

## SCHEDULE 1

### NOTICE OF CONTRIBUTIONS & CHARGES ASSOCIATED WITH DEVELOPMENT

<b>PROJECT ADDRESS</b>	LOT 12 SEC 16 DP 1892, LOT 13 SEC 16 DP 1892, LOT 1 DP 121434, LOT 1 DP 36588, LOT 2 DP 36588, LOT 3 DP 36588, LOT 4 DP 36588, LOT 5 DP 36588, LOT 6 DP 36588, LOT 7 DP 36588, LOT 8 DP 36588, LOT 91 DP 14341, LOT 92 DP 14341, LOT 93 DP 14341, LOT 94 DP... 42 Surveyor Street, CRESTWOOD NSW 2620
<b>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</b>	Erection of an educational establishment (distance education facility) 3 storey.
<b>APPLICATION NO</b>	298-2016
<b>NAME OF APPLICANT</b>	NSW Public Works

#### **Important**

*The following contribution rates are those that apply at the date of issue of this consent. Rates are reviewed quarterly. Contributions will only be accepted at the rate applying at the date of payment. Council's Environment, Planning and Development section should be contacted to receive a current contribution notice of charges.*

<b>Fee Description</b>	<b>Fee Due</b>
------------------------	----------------

#### ***Brownfield***

Nil

#### ***Greenfield***

Nil

#### ***Rural***

Nil

#### ***Section 64 - Water and Sewer***

SEC 64 Water Contribution - Queanbeyan Zone	\$12,701.24
SEC 64 Sewer Contribution - East Zone	\$2,840.88

<b><i>Total Contributions Payable</i></b>	<b><i>\$15,542.12</i></b>
---	---------------------------

#### ***Relevant Criteria on which these calculations were made:***

The following table provides calculations for the applicable ETs for the development, based on Water Directorate *Section 64 Determinations of Equivalent Tenements Guidelines* (May 2009):

<b><u>Item</u></b>	<b><u>No of Units</u></b>	<b><u>ETs per Unit</u></b>	<b><u>ETs</u></b>
<b><u>Water</u></b>			
Education – School - Number of persons	100	0.03	3
<b><u>Sewer</u></b>			
Education – School - Number of persons	100	0.02	2

Date Generated: 27-Sep-2016

Per : \_\_\_\_\_

---

**Report of the Local Development Committee – 27 September 2016**  
**(Ref: SF160088/01-07; Author: Wilson-Ridley)**

---

**Present:** Derek Tooth (QPRC) (Chair), Kelly Cherry (RMS),  
 Senior Constable Sam Morabito (NSW Police)

**Also Present:** Keith Davies (QPRC), Dirl Jol (QPRC), Joanne Wilson-  
 Ridley (QPRC)

**Apologies:** Nil

The Committee met at 12.00pm.

1. Confirmation of the minutes from the meeting held on 27 April 2016

An update on the progress of items from previous meeting was provided and the committee were thanked for their feedback that assisted in achieving amendments improving traffic and safety outcomes for the discussed DAs

2. **Traffic Study DA298-2016 Erection of an educational establishment (distance education facility) at Queanbeyan High School**

In response to the development application for proposed erection of distance education facility at Queanbeyan High School the Committee raised the following:

1. The committee did not support the DA in the current form noting the lack of provision for on-site parking. This concern was raised given the DA location in an existing school zone, with existing school and residential parking usage and the facility generating 105 job position plus periodic traffic with onsite running of 'mini-school'. The committee requested the consideration in the DA for the provision of on-site parking.
2. Safety concerns were raised regarding the cycling strategy for the DA given that the parking needs of the DA are proposed to be met by on-street parking. A number of the proposed roads to be utilized for on-street parking have width and topographical features that when teamed with on-street cycling and school traffic, including buses, raised potential safety risks. The committee requested consideration to widening of the roads surrounding Queanbeyan High School to achieve the DA's cycling strategy
3. It was noted that future use and expansion of the facility was not addressed by the supporting DA documentation. The documentation addressed the parking needs of the facility when it opens but the committee identified a lack of consideration for parking should use of the facility be expanded.

4. The committee noted existing safety concerns with the school zone, especially Agnes Avenue that added concerns to the DA proposal to handle parking needs using surrounding on-street parking. Concern was particularly noted for potential enhanced congestion during school zone times.
5. The committee noted concerns that the existing school zone is used for a High School and that the DA is for an educational facility that will be used for both primary and high school needs. The use of 'mini-school' visits at the facility is noted in the DA and consideration is recommended for the DA to review the school zone for new use by primary school children.
6. Concerns were raised regarding the installation of new driveway access on Agnes Avenue, in conjunction to an existing driveway access, and possible safety concerns for right turn movements both exiting and entering the drive-way, with possible traffic flow impacts caused when vehicles require making a right turn movement into the site.
7. The following inconsistencies with the DA supporting documentation including Transport Impact Assessment was raised by the committee:
  - In citing that the parking needs of the DA could be adequately met by surrounding on-street parking there appeared to be a lack of consideration for current parking usage on Agnes Avenue, Surveyor Street and Early Street both by residents and existing school community
  - Capacity of Early Street to handle parking did not note the limitation of this street in regards to existing double barrier centerlines
  - Capacity of Surveyor Street to handle parking is reduced 25m before Naylor Street for 250m due existing double barrier centerlines.

3. **Development Application DA71-2016 & DA90-2016 – proposed creation of the public laneway'**

In response to the request for the committee to provide comment on the proposed 'Public Laneway' the Committee advised the following:

1. The committee did not support the creation of the requested 'private laneways' into 'public laneway' in the current conditions of the DA - concerns were raised regarding:
  - Pedestrian Safety with no identifiable facilities in the public laneway for pedestrians
  - Potential for the lanes to be used as thru traffic access which is not as per the design
  - Safety concerns with garbage collection including pedestrian safety of residents and potential disruption to garbage collection service should vehicles park in the laneway
  - Proposed lane widths permit only one-way direction traffic did raise safety concerns for vehicles in residences based towards the far end of the lane that may illegally choose to exit the lane in the wrong direction rather than drive the full length of the lane in the correct direction

- Concerns for speeding and thru traffic with the linkage of the public laneways and recommendation for a reasonable visual offset to be included in the design
- Note the need for public laneways to be accessible by emergency services vehicles and concerns the current design might not always permit this access
- Concerns that the location of the garage blocks pedestrian sight distances for vehicle traffic using the laneway

There being no further business the meeting concluded at 1.30pm