



ACT
Government

NOTICE OF DECISION

Made under part 7 of the *Planning and Development Act 2007*

I, George Cilliers, delegate of the planning and land authority, pursuant to section 162 of the *Planning and Development Act 2007*, **refuse**, the proposal for **creation of 261 single dwelling blocks, 7 communal blocks, communal open space parcels, a bioretention pond and associated roads, utilities, landscaping and off site works**, at Block 1 Section 82 WESTON.

DA Number: 201935788
Block: 1
Section: 82
Suburb: WESTON
Application lodged: 11 October 2019
Assessment track: Merit

This decision contains the following information:

Part A – reasons for the Decision
Part B – public notification & entity advice
Attachment 1 – administrative information

A copy of the development application and this approval may be inspected at the planning and land authority's office from 8.30 am to 4.30 pm, Monday to Friday at 16 Challis Street, Dickson, ACT 2602

CONTACT / ENQUIRIES

Phone: (02) 6205 2888

Online Form:

https://www.accesscanberra.act.gov.au/app/forms/epd_feedback

George Cilliers

Delegate of the planning and land
authority

7 February 2020

NOTICE OF DECISION

DA 201935788

PART A – REASONS FOR THE DECISION

The development application (DA 201935788) was **refused** because it was not found to meet the relevant rules and criteria of the Territory Plan, section 119 and section 120 of the *Planning and Development Act 2007 (the Act)*.

The following evidence formed part of the assessment of this application:

Development Application:	201935788
Territory Plan Zones:	RZ4 Medium Density Residential
Development Codes:	Estate Development Code, Residential Zones, Single Dwelling Housing
Precinct Code:	Weston Precinct Map and Code, North Weston Concept Plan
Crown Lease:	Volume 2173 and Folio 3
Legislative requirements:	Sections 119 and 120 of the <i>Planning and Development Act 2007</i>
Entity advice:	As listed in Part B – Entity Advice

Section 119 of the *Planning and Development Act 2007*

In deciding to refuse the application, the planning and land authority (the Authority) firstly considered under section 119(1)(a) of the Act whether the application meets the relevant codes, including the Weston Precinct Map and Code, Estate Development Code, Residential Zones Development Code, Single Dwelling Housing Development Code; and all relevant general codes.

The proposal is not considered to be consistent with the relevant rules and criteria of the above codes. An assessment of the Estate Development Code has identified the following issues and departures that are not supported.

Element 1: Criteria 1

a) Blocks that are suited to their intended use and are consistent with the *desired character* of the relevant land use

In the absence of a 'statement of desired character in the relevant precinct code', the desired character is derived from the zone objectives for the *RZ4 Medium Density Residential* zone. An assessment of the proposal against these objectives identifies a number of elements that do not appropriately respond to the objectives.

The proposed blocks do not represent a suitable size able to accommodate complying developments appropriate to the site and zoning. The pattern of subdivision constrains the ability for standard blocks to be developed and rely on proposed controls in the Planning Control Plan that depart from the Single Dwelling Housing Development Code and the Multi Unit Housing Development Code.

The proposal includes a majority of compact blocks with little variation in size and dwelling offering. 96% of the 261 proposed blocks are compact blocks, with example typologies primarily demonstrating attached housing/townhouse style rows. These are predominantly 2/3 bedroom with some 4 bedroom. Furthermore, there are no large blocks and very few

NOTICE OF DECISION

DA 201935788

medium blocks proposed, thereby limiting the range of possible uses for the site and zoning. Medium and large blocks could facilitate other uses permitted under the zoning and current lease such as health facility, community activity centre and place of worship thereby further contributing to neighbourhood character and services.

Internal streetscapes are dominated by the presentation of three-storey dwellings, POS on setback, double/triple width verge crossings, garages, narrow verges etc. and is not considered to achieve a high standard of residential amenity. A significant number of roads do not include footpaths and mature street trees are not considered to provide appropriate shade. The excessive reliance on 0 metre front setbacks (often with 2 storeys at this setback) is not a familiar configuration for Canberra, nor is it generally supported in the dwelling codes. This presentation and streetscape is therefore likely to contribute poor residential amenity.

Narrow east-west orientated blocks result in significant solar access limitations when additional Territory Plan requirements are considered. This is apparently recognised by the dwelling typologies provided for such dwellings, relying on roof top solar penetration (sky lights) to achieve solar access. The density of the development in conjunction with the prevalent block orientation is considered to limit the solar access of future dwellings and is not supported.

Element 8: Criteria 47

Example typologies provided for non-complying standard block have not demonstrated they are appropriately sized and orientated in order to satisfy the sub-criteria to Criteria 47, i.e. to allow:

- a) the erection of a house that complies with the rules of the Single Dwelling Housing Development Code,
- b) the erection of a house with reasonable *gross floor area*, and
- c) the erection of a house with reasonable access to sunlight.

Some typologies, primarily Type 6, do not represent a permissible development under the Single Dwelling Housing Development Code and are only achievable through significant departures proposed through the Planning Control Plan. Additionally, their proposed location does not indicate that reasonable solar access will be achieved and the use of multiple storeys to achieve a reasonable GFA is also considered unsatisfactory.

Element 8: Criteria 50

The submitted Block Compliance Plan indicates that 52 of the proposed 261 blocks are compliant compact or mid-sized blocks. This equates to 19.92% of the total number of blocks complying with Rule 47, 75.09% attributed to *Integrated Housing Development Parcels* (IHDPs) and 4.98% to non-compliant blocks. The heavy reliance on IHDPs to respond to Criteria 47 is not considered an appropriate response to warrant the lack of maximised compliant standard blocks. Earlier iterations of design provided through the pre-circulation process, demonstrated that a greater number of compliant blocks can be achieved. It is not evident that the number of compliant blocks have been maximised and the proposal is therefore considered to be inconsistent with the criteria.

NOTICE OF DECISION

DA 201935788

Element 8: Criteria 51

Example typologies provided for IHDPs have not demonstrated that a house is able to be designed that achieves the criterion. Specifically, example typologies do not demonstrate consistency with the *desired character*, as established above in Element 1: Criteria 1. An assessment of the IHDPs against the Single Dwelling Code also does not demonstrate that the dwellings are capable of achieving appropriate solar access to the *Principal Private Open Space* and reasonable levels of privacy for other dwellings and their PPOS within the IHDP.

In relation to section **119(2)**, the Authority considered the advice given by each entity to which the application was referred. In this instance, if development approval was provided it would be inconsistent with advice received by entities. Specifically, Transport Canberra and City Services and the Conservator of Flora and Fauna have not supported the proposal in its current form, as detailed below under section 120(f).

In relation to section **119(2)(b)**, the Authority is not satisfied that the development is consistent with the objects of the Territory Plan as in Section 48 of the Act in that it *provides the people of the ACT with an attractive, safe and efficient environment in which to live, work and have their recreation*, whilst not having a detrimental impact upon the surrounding environment. The development proposal lacks convincing evidence that the proposed development will result in an efficient living environment.

The key issues identified in the assessment included comments received by entities and representors; density and monoculture of dwellings; limited site open space; inconsistency with desired character and surrounding neighbourhood; reliance of Integrated Housing to achieve design outcomes; removal of protected trees; site accessibility and walkability; residential amenity and streetscape presentation; internal roads and associated traffic impacts.

Section 120 of the Planning and Development Act 2007

In deciding to refuse the application, the Authority also considered each of the matters or issues set out in section 120(a) – (g) of the Act.

In relation to section **120(a)**, the Authority is not satisfied that the proposed developments meets all the objectives of the *RZ4 Medium Density* zone, as outlined below:

- a) *Provide for the establishment and maintenance of residential areas where the housing is medium rise and predominantly medium density in character and particularly in areas that have very good access to facilities and services and/or frequent public transport services.*

The nearest centre, Coleman Court, is 1.5km away and the Woden Centre is 3.5km (straight line distances). Whilst not excessively far, it is not generally accessible nor 'very good' and will likely result in reliance on private vehicles. However, it could be considered that this objective is satisfied.

- b) *Provide opportunities for redevelopment by enabling changes to the original pattern of subdivision and the density of dwellings*

The proposed pattern of subdivision and subsequent density provides opportunity for redevelopment; however, it is considered to hinder this more than facilitate it. The

NOTICE OF DECISION

DA 201935788

proposed blocks do not represent a suitable size able to accommodate complying developments appropriate to the site and zoning. The pattern of subdivision constraints the ability for standard blocks to be developed and rely on proposed controls in the Planning Control Plan. Subdivision also relies heavily on Integrated Housing Development Parcels in order to achieve a feasible design outcome.

The removal of all trees from the site is not considered a suitable response to the site constraints and opportunities. The redevelopment of the land should be carried out in a more sustainable manner recognising the existing environment. An increase in density is supported by this objective, however, the scale of the proposal with limited mix and excessive repetition is not supported.

- c) *Provide for a wide range of affordable and sustainable housing choices that meet changing household and community needs*

The proposal presents a monoculture of compact blocks with little variation in size. 96% of the 261 blocks proposed are compact blocks, with example typologies all demonstrating attached housing/townhouse style rows. Proposed dwellings are primarily 2/3 bedroom, with some 4 bedrooms.

The Statement Against Relevant Criteria relies on a wider view of the suburb in context of the Estate Development Plan (EDP) to provide a mix and whilst this has been considered, the density, lack of variation (*wide range*), and departures from the Single Dwelling Housing Code including the limitations for solar access are not supported against this objective. The scale of the EDP and limitations due to block sizes and configuration is not conducive to housing choice.

- d) *Ensure development and redevelopment is carefully managed so that it achieves a high standard of residential amenity, makes a positive contribution to the neighbourhood and landscape character of the area and does not have unreasonable negative impacts on neighbouring properties.*

The site is proposed to be bound entirely by attached dwellings with limited pedestrian entry. This would result in a division of the internal estate from the surrounding area, thereby detracting from the neighbourhood and landscape character. Surrounding residential development is within *RZ1 Suburban* zoned land and contrasts heavily to the proposed density and layout.

No large or medium blocks are proposed for the majority of the estate, only 9 individually titled medium sized blocks, separate to the bulk of the estate. This limits the range of possible uses for the site and zoning. Medium and large blocks could allow for some other uses permitted in the RZ4 zone and lease such as *health care facility, community activity centre* and *place of worship* which could contribute to the neighbourhood and local community.

The internal streetscapes are dominated by the presentation of dwellings – 3 storeys, POS on setbacks, zero metre setbacks, double/triple width verge crossings, narrow verges, garages etc. and is not considered to be conducive to a high standard of residential amenity. Additionally, the narrow verge widths and lack of footpaths on many of the proposed internal roads does not provide an appropriate balance of planting and shade to hardstand and impervious surfaces.

NOTICE OF DECISION

DA 201935788

The removal of all trees from the site is not considered to acknowledge or take advantage of some of the remaining natural features of the neighbourhood and landscape character.

Whilst the zone is expected to have larger, more dense development than the nearby *RZ1 Suburban* zoned properties, the configuration, scale and density of this proposal is not supported and will heavily contrast to the surrounding residential areas.

e) *Provide opportunities for home-based employment consistent with residential amenity.*

The large number of compact or integrated dwelling blocks with no large blocks and limited mid-sized blocks appear to constrict the opportunities for such home-based employment. This is further limited by elements such as 0m or small front boundary setbacks and limited visitor parking opportunities. An increase in larger blocks and a lower density in parts, a further mix of block typologies and reconfiguration would be a better outcome for this objective.

f) *Provide for a limited range of small-scale facilities to meet local needs consistent with residential amenity*

The public spaces appear heavily constrained in regard to slope and there is significant reliance upon these spaces for level changes, limiting use and future alternatives. The small and repetitive block layout further minimises adaptability of a residential block for a more communal use to provide any such facilities. It is not sufficiently demonstrated that this objective is well served by the proposed development.

g) *Promote good solar access*

The narrow east-west blocks provide for significant solar access limitations when additional Territory Plan requirements are taken into account. This is apparent from the reliance on roof top solar penetration (sky lights) to achieve solar access.

A large number of blocks having north access have also been designed with limited frontage, requiring vehicle access to the north face and limiting any solar access at ground level into the dwellings living areas or PPOS. Reliance on upper floor PPOS is not supported as a design outcome as suggested in the dwelling plans, which appears required to provide solar access. A wider frontage for such blocks or grouping of blocks for multi-unit development would be preferable.

Some blocks are likely to receive very limited solar access as the northern adjoining blocks will dominate winter solar access. In particular, the southern Type 6 dwellings will have a 2-storey development immediately adjoining their northern boundary. These compact blocks are non-compliant and are not supported.

The density of the development along with the orientation of the blocks are considered to limit the solar access to future dwellings and is not supported as proposed.

h) *Promote energy efficient and conservation*

Noting the solar access issues above, the energy efficiency of future dwellings will most likely require higher energy costs in particular during winter.

The layout relies upon large amounts of impermeable surfaces and limits opportunities for deep root planting and large shade trees to limit the local heat build-up in summer.

NOTICE OF DECISION

DA 201935788

The removal of all existing trees is also not conserving the existing environmental values of the site. It is not evident the proposal is consistent with this objective.

i) Promote sustainable water use

The DA is supported with relevant EDP requirements for WSUD and water reduction requirements. However, TCCS advised that it did not in support the proposed development.

j) Promote active living and active travel

The PPOS configurations are not supported as demonstrated in the potential dwelling designs. They are inconsistent in some parts with the SDHDC (Rule 41) read with the definition of an 'Attached dwelling' – requiring open space at ground level. There are concerns for the solar access of PPOS areas for some dwellings. The density and orientation of the blocks are limiting such elements and raise potential issues with future compliance.

In regard to this objective, the concerns for the PPOS are sometimes offset by larger and useable communal open space areas. The proposed linear communal parks have significant retaining wall and level changes, are all narrow and all within relatively close proximity to a large number of dwellings. Such orientation, level changes and configuration are considered to limit some outdoor recreational opportunities. Wider and larger scale outdoor areas as per the publicly exhibited initial configuration are considered a more reasonable approach to this objective.

Some parts of the proposed development may benefit from greater consideration of active living and active travel measures, particularly considering the *RZ4 Medium Density* zone. The proposed EDP is considered to limit opportunities for active living and therefore cannot be supported against this objective in its current configuration. TCCS advised that it did not in support the proposed development.

k) Encourage an attractive, safe, well-lit and connected pedestrian environment with convenient access to public transport

Refer to advice received from TCCS. The network as proposed is not supported.

The use of large amounts of 0m front setbacks is not a familiar configuration in Canberra suburbs, or generally encouraged in the dwelling codes. Whether this contributes to an attractive pedestrian environment, in particular where there is no immediate footpath in the verge, is doubtful. Lighting requirements could be conditioned to satisfy.

The open space areas will have a reasonable degree of passive surveillance to assist with the safety aspect of the zone objective, however, the density of the dwellings, lack of functionality of the open spaces and heavy reliance on vehicles may offset some of these attributes. Public transport links are present to the south and west and are unchanged by this development.

In relation to section **120(b)**, the Authority is not satisfied that the subject land is suitable for the proposed development in the proposed configuration. (It is acknowledged that an increase in density is implied by the preceding rezoning of the subject land to *RZ4 Medium Density*, however, this development proposal in its current form is considered excessive and inconsistent with the zoning.)

NOTICE OF DECISION

DA 201935788

In relation to section **120(c)**, the Authority is satisfied that the proposal, if approved, could be consistent with the Environmental Significance Opinion (ESO) and the requirements therein.

In relation to section **120(d)**, the Authority considered all representations received in relation to the application. *Part B – Public Notification* of this Decision contains a summary of the most important aspects of the representations received, and comments are provided in response and were appropriate.

In relation to section **120(e)**, the Authority notes the proposal does not constitute a development required to be reviewed by the National Capital Design Review Panel.

In relation to section **120(f)**, the Authority notes most entities supported the proposal on the basis that conditions were imposed to protect relevant matters. However, the Conservator of Flora and Fauna and Transport Canberra and City Services have provided advice stating that the proposal in its current form is not supported. The Conservator does not support the removal of protected trees on the site that do not meet the criteria for removal. TCCS do not support the current verge widths, kerb types, verge paths in and around the site, and landscaped and open space areas.

The Authority considered the advice received from entities, and in this instance the proposed development is not supported, consistent with advice received from the Conservator and TCCS.

In relation to section **120(g)**, the Authority notes that the subject land is not public land.

In relation to section **120(h)**, the Authority considered the probable impacts, including traffic, visual, social and environmental impacts that the proposed development may have. In this regard, the Authority considered the representations received in relation to the application. The Authority also considered the advice and responses from the relevant entities to which the application was referred, some of which proposed conditions to address some of the impacts that might otherwise occur.

In light of the assessment of the proposal against the relevant rules and criteria of the codes, the representations received and the advice for entities, the probable impact of the proposal is not considered to be sufficiently addressed or mitigated to warrant approval of the application. The impact of the proposed density, with limited dwelling diversity, limited useable open space areas, removal of all existing trees on site, and proposed streetscape and residential amenity has not been appropriately addressed by the proposal and is not considered to be something that can be conditioned to achieve compliance.

Please note that this decision does not necessary contain all compliance issues identified in the assessment and entity referrals. The information above summarises the key issues that have been given the most weight in context of the proposal, entity advice, representations received and relevant legislation.

NOTICE OF DECISION

DA 201935788

PART B – PUBLIC NOTIFICATION AND ENTITY ADVICE

PUBLIC NOTIFICATION

Pursuant to Division 7.3.4 of the Act, the application was publicly notified from 10 October 2019 to 15 November 2019. Seven written representations were received during public notification period.

The main issues raised were as follows. Comments are provided as appropriate.

The proposed density is too high and lack of dwelling diversity

Comment: The development has been assessed against the relevant rules and criteria of the Territory Plan, section 119 and section 120 of the *Planning and Development Act 2007*. The assessment concluded that the proposed development in its current form should not be approved. Under this assessment the desired character of the site, the range of dwelling types and block sizes were considered.

Retention of established trees that are still on site

Comment: During the assessment process the application is referred to the Conservator of Flora and Fauna who advised of the status of the trees and whether they meet criteria for removal. The Conservator provided advice stating that the proposal is not supported as the majority of trees proposed for removal do not meet the relevant criteria. The Conservator's advice was considered under section 120(f) of the *Planning and Development Act 2007* and the application is refused, consistent with advice received.

Integration of the estate with surrounding residential areas, particularly on Heysen St

Comment: Under section 120(a) of the *Planning and Development Act 2007*, the proposal is assessed against the relevant zone objectives. Objective d) of the RZ4 zone objectives is aimed at ensuring development and redevelopment makes a positive contribution to the neighbourhood and landscape character of the area and does not have unreasonable negative impacts on neighbouring properties. An assessment against this objective identified that the limited pedestrian access points and continuous rows of compact attached dwellings presented a division between the internal estate and the adjoining residences south of Heysen Street, inconsistent with the aims of the objective.

Potentially unsatisfactory solar access for E/W orientated dwellings

Comment: The development has been assessed against the relevant rules and criteria of the Territory Plan, section 119 and section 120 of the *Planning and Development Act 2007*. The assessment concluded that the proposed development in its current form does not meet the required criteria for approval. Under this assessment solar access to these dwellings and their principal private open space were considered.

Walkability of the estate and narrow verges with no paths

Comment: The lack of pathing on some internal road verges and limited mature street tree shade is not considered a satisfactory outcome for residential amenity and site accessibility. This was also raised during referrals by Transport Canberra and City Services who provided advice stating there is inconsistent connectivity of proposed footpaths and many verge widths and kerb types depart from EDC requirements.

Traffic and infrastructure concerns arising from density and minimal access points

Comment: The proposed EDP was not supported by Transport Canberra and City Services (TCCS). The block is zoned RZ4 which will provide an increased density and associated traffic movements. Any new application will need to address TCCS requirements as well as other issues raised above.

NOTICE OF DECISION

DA 201935788

ENTITY ADVICE

Pursuant to Division 7.3.3 of the *Planning and Development Act*, the application was referred to the below entities. Where an entity requested conditions to be imposed on this development, those conditions have been incorporated into Part A of this Decision. A summary of entity comments can be found below.

1. Conservator of Flora and Fauna (The Conservator)

The Conservator provided initial advice stating that the proposal was not supported. The applicant provided additional information under section 144 of the *Planning and Development Act 2007* which, upon referral, was also not supported by the Conservator.

The advice was carefully considered by the Authority and in this instance the proposed development is not supported, consistent with the Conservator's advice. In the making of this decision, section 119(1)(c) and section 120(f) of the *Planning and Development Act 2007* has been considered by the Authority including any applicable guidelines, realistic alternatives and the objects of the Territory Plan.

2. Transport Canberra and City Services (TCCS)

TCCS provided initial advice stating that the proposal was not supported. The applicant provided additional information under section 144 of the *Planning and Development Act 2007* which, upon referral, was also not supported by TCCS.

The advice was carefully considered by the Authority and in this instance the proposed development is not supported, consistent with TCCS advice. In the making of this decision, Section 119(2) and section 120(f) of the *Planning and Development Act 2007* has been considered by the Authority including any applicable guidelines, realistic alternatives and the objects of the Territory Plan.

3. Evoenergy (Electricity)

The application was referred to Evoenergy; however, a response was not received by the ACT Planning and Land Authority within 15 working days. As per section 150 of the *Planning and Development Act 2007*, where an entity did not respond within this time, it is taken to have given advice that the entity supports the application.

4. Icon Water

Icon Water provided initial advice stating that the proposal was not supported. The applicant provided additional information under section 144 of the *Planning and Development Act 2007* which, upon referral, was supported subject to conditions.

A copy of the Icon Water advice is attached to this Notice of Decision.

5. Jemena (Gas)

Jemena provided advice stating that they have reviewed the proposal and have no comment to make. The additional information provided by the applicant under section 144 was also referred to Jemena who advised they have no comments to make regarding the amendment.

NOTICE OF DECISION

DA 201935788

6. Environment Protection Authority (EPA)

The EPA provided advice stating that the proposal is supported subject to conditions.

As the application is refused, the following extract of the EPA advice is provided for advice:

Conditions:

1. All works at the site must be undertaken in accordance with the requirements of the following documents:
2. *Site Audit Statement (No. 257R) and "Revised Site Audit Report Former Australian Federal Police Complex Block 1 Section 82, Weston, ACT" dated 08 May 2018 by Mr Rod Harwood of Arcadis Australia Pacific Pty Ltd; and
3. *"Environmental Management Plan (EMP for Residual Asbestos in Soil) Former AFP Complex Block 1, Section 82, Weston (2 Unwin Street, Weston ACT)" dated April 2018 by Safe Work & Environments Pty Ltd.
4. All soil subject to disposal from the site must be assessed in accordance with EPA Information Sheet 4 - Requirements for the reuse and disposal of contaminated soil in the ACT.
5. No soil is to be disposed from site without EPA approval.
6. As the site is greater than 0.3 hectares the construction is an activity listed in Schedule 1 as a Class B activity under the Environment Protection Act, 1997. The contractor/builder developing the site must hold an Environmental Authorisation or enter into an Environmental Protection Agreement with the EPA in respect of that activity prior to works commencing.
7. An Erosion and Sediment Control Plan must be submitted to and be endorsed by the EPA prior to works commencing on site.
8. All works must be carried out in accordance with "Environment Protection Guidelines for Construction and Land Development in the ACT, March 2011", available at www.environment.act.gov.au or by calling EPA Planning Liaison on 6207 5642.

Advice for Applicant:

9. For sites greater than 1 hectare, sediment control ponds must be incorporated during the construction phase of the development until 85% of the site is stabilised.
10. Pond construction should be in accordance with the following guidelines:
 1. Be of adequate size to control all runoff from the site (i.e. 150 cubic metres per hectare of catchment).
 2. No discharge from dam unless sediment level is less than 60mg/litre. If sediment level is greater, then prior to discharge, the dam must be dosed with either Alum or Gypsum and allowed to settle until the sediment is less than 60 mg/litre.
 3. Water level must not exceed 20% capacity at all times to allow runoff storage during a rain event.
 4. Regular dredging of the dam must be carried out to remove silt.
 5. Site drawing and details must be provided to Environment Protection Unit, Environment ACT for approval prior to works commencing.
 6. Temporary Erosion & Sediment control ponds must be incorporated into each stage of development. The size of the ponds must be minimum of 150 m³/hectare and the temporary ponds shall not be removed until 85 % of the developments are complete or all the disturbed areas are stabilised. The lessee shall comply with the Environment Protection Act 1997 (the Act) and all relevant policies and guidelines.
11. All excavations that collect water during a rain event are considered a sediment control pond, and must not discharge from the pond unless the sediment level is less than 60mg/litre. If the sediment level is greater, then prior to discharge, the pond must be dosed with either Alum or Gypsum and allowed to settle until the sediment is less than 60 mg/litre.

NOTICE OF DECISION

DA 201935788

7. **ACT Heritage (Heritage)**

ACT Heritage provided advice stating that the proposed development is unlikely to diminish the heritage significance of a place or object and advises that no heritage assessment or *Heritage Act 2004* approval is required prior to works commencement. A copy of the Heritage advice is attached to this Notice of Decision.

The additional information provided by the applicant under section 144 was also referred to Heritage who advised that the S144 application contains no heritage content and therefore are no *Heritage Act 2004* considerations.

8. **ACT Emergency Services Agency (ESA)**

ESA provided advice stating that the proposal is supported and advice is provided. A copy of the ESA advice is attached to this Notice of Decision. The additional information provided by the applicant under section 144 was also referred to ESA who stating that the proposal is supported and advice is provided.

9. **ACT Health – Health Protection Services (ACT Health)**

ACT Health provided advice stating that the proposal is supported subject to conditions. Recommended conditions have been imposed in this Notice of Decision. Refer to Part A for conditions in regard to complying with entity advice.

The additional information provided by the applicant under section 144 was also referred to ACT Health who advised that there are no public health concerns in relation to the proposed amendments. A copy of the ACT Health advice is attached to this Notice of Decision.

NOTICE OF DECISION

DA 201935788

Translation and interpretation services

The ACT Government's translation and interpreter service runs 24 hours a day, every day of the week by calling 131 450.

ENGLISH	If you need interpreting help, telephone:
ARABIC	: إذا احتجت لمساعدة في الترجمة الشفوية ، إتصل برقم الهاتف :
CHINESE	如果你需要传译员的帮助，请打电话：
CROATIAN	Ako trebate pomoć tumača telefonirajte:
GREEK	Αν χρειάζεστε διερμηνέα τηλεφωνήσετε στο
ITALIAN	Se avete bisogno di un interprete, telefonate al numero:
MALTESE	Jekk għandek bżonn l-għajjuna t'interpretu, čempel:
PERSIAN	: اگر به ترجمه شفاهی احتیاج دارید به این شماره تلفن کنید:
PORTUGUESE	Se você precisar da ajuda de um intérprete, telefone:
SERBIAN	Ako vam je potrebna pomoć prevodioca telefoniрајте:
SPANISH	Si necesita la asistencia de un intérprete, llame al:
TURKISH	Tercümana ihtiyacımız varsa lütfen telefon ediniz:
VIETNAMESE	Nếu bạn cần một người thông-ngôn hãy gọi điện-thoại:

TRANSLATING AND INTERPRETING SERVICE

131 450

Canberra and District - 24 hours a day, seven days a week

