



Ref: T6-16-444, LA31699
RJ:EF

13 March 2017

AUSTRALIAN INTERNATIONAL AVIATION COLLEGE
C/- MICHAEL BOHLSCHIED
PRINCIPLE PROJECT MANAGEMENT
PO BOX 32
THE JUNCTION NSW 2291

Civic Centre
22 Tozer Street
PO Box 3078
West Kempsey NSW 2440

Customer Services
P. 02 6566 3200
F. 02 6566 3205
ksc@kempsey.nsw.gov.au
www.kempsey.nsw.gov.au
ABN 70 705 618 663

Dear Sir/Madam

**T6-16-444 PROPOSED PILOT TRAINING FACILITY, KEMPSEY AIRPORT, LOT 1
DP11444474, AIRPORT ROAD, ALDAVILLA – COUNCIL COMMENTS ON
AMENDMENTS TO DRAFT CONDITIONS OF CONSENT AS PROPOSED BY APPLICANT**

Please find following a table providing Council comments in response to the proposed amendments to the draft conditions of consent by the applicant in regards to T6-16-444 (2016NTH030) – Proposed Pilot Training Facility at the Kempsey Airport.

No.	Condition	Applicant Response / Proposed Amendment	Council Comments
1	"The development shall be implemented in accordance with the plans and supporting documents set out in the following table except where modified by any conditions of this consent. ..."	<i>Drawing No. "D13_B OLS Site Plan" has been omitted from the document register. This plan shows the plotting of the development in relation to the Obstacle Limitation Surface under Manual of Standards Part 139 – Aerodromes. We consider this plan should be included under Condition 1. A copy has been enclosed as Annexure 1.</i>	Drawing No. "D13_B OLS Site Plan" will be added to the list of plans and documents in draft Condition 1.
9	"Prior to the issue of any Construction Certificate, plans shall be submitted to Council for approval demonstrating compliance with the Obstacle Limitation Surfaces (OLS) restrictions in accordance with the Manual of Standards Part 139 – Aerodromes (Australian Government Civil Aviation Safety	<i>As noted in relation to Condition 1 (above), an OLS plan has already been submitted by the applicant demonstrating compliance with the Manual of Standards Part 139 – Aerodromes. On this basis, we request that this condition be removed.</i>	Condition has been modified to the following to better reflect Council's intent: "Prior to the issue of any Construction Certificate, plans shall be submitted to Council for approval demonstrating compliance with the Obstacle Limitation Surfaces (OLS) restrictions in accordance with the <i>Manual of Standards Part 139 – Aerodromes</i> (Australian Government Civil Aviation Safety Authority, 2008). These



	Authority, 2008)."		plans shall also detail the setback between the new buildings and the runway centreline and airport taxiways."
15(c)	<p>"A Structural Engineers Certificate has been provided to the Certifier advising that the structures can withstand the force of flowing floodwaters, including debris and buoyancy forces and details of flood vents or other flood proofing measures to ensure that all hangars and other structures can stand the associated hydrostatic forces"</p>	<p><i>As outlined in the applicant's Flood Study (Annexure 1 of the SoEE) at pp 6 and 8, the proposed development site is anticipated to only be subject to backwater flood velocities which will be low and will have minimal hazard to buildings or infrastructure.</i></p> <p><i>The applicant's Flood Study went on to recommend (at p 15) that a condition of approval be set which requires an "Engineer's Certification of all buildings and structures to withstand anticipated to be low, the applicant submits anticipated to be low, the applicant submits that references to "flood vents and other flood proofing measures" is beyond the scope of what will be required on the development, based on the advice of our qualified and expert report writer. The applicant therefore requests Condition 15(c) be revised as follows:</i></p> <p><i>"A Structural Engineers Certificate has been provided to the Certifier advising that the structures can withstand the <u>anticipated load of force of flowing</u> floodwaters, including debris and buoyancy forces and details of flood vents or other flood proofing measures to ensure that all hangars and other structures can stand the associated hydrostatic forces.</i></p>	<p>This is Councils standard condition for development on flood prone lands. It would be Council preference the draft condition remains as it is.</p>
20(c) and 50	<p>20(c): "... the applicant is responsible for ensuring that all students, and all staff beyond Stage 1</p>	<p>Condition 20 (c) (and similarly, Condition 50) requires that all staff beyond Stage 1 Phase 1 to commute via bus (or public</p>	<p>Council considers that Conditions 20(c) and 50 are justified to address traffic safety and</p>


	<p>Phase 1 commute to the facility via a bus shuttle service or via the public bus system if available”</p> <p>50: “The applicant is responsible for ensuring that all students, and all staff beyond Stage 1 Phase 1, commute to/from the pilot training facility via the shuttle bus service provided or via the public bus service if available.”</p> <p>50: “The applicant is responsible for ensuring that all students, and all staff beyond Stage 1 Phase 1, commute to/from the pilot training facility via the shuttle bus service provided or via the public bus service if available.”</p>	<p><i>transport) to the development. Whilst the applicant is satisfied with the condition that students are to be delivered to the development via bus, it is wholly impractical for staff to be required to also commute via bus.</i></p> <p><i>The applicant’s Traffic Study (Annexure 4 of the SoEE) stated that, even with the worst case scenario of 110 cars travelling to the development per day, the development would have a low impact on local road networks (refer to p 20 and 21). This conclusion was modelled using SIDRA Intersection Analysis software, which is industry practice.</i></p> <p><i>The applicant understands that Conditions 20(c) and 50 have been applied to the development by Council as Council was not satisfied that the Traffic Study sufficiently dealt with State Environmental Planning Policy (Infrastructure) 2007 Regulation 104(3)(b)(iii) which requires the consent authority (being Council) to take into consideration “any potential traffic safety, road congestion or parking implications of the development”. To this end, however, the applicant submits that:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Road congestion was found to be minimal (and the development was determined, through scientific analysis, to have a low impact) on local road networks;</i> - <i>Parking at the development has been noted as being more than ample; and</i> - <i>Given that the local road networks will still operate with a good</i> 	<p>amenity.</p>
--	---	---	-----------------

		<p><i>level of service when the proposed development's load is added to the existing traffic levels, road safety is not an issue.</i></p> <p><i>Please refer also to Annexure 2, being correspondence from the applicant's expert traffic consultant, verifying that, on the basis of the findings within the original report, a traffic safety audit will not be required.</i></p> <p><i>The applicant therefore requests that the condition relating to staff being required to travel to and from the development via bus (in relation to any stage or phase of the development) be removed.</i></p>	
20(d) (iii)	<p>"Road Safety Audit - prepared by an appropriately qualified and experienced traffic consultant in accordance with the Guidelines for Road Safety Audit Practices (RTA, 2011) to identify road safety deficiencies and areas of risk that need to be addressed prior to the facility (or next stage of the facility) being constructed. The Traffic Management Plan is to detail how and when the recommendations of the Road Safety Audit will be implemented."</p>	<p><i>The applicant repeats the comments made in relation to Conditions 20(c) and 50 (above). It also restates the advice of its expert traffic consultant of 9 March 2017 (refer Annexure 2) that:</i></p> <p><i>"[The traffic consultant has] revisited the road and intersection conditions and advise that no upgrades are required. We do note that Airport Road is relatively narrow like other roads such as Aldavilla Road which is used for access to the North Coast Correctional Centre. Recent traffic counts on Aldavilla Road identified 65 vehicles in the Saturday (visiting day) morning peak hour and 56 vehicles in the afternoon peak hour. The flight training school is unlikely to generate peak hour flows higher than the correctional centre. There is no upgrade proposed for Aldavilla Road. There is no upgrade required for Airport Road.</i></p>	<p>As above. The road safety audit undertaken has not been provided to Council.</p>

		<p><i>We [further] advise that a road safety audit is not required. This has already been undertaken but not documented in the submission. The [traffic consultant] site inspection was carried out by Kirk Martinez who is accredited as a level 2 Road Safety Auditor. An audit report can be prepared but would be of little value as the findings would not differentiate from the original ... traffic study."</i> [sic]</p> <p><i>The applicant therefore requests that condition 20(d)(iii) (or any other requirement for a Road Safety Audit) be removed from the proposed conditions of consent.</i></p>	
--	--	---	--

Should you require any further information please contact the undersigned on 6566 3200.

Yours faithfully



Rachael Jeffrey
TOWN PLANNER
SUSTAINABLE ENVIRONMENT