

General Description of Comments Made		Category 1		Category 2		Category 3		Category 4		Written		All Categories	
		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%
28	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	