. We are of the belief if the Road had been closed death certainly would have occurred.	
19.38		Against	In regard to the Road, a solution may be for SPCA to move their fruit above the road via conveyer. I suggest this was done years ago with smaller fruit boxes, so with the present technology it would be possible.	No
19.39		Against	Object to the lack of transparency and due process. My other major concern is the matter of closing a west-east crossing that is the preferred route for traffic accessing the developing eastern business and residential properties. It is about the entire traffic management of west- east routes. Routes that are rapidly becoming congested and as the east continues to grow congestion will only increase. Andrew Fairley Avenue just happens to be the link in the most used crossing! I again urge you to consider the larger questions of the city's growth, the place of a large factory in the heart of Shepparton, the impossibility of replacing the west-link route and the consequent traffic chaos, the actual number of weeks or months that SPCA will make use of the road area to move fruit and tomatoes. It is still a seasonal business and it's not clear if or when it might become a year round business. Council would be foolish indeed to close Andrew Fairley Avenue and find it is used for only a few months of the year.	No
19.40		Against	I am totally against the closure of Andrew Fairley Avenue.	No
19.41		Against	I am totally against the closure of the above road, and feel the way council have gone about said closure shows total disrespect for the people of Shepparton.	No
19.42		Against	As a member of the Shepparton community I value SPC Ardmona as a local business presence and the benefit it brings our wider business community. I ca not however support its push to close Andrew Fairley Avenue. Closing an Avenue may not seem like a big deal, but you need only to drive this part of town daily to realise that even as it is with Andrew Fairley Avenue open, traffic movement is inhibited because of SPC Ardmona's sizeable site. Close this Avenue and traffic issues will be greatly exacerbated around this part of town. Unnecessarily long routes would have to be driven to get anywhere in this part of town and the existing alternative routes are not designed to carry even the amount of traffic they have during peak times	No

No	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER	FOR/ AGAINST PROPOSAL	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	REQUEST TO BE HEARD YES/NO
			now.	
19.43		Against	There are some people who do not wish to see this roadway closed, However maybe they could accept it for a shorter period and council investigate Excavating and placing an underpass along the stretch and then selling the to SPC This way people get the best of both Worlds SPV expands jobs are kept and then those who need to go through that way so badly can go under the development Like having Cake and eating it too.	No
19.44		Against	I want to see that Andrew Fairley Ave to remain open as it is an East-West bypass route of the CBD of Shepparton connecting the Western Goulburn Valley and the Eastern Goulburn Valley. Trucks should be kept out of the CBD and use Fryers St, Welsford St, Knight St and Andrew Fairley Ave to go from one end of Shepparton to the Industrial Estate in Shepparton and beyond. This is not in the best interests of Greater Shepparton at all to close Andrew Fairley Ave.	No
19.45		Against	Andrew Fairley Avenue provides East West access that if removed will force congestion to other parts of the city and I have not seen any study into the ramifications or possible plans that will alleviate potential congestion.. I travel along this road to work every morning and believe it to be an important access road for the city.	No
19.46		Against	Our main contention is that this process has been too speedy and without consideration for other alternatives, even at the expense of SPCA not having the efficiencies they expect by next season. There is too much at stake for the whole community to rush this through. We would reiterate that we wish to see SPCA as a viable company in Shepparton for many years to come and would be prepared to be inconvenienced ourselves with the loss of Andrew Fairley Ave. However, we do believe that there are too many other people who would suffer a greater loss than us who must be considered. We also strongly suggest to Council to make a trial of road closure for perhaps one week.	No
19.47		Against	I would like to suggest that the Avenue stay open, and they build a tunnel under the road to either convey the fruit with the present tractor-trailer system, or transport the fruit bins on a conveyor under the road.	No
19.48		Against	Once again the closure of Andrew fairy Ave is on the agenda. This road is a major access route and should not be closed to the people of Shepparton. It is already a bottle neck at the roundabout at balaclava and Hawden st .	No

No	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER	FOR/ AGAINST PROPOSAL	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	REQUEST TO BE HEARD YES/NO
			No deals should be done by the council to facilitate the takeover of this thoroughfare by this company. I ask the council to say no to this proposal once and for all, the people of Shepparton have already spoken on this issue almost twenty years ago and that should be respected by SPC and council.	
19.49		Against	This is an absolute critical road for drivers and predestines in Shepparton. In my opinion this issue should not have even been voted for public consultation, in fact it should have never been given consideration. As you would be well aware the traffic congestion around this area is already a huge problem and has been for years. I acknowledge that we need to support SPC Ardmona but not at such a high cost that would affect so many more people in the Shepparton area. What about the impact of small businesses in the area.	No
19.50		Against	There are alternative options that would be viable and preferable. The Road is a very important link in Shepparton. The problem can be overcome with a little commitment & some lateral thinking.	No
19.51		For	I use Andrew Fairley Av from time to time but can easily find equally adequate ways around. If we can support a manufacturing business by closing a road, I think we should do so. There is no need in my view for a road to need to become redundant before being able to permanently close it	No
19.52		For	It is of more concern that S.P.C is able to continue its operations in Shepparton than to close this road open. The roundabout at the end of Knight street can be something of a problem with too many vehicles using Knight Street (too many heavy vehicles using Knight street) and the traffic from Hawden Street and Railway parade make for anything but smooth traffic flow. The petitioners to retain Andrew Fairley Road are a small pressure group, and do not constitute the majority of rate-payers from Shepparton. Entry to Old Dookie Road is well provided for by Wheeler Street and other ways.	No
19.53		Against	As a business owner in Mitchell Street we strongly oppose the closure of Andrew Fairley Ave as it would affect our business greatly and add to our cost of delivery, not to mention the inconvenience caused. While we want SPCA to operate efficiently into the future, we don't see that this closure is essential to the future success of SPCA given the costs and inconvenience it will impose on ours and other businesses in the area. SPCA needs to look at its work practices and wage costs to create the efficiencies it requires before asking us to make a sacrifice on its behalf. We would expect common sense to prevail.	No

No	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER	FOR/ AGAINST PROPOSAL	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	REQUEST TO BE HEARD YES/NO
19.54		Against	I live in Chertsey Road and I find the idea of closing the Road an appalling idea. How terribly inconvenient this closure would be if we could no longer use the Road to get to Old Dookie Road. This is public land and the idea should never even be given any thought at all. Driving down to Fryers Street to have to then do a round trip to get to Old Dookie Road is a totally ridiculous idea. I thought this plan was scotched some years back when it was mooted once before. What voice do ordinary residents have to make their wishes heard? Big Companies like SPCA have all the power and the nearby residents are discounted every time. Why don't SPCA merge with the council to build an overpass or an underpass to solve SPCA's problem? This would make far more sense. Shepparton City Council seem only too happy to spend money on other less necessary plans!	No
19.55		Against	As per 19.48 above.	No
19.56		Against	I again urge you to consider the larger questions of the city's growth, the place of a large factory in the heart of Shepparton, the impossibility of replacing the west-link route and the consequent traffic chaos, the actual number of weeks or months that SPCA will make use of the road area to move fruit and tomatoes. It is about the entire traffic management of west- east routes. Routes that are rapidly becoming congested and as the east continues to grow congestion will only increase. Andrew Fairley Avenue just happens to be the link in the most used crossing!	No
19.57		Against	I have been a paramedic in Shepparton for over 30 years and remember clearly the attempt to close this vital road in 1996. The response time for an ambulance responding from Knight street, using our Safe Driving Model, would incur approximately an extra 2 minutes to attend a patient in Old Dookie Road – provided the roads were relatively clear of traffic. This is clearly not ideal in an industry reliant on the ability to respond to a patient in the shortest possible time frame. The fact that in excess of some 6,000 vehicles utilize this road on a daily basis, means that these vehicle will have to divert to other access roads across the railway line, adding to the already congested roads – especially at school times and between 5:00 pm and 6:00 pm on week days. This is not taking into account the further congestion from the cartage of extra produce across the Causeway to SPCA. There appear to be no guarantees for the future existence of SPCA, even	No

No	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER	FOR/ AGAINST PROPOSAL	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	REQUEST TO BE HEARD YES/NO
			<p>with the taxpayer bailout, whereas the removal of Andrew Fairley Avenue appears permanent.</p> <p>It is my personal belief that Emergency Services will require access to this area of Shepparton more and more in the future, as development of this vital area of growth accelerates. We are already seeing evidence of this growth, with the new milk processing plant and further subdivisions around Dobson's Estate, which has already in excess of 200 homes.</p> <p>The Shepparton CBD, including the Shepparton Ambulance Station is contained within the confines of the river to the West and the railway line to the East. We have already been exposed to the major issues involving the closure of the Causeway, on a number of occasions. With such limited access across the railway line, let us not make the same mistake, deliberately, by closing Andrew Fairley Avenue.</p>	
19.58		Against	<p>We object to the Council proposed closure and sale of the purported surplus land to SPCA as proposes by Council and SPCA.</p> <p>It is unreasonable and unfair to even consider closing a road that is currently used by more than 8000 vehicles per day and therefore a clear demonstration that the road is required by residents and businesses of Shepparton and is currently being used for the important East/West crossing of these businesses and residents of the area.</p> <p>Both council and SPCA have failed to show that the road is not required.</p> <p>The community has a legitimate expectation that the road must be retained and remain open whilst the road has a use for the rate payers and road users of Greater Shepparton.</p> <p>I take this opportunity as a user of Andrew Fairley Avenue to request to be heard as well as support our submission address to council.</p>	Yes
19.59		For	I strongly support the closure of Andrew Fairley Avenue, to fully support SPC Ardmona in their request for the road to be closed.	No
19.60		For	I strongly support the closure of Andrew Fairley Avenue, to fully support SPC Ardmona in their request for the road to be closed.	No
19.61		Against	Will create a bottle neck for traffic at the intersection at the end of Fryers Street. It would be better if a car counter was placed in Andrew Fairley Drive to see how many people would be affected by your decision. What will be next the road beside the showgrounds.	No
19.62		Against	The Avenue is a well used road critical to the connection of our city west to	No

No	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER	FOR/ AGAINST PROPOSAL	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	REQUEST TO BE HEARD YES/NO
			east. SPC important to community but not as important as the ability to move through areas of the city. If SPCA are in a state of closing, we as a community should let them close as any other business would.	
19.63		Against	Andrew Fairley Avenue is a public asset and I don't believe the City of Greater Shepparton should offer a public asset without public consultation. I am certain that the road closure will have a detrimental effect on the businesses in the surrounding area. What next will SPC ask for? The roads around the plant are currently at capacity and closure will only put more traffic on these roads. Can an overpass or underpass be created.	No
19.64		Against	I read in the paper that Jeanette Powell ruled out any intervention saying the closure was a matter of City of Greater Shepparton and the Government's contribution was not contingent on a road closure, therefore SPC acknowledged the fact that it was made without any commitment or expectation that Andrew Fairley Avenue would be closed. It is incomprehensible that Council can announce the closure of a major linking road without due through to previous traffic management plans. He discusses the rail crossings along High Street, Balaclava Road and Andrew Fairley Avenue. High Street and Balaclava Road are not logistical options and therefore I submit that Andrew Fairley Avenue cannot be closed.	No
19.65		Against	The road carries 6,000-7,000, if it is closed where will these vehicles go? The surrounding roads are not built to carry this number of vehicles, these roads would be mayhem at peak times. This proposal was brought up 18 years ago and the community successfully argued against this proposal. Why is the council so committed to SPCA to the detriment of the rest of Shepparton's industry by selling off this road that is a feeder to the east for all traffic from the west.	No
19.66		Against	My suggestion is put a tunnel in to keep favor with the locals then give the land on top to SPC. This would also take out rail crossing as well.	No
19.67		Against	List of petitions	No
19.68		Against	Should remain a public thoroughfare only a limited site for 5 years. The parent company has allowed spc to become run down. Mooroopna freight hub will become a waste of money. Not to mention the workers who have lost their jobs over recent years and the growers who have had quotas severely cut. In 1996 the iead was squash we have only grown in population.	No
19.69		Against	Insufficient information has been received by ratepayers. Due to the immense amount of traffic that travels this road daily in would be inefficient for people	Yes

No	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER	FOR/ AGAINST PROPOSAL	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	REQUEST TO BE HEARD YES/NO
			of Shepparton. Roads require a lot of attention to make them better	
19.70		Against	<p>Members of the Shepparton Police station have expressed their concerns and believe closure of the road would create problems for Police in respect to preventing an expedient route to the industrial and residential areas in the immediate vicinity of Andrew fairley avenue.</p> <p>There has been obvious increase in vehicular along railway parade in peak times.</p> <p>Would be a large problem for heavy vehicles traveling to the industrial area.</p> <p>Although our response times to emergency situations is paramount, I have great concerns in relation to the amount of traffic in regards to going a different way.</p>	No
19.71		Against	<p>The closure of the road would have a dramatic impact on the industrial estates around Lockwood Road, Old Dookie Road, Wheeler Street, Drummond Road and Florence Street. The closure of the road would have a dramatic impact for access for emergency services such as police, fire etc. I would hate to be in that situation where we had to wait an extra 5 minutes for essential services due to the closure of one road. The added cost to our business would be an estimated \$40,000.00 per annum based on the cost of running our vehicles at \$2.30 per kilometre. We have not had the opportunity to inspect a traffic management report or any other relevant information we have to provide when doing these works. I believe council needs to be consistent with the process or face a costly process through VCAT. I believe that the road has a water main that runs under the road to service both east and west sides of town plus the water required for SPCA. SPCA claim the closure will benefit them 3%. There would be better solutions if thought through that would be better suited long term if SPCA would commit to this project long term. He offers solutions.</p>	
19.72		Against	<p>I have used this road many times daily for the last 27 years mainly related to the running of my various businesses. The closure of this road will seriously impact on all businesses especially those operating to he East of the railway line. This will come at what cost? I implore the council to use common sense and withdraw any proposal to close this road as they did many years ago.</p>	Yes
19.73		Against	<p>Why should we sell a road with them company might not be around after 5 years. With the money received from state government they could build an underpass to accommodate the cannery's cross traffic.</p>	No
19.74		Against	LATE SUBMISSION – Population growth 26%. Being forced to use Fryers	No

No	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER	FOR/ AGAINST PROPOSAL	SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	REQUEST TO BE HEARD YES/NO
			Street more the extra carbon monoxide would not promote Shepparton's café precinct.	
19.75		Against	LATE SUBMISSION – Shouldn't be sold for a private entity's gain. Road should be available for emergency services and public use.	No
19.76		Against	LATE SUBMISSION – The decision all boils down to the individual councilors. There is a lack of due process caused by an unrealistic timeline. The projects true costs and benefits/impact have not been properly investigated. SPCA are not paying their fair share of associated costs, rate payers should not have to contribute additional funds on top of the \$22million already put forward. There is a cost risk to rate payers. The proposal goes against well-established local government policy for street closures. The decision to close the road will bring discredit to councilors. He offers a way to bring a result for both parties.	