| Community of Community Made | Category 1 Category | | tegory 2 | Category 3 | | Category 4 | | Written | | All Categories | | |
|---|---------------------|------------|----------|------------|------|------------|-----|------------|-----|----------------|------|------------|
| General Description of Comments Made | 148 | % of Resp. | 499 | % of Resp. | 581 | % of Resp. | 136 | % of Resp. | 137 | % of Resp. | 1501 | % of Resp. |
| 1 Concerns about the removal and/or pruning of trees (including significant and/or old trees) and other vegetation or bush | 25 | 16.89% | 214 | 42.89% | 265 | 45.61% | 34 | 25.00% | 68 | 49.64% | 606 | 40.37% |
| 2 Concerns about the environmental impact (biodiversity (flora and fauna) including loss of habitat) | 33 | 22.30% | 226 | 45.29% | 229 | 39.41% | 37 | 27.21% | 79 | 57.66% | 604 | 40.24% |
| 3 Concerns with amenity loss (we like or chose natural bush area/block and the privacy this brings) | 16 | 10.81% | 88 | 17.64% | 114 | 19.62% | 15 | 11.03% | 45 | 32.85% | 278 | 18.52% |
| 4 Concerns about increased and ongoing costs to achieve compliance | 9 | 6.08% | 72 | 14.43% | 115 | 19.79% | 19 | 13.97% | 50 | 36.50% | 265 | 17.65% |
| 5 Concerns about the environmental impact generally (including increasing the impact of climate change) | 14 | 9.46% | 87 | 17.43% | 71 | 12.22% | 19 | 13.97% | 40 | 29.20% | 231 | 15.39% |
| 6 Concerns with amenity loss (generally, loss of privacy and/or mental health) | 6 | 4.05% | 79 | 15.83% | 102 | 17.56% | 9 | 6.62% | 18 | 13.14% | 214 | 14.26% |
| 7 Existing controls (Notice) are adequate and complied with (additional measures not needed) | 15 | 10.14% | 55 | 11.02% | 92 | 15.83% | 19 | 13.97% | 23 | 16.79% | 204 | 13.59% |
| 8 Concerns requirements do or may conflict with environmental or other legislation, covenants or planning policy (should not be retrospective) | 2 | 1.35% | 49 | 9.82% | 57 | 9.81% | 8 | 5.88% | 51 | 37.23% | 167 | 11.13% |
| 9 Concerns requirements are excessive, not practical or realistic | 6 | 4.05% | 61 | 12.22% | 61 | 10.50% | 18 | 13.24% | 12 | 8.76% | 158 | 10.53% |
| 10 Concerns about lack of fire mitigation works, including firebreaks, on public land (including road reserve) | 6 | 4.05% | 53 | 10.62% | 41 | 7.06% | 11 | 8.09% | 20 | 14.60% | 131 | 8.73% |
| 11 Low or no risk (requirements of Notice not appropriate for category or are not proportional to risk) | 25 | 16.89% | 69 | 13.83% | 21 | 3.61% | 2 | 1.47% | 9 | 6.57% | 126 | 8.39% |
| 12 Property owners know and accept the risks associated with fire (need less regulation, not more) | 2 | 1.35% | 17 | 3.41% | 58 | 9.98% | 12 | 8.82% | 23 | 16.79% | 112 | 7.46% |
| 13 Concerns about need to replace wooden fencing as part of APZ requirements | 2 | 1.35% | 41 | 8.22% | 29 | 4.99% | 8 | 5.88% | 15 | 10.95% | 95 | 6.33% |
| 14 Concerns about limiting the height and spacing of shrubs (loss of amenity and fire retardent species) | 8 | 5.41% | 42 | 8.42% | 25 | 4.30% | 2 | 1.47% | 16 | 11.68% | 93 | 6.20% |
| 15 Concerns with firebreaks (not needed when adjacent to strategic firebreaks) | 0 | 0.00% | 1 | 0.20% | 68 | 11.70% | 3 | 2.21% | 18 | 13.14% | 90 | 6.00% |
| 16 Concerns about spacing of trees (amenity and habitat impact) | 13 | 8.78% | 35 | 7.01% | 16 | 2.75% | 6 | 4.41% | 18 | 13.14% | 88 | 5.86% |
| 17 Risk to properties should be assessed on an individual basis, not a one size fits all | 0 | 0.00% | 19 | 3.81% | 41 | 7.06% | 8 | 5.88% | 18 | 13.14% | 86 | 5.73% |
| 18 Need to consider/investigate/develop other mitigation strategies inc. education and cultural burning | 4 | 2.70% | 26 | 5.21% | 28 | 4.82% | 11 | 8.09% | 13 | 9.49% | 82 | 5.46% |
| 19 Need to have or give consideration to additional measures (e.g. rooftop sprinklers, gutter guards, or onsite firefighting equipment) | 3 | 2.03% | 13 | 2.61% | 38 | 6.54% | 10 | 7.35% | 18 | 13.14% | 82 | 5.46% |
| 20 Concerns with firebreaks (not needed due to low risk, or because they will not provide additional protection from fire) | 2 | 1.35% | 9 | 1.80% | 39 | 6.71% | 0 | 0.00% | 18 | 13.14% | 68 | 4.53% |
| 21 Concerns about soil erosion, weed generation, and dieback infestation due to removal of vegetation (in APZ and for new firebreaks) | 0 | 0.00% | 3 | 0.60% | 42 | 7.23% | 2 | 1.47% | 20 | 14.60% | 67 | 4.46% |
| 22 Concerns compliance will decrease property value | 1 | 0.68% | 25 | 5.01% | 22 | 3.79% | 6 | 4.41% | 9 | 6.57% | 63 | 4.20% |
| 23 Concerns about increased and ongoing costs to install firebreaks | 0 | 0.00% | 0 | 0.00% | 44 | 7.57% | 3 | 2.21% | 14 | 10.22% | 61 | 4.06% |
| 24 Need to give consideration to existing vegetation, including trees, may be fire retardent species | 0 | 0.00% | 18 | 3.61% | 18 | 3.10% | 16 | 11.76% | 7 | 5.11% | 59 | 3.93% |
| 25 BAL standards (building house to BAL standards should be enough) | 2 | 1.35% | 16 | 3.21% | 18 | 3.10% | 3 | 2.21% | 10 | 7.30% | 49 | 3.26% |
| 26 Concerns that property categories are based on mapping or property size, no relationship to risk (bushfire prone next to non-bushfire prone) | 2 | 1.35% | 21 | 4.21% | 4 | 0.69% | 10 | 7.35% | 11 | 8.03% | 48 | 3.20% |
| 27 Concerns requirements not aligned to the Strategic Community Plan and/or Community Values | 2 | 1.35% | 7 | 1.40% | 17 | 2.93% | 0 | 0.00% | 19 | 13.87% | 45 | 3.00% |
| Need to give consideration to FMPs, BMPs, or other emergency plans (e.g. personal response/evacuation plans) | 3 | 2.03% | 5 | 1.00% | 14 | 2.41% | 6 | 4.41% | 16 | 11.68% | 44 | 2.93% |
| 29 Need to improve definitions (e.g. APZ, firebreaks, low threat vegetation, ground covers, combustable materials) | 4 | 2.70% | 4 | 0.80% | 18 | 3.10% | 10 | 7.35% | 8 | 5.84% | 44 | 2.93% |
| 30 Concerns about risk (overhanging trees and/or dry grass) from neighbouring properties (inc. vacant blocks/absentee owners) | 8 | 5.41% | 15 | 3.01% | 8 | 1.38% | 7 | 5.15% | 5 | 3.65% | 43 | 2.86% |
| 31 Concerns with firebreaks (not needed when adjacent to roads or there is alternate access (e.g. via paddocks) | 0 | 0.00% | 1 | 0.20% | 31 | 5.34% | 3 | 2.21% | 8 | 5.84% | 43 | 2.86% |
| 32 Concerns with firebreak alignment (not practical due to topography, creeklines, rocks, and trees) | 0 | 0.00% | 1 | 0.20% | 28 | 4.82% | 3 | 2.21% | 9 | 6.57% | 41 | 2.73% |
| 33 Cultivated lawns and gardens reduce the risk of fire/should be exempt | 9 | 6.08% | 15 | 3.01% | 7 | 1.20% | 1 | 0.74% | 8 | 5.84% | 40 | 2.66% |
| 34 Concerns about increased size of APZ from 20m to 25m | 0 | 0.00% | 1 | 0.20% | 23 | 3.96% | 4 | 2.94% | 3 | 2.19% | 31 | 2.07% |
| 35 City needs to be tougher on non-compliance with existing Notice (not change requirements for compliant properties) | 0 | 0.00% | 9 | 1.80% | 17 | 2.93% | 0 | 0.00% | 2 | 1.46% | 28 | 1.87% |
| 36 Concerns about the City's management/maintenance of strategic firebreaks (SFBs) and emergency access ways (EAWs) | 0 | 0.00% | 1 | 0.20% | 20 | 3.44% | 1 | 0.74% | 3 | 2.19% | 25 | 1.67% |
| 37 Proposed changes are needed or supported (they are more sensible and logical, easier to follow) | 5 | 3.38% | 9 | 1.80% | 9 | 1.55% | 0 | 0.00% | 1 | 0.73% | 24 | 1.60% |
| 38 More trees are needed, not less | 7 | 4.73% | 4 | 0.80% | 2 | 0.34% | 0 | 0.00% | 9 | 6.57% | 22 | 1.47% |
| 39 Low or no risk (large fires not likely to happen or have not happened here) | 3 | 2.03% | 8 | 1.60% | 4 | 0.69% | 0 | 0.00% | 4 | 2.92% | 19 | 1.27% |
| | 237 | | 1419 | | 1856 | | 326 | | 738 | | 4576 | |