CITY OF PALMERSTON

Notice of Council Meeting
To be held in Council Chambers, Civic Plaza, Palmerston
On Tuesday, 5 May 2015 at 6:30pm

AGENDA

Audio Disclaimer
An audio recording of this meeting is being made for minute taking purposes as authorised by City of Palmerston Policy MEE3 Recording of Meetings, available on Council’s Website.

1. PRESENT

2. APOLOGIES

ACCEPTANCE OF APOLOGIES AND LEAVE OF ABSENCE

3. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

RECOMMENDATION

1. THAT the minutes of the Special Council Meeting held Tuesday, 21 April 2015 pages 7940 to 7941 be confirmed.

2. THAT the minutes of the Council Meeting held Tuesday, 21 April 2015 pages 7942 to 7949 be confirmed.

3. THAT the minutes of the Confidential Council Meeting held Tuesday, 21 April 2015 pages 175 to 176 be confirmed.

4. MAYOR’S REPORT

5. REPORT OF DELEGATES

6. QUESTIONS (WITHOUT DEBATE) FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

7. QUESTIONS (WITHOUT DEBATE) FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS NOT BEEN GIVEN

8. PETITIONS
9. DEPUTATIONS / PRESENTATIONS

9.1 NT Department of Corrections – Community Work
The Department of Correctional Services will discuss community work with Council and outline how this can be achieved through a community approach.

10. CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

11. COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

11.1 Governance and Organisation
Nil

11.2 Economic Development and Infrastructure
Nil

11.3 Community Culture and Environment
Nil

12. INFORMATION AGENDA

12.1 Items for Exclusion

12.2 Receipt of Information Reports

RECOMMENDATION
THAT the information items contained within the Information Agenda, be received.

12.3 Officer Reports

12.3.1 Action Report 8/0646
12.3.2 Archer Landfill Site – Pollution Abatement Notice 8/0647

13. DEBATE AGENDA

13.1 Officer Reports

13.1.1 The Bump Bub Beyond Expo – Temporary Road Closure Frances Drive and Mansfield Street 8/0648
13.1.2 50 x 1, 121 x 2 and 17 x 3 bedroom multiple dwellings (including 22 serviced apartments), 168 motel suites, shops and offices in a 17 storey building comprising 3 towers in 3 stages, plus one basement level on Lot 10026 (1) Palmerston Circuit and Lot 9635 (15) The Boulevard, Palmerston.

13.1.3 Landscape Changes to Memorial Park

13.1.4 The Heights Durack – University Access Road

13.1.5 Shopping Trolley Collection Options

13.1.6 NT Black Spot Road Program

14. CORRESPONDENCE

15. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME
At the invitation of the Chair

16. OTHER BUSINESS – ALDERMAN REPORTS

By-law 14(8) provides that the Chairman must not accept a motion without notice if the effect of the motion would, if carried, be to incur expenditure in excess of $1,000 unless

a) the motion relates to the subject matter of a committee’s or sub committee’s recommendations (as the case may be, or an officer’s report that is listed for consideration on the business paper; or
b) the matter is urgent

17. CONFIDENTIAL REPORTS

17.1 Application to Borrow Money for the Expenses in regards to the Pollution Abatement Notice for 240 Elrundie Avenue

RECOMMENDATION

1. THAT pursuant to Section 65 of the Local Government Act, the Council orders that the public be excluded from the meeting with the exception of the Chief Executive Officer, Minute Secretary, Director of Corporate and Community Services and the Director of Technical Services, on the basis that Council considers it necessary and appropriate to act in a manner closed to the public in order to receive, discuss and consider a report and associated documents in relation to confidential agenda item 17.1 Application to Borrow Money for the Expenses in regards to the Pollution Abatement Notice for 240 Elrundie Avenue and the Council is satisfied that the meeting should be conducted in a place open to the public is outweighed in relation to the matter because receiving, considering and discussing the report and associated documentation involves:

(c) information that would, if publicly disclosed, be likely to:

   (iv) prejudice the interests of the council or some other person;
This item is considered confidential pursuant to Regulation 8 (c)(iv) of the Local Government (Administration) Regulations.

2. THAT Council orders that the minutes from the Confidential Council meeting held on 5 May 2015, in relation to confidential item number 17.1 Application to Borrow Money for the Expenses in regards to the Pollution Abatement Notice for 240 Elrundie Avenue and associated documents remain confidential and not available for public inspection for a period of 2 years from the date of this meeting or a lesser period as determined by the Chief Executive Officer.

18. CLOSURE

Mark Spanigler
Acting Chief Executive Officer

Any member of Council who may have a conflict of interest, or a possible conflict of interest in regard to any item of business to be discussed at a Council meeting or a Committee meeting should declare that conflict of interest to enable Council to manage the conflict and resolve it in accordance with its obligations under the Local Government Act and its policies regarding the same.
APPLICATION FOR A DEPUTATION TO THE
CITY OF PALMERSTON

Name: Allen Pitcher

Organisation: Department of Corrections

Contact Tel: 08 8935 0127

Contact Email: allen.picher@corrections.sa.gov.au

Presentation topic: Community Work

Date of Request: 24 April 2015

Meeting date requested: 5 May 2015

Time requested (length): 15 minutes

Names of those making the address:

1) Allen Pitcher
   Title: Community Work Coordinator
   Organisation: Corrections SA

2) Andrew Pike
   Title: Regional Manager
   Organisation: Corrections SA

Purpose of the deputation: The presentation is to
inform and educate how the new can
be achieved through a community approach.

A copy of the presentation is required on application.

Please forward this application to: Mr Nick Bradin Chief Executive Officer
City of Palmerston, PO Box 1, PALMERSTON NT 0841
Fax No: (08) 8935 9000 Email: info@cityofpalmerston.nt.gov.au
For any queries please call (08) 8935 9000

Allen Pitcher

Approved (Chief Executive Officer)

(City of Palmerston)
Municipal Plan:
4. Governance & Organisation

4.3 People

We value our people, and the culture of our organisation. We are committed to continuous improvement

Summary:

Provided with this report are individual action items outstanding from previous Council Meetings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dec #</th>
<th>Task Date</th>
<th>Matter</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8/0787</td>
<td>17/09/2013</td>
<td>Real Housing for Growth Project</td>
<td>Design and project management contract awarded to Thinc.</td>
<td>CEO Housing has agreed an extension of time for practical completion until 9 June 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agreement to lease with the CEO Department of Housing has been executed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/0847</td>
<td>19/11/2013</td>
<td>TC Zone Land</td>
<td>Discuss with NT Government on acquiring the Tourist Commercial (TC) Zone land – Part Lot 8405</td>
<td>Letter received 9 April 2014 advising investigations are currently being undertaken to inform the potential release of this site including servicing and development options.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/0879</td>
<td>11/12/2013</td>
<td>Development of Lot 10029 and Part Lot 9608</td>
<td>Expression of Interest for the development of Lot 10029 and Part Lot 9608 be prepared for Council approval.</td>
<td>Letters sent to developers requesting reasons for not responding to the EOI and any suggestions for an amended process. No responses received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/0899</td>
<td>14/01/2014</td>
<td>Expression of Interest – Development of Lot 10024 and Part Lot 9609</td>
<td>An EOI to be brought to Council for the development of Lot 10024 and part Lot 9609 with the purpose being for the provision of public car parking combined with a mixed use development comprising of retail, commercial or residential.</td>
<td>Matter referred to EDI Committee 12 March 2015.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/0949</td>
<td>18/02/2014</td>
<td>Car Parking Contribution Plan Update</td>
<td>Matter on the table</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/1126</td>
<td>Reconstruct Radford Road</td>
<td>Council to enter into a memorandum of understanding regarding the use of any contractor security held by LDC.</td>
<td>Construction work in progress.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/1235</td>
<td>Palmerston Sporting Grounds</td>
<td>CEO to seek further clarification from the NT Government on their proposal to transfer ownership and management of sporting facilities in Palmerston.</td>
<td>Meeting with Minister held 30 March 2015. Invitation was extended to attend a function for further discussion in April.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/1290</td>
<td>Quarterly Meetings with NT Government Senior Ministers</td>
<td>Mayor and the chairs or delegate of the three Standing Committees be established to meet with senior Ministers of the NT Government on a quarterly basis to seek financial support and provide updates on projects and initiatives associated with the Palmerston City Centre Master Plan.</td>
<td>Meeting held with Minister Chandler on 24 November 2014.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 8/1354   | Draft Palmerston City Centre Master Plan 2014 and associated documents | - Draft Palmerston City Centre Parking Strategy to be presented to and considered by the City of Palmerston’s Car Parking Committee.  
- Final documents and application submission to amend the NT Planning Scheme be submitted to Council for endorsement at the Council meeting scheduled 17 February 2015.  
- Mayor to forward a letter to the Minister for Lands and Planning to inform the NT Government of the public consultation process for the Draft City Centre Master Plan “package”, prior to lodgement of the formal rezoning application with the Minister in 2015.  
- Council has adopted the Palmerston City Centre MP and associated documents with the exception of the Carparking strategy. Once the Carparking strategy has been to the Car Parking Advisory Group comments will be incorporated into the Palmerston City Centre Planning Frameworks and the document will be submitted to the Minister |                                                                                                                                                                                          |
<p>| 8/1378   | Amendments to Palmerston Eastern Suburbs planning principles and plan | Council to write a letter to the Department for Lands and Planning requesting a review of the Palmerston Eastern Suburbs Area Plan and Planning Principles.                                                                                                                                                                                                 | Elected members met with local MLA’s on 11/3.                                                                                                                                                 |
| 8/1412   | Shopping Trolley Collection Options                                  | Workshop to be organised with Elected Members on the options available for the timely collection and return of abandoned shopping trolleys.                                                                                                                                                                                              | Workshop held 14/4. Report to go to the next available Council meeting.                                                                                                                       |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 8/1419 | 17/02/2015 | Draft Proposed Amendments to NT Planning Scheme, Palmerston City Centre Master Plan 2015, Draft Palmerston City Centre Parking Strategy and Draft Palmerston City Centre Public Realm and Subdivision Great Streets Strategy | - The Palmerston City Centre Master Plan 2015 and the Palmerston City Centre Planning Framework report be forwarded to the Minister for Lands and Planning,  
- The draft Car Parking Strategy be amended based on the outcome of deliberations by the City of Palmerston’s Car Parking Advisory Group, prior to the submission to the Minister for Lands and Planning  
Consultation with the Carparking Advisory Group members completed 14/4. Report to be presented to the May EDI meeting. |
| 8/1434 | 03/03/2015 | Small lot subdivisions                                                                   | Council approach the Shadow Minister for Lands and Planning requesting a meeting in regards to small lot subdivisions                  | Meeting to be rescheduled.                                                                 |
| 8/1456 | 17/03/2015 | Community Work Program Partnership with City of Palmerston Library                      | CEO to invite a representative from the Corrections Department to address Council on Community Work Placement Program                      | To be arranged.                                                                                                                                 |

**RECOMMENDATION**

THAT Council receives Report Number 8/0646.

**Recommending Officer:** Ricki Bruhn, Chief Executive Officer

Any queries on this report may be directed to Ricki Bruhn, Chief Executive Officer on telephone (08) 8935 9902 or email ricki.bruhn@palmerston.nt.gov.au
ITEM NO. 12.3.2  Archer Landfill Site – Pollution Abatement Notice

FROM: Director of Technical Services
REPORT NUMBER: 8/0647
MEETING DATE: 5 May 2015

Municipal Plan:
3. Environment & Infrastructure
   3.3 Waste
       3.3 We are committed to providing comprehensive and effective waste management services to our community

Summary:
Council has received its Pollution Abatement Notice (PAN) for the Archer Landfill site (Attachment A). The initial requirements under the notice,
   - Landfill Gas Management Plan
   - Landfill Rehabilitation Plan
   - Review of Hydrogeological Assessment (carried out in August 2012)
are required to commence immediately.

General:
At the third review 2014/15 staff are recommending that the Professional Services budget in the Development and General Technical Services areas be consolidated. This would give an overall balance of approximately $90,000. The initial estimate for the work to be undertaken this financial year on the PAN is approximately $70,000. Detailed quotes are yet to be received.

The PAN will now allow Council to rehabilitate the landfill site that has been closed for almost 4 years.

Financial Implications:
The initial estimate for preliminary works is $70,000.

Legislation / Policy:
The PAN has been issued pursuant to the Waste Management and Pollution Control Act.

RECOMMENDATION
1. THAT Council receive and note Report Number 8/0647.
Recommending Officer:  Mark Spangler, Director of Technical Services

Any queries on this report may be directed to Mark Spangler, Director of Technical Services on telephone (08) 8935 9958 or email mark.spangler@palmerston.nt.gov.au.

Schedule of Attachments:

Attachment A: Pollution Abatement Notice.
Dear Mr. Bruhn,

POLLUTION ABATEMENT NOTICE FOR 240 Elrundie Avenue, Archer NT.

Please find enclosed a Pollution Abatement Notice (PAN) for 240 Elrundie Avenue, Archer, Northern Territory (Lot 04302 Town of Palmerston).

The PAN identifies land that I believe, on reasonable grounds, is polluted from its former use as a landfill, and requires actions in relation to managing landfill gas and leachate, rehabilitation and aftercare.

Should you have any queries regarding this matter, please do not hesitate to contact Roni Opden, Senior Environmental Officer on telephone 8924 4216 or email: waste@nt.gov.au.

Yours sincerely,

DR WILLIAM (BILL) FREELAND
Chairperson
Delegate for the NT EPA

April 2015
POLLUTION ABATEMENT NOTICE
No. 2015/1

(Issued pursuant to section 77 of the Waste Management and Pollution Control Act)

Issued to: City of Palmerston

Name: Ricki Bruhn, Chief Executive Officer
Address: PO Box 1, Palmerston NT 0831
Tel: (08) 8935 9902
Fax: (08) 8935 9900

In relation to premises: Archer Waste Facility Landfill
240 Elrundie Avenue
Archer NT
Lot 04302
Town of Palmerston

Reason:

I, William (Bill) Freeland, the Chairperson of the Northern Territory Environment Protection Authority (NT EPA) pursuant to the Waste Management and Pollution Control Act ("the Act"), believe on reasonable grounds that:

1. The City of Palmerston is the owner or occupier of 240 Elrundie Avenue, Archer NT, Lot 04302 Town of Palmerston (the premises); and/or

2. The premises was used for the disposal of waste by burial (a landfill), previously authorised under Environment Protection Licence (EPL69), which expired on 31 August 2012; and

3. The landfill activity has caused, or is likely to cause pollution resulting in environmental harm, namely to groundwater and to receptors beyond the boundary of the premises.

Action Required

On and from the date of this notice:

General Requirements

1. The City of Palmerston is required to implement procedures to detect and prevent:
a. Further waste from being deposited at the landfill;

b. Fires from occurring at the premises;

c. Smoke, dust, fumes or odour from causing an environmental nuisance or environmental harm beyond the premises boundary; and

d. Litter, waste or contaminants from being discharged from the boundary of the premises.

**Landfill Gas Management**

2. The City of Palmerston must take all reasonable and practicable measures to manage landfill gas emissions.

3. Within 4 months of this notice you are required to undertake a Landfill Gas Risk Assessment in accordance with Appendix 1 to determine the requirements for landfill gas monitoring, landfill gas collection and treatment or other landfill gas management controls.

4. A qualified person, registered under section 68 of the Act, must review the Landfill Gas Risk Assessment and proposed landfill gas monitoring, landfill gas collection and treatment or other landfill gas management controls, and provide:
   a. a recommendation for the implementation of suitable control measures;
   b. an explanation detailing how emissions of landfill gas will comply with the action levels specified in Appendix 2;
   c. an indicative timeframe for implementation of control measures; and
   d. endorse the viability of any proposed landfill gas management controls.

5. A copy of the Landfill Gas Risk Assessment and qualified person review must be provided to the NT EPA within 6 months of this notice, and must endorse the viability of landfill gas management controls.

**Leachate Management**

6. The Hydrogeological Assessment (HA) report previously submitted to the NT EPA (GHD – Report for Archer Waste Facility Monitoring, Hydrogeological Assessment August 2012) must be reviewed by a qualified person (registered under section 68 of the Act) within 4 months of this notice to identify:
   a. information gaps in the HA report, if any;
   b. risks associated with the HA and any gaps identified in 6(a);
c. management actions required to be implemented to address any gaps and risks identified in 6(a) and 6(b);  
d. the maximum leachate levels that will not pose an unacceptable risk to the groundwater environment and that will allow for effective management of leachate; and  
e. where leachate levels exceed the maximum level determined under the HA, an appropriate timeframe for achieving the maximum leachate level, taking into account the significance of the risks to the environment.

7. A copy of the qualified persons review must be provided to the NT EPA within 6 months of this notice.

Landfill Rehabilitation Plan

8. Within 4 months of this notice you are required to develop a Landfill Rehabilitation Plan for the premises.

9. The Landfill Rehabilitation Plan must include:
   a. a timeline for implementation, which is not to exceed a period of 18 months from the date of this notice;  
   b. a cap design and a Construction Quality Assurance (CQA) plan for construction of the cap; and  
   c. a pre-settlement and post-settlement contour plan of the premises.

10. A qualified person, pursuant to section 68 of the Act, must review the Landfill Rehabilitation Plan.

11. A copy of the Landfill Rehabilitation Plan and qualified person review must be provided to the NT EPA within 6 months of this notice.

12. The qualified person shall confirm in writing that the proposed Landfill Rehabilitation Plan is consistent with the NT EPA Guidelines for the Siting, Design and Management of Solid Waste Disposal Sites in the Northern Territory January 2013 ("the NT EPA Landfill Guidelines"), and the Closed Landfill Guidelines (EPA Victoria).

Aftercare Management Plan

13. Within 12 months of this notice, you must develop an Aftercare Management Plan for the premises that is consistent with the Aftercare guidance in the NT EPA Landfill Guidelines. The Aftercare Management Plan must, as a minimum, contain the following:
   a. inspection and maintenance of the landfill cap to prevent, control and remediate erosion, restore depressions, seal cracks and maintain vegetation;  
   b. inspection, maintenance and operation of the leachate collection and treatment system;
c. installation, inspection, maintenance and operation of the landfill gas management system in accordance with the findings of Condition 6;

d. inspection and maintenance of surface water control and collection infrastructure; and

e. an Environmental Monitoring Program for the landfill.

14. A qualified person, pursuant to section 68 of the Act, must review the Environmental Monitoring Program required in 13(e).

15. A copy of the Environmental Monitoring Program and qualified person review must be provided to the NT EPA within 18 months of this notice.

16. The qualified person shall confirm in writing that the proposed Environmental Monitoring Program is consistent with the NT EPA Landfill Guidelines.

---

**Important Notice**

Failure to comply with this notice is an offence under section 80 of the *Waste Management and Pollution Control Act* and may incur significant penalties and/or other statutory action.

This notice takes effect on the date on which it is served upon you. Pursuant to section 108 of the *Waste Management and Pollution Control Act*, you have the right to apply for a review of the decision to issue you with this Pollution Abatement Notice. If you intend to apply for a review, YOU MUST MAKE AN APPLICATION NOT LATER THAN 7 DAYS after the date you were served with this notice. For information on how to lodge an application for review, contact the Northern Territory Environment Protection Authority, telephone 8924 4218.

Pursuant to section 112 of the *Waste Management and Pollution Control Act* the person issued with this notice must fulfil certain obligations before selling, leasing, sub-leasing, giving or exchanging land, premises, a vehicle or business which is the subject of this Notice.
Office Use Only - Service of Notice

Personal or by Post: (Circle as appropriate)

If Personal: Served to: ______________ at: ______________

Date: / / Time: ______

By: Name: ______________ Signature: ______________

Agency: ______________

If Post: Registered or certified mail no: 515524829018 22/4/2015

ATTACHMENT A
Definitions

| contaminant | a solid, liquid or gas or any combination of such substances and includes: (a) noise, odour, heat and electromagnetic radiation; (b) a prescribed substance or prescribed class of substances; and (c) a substance having a prescribed property or prescribed class of properties. |
| discharge | allow a liquid, gas or other substance to flow out from where it has been confined. |
| environmental harm | (a) any harm to or adverse effect on the environment; or (b) any potential harm (including the risk of harm and future harm) to or potential adverse effect on the environment, of any degree or duration and includes environmental nuisance. |
| leachate | Any liquid produced by the action of water percolating through waste, and that contains contaminants. |
| Qualified person | a person registered under Section 58 of the Waste Management and Pollution Control Act. |

References

*Closed Landfill Guidelines* EPA Victoria Publication 1490 (2012)

*Best Practice Environmental Management, Siting, Design, Operation and Rehabilitation of Landfills* EPA Victoria Publication 788.2 (2010)


*Guidelines for the Siting, Design and Management of Solid Waste Disposal Sites in the Northern Territory* Northern Territory Environment Protection Authority (2013)
Appendix 1: Landfill Gas Risk Assessment (from Closed Landfill Guidelines EPA Victoria)

Introduction

The landfill gas risk assessment process described below is adapted from the risk assessment and gas generation and composition assessment procedure described in the UK Environment Agency publication LFTGN 03. A risk assessment based only on air dispersion modelling is not appropriate for a landfill gas risk assessment, as this does not consider sub-surface migration pathways.

The risk assessment approach, summarised below, involves:

- development of a conceptual model of the landfill and its surroundings
- hazard identification and risk screening
- quantitative risk assessment.

Conceptual model

A conceptual model for the landfill and surrounding environment should be prepared with regard to landfill gas generation and management. The model should include information on:

- the environmental setting of the landfill, including all receptors
- the pathways to receptors, including emission points for landfill gases and combustion products
- the nature of the waste
- landfill gas production forecasting and validation with on-site data. Where necessary (for example in the absence of robust data to inform a forecasting model) a landfill gas pumping trial should be undertaken. Advice on how to conduct a pumping trial should be sought from a specialist contractor.
- action levels to be met (Appendix 2 (BPEM Table 6.4))
- landfill gas perimeter bore monitoring
- landfill gas surface emissions monitoring
- the design of the landfill gas management system
- operational management and control measures to be implemented
- a hydrogeological cross-section.

The form and content of the conceptual model should be selected to reflect the scale and complexity of the site and be suitable for use in the risk assessment. Consideration should also be given to the potential requirements of the environmental auditor, who will be examining the landfill gas risk assessment as part of the environmental audit program.
Hazard identification and risk screening

The objective of the hazard identification and risk screening stage is to consider the information contained in the conceptual model to determine:

- the scale of risk - based on the landfill gas forecasting or pumping trial, the landfill gas monitoring results, the site design and the landfill gas management system
- the sensitivity of the receptors - their number, type and location
- the pathways to the receptors - for example, direct release to the atmosphere, sub-surface migration, indirect release to the atmosphere or direct release of combustion products
- prioritisation of receptors and impact assessment.

Quantitative risk assessment

The risk assessment should use the output from the hazard identification and screening to evaluate the risk to each receptor. The objective of the risk assessment is to determine if the landfill gas management and monitoring at the landfill site is sufficient to:

- enable completion of a representative quantitative landfill gas risk assessment
- mitigate any risks identified to receptors
- where the management and monitoring of landfill gas is not sufficient to enable the completion of a representative landfill gas risk assessment, the environmental audit which follows the risk assessment or risk assessment review should make recommendations to enable a representative landfill gas risk assessment to be undertaken
- where the management and monitoring of landfill gas is not sufficient to mitigate risks identified to receptors, to recommend what action needs to be taken. These recommendations should be included in the environmental audit which follows the risk assessment or risk assessment review.
## Appendix 2: Landfill gas action levels (from *Best Practice Environmental Management* (Table 6.4) EPA Victoria)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Parameter(s)</th>
<th>Action level and unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landfill surface final cover areas and penetrations through it</td>
<td>Methane</td>
<td>100 ppm¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within immediate vicinity of penetrations through final cover</td>
<td>Methane</td>
<td>1000 ppm¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landfill surface intermediate cover areas² not within immediate area of</td>
<td>Methane</td>
<td>0.1mg/m²/second</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>any surface penetrations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsurface geology at the landfill boundary</td>
<td>Methane and carbon dioxide</td>
<td>1% v/v methane and 1.5% v/v carbon dioxide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsurface services on and adjacent to the site</td>
<td>Methane and carbon dioxide</td>
<td>1% v/v methane and 1.5% v/v carbon dioxide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings/structures on and adjacent to the site</td>
<td>Methane and carbon dioxide</td>
<td>0.5% v/v methane and 0.5% v/v carbon dioxide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landfill gas flares</td>
<td>Volatile organic compounds (excluding</td>
<td>98% destruction efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>methane)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biofilters</td>
<td>Methane</td>
<td>&lt; 1.0 g/m²/hr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Point of measurement is 5 cm from surface or point of discharge
2. Intermediate cover areas are those that have not reached final profile and are not scheduled to receive waste during the next three months.

*Source: Table 6.4 of the Best Practice Environmental Management, Siting, Design, Operation and Rehabilitation of Landfills (EPA Victoria Publication 788.1) (2010)*
Summary:

This report recommends Council consent to the temporary road closure and use of the power outlets along Frances Drive, Mansfield Street and the closure of the Recreation Centre carpark for the Bump Bub Beyond Expo (BBB Expo). This will be held on Sunday 24th May 2015 from 9am-3pm at the Palmerston Recreation Centre.

Background:

The first Bump, Bub and Beyond Expo was held on the 14 September 2014 at the Palmerston Recreation Centre. By all reports it was a very successful event and this year is looking to be bigger and better.

The main objectives of the expo were:

- To provide a one stop shop for families to come to access all information and services available during pregnancy and beyond.
- To provide local employment and support economic growth (particularly small businesses run by mums and community groups running food stalls)
- Provide social, health and well-being outcomes through social interaction
- Provide a place for Not for Profit Organisations/Community Groups and Service providers to connect with families in the community.
- Tourism opportunities to showcase the Palmerston CBD by bringing in residents/visitors from Darwin and rural areas

General:

The BBB Expo will be held on Sunday 24th May 2015 from 9am-3pm at the Palmerston Recreation Centre. It’s an event for expecting parents, parents who are planning and children up to the age of 6yrs. It was a successful event last year and now will be an annual event that would bring activity to the new Goyder Square when completed as well as activate the general City Centre.
The BBB Expo is only held in the Palmerston municipality and is held twice per year (approximately May and November each year) and provides;

- Stalls with locally made products and services on display, selling to the public on the day.
- A pre-loved component of the expo to allow families to on sell their pre-loved baby items.
- Assist and provide nominated charity groups at the door to take a gold coin donation for entry.
- Provide food stalls run by local community groups and local businesses and provide entertainment for children accompanying parents.

Due to the popularity of the event held in November last year there has been an increase in interest for stall holders and the BBB Expo committee have had interest already from over 100 stall holders. The Recreation Centre does not have the capacity to provide sufficient space and power to meet the increased demand by stall holders.

Due to the increasing needs the BBB Expo committee are requesting the use of the space and power outlets designed for the Palmerston market stallholders. This will require a temporary road closure of Frances Drive, Mansfield Street and the Recreation Centre car parks.

Financial Implications:

Should Council wish a meter reading can be made on the electrical circuit and the uses charged appropriately. Road closure is sponsored by JLM Civil Works Pty Ltd. Any other costs will be covered by the Bump Bub Beyond Expo Committee.

Legislation / Policy:

Nil.

RECOMMENDATION

1. THAT Council receive and note Report Number 8/0648.

2. THAT Council consent to the temporary road closure and use of the power outlets along Frances Drive, Mansfield Street and the closure of the Recreation Centre car park for the purpose of running the Bump Bub Beyond Expo, subject to a road closure advertisement being placed in the NT News prior to the closure occurring and all costs being covered by Bump Bub Beyond Expo Committee including power use.

Recommending Officer: Mark Spangler, Director of Technical Services

Any queries on this report may be directed to Mark Spangler, Director of Technical Services on telephone (08) 8935 9958 or email mark.spangler@palmerston.nt.gov.au.

Author: Natasha Clifton, Executive Assistant to Director Technical Services.
Schedule of Attachments:

Attachment A: Road Closure Map.
ITEM NO.  13.1.2  50 x 1, 121 x 2 and 17 x 3 bedroom multiple dwellings (including 22 serviced apartments), 168 motel suites, shops and offices in a 17 storey building comprising 3 towers in 3 stages, plus one basement level on Lot 10026 (1) Palmerston Circuit and Lot 9635 (15) The Boulevard, Palmerston

FROM:  Director of Technical Services
REPORT NUMBER:  8/0654
MEETING DATE:  5 May 2015

Summary:

This report outlines issues to be considered by Council in regard to the development application lodged for 50 x 1, 121 x 2 and 17 x 3 bedroom multiple dwellings (including 22 serviced apartments), 168 motel suites, shops and offices in a 17 storey building comprising 3 towers in 3 stages, plus one basement level on Lot 10026 (1) Palmerston Circuit and Lot 9635 (15) The Boulevard, Palmerston.

Background:

Lot 10026 and Lot 9635 within the Palmerston City Centre were the subject of a recent subdivision and consolidation application, which created in principle Lot 12825A. Currently, Council has a lease over Lot 9635 to provide car parking for the recreation centre. Once that lease expires in 2017, Lot 12825A will be formalised, as show in the figure below.

Source: Application Statement of Effect
The lot is within the Palmerston Central Business District and is located within Zone CB (Central Business) as is the majority of the downtown, save for a couple of parcels in Zone PS (Public Open Space). The subject site borders The Boulevard, Palmerston Circuit and Hillson Street.

The application proposes 50 x 1, 121 x 2 and 17 x 3 bedroom multiple dwellings (including 22 serviced apartments), 168 motel suites, shops and offices in a 17 storey building comprising 3 towers in 3 stages, plus one basement level.

Stage 1 will comprise the portion of the site closest to Palmerston Circuit, as the portion of the site currently on Lot 9635 is the subject of Council’s lease for car parking for the recreation centre. Once the lease expires in 2017, the following stages will be constructed, with Stage 2 occupying the balance of Lot 10026 and stage 3 the portion of the site on Lot 9635.

The proposal is for the Ground Floor and Level 1 to be occupied by retail uses and the lobbies for the residential and motel uses. The retail area appears to be configured such that the retail shops would be accessed off of internal mall space rather than facing out to the Boulevard and other surrounding streets.

The Basement and Levels 2, 3 and 4 are proposed to be car parking for the site. The car parking will be accessed from a new drive/alley to be created linking Hillson Street and Palmerston Circuit. There are 582 car parking bays and 39 motorcycle bays proposed for the development.

Office space is proposed on Levels 5 and 6.

Communal open space, including a pool and BBQ area, is proposed on Level 5.

Levels 6-9 are proposed for motel units, including standard motel rooms, 2 bedroom motel rooms, studio motel rooms including a kitchenette and 2 and 3 bedroom motel rooms also including kitchenettes.

Levels 8-16 have residential apartments and Levels 10 and 11 include serviced apartments.

Towers 2 and 3 for Stages 2 and 3 only extend to Level 15, with service facilities at this level. Tower 1, adjacent Palmerston Circuit, extends to Level 17, with plant room facilities at this level.

The application also proposes a porte cochere on Council land off Palmerston Circuit. Council has not been approached for any formal authorisation or approval for use of this Council property.

**General:**

Council officers have a number of concerns with the development proposal, which are detailed and discussed herein.

**Non-compliance with NT Planning Scheme Requirements**

The application does not comply with Clauses 6.5.1, 6.6, 7.5 of the NT Planning Scheme.
Clause 6.5.1 Parking Requirements

The application proposes 582 car parking spaces plus 39 motorcycle parking spaces for the development. An analysis against the requirements of the NT Planning Scheme reveals that the development would require 1,094 car parking spaces, a shortfall of 512 spaces.

Council does not support a reduction in car parking spaces for the site and does not accept the arguments within the application that compare the area to the Darwin CBD. The development application has suggested a series of reductions in the car parking rates for the site.

The first reduction is the recommendation that the car parking rates should be based on the reduced rates for the City of Darwin CBD. The development proposed is not located within the Darwin CBD with the full benefit of years of CBD development for a capital city but is located within the City of Palmerston, which currently has no residential development and limited office development. As such, the site is subject to the relevant aspects of the NT Planning Scheme that apply to the City of Palmerston. Council supports the requirements of the NT Planning Scheme.

The second reduction is the recommendation that due to a mix of uses the site should receive an additional 10% reduction on top of the Darwin CBD rates. It is noted that the original reduction for the Darwin CBD rates was created to account for the mixed-use nature of the CBD; thus an additional reduction based on the same principle appears illogical. Council does not accept the recommendation that on top of utilising reduced rates for the Darwin CBD, that there would be enough development within this site to warrant an additional reduction on top of the CBD reduced rate.

A third reduction of 10% is recommended due to tenancy fitout reducing the amount of net floor area for retail spaces. While some form of reduction has been utilised in other developments due to tenancy fitout, it remains unclear whether the original generation rates for the NT Planning Scheme already take this element into account in determining the overall rate.

Reductions are proposed for 5 dual-key apartments accessed by a single air-lock door, to provide only 5 spaces for these units. However, it is noted that each of these 10 units could be rented separately.

Finally, the application has proposed a reduction of 1 car parking bay for every 3 motorcycle bays provided. As the development provides 39 motorcycle bays, 13 car parking bays are requested to be waived in favour of motorcycle bays. The extent of this proposed reduction is not supported, as the application is proposing that 6.7% of the total parking provided be provided in motorcycle bays. The overall rate of NT motorcycle registration is only 5% of the total registration. It would seem logical to then limit the replacement rate for motorcycle parking at 5% of the total parking provided.

Most of the car parking spaces provided are of the minimum dimensions as required by the NT Planning Scheme. However, 12 of the spaces are proposed as small car bays, where the length of the bay has been reduced to 2.2m.

Further the application proposes that 20 of the spaces provided operate with the use of car stackers, such that there are 10 on ground spaces with 10 cars lifted above each of these spaces. The application recommends that these spaces be limited to pool cars (of which 10 are recommended within the application) and motel staff parking. The car stackers proposed are not part of a holistic independent mechanical
system but are separate units raised above individual car parking spaces. It is unclear how the car stacker system would be managed and operated. It is noted that the NT Planning Scheme requires that each space be able to be separately accessed.

The 10 proposed pool cars will occupy and be required to have reserved 10 of the spaces allocated to the development. The application proposes that 5 of the pool cars would be available for residents and 5 would be available for motel guests. The application notes that in Melbourne and Sydney pool cars can reduce the requirement for private motor vehicle ownership by 7-10 or 12 cars, respectively. Carshare Darwin has estimated that each share vehicle could reduce the need for 8 privately owned cars. More information on this assessment would be useful to determine the viability of 8 separate individuals sharing one vehicle while living in the Palmerston City Centre at this time. The application is unclear on how the pool car system would be managed, particularly for the residential vehicles.

Council officers recommend that the site not be granted any car parking variations or waivers and that the full car parking space shortfall be subject to Council’s Car Parking Contribution Plan.

Council conducted a car parking survey of the CBD in 2012. This survey demonstrated that the demand for car parking in the CBD is equal to the requirements of the NT Planning Scheme. Therefore, any outright waivers of car parking spaces will leave the CBD with an overall car parking shortfall. The indications at present are that the CBD is near 100% occupancy on the available parking.

**Clause 6.6 Loading Bays**
The proposed development requires 8 loading bays with dimensions of 7.5m by 3.5m and an at least 4m clearance. The application proposes 3 loading bays, plus additional drop off area within the porte cochere along Palmerston Circuit to account for 3 loading bays. The application also proposes that loading could occur from a drop-off zone along the internal drive aisle/laneway, which would equate to 2 loading bays.

It is noted that the apparent waste collection point would be on the basement level, utilising the two loading bays provided there. Transpacific and Cleanaway Waste Management Services has indicated that a minimum of 6m clearance would be required for this internal loading bay to satisfy waste removal vehicles. The applicant should address whether this height clearance can be met in the proposed basement level loading bays.

**Clause 7.5 Private Open Space**
The application proposes variations to the private open space areas required for the multiple dwelling units, serviced apartments and motel rooms.

Private open space for all residential units above ground floor is to be a minimum of 12m² with minimum dimensions of 2.8m by 4m.

Of the two bedroom multiple dwellings, 13 of the units have balconies that do not meet the minimum dimension requirements and 3 of the three bedroom units do not meet the minimum dimension requirements. However, each of these units does meet the overall 12m² size requirement.

The application states that smaller balconies are proposed for the single bedroom and studio apartments. There are no private open space area reductions provided for within the NT Planning Scheme for smaller units. It could be argued that these units
deserve as much outdoor space as the other units as they have less overall space within the unit. For example, if most of the space within a studio unit is taken up by a bed/sleeping area, it would make sense to have an expanded outdoor area that would provide room for a table/eating area.

The serviced apartments are noted as being provided with smaller private open space areas due to the temporary nature of the use. However, it is noted that within the NT Planning Scheme, only motel rooms are associated with traveller populations and that serviced apartments are considered multiple dwellings, with no requirements that these units have any length of rental time restrictions attached. It is therefore inaccurate to refer to serviced apartments as having a temporary nature.

Only 21 of the 168 motel rooms have balconies.

The purpose of the private open space clause is to provide for an area that acts as an extension of the function of the dwelling and that is of an adequate size to provide for domestic purposes. In particular, it is unclear whether the reduced balcony sizes for the single bedroom units, studio units, and serviced apartments meets the purpose of this clause.

It is recommended that Council not support a reduction in private open space areas for these units.

Clause 7.6 Communal Open Space
The application meets the requirements of the NT Planning Scheme for communal open space area. However, it is noted that this area appears to be shared between the motel, serviced apartment and residential uses with no restrictions. It is unclear whether there would be any conflict or detriment to the shared use of pool and BBQ areas between permanent residents and transient motel guests. It is acknowledged that the different populations may have varying priorities and level of care when using joint facilities. The clause notes that the design of the communal open space should consider the “need to clearly distinguish communal open space from private and public open space”. It could be argued that space for motel guests is closer to public open space than communal open space to be enjoyed by a set group of longer-term residents.

Traffic Impact Assessment
The application has provided a traffic impact assessment (TIA) for the development. Council notes that the TIA does not address the appropriate ultimate design for The Boulevard and Palmerston Circuit. The approved design for The Boulevard is a T-intersection at Palmerston Circuit. The TIA assesses the current roundabout design. As the T-intersection is approved by Council and its installation is imminent, the TIA should be revised to address the appropriate road design for this site.

Further, the traffic impact assessment should particularly address the potential for conflict between the vehicle exit for the porte cochere and the proposed new drive aisle/laneway off Palmerston Circuit. The applicant should consider a one-way operating design for this proposed drive aisle/laneway.

Council officers will also require a Road Safety Audit on all entry and exit points to the site, including the proposed porte cochere off Palmerston Circuit.

Porte Cochere
As noted above, the application proposes a porte cochere access off Palmerston Circuit. Also, as noted above, the application has not addressed the appropriate road design adjacent this porte cochere feature.

Further, the proposed porte cochere, associated landscaping features and bicycle racks are on Council property, rather than within the site boundary of the subject property. Council has not been approached by the developer to utilise this land or given any approval for the development of this portion of Council property.

Council should consider whether or not it is appropriate to have this essential site feature on Council property rather than within the site itself. Council should consider whether it would like to take on responsibility for long-term maintenance of this feature. Should Council be approving of the porte cochere arrangement, it may wish to consider whether or not the developer should potentially purchase this portion of Council road reserve from Council or enter into a long-term lease/permit to occupy.

**Awnings**

The application proposes awnings over Council road reserve for 3 of the four sides of the development. All awnings over Council road reserve must be detachable and the development proponents must enter into an awning agreement with Council.

**Lack of Interface with The Boulevard**

The City of Palmerston has a detailed design for The Boulevard, which is currently being implemented. The front of the building facing The Boulevard should accord with that design. Accordingly, and in line with the Palmerston Masterplan, the overarching goal is to activate the streetscape and particularly The Boulevard frontage. From the plans provided, the retail units within this large full-block structure will not be activated onto The Boulevard but will be inwardly focused towards an internal mall. There are no doorways shown to the Boulevard and all shops are shown to open only onto the internal mall.

This design is unacceptable. The primary entryways for the retail and restaurant shops should open outward to The Boulevard.

There should be no back of house features to The Boulevard. Providing blank walls or only windows that are easily covered, rather than actual entryways to the shops, onto The Boulevard is not in accordance with the Masterplan design and is not accepted.

Further, it is noted that in many new developments where there are multiple entries into a shop or restaurant, one or more of those entries will end up being locked or blocked off to the public. This design occurs for a variety of reasons, usually primarily that the retail use does not have enough staff to monitor multiple entrances. As one entry is to an internal air-conditioned mall, it is unlikely that this would end up being the back of house.

The site must be activated to The Boulevard, with the primary entries to individual businesses off of this street, in order to ensure activation of this street.

**Towers**

The overall building design is commended for including multiple towers, when viewed from The Boulevard.
However, it is noted that from the two sides along Palmerston Circuit and Hillson Street, the towers continue to appear as one continuous building, for the full width of those sides of the site, over 60m.

For the side of the building along the drive aisle/laneway, as noted within the application, it is expected that this side of the site will be covered up by future development on the adjacent sites. Until such time as additional development occurs on those adjacent sites, there is still a large blank wall five storeys high to that frontage.

Further, it is noted that while the application has felt free to compare the proposed development against portions of the Darwin City Centre requirements within the NT Planning Scheme, the requirements in Clause 6.3.2 that require a setback from the podium level to the tower level have not been employed within this development. This development proposes the zero lot line setback for the full height of the 15 and 17 storey towers. Council should consider whether or not this in an appropriate interface.

**Palmerston Master Plan**

The application briefly assesses the development against the original Palmerston City Centre Master Plan 2030, noting that that plan has no weight at an NT Government level. It is noted that the more recent version of the Palmerston City Centre Master Plan was adopted by Council in February 2015. However, given the likely planning timeframes related to development of this site, it is reasonable to assess the development against the original master plan that would have been in place during the preparation of this current development proposal. There are numerous new guidelines, primarily around building design and public realm within the new master plan that have not been addressed by this development proposal.

The proposal does provide some activation to The Boulevard, though the full design for this street is not taken into account in the traffic assessments for the application. It is unclear to what level direct interaction with The Boulevard is encouraged at ground level.

Of interest is how the building responds to the tropical climate; although there are balconies of varying sizes provided to the residential units, the retail, office and motel spaces appear to be highly insulated and dependent upon internal air conditioned spaces. In all aspects of the design, there appears to be little opportunity for cross flow of breezes through the buildings.

**Reticulated gas**

Council officers recommend provision for reticulated gas to the development with appropriately screened gas cylinders in locations that can be readily serviced.

**Summary**

It is recommended that the City of Palmerston object to the development as currently proposed. The development is far short on provision of car parking spaces and the traffic impact assessment requires revision. The development includes proposals for use of Council land that have not been addressed by Council.

The building lacks appropriate interface with The Boulevard to fully activate this street in the manner expected by Council and the approved master plan and street designs.

There are questions over the suitability of the private and communal open space areas provided, as well as the appropriateness of the building design as a flat wall to the street frontages.
There are several opportunities for revisions to this proposal that would make it a stronger development that would contribute much more to the Palmerston City Centre.

**Financial Implications:**

Permitting a porte cochere on Palmerston Circuit may attract an annual income for the occupancy permit, similar to Alfresco Dining. The current Alfresco Dining rate is $177 per square metre per year.

**Legislation / Policy:**

There are no legislation or policy implications for Council as a result of this proposal.

**RECOMMENDATION**

1. THAT Council receives Report Number 8/0654.
2. THAT Attachment A to Report Number 8/0654 be endorsed.

**Recommending Officer:** Mark Spangler, Director of Technical Services

Any queries on this report may be directed to Mark Spangler, Director of Technical Services on telephone (08) 8935 9958 or email mark.spangler@palmerston.nt.gov.au.

**Schedule of Attachments:**

Attachment A: Council’s letter of comment for 50 x 1, 121 x 2 and 17 x 3 bedroom multiple dwellings (including 22 serviced apartments), 168 motel suites, shops and offices in a 17 storey building comprising 3 towers in 3 stages, plus one basement level on Lot 10026 (1) Palmerston Circuit and Lot 9635 (15) The Boulevard, Palmerston.

Attachment B: Development Application and Drawings.

**SCHEDULE OF ATTACHMENTS EXCEED FILE SIZE**

For viewing please visit the Council Public Office or refer to the Council Website:-
Introduction:

At the Economic Development and Infrastructure Committee meeting held on 9 April 2015 Council resolved to have a report presented that considered the cost to replace the verge landscaping adjoining Memorial Park between the Post Office and the McDonalds bus stop.

The following report presents the staff cost estimate.

General:

In providing the cost estimate for the works staff have looked at grassing with and without the preservation of the existing trees. The price difference in preserving the trees is quite minimal and has therefore been ignored as a separate cost.

The scope of works includes clearing existing garden beds, renewal of irrigation, replacement of soil bed, seeding, fertilising, traffic control and 20% contingency.

The total cost is estimated at $34,000 + GST.

Financial Implications:

Refer to General section of report.

Legislation / Policy:

Nil.

RECOMMENDATION

1. THAT Council receive and note Report Number 8/0650.
**Recommending Officer:**  Mark Spangler, Director of Technical Services

Any queries on this report may be directed to Mark Spangler, Director of Technical Services on telephone (08) 8935 9958 or email mark.spangler@palmerston.nt.gov.au.

**Schedule of Attachments:**

Nil.
Introduction:

CIC Australia, developers of The Heights, Durack have approached Council to take care and control of the University access road that connects University Avenue to Packard Avenue. This report examines Council's draft policy on accepting roads and recommends that subject to the road meeting all of Council's normal subdivision requirements including retaining stormwater discharges in road reserves or easements Council accept the road for the purpose of care and control.

General:

The University access road not only services the University Campus but will in the future provide a two directional access to The Heights, Durack residential subdivision. The road is one of two entry roads to the subdivision and one of three exit roads from the subdivision. The Heights Durack will provide more than 800 dwellings.

Council's normal standards for residential collector roads are as follows:

Roads

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Width of road - secondary collector</th>
<th>8m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Width of road reserve</td>
<td>18m &amp; 21m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerb &amp; gutter</td>
<td>Both sides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footpaths</td>
<td>1.5m one side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.5m one side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum pavement design life</td>
<td>30 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum pavement design loading</td>
<td>$5 \times 10^5$ E.S.A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum AADT (secondary collector)</td>
<td>3000 vehicles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(primary collector)</td>
<td>&gt;3000 vehicles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Drainage

| Initial storm                      | 5 year |
| Major storm                        | 100 year |
Street Lighting

Streetscape

Street Trees

Both sides min 10m spacing with irrigation

Verges

Dryland grass

The road fits the normal category of road that Council would take care and control of within its Municipality.

The road would normally be defined as a primary collector given it services more than 250 dwellings and links to a sub-arterial. In this instance its only neighbour is the CDU Palmerston Campus and restriction of on-street parking would be possible if road traffic volumes became a safety issue. It is recommended that an 8m width pavement be adopted.

Financial Implications:

Once passed onto Council for care and control Council will incur normal road maintenance costs.

Legislation / Policy:

City of Palmerston Draft Subdivision and Development Guidelines.

RECOMMENDATION

1. THAT Council receive and note Report Number 8/0651.

2. THAT Council accept the University access road subject to it meeting the following minimum standards.

Roads

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Width of road</td>
<td>8m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Width of road reserve</td>
<td>18m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerb &amp; gutter</td>
<td>Both sides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footpaths</td>
<td>1.5m one side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.5m one side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum pavement design life</td>
<td>30 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum pavement design loading</td>
<td>$5 \times 10^5$ E.S.A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum AADT</td>
<td>$&gt;3000$ vehicles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Drainage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Storm Type</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial storm</td>
<td>5 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major storm</td>
<td>100 year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Street Lighting

P2

Streetscape
Street Trees  Both sides min 10m spacing with irrigation

Verges  Dryland grass

And detailed design standards as stated in the draft Subdivision and Development Guidelines.

**Recommending Officer:** Mark Spangler, Director of Technical Services

Any queries on this report may be directed to Mark Spangler, Director of Technical Services on telephone (08) 8935 9958 or email mark.spangler@palmerston.nt.gov.au.

**Schedule of Attachments:**

Nil.
ITEM NO. 13.1.5 Shopping Trolley Collection Options

FROM: Director of Technical Services
REPORT NUMBER: 8/0652
MEETING DATE: 5 May 2015

Municipal Plan:

2. Economic Development

2.3 City Planning

2.3 We are committed to effective and responsible city planning which balances and meets both residential and commercial needs in our community

Summary:

A workshop was held on 14th April to discuss options for the clearing of abandoned shopping trolleys from streets and parks of the Municipality. As a result the following report is presented and recommends that:

- THAT Council approve the option to enter into a “collection and return” agreement with each supermarket.
- THAT the CEO be delegated the responsibility to negotiate with trolley owners individual agreements for the return of trolleys and the payment of costs.
- THAT the CEO and Mayor be delegated the responsibility for signing and sealing any agreements resulting from resolution 3 above.
- THAT the trolley cost recovery value in accordance with clause 67 of the Palmerston (Public Places) By-laws be set as $120 per trolley.

General:

At the Economic Development and Infrastructure Committee (EDI) meeting held on 4 December 2014 the Committee resolved that:

9.4 Abandoned Trolleys EDI/125

5. THAT a further report be brought to the EDI committee setting out options available to council for the collection and return of abandoned trolleys.

CARRIED EDI/0248–04/12/2014

Report EDI/137 (Attachment A) was presented to the EDI Committee on 12 February 2015 listing the options available to Council. The Committee resolved that:
5. THAT staff coordinate a workshop for Elected Members on the options available for the timely collection and return of abandoned shopping trolleys.

CARRIED EDI/0270–12/02/2015

Preliminary discussions have taken place with the major supermarkets in the Palmerston City Centre resulting in all agreeing that an alternative to the current trolley collection process is desirable. No business has expressed that individual agreements to return trolleys are not possible. Each has reserved its final decision until a review of the draft agreement can be made.

Financial Implications:

Nil or near nil cost to Council.

Legislation / Policy:

Palmerston Public Places By-laws.

RECOMMENDATION

1. THAT Council receive and note Report Number 8/0652.

2. THAT Council approve the option to enter into a “collection and return” agreement with each supermarket.

3. THAT the CEO be delegated the responsibility to negotiate with trolley owners individual agreements for the return of trolleys and the payment of costs.

4. THAT the CEO and Mayor be delegated the responsibility for signing and sealing any agreements resulting from resolution 3 above.

5. THAT the trolley cost recovery value in accordance with clause 67 of the Palmerston (Public Places) By-laws be set as $120 per trolley.

Recommending Officer: Mark Spangler, Director of Technical Services

Any queries on this report may be directed to Mark Spangler, Director of Technical Services on telephone (08) 8935 9958 or email mark.spangler@palmerston.nt.gov.au.

Schedule of Attachments:

Attachment A: Report Number EDI/137.

Attachment B: Report Number EDI/125.
Summary:

At the EDI Committee meeting held on 4 December 2014 the Committee resolved that:

9.4 Abandoned Trolleys

2. THAT a further report be brought to the EDI committee setting out options available to council for the collection and return of abandoned trolleys.

CARRIED EDI/0248–04/12/2014

The following report presents options available to Council for the collection of abandoned trolleys.

General:

The following options are available to Council for the collection of abandoned shopping trolleys.

Option 1: Do nothing.

This option would result in the supermarkets arranging the collection of their own trolleys under their current collection arrangements with a trolley contractor.

Option 2: Collection of trolleys in accordance with the CoP By-laws.

This option is the current arrangement whereby Council undertakes one survey of specific streets per fortnight.

Option 3: Enter into a “collection and return” agreement with each supermarket.

This is the option shown in Report Number EDI/125 (Attachment A).
Financial Implications:

Option 1: No cost to Council.

Option 2: With the current recovery cost per trolley of $41 this option would come at a cost to Council of $21,000 per annum. The recovery cost could be increased to a level that would result in nil or close to nil cost to Council.

Option 3: Nil or near nil cost to Council.

Legislation / Policy:

Council can only operate within the powers that are bestowed to it under the By-laws. Those By-laws dictate very strictly how abandoned trolleys are collected, owners notified and if required trolleys disposed of.

Any deviation from the By-laws will require individual agreements with trolley owners.

RECOMMENDATION

1. THAT the Committee receive Report Number EDI/137.

2. THAT Council endorses Option 3 in Report Number EDI/137.

3. THAT the CEO be delegated the responsibility to negotiate with trolley owners individual agreements for the return of trolleys and the payment of costs.

4. THAT the CEO and Mayor be delegated the responsibility for signing and sealing any agreements resulting from resolution 3 above.

Recommending Officer: Mark Spangler, Director of Technical Services

Any queries on this report may be directed to Mark Spangler, Director of Technical Services on telephone (08) 8935 9958 or email mark.spangler@palmerston.nt.gov.au.

Schedule of Attachments:

Attachment A: Report Number EDI/125.
ITEM NO.  9.4  Abandoned Trolleys

FROM:  Director of Technical Services
REPORT NUMBER:  EDI/125
MEETING DATE:  4 December 2014

Municipal Plan:

3. Environment & Infrastructure
   3.2 Assets and Infrastructure
      3.2 We are committed to maintaining and developing community assets and infrastructure which meet the needs of our community

Introduction:

The following report assesses the costs associated with managing abandoned trolleys in the Municipality.

General:

At the Ordinary Meeting of Council held on 15 July 2014, Council resolved to reduce its trolley collection from twice weekly to once fortnightly. Cost recovery remains at $41 per trolley.

Prior to 15 July 2014 Council was collecting an average 5 trolleys per survey. The current rate of collection is 9 trolleys per survey.

Since reducing the trolley collection level of service 109 trolleys have been collected at a total cost of $3,474. The supermarkets slow response time to paying invoices and collecting trolleys from Council’s contractor’s storage yard has resulted in an average residency time for a trolley being approximately 30 days. The storage cost of $3 per day means that Council should be recovering an average $90 per trolley to cover storage fees.

The average survey fee per trolley is $32. This means that for Council’s trolley collection program to be cost neutral a change of $120 per trolley should be considered.

Alternate solution

Council may consider the introduction of a new trolley collection and return system if it seeks to reduce cost to the supermarkets and to become cost neutral itself. This year’s trolley collections has demonstrated that storage of trolleys is an expensive and hard to manage process. To avoid storage it is proposed that Council consider the following amendment to its current process.

   1. Council continue to collect trolleys on a fortnightly basis
2. Rather than store the collected trolleys council return the trolleys to the stores on the day of collection and obtain a signed receipt detailing the number of trolleys being returned
3. Council invoice the stores at the current rate of $41 per trolley

This process is not compliant with the Abandoned Trolley by-law and could only be implemented with the written consent of the supermarkets. Given that there is a significant cost benefit to supermarkets it is likely that it would be acceptable.

Financial Implications:

See General section of this report.

Legislation / Policy:

Palmerston (Public Places) By-laws.

RECOMMENDATION

1. THAT the Committee take note of Report EDI/118.

2. THAT Council discuss with the local supermarkets the establishment of an agreement to return abandoned trolleys directly to the supermarkets at a reduced cost.

3. THAT the charge for the return of abandoned trolleys be set at $120 including GST

Recommendation Officer: Mark Spangler, Director of Technical Services

Any queries on this report may be directed to Mark Spangler, Director of Technical Services on telephone (08) 8935 9958 or email mark.spangler@palmerston.nt.gov.au.

Schedule of Attachments:

Nil.
Summary:

This report nominates two projects to be considered for Black Spot funding:

1. Essington Avenue/TEMPLE Terrace Intersection
2. Tilston Avenue/TEMPLE Terrace Intersection

Background:

Report Number 8/0615 was provided to Council on 13th January 2015 nominating four (4) projects for Blackspot support and joint funding by the Department of Infrastructure/ Regional Development and City of Palmerston, for the 2015/2016 financial year:-

- Temple Terrace / Emery Avenue Intersection Improvement (Estimated Project cost: $750,000)
- Temple Terrace / Essington Avenue Intersection Improvement (Estimated Project cost: $20,000)
- Temple Terrace / Tilston Avenue Intersection Improvement (Estimated Project cost: $20,000)
- Flockhart Drive Pedestrian Bridge (Estimated Project cost: $440,000)

Northern Territory (NT) Black Spot Program Consultative Panel recommended to partially fund only two (2) of these projects:

- Temple Terrace / Emery Avenue roundabout
- Flockhart Footbridge.
General:

Subsequent to the above submissions, the department has written to Council requesting further nominations for Black Spot funding.

Two projects are recommended, and these are:

- Essington Avenue/Temple Terrace Intersection. Estimated cost $20,000.
- Tilston Avenue/Temple Terrace Intersection. Estimated cost $20,000.

Financial Implications:

Nil cost to Council.

Legislation / Policy:

Nil

RECOMMENDATION

1. THAT Council receives Report Number 8/0653.

2. THAT Council submits both the Essington Avenue/Temple Terrace Intersection and the Tilston Avenue/Temple terrace Intersection as Black Spot projects for the next round of Black Spot applications.

Recommending Officer: Mark Spangler, Director of Technical Services

Any queries on this report may be directed to Mark Spangler, Director of Technical Services on telephone (08) 8935 9958 or email mark.spangler@palmerston.nt.gov.au.

Author: Mike Staunton, Capital Works Coordinator.

Schedule of Attachments:

Attachment A: A copy of letter received from the NT Government, Department of Transport, regarding the NT Black Spot Program request for submissions.

Attachment B: A copy of the Blackspot Funding Submission and Nomination Form for Essington Avenue/Temple Terrace Intersection.

Attachment C: A copy of the Blackspot Funding Submission and Nomination Form for Tilston Avenue/Temple Terrace Intersection.
Dear Mr Bruhn,

This Department is seeking nominations of suitable projects for Black Spot Program 2016-17. The Northern Territory Consultative Panel will meet in September 2015 to consider the nominations and recommend priority projects for approval by the Federal Minister for the Department of Infrastructure and Regional Development.

The Australian Government has announced an additional $1.66 Million to the Northern Territory Black Spot Program in 2016-17. This gives a total $2.66 Million for Northern Territory Black Spot Projects and I would strongly recommend submitting your nominations.

The nomination form and the copy of the Notes of Administration are available at:


The Department of Transport is required to assess all nominations prior to consideration by the Northern Territory Black Spot Program Consultative Panel. All nominations received in time will be submitted to the Panel for their consideration regardless of project eligibility for funding. Nominations are due by 31 July 2015. Nominations received after 31 July 2015 may not be submitted for the Panel’s consideration.

Please note that there are some changes to main eligibility criteria to consider as follows:
1. Benefit Cost Ratio Based Submissions - For individual sites such as intersections, mid-block or short road sections, there has to be a history of at least two casualty crashes over a five-year period. In addition, the minimum required benefit cost ratio for eligible projects is reduced from 2:1 to 1:1. For lengths of road, there must be an average of 0.13 casualty crashes per kilometre of the length in question over five years; or the road length to be treated must be amongst the top 10 percent of sites with a demonstrated higher crash rate that other roads in a region.

2. Road Safety Audit Based Submissions - For road locations which have a high crash risk, a Road Safety Audit need to be conducted including remedial works. It is mandatory to include remedial works in the audit report.

Additional information is also available at the following website.

It is a requirement that approved Australian Government Black Spot sites must comply with Australian Government Black Spot Signage Guidelines for public recognition. This information is available on:

All nominations should be referred to The Black Spot Consultative Panel, Department of Transport, GPO Box 2520, Darwin NT, 0801.

Should you require assistance with the preparation of your nomination you may contact Mr Peter McInden of the Local Government Association of the Northern Territory on 8944 9691 or Mr Afshin Beigi (Department of Transport) on 8924 7280.

Yours sincerely

LOUISE MCCORMICK
Executive Director, Transport Infrastructure Planning

22 April 2015
21 October 2014

Capital Works Co-ordinator
City of Palmerston
PO Box 1
Palmerston NT 0831

Attention: Michael Staunton

TEMPLE TERRACE/ESSINGTON AVENUE JUNCTION – BLACK SPOT FUNDING SUBMISSION

The following letter provides a summary of a review undertaken into casualty crashes at the junction of Temple Terrace with Essington Avenue, Gray. The proposed treatment, anticipated treatment cost and Benefit Cost Ratio are also provided.

Crash History

Crashes were assessed for the period 1st July 2009 to 30th June 2014.

The casualty crashes experienced at the junction include:

- 1 angle
- 1 hit pedestrian
- 1 hit other object
- 1 ran off road

The ‘hit pedestrian’ crash involved a vehicle turning right from Temple Terrace into Essington Avenue. The ‘ran off road’ crash involved a westbound vehicle on Temple Terrace and the 2 remaining crashes involved a vehicle turning right from Essington Avenue.

All four crashes resulted in injury.

Proposed Treatment

It is proposed to provide line marking to reduce the westbound carriageway of Temple Terrace to a single through lane and provide a dedicated left turn deceleration lane. This alteration would allow the stop line on Essington Avenue to be brought forward and this would improve sight distance from this approach.

Right turning vehicles both in and out of Essington Avenue would only need to cross a single lane of traffic (rather than two) and this change therefore reduces the number of potential conflict points at the junction.

Identified Costs

The anticipated cost for the line marking including survey, design and installation is $20,000.

Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR)

Based on the available casualty crash data and the information provided in the Black Spot ‘Notes on Administration’, the following reduction factors have been applied:

- 1 x adjacent approach, install left turn lane & improve sight lines 37%
- 1 x loss of control (L or R turn), improve sight lines 20%

The improvement in sight lines crash reduction has not been applied to the hit pedestrian crashes as the sight distance from the right turn from Temple Terrace would not be altered.

A design life of 5 years has been adopted for this line marking treatment.
The following BCR is anticipated:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total cost</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total savings</td>
<td>$16,956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present value of benefits</td>
<td>$69,523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net present value</td>
<td>$49,523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCR</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This meets the requirement of a greater than 1:1 benefit cost ratio and it is therefore recommended that this project is submitted for Black Spot funding.

Yours faithfully
TONKIN CONSULTING

B Smith,
Senior Road Safety Auditor

Enc Concept Sketch
Temple Terrace/Essington Avenue Junction – Concept Sketch
# AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT BLACK SPOT PROGRAMME
## NOMINATION FORM

### Nominee Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nominee Reference No:</th>
<th>Nominee Reference No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(DoIT use only)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Title: Dr/Mr/Mrs/ etc:</th>
<th>Mr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Surname:</td>
<td>Staunton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. First Name:</td>
<td>Michael</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Organisation:</td>
<td>City of Palmerston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Position Title / Occupation:</td>
<td>Capital Works Co-ordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Postal Address:</td>
<td>PO Box 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Palmerston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. State:</td>
<td>NT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Postcode:</td>
<td>0831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Telephone Number:</td>
<td>08 8935 9957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Fax Number:</td>
<td>08 8935 9900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. E-mail address</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Michael.staunton@palmerston.nt.gov.au">Michael.staunton@palmerston.nt.gov.au</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Date of Submission:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Site Nomination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nomination Reference No:</th>
<th>Nomination Reference No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(DoIT use only)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>13. Shire or Council area in which site nomination is located:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Palmerston</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>14. Suburb/Town etc</th>
<th>15. Postcode (of site)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gray</td>
<td>0830</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>16. Site Description: (eg 'intersection, 5km road length, 20kms west of Smithsville)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Temple Terrace and Essington Avenue T-junction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>17. Road Name(s):</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary Road:</td>
<td>Temple Terrace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersecting Road:</td>
<td>Essington Avenue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>18. Nature of Concern:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The speed of vehicles approaching from the east contributes to crashes involving turning vehicles.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLEASE FORWARD NOMINATION FORM TO LOCAL OR STATE ROAD AUTHORITY FOR SITE ASSESSMENT AND TREATMENT PROPOSAL**
### Site Assessment

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. National Land Transport Network (Y/N)</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Is this a State or Local road?</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Is this an Urban or Rural project?</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Geographic location (Geocode).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X: 130.981672 Y: -12.485228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Problem Diagnosis: (eg right turn crashes, rear end crashes)</td>
<td>Right turning vehicles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. AADT at location</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Primary crash-type code (DCA), if available.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Crash History *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be completed for a SPOT and for a LENGTH proposal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatal crashes:</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injury crashes:</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total casualty crashes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measurement period: from:</td>
<td>July 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to:</td>
<td>June 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Years</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Crash History *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be completed only for a LENGTH proposal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatal crashes per km</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injury crashes per km</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total casualty crashes per km</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the calculated crash rate per kilometre per annum for this site?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has this road length been assessed among the top 10% of lengths identified within the State with a demonstrably higher crash rate than other roads in the State? (Y/N)</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If YES, what is the State calculated crash rate per kilometre per annum at the 10%</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* For all crash history based proposals 8. must be completed, for a proposal based on a road length 9. is also to be completed.
** Optional, liaison with the State road authority may be required.

### Road Safety Audit

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. IS THE PROPOSAL SUPPORTED BY A ROAD SAFETY AUDIT? (Y/N)</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If no crash history has been specified above, the proposal must be supported by a Road Safety Audit. For guidance refer to AUSTROADS Publication No. AGRS06-09 ‘Guide to Road Safety Part 6:Road Safety Audit’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a copy of the relevant report (or section of the report) attached? (Y/N)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Treatment Proposal

11. Proposed Treatment: (eg install signs, modify signals, install roundabout)

   Install line marking to alter the location of the side road give way hold line to improve sight lines and allow a left turn lane to be provided.

12. Treatment Code: (If applicable)  
   - K6  
   * See Appendix 1 of Notes on Administration

13. Estimated Cost to Black Spot Program:  
   - $20,000

14. Net Present Value:  
   - $49,523

15. Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR)  
   - 3.48 Not required if nomination is a Road Safety Audit project

16. Other contributions to this project  
   - $  
   Source:

17. Environmental clearances:  
   - Are there any environmental or heritage concerns with this project: (Y/N)  
   - N
   - If ‘YES, have clearances been obtained?  
   - (If YES, please attach)

18. Expected start date (physical construction)

19. Expected completion date (physical construction)

### Contact Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact Person:</th>
<th>Michael Staunton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organisation:</td>
<td>City of Palmerston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone Number</td>
<td>08 8935 9957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facsimile Number</td>
<td>08 8935 9900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail address</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Michael.Staunton@palmerston.nt.gov.au">Michael.Staunton@palmerston.nt.gov.au</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# BLACK SPOT CONSULTATIVE PANELS

All nominations are to be referred to the Black Spot Consultative Panel in your state:

## STATE ROAD AND TRANSPORT AGENCY ADDRESSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Address Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| New South Wales        | The Black Spot Consultative Panel  
                          | Roads and Maritime Services  
                          | Locked Bag 928  
                          | NORTH SYDNEY NSW 2059, DX10516 |
| Victoria               | The Black Spot Consultative Panel  
                          | VICROADS  
                          | 60 Denmark Street  
                          | KEW VIC 3101 |
| Queensland             | The Black Spot Consultative Panel  
                          | Department of Transport and Main Roads  
                          | GPO Box 2595  
                          | BRISBANE QLD 4001 |
| Western Australia      | The Black Spot Consultative Panel  
                          | Main Roads Western Australia  
                          | PO Box 6202  
                          | EAST PERTH WA 6892 |
| South Australia        | The Black Spot Consultative Panel  
                          | C/O Manager, Road Asset Policy and Programs  
                          | Department of Planning, Transport & Infrastructure  
                          | GPO Box 1533  
                          | ADELAIDE SA 5001 |
| Tasmania               | The Black Spot Consultative Panel  
                          | Department of State Growth  
                          | GPO Box 536  
                          | HOBART TAS 7001 |
| Northern Territory     | The Black Spot Consultative Panel  
                          | Department of Transport  
                          | PO Box 2520  
                          | DARWIN NT 0801 |
| Australian Capital     | The Black Spot Consultative Panel  
                          | Department of Territory and Municipal Services  
                          | Locked Bag 2000  
                          | CIVIC SQUARE ACT 2608 |
21 October 2014

Capital Works Co-ordinator
City of Palmerston
PO Box 1
Palmerston NT 0831

Attention: Michael Staunton

TEMPLE TERRACE/TILSTON AVENUE JUNCTION – BLACK SPOT FUNDING SUBMISSION

The following letter provides a summary of a review undertaken into casualty crashes at the junction of Temple Terrace with Tilston Avenue, Driver. The proposed treatment, anticipated treatment cost and Benefit Cost Ratio are also provided.

Crash History

Crashes were assessed for the period 1st July 2009 to 30th June 2014.

The crashes experienced at the junction include:

- 1 angle, right-through crash, right turn into Tilston Avenue collision with northbound through movement.
- 1 fell off motorcycle crash, northbound.

An additional casualty crash was recorded 100m south of the junction (at the change in alignment of the northbound carriageway). This crash has been included in the calculations as the proposed treatment extends to this location.

- 1 ran off road, right of carriageway to object or vehicle, northbound.

All three crashes resulted in injury only.

Proposed Treatment

It is proposed that the existing line marking is altered to provide a dedicated left turn lane from Temple Terrace into Tilston Avenue. Vehicles were observed to only enter the left hand lane south of Tilston Avenue if they were turning left.

Right turning vehicles both in and out of Tilston Avenue would only need to cross a single lane of traffic (rather than two) and this change therefore reduces the number of potential conflict points at the junction.

It is anticipated that there would also be an additional benefit from improving sight lines for vehicles exiting Tilston Avenue. This benefit has not been included within the calculated crash reductions.

Identified Costs

The anticipated cost for the line marking including survey, design and installation is $20,000.

Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR)

Based on the available casualty crash data and the information provided in the Black Spot ‘Notes on Administration’, the following reduction factors have been applied:

- 1 x adjacent approach, install left turn lane 10%
- 1 x curve, off road hit object, delineation/edge line 15%

A 10% crash reduction has been adopted for the ‘curve, off road hit object’ crash delineation/edge line treatment (rather than the standard 30%) as there is already a kerb in this location and the proposed line...
marking would be enhancing the existing delineation and reducing the curve rather than providing new delineation.

No crash reduction has been applied for the ‘loss of control, on road’ (motorcycle) crash. However, it is anticipated that the altered alignment may reduce the likelihood for this type of crash occurring.

A design life of 5 years has been adopted for this line marking treatment.

Based on the above, the following benefit cost ratio (BCR) is anticipated:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total cost</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total savings</td>
<td>$6,994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present value of benefits</td>
<td>$28,677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net present value</td>
<td>$8,677</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BCR 1.43**

This meets the requirement of a greater than 1:1 benefit cost ratio and it is therefore recommended that this project is submitted for Black Spot funding.

Yours faithfully

TONKIN CONSULTING

B Smith,
Senior Road Safety Auditor

Enc Concept Sketch
Temple Terrace/Tilston Avenue Junction – Concept Sketch
Nominee Details

1. Title: Dr/Mr/Mrs/ etc: Mr

2. Surname: Staunton

3. First Name: Michael

4. Organisation: City of Palmerston

5. Position Title / Occupation: Capital Works Co-ordinator

6. Postal Address: PO Box 1


7. State: NT

8. Postcode: 0831

9. Telephone Number: 08 8935 9957

10. Fax Number: 08 8935 9900

11. E-mail address: michael.staunton@palmerston.nt.gov.au

12. Date of Submission:

Site Nomination

13. Shire or Council area in which site nomination is located: City of Palmerston

14. Suburb/Town etc: Driver

15. Postcode (of site): 0830

16. Site Description: (eg ‘intersection, 5km road length, 20kms west of Smithville)

Temple Terrace & Tilston Avenue T-Junction

17. Road Name(s):

Primary Road: Temple Terrace

Intersecting Road: (If any) Tilston Avenue

18. Nature of Concern:

Crashes involving north-bound vehicles.

PLEASE FORWARD NOMINATION FORM TO LOCAL OR STATE ROAD AUTHORITY FOR SITE ASSESSMENT AND TREATMENT PROPOSAL.
### Site Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>National Land Transport Network (Y/N)</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Is this a State or Local road?</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Is this an Urban or Rural project?</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Geographic location (Geocode).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1: X: 130.974948 Y: -12.496074</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2: X: 130.94567 Y: -12.51892</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Problem Diagnosis: (eg right turn crashes, rear end crashes)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northbound vehicles involved in crashes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>AADT at location</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Primary crash-type code (DCA), if available.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Crash History * To be completed for a SPOT and for a LENGTH proposal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fatal crashes:</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Injury crashes:</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total casualty crashes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Measurement period: from:</td>
<td>July 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to:</td>
<td>June 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of Years:</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Crash History * To be completed only for a LENGTH proposal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fatal crashes per km</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Injury crashes per km</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total casualty crashes per km</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What is the calculated crash rate per kilometre per annum for this site?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has this road length been assessed among the top 10% of lengths identified within the State with a demonstrably higher crash rate than other roads in the State? (Y/N)</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|        | If YES, what is the State calculated crash rate per kilometre per annum at the 10% | **  

* For all crash history based proposals 8. must be completed, for a proposal based on a road length 9. is also to be completed.  
** Optional, liaison with the State road authority may be required.

### Road Safety Audit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>IS THE PROPOSAL SUPPORTED BY A ROAD SAFETY AUDIT? (Y/N)</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If no crash history has been specified above, the proposal must be supported by a Road Safety Audit. For guidance refer to AUSTROADS Publication No. AGRS06-09 ‘Guide to Road Safety Part 6:Road Safety Audit’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is a copy of the relevant report (or section of the report) attached? (Y/N)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
 Treatment Proposal

11. Proposed Treatment: (eg install signs, modify signals, install roundabout)

Install line marking to alter the location of the side road give way hold line to improve sight lines and allow a left turn lane to be provided.

12. Treatment Code: (If applicable)  K6  * See Appendix 1 of Notes on Administration

13. Estimated Cost to Black Spot Program:  $20,000


15. Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR)  2.43  Not required if nomination is a Road Safety Audit project

16. Other contributions to this project  

| Source: |

17. Environmental clearances:

Are there any environmental or heritage concerns with this project: (Y/N)  N

If 'YES, have clearances been obtained?  (If YES, please attach)  

18. Expected start date (physical construction)  

19. Expected completion date (physical construction)  

Contact Details

Contact Person:  Michael Stauton

Organisation:  City of Palmerston

Telephone Number  08 8935 9957

Facsimile Number  08 8935 9900

E-mail address  Michael.staunton@palmerston.nt.gov.au

Signature  

ATTACHMENT C
BLACK SPOT CONSULTATIVE PANELS

All nominations are to be referred to the Black Spot Consultative Panel in your state:

STATE ROAD AND TRANSPORT AGENCY ADDRESSES

New South Wales  The Black Spot Consultative Panel
Roads and Maritime Services
Locked Bag 928
NORTH SYDNEY  NSW 2059, DX10516

Victoria  The Black Spot Consultative Panel
VICROADS
60 Denmark Street
KEW  VIC 3101

Queensland  The Black Spot Consultative Panel
Department of Transport and Main Roads
GPO Box 2595
BRISBANE  QLD 4001

Western Australia  The Black Spot Consultative Panel
Main Roads Western Australia
PO Box 6202
EAST PERTH  WA  6892

South Australia  The Black Spot Consultative Panel
C/O Manager, Road Asset Policy and Programs
Department of Planning, Transport & Infrastructure
GPO Box 1533
ADELAIDE  SA 5001

Tasmania  The Black Spot Consultative Panel
Department of State Growth
GPO Box 536
HOBART  TAS 7001

Northern Territory  The Black Spot Consultative Panel
Department of Transport
PO Box 2520
DARWIN  NT  0801

Australian Capital Territory  The Black Spot Consultative Panel
Department of Territory and Municipal Services
Locked Bag 2000
CIVIC SQUARE  ACT  2608