



Australian Government
National Capital Authority

CONSULTATION REPORT

**WORKS APPROVAL 18715 - SECTION 5 CAMPBELL
INFRASTRUCTURE WORKS**

**WORKS APPROVAL 18766 – SECTION 5 CAMPBELL
REMEDICATION OF CONTAMINATED AREAS**

MARCH 2013

| | |
|--|-----------|
| PART 1 - INTRODUCTION | 3 |
| PART 2 - PUBLIC CONSULTATION REQUIREMENTS | 3 |
| 2.1 National Capital Plan | 3 |
| 2.2 Commitment to Community Engagement | 3 |
| PART 3 – SUMMARY OF PUBLIC CONSULTATION | 4 |
| 3.1 The public consultation process | 4 |
| 3.2 Submissions Received, Comments and Response | 5 |
| PART 4 - COMMENT AND RESPONSE | 6 |
| CONCLUSION | 10 |
| Attachments | |
| Attachment A - Canberra Times – public notice | 11 |
| Attachment B – Letter to residents | 12 |
| Attachment C –Detailed responses | 13 |

PART 1 - INTRODUCTION

Under the *Australian Capital Territory (Planning and Land Management) Act 1988*, the National Capital Authority (NCA) prepares and administers the National Capital Plan (the Plan) to ensure that Canberra and the Territory are planned and developed in accordance with their national significance.

The Plan sets out the broad planning framework for the Australian Capital Territory (ACT). Areas designated as having special characteristics of the National Capital are subject to detailed planning policies and guidelines.

Any buildings or structures, demolition, landscaping or excavation works in Designated Areas require the approval of the NCA. The NCA considers such proposals in the context of the relevant provisions of the Plan.

The NCA has received 2 applications for the development of Section 5, Campbell. One application is for the provision of site services infrastructure and the second application is for site remediation and decontamination.

Many respondents addressed both proposals in a single submission without distinguishing which of the two applications they were addressing. The NCA has therefore elected to prepare one Consultation Report addressing both applications.

The following report details the process undertaken by the NCA relating to these applications.

PART 2 - PUBLIC CONSULTATION REQUIREMENTS

2.1 National Capital Plan

Under the Plan, the requirements for public consultation apply, but are not limited to, certain residential developments, telecommunications facilities (that are not considered low impact) and amending or issuing an instrument under the Plan (including Development Control Plans).

2.2 Commitment to Community Engagement

The NCA's 'Commitment to Community Engagement (August 2011)' details how the NCA conducts consultation. The purpose is to achieve a greater level of consistency and transparency in the NCA's decision making process.

The Commitment to Community Engagement describes:

- the minimum requirements for consultation
- the timeframes for amendments to the Plan
- what is involved in preparing a new Development Control Plan
- the process for amending or issuing an instrument under the Plan
- the process by which WA applications, which are released for public consultation, will be assessed.

Part 2 (Consultation Protocol) of the NCA's Commitment to Community Engagement (August 2011) describes the consultation process for WA applications. The consultation protocol includes criteria for which an application will be assessed, in order to determine

whether the application should be released for public notification or full public consultation.

For development applications, the NCA undertakes a risk assessment of each proposal against the assessment criteria set out in the Consultation Protocol. The public notification process will include information about the NCA's risk assessment of the proposal against the assessment criteria below.

1. What is the likelihood that the proposal will adversely affect existing public space and / or community amenity?
2. What is the likelihood that the proposal will adversely affect existing environmental, heritage or landscape values?
3. What is the likelihood that the proposal is discordant with the general development and amenity of the locality in terms of materials, finishes, scale, massing, design and quality?
4. What is the likelihood that the proposal is inconsistent with an existing Heritage Management Plan (HMP)? (If there is no HMP, this question is not applicable).

The combination of the likelihood and consequence from the criteria above categorises an overall perceived risk into five ratings being 'negligible', 'low', 'significant', 'high' or 'extreme'. Works assessed as having an 'extreme' risk will be rejected.

Full public consultation for WAs will be required where the NCA's perceived risk rating is 'significant' or 'high', and also for any development where consultation is a mandatory requirement under the Plan.

When a WA application is lodged and consultation is required, the applicant is required to consult with the community and stakeholders. The NCA may stipulate specific requirements for consultation and, for higher perceived risk proposals, may undertake the consultation process itself.

The NCA may set aside the requirement to undertake full public consultation where:

- (a) previous consultation has been undertaken
- (b) for minor amendments to previously approved works
- (c) proposals are exempt, as demonstrated in the 'Commitment to Community Engagement (August 2011)'
- (d) the NCA determines it unnecessary and no stakeholders will be affected.

The Plan has specific requirements in relation to consultation for telecommunications facility, in relation to any new towers, masts or monopoles.

As both applications for the development of Section 5 Campbell were assessed at a level of risk other than 'low', as such the applications were subject to full public consultation.

PART 3 – SUMMARY OF PUBLIC CONSULTATION

3.1 The public consultation process

The public consultation for both applications was undertaken between 23 January and 15 February 2013.

The consultation took the form of:

- On Wednesday 23 January 2013, publishing a public notice in *The Canberra Times* detailing the proposed works and inviting submissions to be made to the NCA in relation to the proposal ([Attachment A](#))
- Between 23 January and 15 February 2013, publishing details of the two proposals, including the applicant's plans and planning report on the NCA's website
- On 22 January 2013, the NCA writing a letter to relevant authorities (Department of Finance and Deregulation, Australian War Memorial, New Zealand High Commission, Department of Defence, National Trust and various residents' associations ([Attachment B](#)))
- On 22 January 2013, the NCA delivered a notification letter to 218 properties surrounding the site
- Emailing 27 residents who had made previous submissions to the NCA on draft Amendment 74 to the Plan.

In addition to the NCA's consultation activities the ACT Land Development Agency (LDA) undertook a community consultation process prior to the Works Approval application being submitted. This included:

- On 21 November 2012, a meeting with Campbell Residents Association regarding the project and matters concerning the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* (EPBC Act)
- On 17 December 2012, the LDA delivered letters to approximately 193 properties surrounding the site (including Page St, Chowne St, Rankin St, Creswell St, Getting Cres, Feakes Place, Anzac Park, Blamey Crescent).

3.2 Submissions Received, Comments and Response

The NCA received eight submissions objecting to part or all of the development or raising questions.

Letters or emails of acknowledgment were sent to all the submitters advising them that their submissions will be taken into consideration before a decision is made on the application.

The key issues raised by the community during the consultation process were:

1. Concerns about traffic and car parking increases with particular reference to the impact on the surrounding street network.
2. Concerns about content of the contamination material – likely to be asbestos and impact of site remediation works on surrounding residents
3. General comments and concerns regarding the infrastructure works and impacts during and after construction (storm water disposal, water supply, sewerage infrastructure).
4. Concerns about the impact of construction on residential amenity in terms of hours of construction/noise and dust control.
5. Concerns regarding the heritage values of the site and impact on the Commonwealth and National Heritage Values of the Parliament House vista.

Due to the complex nature of some of the submissions, the NCA requested that the LDA respond to the individual issues raised in the submissions. The LDA's responses to the submissions are available at [Attachment C](#).

PART 4 - COMMENT AND RESPONSE

A summary of the key themes raised and NCA response is provided below. The LDA's responses are provided in italics.

1. Concerns regarding traffic and car parking increases, impacts on surrounding street networks

1.1.1 Submitter's issues

A number of submitters raised concern that the development would increase the vehicle density and traffic in the area.

1.1.2 NCA comment

This proposal is consistent with the planning principles set by Draft Amendment 74 to the Plan. A traffic impact assessment undertaken at the time of preparation of Draft Amendment 74 did not identify that a significant increase of traffic would occur within adjacent suburban streets as a result of construction.

The NCA also sought a response from the LDA who advised that :

A Road Hierarchy and Traffic Analysis report was prepared by transport specialists to assess the impact of the site's development on the surrounding network. This work also included traffic counts of surrounding streets. In summary the proposed internal road network will provide an acceptable level of performance and the road network will carry daily traffic volumes appropriate to their design geometry.

Car parking requirements were determined as part of the Amendment 74 planning process. The Road Hierarchy and Traffic Analysis report undertaken by Cardo found the parking provided was sufficient to cater for the development and that the expected peak hour traffic generated by the proposed development can be accommodated at the nearby intersections and road network.

All relevant traffic reports and new road designs have been publicly notified as part of the NCA Works Approval application process.

2. Concerns about content of the contamination material, impact of site remediation works on health of surrounding residents, dust management methods during remediation works

1.1.3 Submitter's issues

A number of submitters had concerns about content of the contamination material – likely to be asbestos and impact of site remediation works on surrounding residents.

1.1.4 NCA comment

A Remediation Action Plan (RAP) has been prepared identifying areas of contamination on the site. A Waste Disposal Plan (WDP) has also been prepared which contains measures to ensure the handling of contaminated material meets environmental protection guidelines as well as eliminates any potential impact on the surrounding environment. The RAP and the WDP have been independently reviewed by a qualified site auditor and endorsed by the EPA.

The LDA provided the following comment with regard to the handling of contamination:

Contaminated material will be removed from site based on approved EPA requirements. This will include all materials are covered and appropriately sealed eliminating any risk of exposure. The material will be dampened before placing in containers to prevent the chance of fibres and dust becoming airborne. The contractor will be required to hold an EPA waste transport permit.

The contractor will be required to submit details of how and where materials will be transported and disposed for approval by the relevant authorities.

There are guidelines, approvals and licensing requirements the developer and contractor will need to abide by, a summary is in Section 12.1 of the RAP.

An Occupational Hygienist (OH) will be onsite during remediation works.

In section 12.2 'General' there are references to mobile water cart available full time during remedial works and if unacceptable levels of dust is generated works will be halted. The OH will determine the acceptable levels as part of the EMP and OHS Plan.

The 'unacceptable level of dust' varies depending on the proximity and period of exposure, workers onsite are generally more critically exposed. A mobile water cart will be available full time on site during the remedial works. If unacceptable level of dust is generated, works will be halted and additional dust suppression techniques will be employed.

The contractor will be responsible for the implementation of the RAP, which include, engaging an environmental consultant and engaging a remediation contractor who holds a Class A Asbestos Removal License. The Class A Licensed Asbestos contractor and occupation hygienist will be responsible for the management of the monitoring of air-borne fibres during remediation. This will include undertaking daily air monitoring during remediation works to confirm no asbestos fibres are leaving the remediation areas.

3. Infrastructure works and impacts during and after construction

1.1.5 Submitter's issues

General comments and concerns were raised regarding the infrastructure works and impacts during and after construction such as storm water disposal, water supply, sewerage infrastructure.

1.1.6 NCA comment

Investigations undertaken as part of the overall Section 5 Campbell planning process (including Amendment 74 process) thoroughly assessed the infrastructure capacity of the area and identified areas requiring upgrades.

The LDA supplied the following response to the issues of infrastructure capacity:

As part of the requirements to provide a compliant design capable of servicing the proposed development all services providers have been consulted with.

Actew have been consulted on the proposals and it has been confirmed that there is sufficient capacity in the existing sewer network downstream of Campbell to accept the proposed loads. The existing 225mm clay sewer through Section 5 will be upgraded to a 300mm plastic sewer.

Actew have also confirmed that the existing water network is capable of servicing the proposed development based on calculations.

ActewAGL have calculated that the existing High Voltage network has sufficient capacity to supply the internal substation on each block. Street lighting will be powered by the existing (although soon to be upgraded by an unrelated project) substation on Getting Crescent.

The existing stormwater infrastructure will be upgraded as part of the proposals. Larger stormwater pipes are to be provided, increasing capacity and reduce flooding in Campbell. The provision of a retarding basin will help to regulate stormwater during storm events by providing temporary storage and controlled release, reducing flooding in the Campbell catchment and on Constitution Avenue. A Gross Pollutant Trap (GPT), provision of a creek and shallow planted wetland will significantly improve the quality of stormwater before being released into Lake Burley Griffin.

The ACT gas authority (ZNX formally known as Jemena) has confirmed that through minor upgrades to the existing network in Campbell, sufficient capacity is available to provide gas servicing to the Campbell Section 5 development.

The LDA is in negotiations with telecommunication providers to extend existing infrastructure into the development. This may result in improved telecommunication services for existing Campbell residents.

Sewerage demand calculations for Campbell and the proposed development have been agreed with Actew. The assessment found that the proposed sewerage loads introduced by Campbell Section 5 can be accommodated by the existing sewer network downstream of the site. The existing sewer traversing the site will be upgraded to a larger diameter plastic sewer, increasing capacity.

4. Concerns about the impact of construction on residential amenity in terms of hours of construction/noise and dust control

1.1.7 Submitter's issues

Concerns were raised regarding the impact of construction on the residential amenity of the area. A request to reduce the 7am to 6pm hours of operation on Saturdays was also received.

1.1.8 NCA comment

The submitter's concern about reducing the Saturday hours of operation for remediation works has been noted and this will be altered accordingly.

The issue of dust control has been discussed above. Dust management measures are described in the RAP and include regular monitoring for airborne pollutants and the use of water spray tanks should levels generated become unacceptable.

The LDA provided the following response with regard to the impact of construction noise and vibration:

The adjacent buildings are of residential-type construction and as such a maximum peak particle velocity of 10 mm/sec is appropriate to restrict structural damage. It is noted that, people may find vibration levels above about 3 – 5 mm/s as being 'strongly perceptible' to 'disturbing', even though they may not cause damage to structures. Hence, complaints from neighbours are possible even at low vibration levels and some reassurance, possibly by vibration monitoring, is likely to be necessary.

The nature of remediation works requires the use of heavy machinery and excavation of land. This will result in noise generation, dust and vibration. Whilst this is an unfavorable outcome for a residential area it is a short term process and will ultimately allow for the development of the site in a safe manner.

5. Environment Protection Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 concerns - heritage values of the site and impact on the Commonwealth and National Heritage Values of the Parliament House vista

1.1.9 Submitter's issues

A number of submissions raised concerns about the impact of the development on the heritage values of the area.

1.1.10 NCA comment

The proposed development reflects the intended outcomes of Amendment 74. The Amendment 74 planning process involved extensive site investigations, heritage assessments and other relevant background studies. Department of Sustainability,

Environment, Water, Population and Communities (SEWPAC) sent the NCA a letter (25 May 2012) of support for Amendment 74 stating that the amendment takes adequate account of the National and Commonwealth heritage places within the vicinity of the site.

On 13 May 2013 the minister determined that the proposed development adequately addresses the issues relating to Listed threatened species and communities, National Heritage Places and Commonwealth land and approved the proposal.

Conclusion

The NCA's consultation process was carried out in accordance with the Plan and the NCA's 'Commitment to Community Engagement (August 2011)'.

Eight written submissions were received.

The application has been assessed as consistent with the Plan and was approved on 21 May 2013.

Attachment A - Canberra Times – public notice



Australian Government
National Capital Authority

WORKS APPROVAL



BLOCK 14 SECTION 22 BARTON – 21 NATIONAL CIRCUIT

The National Capital Authority (NCA) has received a works approval application from Section 22 Barton Pty Ltd for the development of 21 National Circuit Barton, Stage 1 works.

The development includes construction of a structured car park and mixed use development (hotel).

SECTION 5 CAMPBELL

Section 5 Campbell – Infrastructure works (roads, storm water and services) and site remediation of contaminated areas.

The National Capital Authority has received 2 separate works approval applications from Cardo Pty Ltd relating to the land at Section 5 Campbell, corner of Constitution Avenue and Arzac Park East being:

1. WA18715: infrastructure works (construction of internal roads, stormwater and sewerage upgrades and electrical and telecommunications services); and
2. WA18766: site remediation of contaminated land.

For any questions please contact Natalie Broughton on 6271 2867.
Comments on the proposal are invited and should be sent to:
worksapproval@natcap.gov.au or GPO Box 373 Canberra ACT 2601 by
COB 15 February 2013.

**Information and plans for both applications can be found at
www.nationalcapital.gov.au/haveyoursay**

All submissions, including names and addresses will be made publicly available at the NCA office and on the website, subject to approval in writing by the submitter, in accordance with the NCA's Commitment to Community Engagement.

WWW.NATIONALCAPITAL.GOV.AU

Attachment B – Letter to residents



Australian Government
National Capital Authority

File No: 13/52; Job No: WA 18715/18766

Dear Resident

Section 5 Campbell - works approval applications
WA18766 - Site remediation & WA18715 - Infrastructure and site servicing works

The National Capital Authority (NCA) has received two works approval applications from Cardno (ACT/NSW) Pty Ltd on behalf of the Land Development Agency (LDA) for works to Section 5 Campbell. WA18766 for site remediation of contaminated land and WA18715 for infrastructure and site servicing works.

The plans and supporting documentation on the proposals can be viewed on the NCA's website www.nationalcapital.gov.au

Please provide any written comments you may have on the proposal by close of business on Friday 15 February 2013 to worksapproval@natcap.gov.au or GPO Box 373, Canberra, ACT 2601. All submissions, including names and addresses will be made publicly available at the NCA office and on the website subject to approval in writing by the submitter, in accordance with the NCA's Commitment to Community Engagement.

If you require any further information please contact Edwina Nelson on 6271 2871 or Natalie Broughton on 6271 2867 or email worksapproval@natcap.gov.au.

Yours sincerely

Andrew Smith
Chief Planner

22 January 2013

Building the National Capital in the hearts of all Australians

T 02 6271 2888 | F 02 6273 4427 | www.nationalcapital.gov.au | email natcap@natcap.gov.au

Couriers & deliveries: Treasury Building, King Edward Terrace, Parkes ACT 2600 | Mailing: GPO Box 373 Canberra ACT 2601

ABN 75 149 374 427

Attachment C – Summary of submissions and LDA response

Note: The National Capital Authority (NCA) undertakes an open and transparent works application process. Works Approval documentation advised that the NCA would prepare a Consultation Report for publication on the NCA website, and that this Consultation Report would include a summary of each submission, along with the name of each person making the submission. Names of submitters have been omitted where a submitter requested confidentiality.

| Issue | Submitted By | LDA Response – <i>Note: The ACT Land Development Agency’s (LDA’s) responses are provided in italics.</i> |
|--|----------------------|--|
| ENGINEERING WORKS | | |
| <p>Where is the assessment of existing water, electricity, gas, stormwater and sewerage infrastructure covered off in these documents? The LDA were asked via community feedback on Amend 74 to National Capital Plan that such an assessment was required. I believe that we were advised that such a study would be completed to ensure that there was adequate capacity.</p> | <p>Mark Anderson</p> | <p><i>As part of the requirements to provide a compliant design capable of servicing the proposed development all services providers are consulted with.</i></p> <p><i>Actew have been consulted on the proposals and it has been confirmed that there is sufficient capacity in the existing sewer network downstream of Campbell to accept the proposed loads. The exiting 225mm clay sewer through Section 5 will be upgraded to a 300mm plastic sewer.</i></p> <p><i>Actew have also confirmed that the existing water network is capable of servicing the proposed development based on calculations.</i></p> <p><i>ActewAGL have calculated that the existing High Voltage network has sufficient capacity to supply the internal substation on each block. Street lighting will be powered by the existing (although soon to be upgraded by an unrelated project) substation on Getting Crescent.</i></p> <p><i>The existing stormwater infrastructure will be upgraded as part of the proposals. Larger stormwater pipes are to be provided,</i></p> |

| Issue | Submitted By | LDA Response – Note: The ACT Land Development Agency's (LDA's) responses are provided in italics. |
|---|--------------------------|--|
| | | <p><i>increasing capacity and reduce flooding in Campbell. The provision of a retarding basin will help to regulate stormwater during storm events by providing temporary storage and controlled release, reducing flooding in the Campbell catchment and on Constitution Avenue. A Gross Pollutant Trap (GPT), provision of a creek and shallow planted wetland will significantly improve the quality of stormwater before being released into Lake Burley Griffin.</i></p> <p><i>The ACT gas authority (ZNX formally known as Jemena) has confirmed that through minor upgrades to the existing network in Campbell, sufficient capacity is available to provide gas servicing to the Campbell Section 5 development.</i></p> <p><i>The LDA is in negotiations with telecommunication providers to extend existing infrastructure into the development. This may result in improved telecommunication services for existing Campbell residents.</i></p> |
| <p>Page 9 – Drawing 110029-C1106</p> <p>Points M and N use terms ‘break into’. This suggests that the sewerage for the 500 new apartments on Section 5 are being cut into the existing infrastructure.</p> <p>How can 50 year old infrastructure cope with the ‘output’ of so many new dwellings?</p> <p>Why isn’t capacity being upgraded?</p> | <p>Mark Anderson</p> | <p><i>Sewerage demand calculations for Campbell and the proposed development have been agreed with Actew. The assessment found that the proposed sewerage loads introduced by Campbell Section 5 can be accommodated by the existing sewer network downstream of the site. The existing sewer traversing the site will be upgraded to a larger diameter plastic sewer, increasing capacity.</i></p> <p>For stormwater see previous comments.</p> |

| Issue | Submitted By | LDA Response – Note: The ACT Land Development Agency's (LDA's) responses are provided in italics. |
|--|----------------------|---|
| <p>The same questions apply to the Stormwater section of this diagram.</p> | | |
| <p>Page 14 – Construction Traffic</p> <p>Please confirm that construction traffic will not be permitted to travel through Campbell to dispose of the contaminated materials. Essentially, that it will be required to arrive and depart via Constitution Avenue and the very southern parts of Creswell St and Anzac Park East (preferable because it is away from residential housing to absolutely minimise the risk of airborne asbestos and other contaminants reaching properties or people in the open spaces)</p> | <p>Mark Anderson</p> | <p><i>Contaminated material will be removed from site based on approved EPA requirements. This will include all materials are covered and appropriately sealed eliminating any risk to exposure. The material will be dampened before placing in containers to prevent the chance of fibres and dust becoming airborne. The contractor will be required to hold an EPA waste transport permit.</i></p> <p><i>The contractor will be required to submit details of how and where materials will be transported and disposed for approval by the relevant authorities</i></p> |
| <p>Page 15 – Drawing 110029-C1121</p> <p>For what period will this detour be in place while the Getting/Creswell roundabout is constructed?</p> | <p>Mark Anderson</p> | <p><i>It is envisaged that the detour to allow the construction of the roundabout will be required for 4-6 weeks. Access for residents will be maintained at all times. The community will be given notice of any road closures and diversions (at least 2 weeks) before they are implemented.</i></p> |

| Issue | Submitted By | LDA Response – Note: The ACT Land Development Agency’s (LDA’s) responses are provided in italics. |
|--|----------------------|---|
| <p>Page 17 – Drawing 1110029-C1123</p> <p>For what period will this detour be in place while roadworks on Anzac Park East are complete?</p> | <p>Mark Anderson</p> | <p><i>It is envisaged that this road will require temporary closure for 4-6 weeks immediately south of its junction with Page Street to its intersection with Constitution Avenue. The community will be given notice of any road closures and diversions (at least 2 weeks) before they are implemented.</i></p> |
| <p>Page 26 – Drawing 110029-C1208</p> <p>What coordination has the NCA, LDA and any of the many companies listed on the diagrams had with Hindmarsh, the owner of the Saab Building on the corner of Creswell St and Constitution Avenue?</p> <p>Hindmarsh has released plans for the redevelopment of that site, and appear that they will be excavating areas of the curb near the corner of Creswell St and Getting Cres. It would be wasteful for ratepayers’ money to be expended on curb renovations which might be damaged by Hindmarsh works at a later time.</p> | <p>Mark Anderson</p> | <p><i>Hindmarsh have been consulted and are aware of the Section 5 development. The LDA are equally aware of the aspirations of the redevelopment of the Saab Building site.</i></p> <p><i>Redevelopment of the Saab Building will require works approval from the NCA. This application will be subject to full public consultation.</i></p> <p><i>If there is any damage to public land through construction of the Hindmarsh development, they will have to “make good” any damage at their expense.</i></p> |
| <p>General</p> | <p>Mark</p> | <p><i>A condition survey will be conducted before and after the works</i></p> |

| Issue | Submitted By | LDA Response – Note: The ACT Land Development Agency's (LDA's) responses are provided in italics. |
|---|---------------|---|
| <p>What repairs will be undertaken to Creswell Street, Getting Crescent, Feakes Place, Chowne Street, Page Street and Anzac Park East after construction/remediation work is completed to rectify damage caused by haulage and earthmoving vehicles/equipment?</p> <p>Where is the traffic island that is to implement left turn in/left turn out for Creswell Street, to stop traffic from Russell and ASIO using this suburban street to avoid the Anzac Parade intersection?</p> | Anderson | <p><i>begin by the ACT Government, the contractor and consultants to assess the condition of roads, signs, landscaping etc. The contractor will be contractually required to rectify any damage at their expense to return all areas to the state they were before works began.</i></p> <p><i>The left in/left out intersection upgrade will be included within the tendered works package. The strategy for the intersection is that chevron line marking and signage will be used to manage traffic until the ultimate upgrade is delivered. This has been discussed with NCA and RoadsACT.</i></p> |
| <p>Finance should be directly consulted, where any services are required (sewer and stormwater) for Section 5, that may impact on the services associated with any future development of Anzac park East.</p> | Finance | <p><i>All infrastructure plans associated with the CS5 project are contained within the Works Approval documents. Extensive Stormwater retention and treatment is incorporated on site and all other services including sewer are connected/tied in to existing trunk infrastructure.</i></p> |
| LANDSCAPE | | |
| <p>Why does the development get a mix of coloured granite pavers as part of the footpath structures when the surrounding streets, if they have footpaths, are of bleached concrete?</p> | Mark Anderson | <p><i>The Section 5 Estate is subject to the design standard of the NCA. It is to be a high quality development and is designed to contribute back to the community through its public realm. High quality materials are reflect the significance of the site. The prestigious location will demand a quality design outcome which starts with the material selection used in the public realm.</i></p> |

| Issue | Submitted By | LDA Response – Note: The ACT Land Development Agency’s (LDA’s) responses are provided in italics. |
|--|---------------|--|
| | | <i>Modern construction techniques will also be used to obtain higher quality finishes than those found in the older parts of Campbell.</i> |
| Who is paying for this high standard finish – the LDA (ie ratepayers), the NCA or the developers? | Mark Anderson | <i>The LDA will be paying for estate development. Some public realm upgrades will be required by the developers.</i> |
| A concrete path is shown as being constructed on Creswell Street (western side) from Getting Cres extension up to Chowne Street. There does not appear to be any paths or kerbing to be constructed on Chowne and Page Streets where they touch the new parkland. Why is this case? | Mark Anderson | <i>There is little disturbance to existing conditions at the northern end of the CS5 site. No footpaths or kerbs are designed into this area as the informal edge and existing trees with natural earth worn paths are felt to have intrinsic character of value and as such are to be retained. Access to the verge is to be maintained for use during memorial events as it is currently.</i> |
| REMEDIATION | | |
| Throughout this document, there is an emphasis on the safety of workers (which is right and proper), but there is no mention of the safety of surrounding residents. | Mark Anderson | <p><i>The Remediation Action Plan (RAP) document is about protecting the on-site and off-site (surrounding) land-uses and potential receptors</i></p> <p><i>Section 13 of the RAP titled: Environmental Management Plan (EMP) gives comments on considerations that would be required for surrounding land-uses including neighbouring residents.</i></p> <p><i>The EMP should detail specific thresholds and protocols the contractor will put in place to control many of the issues raised.</i></p> <p><i>Section 14.2 within the Occupational Health and safety (OHS) part</i></p> |

| Issue | Submitted By | LDA Response – Note: The ACT Land Development Agency’s (LDA’s) responses are provided in italics. |
|--|----------------------|---|
| | | <i>of the plan makes special reference of the residential development surrounding the site.</i> |
| <p>Page 2, Para 1.3, OHS Procedures</p> <p>I am disappointed that the series of dot points does not explicitly reference the safety of existing residents to whom a duty of care is owed by the people completing the work. We are at risk of airborne contaminants during excavation, storage and movement of contaminants on the site and must be considered in all plans.</p> | <p>Mark Anderson</p> | <p><i>A Para-occupational Monitoring Plan must be developed by the Class A licensed asbestos removal Contractor and approved by a suitably qualified Occupational Hygienist. Monitoring will use the “Membrane Filter Method” with monitoring locations situated both inside and outside the works area.</i></p> <p><i>Sampling will be undertaken over each day of remedial works. The monitoring locations will need to be placed based on wind direction (to be determined on the day) and located at sensitive receptors</i></p> <p><i>(i.e. surrounding residential development and site office located outside the remediation areas).</i></p> <p><i>The method of remediation is designed to minimise disturbance.</i></p> |
| <p>Page 11, Dig and Dump</p> <p>This states the ‘off site transport of contaminated soil increases the risk of exposure within the surrounding community and is the least preferred option in the hierarchy of waste management’.</p> <p>The next paragraph states that: ‘Although off-site transport of contaminated soil increases the risk of exposure within the local community and is the least preferred</p> | <p>Mark Anderson</p> | <p><i>A Construction, Environment and Management Plan (CEMP) will be prepared to regulate the manner in which works are undertaken on site. This ensures the safety of workers and surrounding residents. The validation, sampling and analysis methodology is applied to ensure that all contamination is removed from the site and that remaining soils are suitable for the proposed use.</i></p> <p><i>Given that ACM is not amenable to destruction “treatment” technologies for on-site or off-site treatment to destroy the contaminant (or reduce it to an acceptable level) the removal of</i></p> |

| Issue | Submitted By | LDA Response – Note: The ACT Land Development Agency’s (LDA’s) responses are provided in italics. |
|---|----------------------|---|
| <p>option in the hierarchy of waste management, the removal of contaminated soil is the preferred remediation option in the hierarchical policy for site remediation...the removal of the contamination will avoid the site being registered as a contaminated site and will mean the any future development or the sale of land in the future will not be affected’.</p> <p>Why weren’t these options and hierarchies communicated to the Campbell community during the consultative process for Amendment 74 to the National Capital Plan?</p> <p>Clearly, this is a case of profits before people in this ‘People’s Project’ as Section 5 is being described by the LDA</p> | | <p><i>the contaminated soil is therefore the preferred remediation option in hierarchical policy for site remediation in the Guidelines for the Site Auditors Scheme NSW DEC 2006.</i></p> <p><i>The dig and dump strategy is the least preferred because of transferring waste from one place to another (filling up designated landfills).</i></p> <p><i>A facility that is designed to store these wastes in a controlled environment is better than the uncontrolled environment (i.e. in the middle of the Campbell residential area).</i></p> <p><i>At the moment the risk to people is low due to the minimal land-use the site has, however if the site is to be developed for a more intensive use then remediation is required first.</i></p> |
| <p>Page 14, Para 11.4 Class A Licensed Asbestos Contractor</p> <p>As per my comment on Para 1.3 above, I would like to see explicit reference to local residents in the context of ‘safety of all personnel on site’.</p> <p>The responsible entity has a duty of care to the workers on site and also to the public – if this is not written down in plan, how can we</p> | <p>Mark Anderson</p> | <p><i>More information available in Section 14.2 of the RAP.</i></p> <p><i>There are guidelines, approvals and licensing requirements the developer and contractor will need to abide by, a summary is in Section 12.1 of the plan.</i></p> <p><i>The Occupational Hygienist (OH) will be onsite during remediation works</i></p> <p><i>In section 12.2 ‘General’ there are references to mobile water cart available full time during remedial works and if unacceptable</i></p> |

| Issue | Submitted By | LDA Response – Note: The ACT Land Development Agency’s (LDA’s) responses are provided in italics. |
|---|----------------------|---|
| <p>have confidence that anyone is actually looking out for impacts on residents?</p> <p>There is mention of an Occupational Hygienist – will this specialist be on site or at least on call at all times?</p> <p>How will they become aware of a problem and in what timeframes must a problem be communicated to them?</p> <p>What processes are observed on windy days – I cannot find any mention of this issue, which to my mind surely increases the risk associated with remediation activities?</p> <p>How will it be determined that the dust reduction measures are working effectively during all digging, stockpiling, loading and transportation activities?</p> | | <p><i>level of dust is generated works will be halted</i></p> <p><i>The OH will determine the acceptable levels as part of the EMP and OHS Plan</i></p> |
| <p>Page 17, 5th dot point</p> <p>Please provide a definition of what comprises an ‘unacceptable level of dust’?</p> | <p>Mark Anderson</p> | <p><i>The unacceptable level of dust varies depending on the receptor due to proximity and period of exposure, workers onsite are generally more critically exposed. The contractor will be responsible for the implementation of the RAP, which include, engaging an environmental consultant and engaging a remediation contractor who holds a Class A Asbestos Removal License. The Class A Licensed Asbestos contractor that will be responsible for the management of the occupation hygienist who will be responsible for the monitoring of air-borne fibres during</i></p> |

| Issue | Submitted By | LDA Response – Note: The ACT Land Development Agency’s (LDA’s) responses are provided in italics. |
|---|----------------------|---|
| | | <p><i>remediation. This will include Undertaking daily air monitoring during remediation works to confirm no asbestos fibres are leaving the remediation areas.</i></p> <p><i>The air monitoring programme will be detailed by a suitably qualified Occupational Hygienist and be submitted by the Class A licensed asbestos removal contractor with his tender;</i></p> <p><i>A mobile water cart will be available full time on site during the remedial works. If unacceptable level of dust is generated, works will be halted and additional dust suppression techniques will be employed.</i></p> |
| <p>Page 19, Contingencies for Unexpected Finds</p> <p>It is not immediately evident what happens if unexpected levels of contaminants are discovered. What is that process please?</p> <p>What is the contingency action for unexpected levels of dust and/or wind events?</p> | <p>Mark Anderson</p> | <p><i>Stop work and isolate area for further assessment and advice from the environmental consultant.</i></p> <p><i>Stop work and apply dust suppression (water) work should cease on windy days where dust generation will not be able to be readily controlled</i></p> |
| <p>Page 24, Para 14.3</p> <p>I am disappointed that this plan allows for remediation works to occur from 7 am to 6 pm on Saturdays ‘unless otherwise stated in relevant conditions of the development approval’.</p> | <p>Mark Anderson</p> | <p><i>Generally the workers onsite would be at a higher risk of exposure from adverse impacts of the remediation process and as such have predominantly been referenced</i></p> <p><i>The adjacent buildings are of residential-type construction and as such a maximum peak particle velocity of 10 mm/sec is</i></p> |

| Issue | Submitted By | LDA Response – Note: The ACT Land Development Agency's (LDA's) responses are provided in italics. |
|--|--------------------------|---|
| <p>The community provided feedback during Amendment 74 activities that because of the prolonged nature of works on Section 5, it deserved some respite. A 9 am start on Saturday would go a long way to boosting community acceptance of this imposition.</p> <p>Please ensure that this concession to the community is taken up – please!</p> <p>The community appreciates Douglas Partners describing residents as ‘receptors’ of noise.</p> <p>It is this type of comment, combined with the lack of explicit statements about residents’ safety, that suggest to me that community safety takes a second place with this work.</p> <p>More positive and community-inclusive statements would help to alleviate this concern.</p> <p>What is a reasonable level of noise and vibration?</p> | | <p><i>appropriate to restrict structural damage. It is noted that, people may find vibration levels above about 3 – 5 mm/s as being strongly perceptible to disturbing, even though they may not cause damage to structures. Hence, complaints from neighbours are possible even at low vibration levels and some reassurance, possibly by vibration monitoring, is likely to be necessary.</i></p> |
| <p>Page 25, Para 14.6 Public Complaints</p> <p>The plan must include publishing an After Hours contact number for residents to call with concerns about dust, noise and the like.</p> | <p>Mark Anderson</p> | <p><i>The LDA and NCA are always contactable and willing to address matters of community concern. The contact number of the superintendent or site supervisor will be displayed on a site sign.</i></p> |

| Issue | Submitted By | LDA Response – Note: The ACT Land Development Agency's (LDA's) responses are provided in italics. |
|--|----------------------|--|
| <p>Page 25, Para 14.8 Dust Management</p> <p>There is no mention here of the plan for windy conditions. There needs to be coverage.</p> | <p>Mark Anderson</p> | <p><i>Measures to minimise dust will also cover windy days. Sections 11 and 14.2 of the RAP make allowances for windy days.</i></p> |
| <p>Pages 26 – 27 Occupational Health and Safety</p> <p>There are a large number of requirements specified for workers on site.</p> <p>Nothing is specified as precautions for nearby residents or passing pedestrians</p> <p>How far from existing residences are the contaminated soil and remediation activities?</p> <p>What precautions should pedestrians take when moving near the site?</p> <p>How will these precautions be publicized?</p> <p>What emergency response provisions will exist in the event of an unanticipated impact on local residents, despite the plans to prevent this from occurring?</p> <p>Who will review and approve such plans?</p> <p>How will these matters be communicated to the community IN ADVANCE of work</p> | <p>Mark Anderson</p> | <p><i>The Contractor will be required to abide by relevant legislation, and approvals and conditions from the ACT Government (incl; WorkSafe ACT and the ACT EPA) and the NCA</i></p> <p><i>Drawings 1 and 2 of the RAP outlines the areas which contain contamination.</i></p> <p><i>The site will be securely fenced off, residents must abide by traffic management and not enter the site.</i></p> <p><i>Signs will be erected around the site, more information will be available on the LDA's website.</i></p> |

| Issue | Submitted By | LDA Response – Note: The ACT Land Development Agency's (LDA's) responses are provided in italics. |
|---|--|--|
| starting? | | |
| <p>It is specified in the Remediation Action Plan prepared by Douglas Partners that the scope of works will include delineation of the extent of contamination adjacent to the southern boundary once the delineation and remediation has been completed on site. Where test pitting occurs in the southern road reserve Finance should be consulted as this work may impact on the Finance managed Anzac Park East and its future development, a site that will also require further assessment and most likely asbestos removal from under the existing carpark.</p> | Finance | <p>Noted. The LDA would liaise with the Department of Finance and Deregulation and the NCA if required to undertake works.</p> |
| <p>It should be highlighted in the CEMP's that construction traffic is not to use any part of the Anzac Park East site for parking outside the marked parking bays, including under the blue gums and that all rubbish and drifts across should be removed.</p> | Finance | <p>Noted: Will be dealt with through traffic management process.</p> |
| <p>Asbestos fears: We have discovered only recently that this land is contaminated with asbestos form old building waste, and apparently the Land Development Agency plans to go ahead</p> | <p>Angela Shanahan (Letter to Editor – Canberra</p> | <p><i>See comments above in relation to Occupational Health and Safety, Remediation of the site is to be undertaken by the LDA so as to control the operation as precisely as possible. Leaving the asbestos in place is not a long term solution as any development will disturb it and therefore require remediation. Leaving the CS5 site as fallow land is deemed inappropriate and negligent to the</i></p> |

| Issue | Submitted By | LDA Response - Note: The ACT Land Development Agency's (LDA's) responses are provided in italics. |
|---|-----------------------------|--|
| <p>digging it up to build infrastructure and to change traffic movement along Constitution Avenue and in lower Campbell.</p> <p>Many Campbell residents are very worried that despite assurances that the asbestos will be monitored, asbestos contamination will pose a threat to the whole neighbourhood. It is a huge dusty site and there is no safe level for asbestos. Residents of Campbell found out about asbestos contamination only late last year, even though, apparently, there was a report about it the previous year. The National Capital Authority sent out the letter soliciting comments on January 22, which allowed just a few weeks to comment.</p> <p>What is worse, only a small ring of house has been letterboxes, not the whole area, or even most of lower Campbell. Dust does not allow for boundaries. For many residents, the asbestos problem adds insult to injury because the development is very unpopular, being a high -density multistorey project in a single-dwelling area. However, no matter what one thinks of the development, it is very worrying to be digging up an old asbestos dump, possibly endangering the</p> | <p>Times 18/2/2013)</p> | <p><i>duty of care the ACT government has to the future of Canberra.</i></p> |

| Issue | Submitted By | LDA Response - Note: The ACT Land Development Agency's (LDA's) responses are provided in italics. |
|---|---------------|---|
| health of residents. | | |
| <p>As a long time resident I can advise you that there is asbestos on the site. If you draw a line diagonally across the site from the corner of Anzac Parade and Constitution Ave to Creswell & Chowne this covers the area where asbestos was dumped. The trees on the perimeter of Anzac parade, Page and Chowne Streets have been planted over asbestos. Looking at Douglas Partners map the following sites are affected 1-12, 13-14, 15-34, 41, 42-43, 50, 51, 58-69-80. If you are not going to move the trees then the asbestos will not be disturbed.</p> | Name withheld | <i>Contractors in charge of the remediation will be made aware of your comments for their consideration.</i> |
| EPBC | | |
| <p>The EPBC Referral for the site resulted in a Controlled Action decision in 2012 and subsequently Preliminary Documentation (PD) was prepared by the LDA for the site. This documentation included several inconsistencies specifically relating to the site and tree removal.</p> <p>It is difficult to see how the Works Approval Applications can proceed without these inconsistencies being resolved. I note that</p> | Julie Doyle | On 13 May 2013 the minister determined that the proposed development adequately addresses the issues relating to Listed threatened species and communities, National Heritage Places and Commonwealth land and approved the proposal. |

| Issue | Submitted By | LDA Response – Note: The ACT Land Development Agency’s (LDA’s) responses are provided in italics. |
|--|----------------------|---|
| <p>the LDA has advised that the proposed works will not proceed until formal EPBC Approval has been obtained, however, they have not identified that they will be amending their PD to accommodate the discrepancies identified.</p> | | |
| <p>TRAFFIC AND PARKING</p> | | |
| <p>Seriously high risk of a dangerous accident on Creswell Street due to parking rules north of Blamey Crescent opposite the infant school: impact of development on CS5??</p> <p>Concern about safety on the roads which could be a concern in relation to the infrastructure work and also the long term impact of development on CS5</p> <p>Creswell Street is narrow and windy and there are school buses and parents dropping off and collecting children aged 5 – 7</p> <p>Unrestricted parking along Creswell Street attracts people to park and walk to their jobs in civic. If parking could be restricted it could make the street a lot safer for the families that go to the school and less stressful for the mostly elderly people living in the street.</p> | <p>Name withheld</p> | <p>It is an important objective of the development, and the NCA’s vision of Constitution Avenue, that alternative modes of transportation are encouraged with the aim of reducing dependency on private motor vehicles. The development of the site is predominantly a residential development with almost 90% gross floor area proposed for residential use. Therefore, it is not expected that development of the site will generate a significant level of commuter parking.</p> <p>Restricted parking associated with the new development to hinder commuters working in the City can be raised with Roads ACT.</p> |

| Issue | Submitted By | LDA Response – <i>Note: The ACT Land Development Agency's (LDA's) responses are provided in italics.</i> |
|--|-----------------|---|
| <p>I note that on p.95 the TAMS submission refers to the Cardno traffic reports view that even if Constitution Avenue is duplicated (which we have been told it will not be along Section5) 'it will still perform unsatisfactory and will be an absolute disaster (over 2km queues on Constitution Avenue)'. This is exactly what many Campbell residents fear. Has anything been done to avoid it?</p> <p>The Cardno response was simply that traffic is being planned by the ACT government. This is surely yet one more example of issues falling between jurisdictional tools leaving the citizenry to suffer the consequences.</p> | Andrew Schuller | <p>The LDA has received comprehensive advice and forecasting analysis regarding the transport and traffic needs of the Environs study area. This advice has allowed the LDA to develop the proposed Master Plan with confidence that impact on existing and future residents can be managed.</p> <p>A Road Hierarchy and Traffic Analysis report was prepared by transport specialists to assess the impact of the development of the site on the surrounding network. This work also included traffic counts of surrounding streets. In summary the proposed internal road network will provide an acceptable level of performance and the road network will carry daily traffic volumes appropriate to their design geometry.</p> <p>All relevant traffic reports and new road designs have been publicly notified as part of the NCA Works Approval application process.</p> |
| <p>.p.76 8.5.4 states: 'the median will force a large proportion of the traffic through Section 5. Can this really be the intention?</p> | Andrew Schuller | <p>Yes, the intention is to direct traffic to the new signalised intersection at Wendouree and avoid the direct connection to Creswell Street. This device has been implemented to allay surrounding resident fears of rat running through Campbell.</p> |
| <p>Surely building a roundabout at the Creswell/Getting intersection will be dangerous when all the traffic emerging from the redevelopment SAAB building will</p> | Andrew Schuller | <p>Traffic modelling of anticipated peak flows show that the roundabout will function to Roads ACT levels of acceptable performance.</p> |

| Issue | Submitted By | LDA Response – Note: The ACT Land Development Agency’s (LDA’s) responses are provided in italics. |
|---|-----------------|---|
| emerge in the very short stretch between the roundabout and Constitution Avenue. | | |
| <p>I note that diagonal parking is suggested along Cresswell St as well as Anzac Parade East. So on three sides Section 5 is hemmed by parked cars. This is not what a residential suburb should look like and is very far from the solution to the deep concerns that have constantly been expressed by Canberra residents about the parking implications of Section 5 development.</p> <p>I objected to the introduction of diagonal parking on Cresswell St on aesthetic grounds. This sort of parking will also add to the chaos and danger on this stretch of road. Drivers negotiating the new roundabout at the Cresswell/Getting intersection will be faced with cars – often unsighted – entering or leaving diagonal parking slots.</p> | Andrew Schuller | There is no diagonal parking on Cresswell or Anzac Park East. Drawings representing work to be carried out have used a diagonal hatch which is misinterpreted as parking bays. However, the notations pointing to these areas read “Construct indented <i>parallel</i> parking bays”. |
| HERITAGE AND BUILDING HEIGHTS | | |
| <p>Statement of heritage Impact does not assess the impact of the proposed development on the gazetted Commonwealth and National Heritage values of the Parliament House vista and the Portal Extension Buildings.</p> | Finance | <p>This issue was raised through the EPBC Act process and is now addressed in the Preliminary Documentation. Copies of the findings can be found at:</p> <p>http://www.environment.gov.au/cgi-bin/epbc/epbc_ap.pl?name=referral_detail&proposal_id=6292</p> |

| Issue | Submitted By | LDA Response – Note: The ACT Land Development Agency’s (LDA’s) responses are provided in italics. |
|---|-----------------|--|
| The maximum height of the proposed development of 25 metres is of concern for its impact on Anzac Park East. The mixed purpose nature of the new development may impact on Finances options in considering future uses on adjacent land. | Fiannce | Development of Section 5 Campbell is in accordance with Amendment 74 to the National Capital Plan and as such adds to the realisation of Constitution Avenue as a vibrant Boulevard. Development of this type is seen to add to the attractiveness of the East Portal building for future tenants. |
| Finance did not receive notification of the EPBC referral and has subsequently not provided comment on the proposed development but will contact SEWPaC shortly to seek any updates. | Finance | Information can be found at: http://www.environment.gov.au/cgi-bin/epbc/epbc_ap.pl?name=referral_detail&proposal_id=6292 |
| P.14 Section 4.1.4 This still allows a let out for departures from the 25m height limit. Residents have frequently complained about this and expressed the wish that no extensions beyond 25m are allowed. | Andrew Schuller | Amendment 74 to the National Capital Plan was approved by the Hon Simon Crean on 15 November 2012. This Amendment is now the legislative instrument by which future building development applications will be assessed. It is now incorporated into the Plan and will used by the NCA as the regulatory framework to guide and assess all future development on the site. |
| P.88 – a comment from Helen McKeown says that ‘the height of new building on the site currently proposed a maximum 25m above ground level should be stipulated in direct relation to parapet height of the west wing of east portal building.’ This raises two issues: There is a rise in ground level from Cresswell | Andrew Schuller | Amendment 74 addresses the 25m height limit measurement as follows – <i>“Building height is to be measured from and between the finish footpath level at each corner of a development block”</i> . Page 9 of the Amendment has an illustration which further helps to clarify this regulation. The Amendment is available via www.nationalcapital.gov.au |

| Issue | Submitted By | LDA Response - Note: The ACT Land Development Agency's (LDA's) responses are provided in italics. |
|---|------------------------|--|
| <p>St to Anzac parade. The 25m should be measured from the average ground level along this stretch not the level opposite the East Portal Building ie we do not want a repeat of the extraordinary ploy that ASIO used to measure its 25m height from the highest point on Constitution Avenue.</p> <p>on page.21 section 5.1 it us stated that the West Portal Building parapet is 28m. If the recommendation that Section 5 buildings can rise to the level of the parapet does this mean that they will be 28m high? That would be an appalling outcome.</p> | | |
| <p>C.P21. Section 5.1 also refers to the 'approved development east of Creswell St. If this is the SAAB building when was this approved? I understood that works approvals still have to be submitted for it.</p> | <p>Andrew Schuller</p> | <p><i>This excerpt refers to background information used in the Heritage Report and is not limited or specific to the Saab building but rather refers to any known developments proposed in the vicinity of the CS5 project.</i></p> |