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Order of business

1. OPENING

2. APOLOGIES

3. DISCLOSURES OF PECUNIARY INTEREST

4. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

1. Ordinary meeting no 24 held on 7 October
2. Extraordinary meeting 25 held on 14 October
3. Extraordinary meeting 26 held on 28 October
4. Finance and Audit Committee Meeting held on 4 November 2010

5. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

6. QUESTIONS FROM THE GALLERY

Members of the public have an opportunity to address Council at this point in the meeting or to indicate that they wish to address a specific item listed in the business paper. There is a time limit of three minutes per person but Council can, by resolution, provide an extension for any speaker. Councillors and staff will not enter into debate with speakers. Speakers should be aware this council meeting is being recorded. Following the commencement of the Government Information (Public Access) Act 2009 on 1 July 2010, these recordings will be placed on Council’s website as soon as practicable after the meeting. Speakers are reminded that their statements are therefore available on the public record.

LISTED ITEMS:
(i) The Mayor will ask if any members of the public gallery wish to address an item listed in the business paper. The people who so nominate will be given an opportunity to address council immediately prior to the item being considered by council.

UNLISTED ITEMS:
(ii) The Mayor will provide an opportunity for members of the public to raise issues of a general nature.

7. MAYORAL REPORT

8. MAYORAL MINUTE
9. MOTIONS ON NOTICE/RESCISSION MOTIONS

Item 9.1. Presentation by Country Energy

Country Energy will conduct their annual presentation to update the meeting about activity in the Council area.

10. ITEMS FOR DETERMINATION

Item 10.1. Subdivision fees

**SUBJECT**
Proposed amendment of subdivision certificate fees and principal certifying authority fees for subdivision

**FILE NO.**
CM0013

**DIVISION**
Planning and Environmental Services

**Attachments**
1. Proposed amendment to page 14 – adopted fees and charges
2. Proposed amendment to page 15 – adopted fees and charges
3. Proposed amendment to page 21 – adopted fees and charges
4. Proposed amendment to page 19 – adopted fees and charges

**Synopsis**
This report presents discussion on the adopted fees for subdivision certificates and recommends amendments in relation to subdivision certificate fees and principal certifying authority fees for subdivisions, for exhibition. An amendment to the fees for weeds inspections is also recommended – this is a reinspection and administration fee for compliance with s 18 or s 20 Notice and was inadvertently missed in the adopted Management Plan.

**Recommendation**
Recommended that Council:
1. Adopt the amended 2010/11 Fees & Charges for the Subdivision Certificate and Principal Certifying Authority in accordance with the discussion in this report;
2. Place on Public Notice the proposed Fees and Charges in accordance with s 705 of the *Local Government Act 1993* and Council’s policies for a period of 28 days;
3. Receive a further report on any submissions received following the conclusion of the Public Notice period.

**Report**
Palerang Council is the only authority that can release a subdivision certificate for registration. Palerang Council, therefore, is the only authority that can be appointed principal certifying authority for subdivision works in the Palerang Local Government Area.

The current fees for subdivision were substantially increased in the 2010/2011 Management Plan. Although the new fees were advertised for the statutory period no
submissions were made. However, since implementation a number of applicants have raised concerns about the cost or potential cost, particularly for large subdivisions.

The following examples illustrate approximate costs associated with subdivision [construction certificate (CC), principal certifying authority (PCA) and subdivision certificate release (SDC)] under the current fees and charges, for a range of subdivisions. Note that the PCA fees in particular would vary depending on the location of the subdivision (rural or urban) and the length of road, sewage and water infrastructure and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>CC</th>
<th>PCA</th>
<th>SDC</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 lots</td>
<td>650.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>1 000.00</td>
<td>1 750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 lots</td>
<td>1 850.00</td>
<td>2 500.00</td>
<td>5 000.00</td>
<td>9 350.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 lots</td>
<td>4 850.00</td>
<td>6 440.00</td>
<td>12 500.00</td>
<td>23 700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 lots</td>
<td>11 750.00</td>
<td>15 000.00</td>
<td>38 000.00</td>
<td>64 7500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Through recent experience it has been determined that a majority of effort is required in the first two stages of the process as follows;

**CC**
- consideration of design documentation submitted and advice to applicants including required amendments to plans,
- checking design documentation against consent conditions,
- site inspections,
- providing design criteria for future public infrastructure such as sewer, water, kerb & gutter and roads,
- liaising with applicant,
- administration (correspondence, stamping & signing plans, scanning, filing, phone calls, bookings).

**PCA**
- inspection of completed work by engineer (at various stages depending on the type and amount of work required), identifying defects, reinspections,
- review of test results, works as executed plans and certifications,
- liaising with applicant,
- administration (correspondence, scanning, filing, phone calls, bookings),
- inspection at end of defects liability period.

**SDC**
- inspection by planner,
- checking against consent conditions,
- liaising with applicant (plans must be picked up at Customer Service and signed for),
- administration (correspondence, stamping & signing plans, scanning, filing, phone calls).
It is estimated that it costs Council between $100.00 and $200.00 per hour to undertake these tasks (given the difference between administrative and professional/technical staff wages and the need to travel varying distances to sites).

The adopted fees were determined based on the amount of work that is required at each stage of the process. At the time the fees were drafted considerable time was being spent at the subdivision certificate stage which indicated that the higher fee was relevant. However, in retrospect it is acknowledged that some of this work is PCA work and should be covered by the PCA fees rather than higher subdivision certificate fees.

It is acknowledged that there is no distinction between an SDC for subdivision and boundary adjustment (which, if achieved as exempt development, would normally not require as much work).

It is acknowledged that in the majority of rural subdivisions the main work for Council is to inspect and approve the rural entry. The current fee for this inspection ($96.80) does not accurately reflect the cost to Council. A more accurate fee is $230.00 which is consistent with Council issuing an occupation certificate on a development and includes the inspection fee of $170.00 and administration to produce relevant documentation. The cost of the other inspection is covered by the s 138 consent fee of $450 for a subdivision.

To reflect more accurately the costs associated with the release of subdivision certificates and clarify fees associated with subdivision the following is recommended:

**Boundary adjustment**
- $500.00 base fee
- no fee per additional lot.

**Principal Certifying Authority**
- increase fee for entrances from $96.80 to $230.00,
- move inspection and review fee from E.20 and E.20.1 to G.8.1 (same work, inconsistent fee).

**Subdivision Certificate (land and strata)**
- $500.00 base fee retained
- $50.00 per additional lot (amended from $500 per additional lot)
- new fee of $150 for resigning of documents.

**Financial considerations**
While the adjusted SDC fees will result in a loss to potential income the current fee could be considered double dipping and it is considered appropriate to adjust it. Some applicants have already raised concerns with Council over the SDC fee and it is likely more complaints will be registered when subdivisions currently under constructed are finalised.

**Policy implications**
NIL

**Social implications**
NIL

**Environmental considerations** NIL
Attachment 1. Proposed amendment to page 14 - adopted fees and charges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref No.</th>
<th>Description of Service</th>
<th>Pricing Policy Category</th>
<th>Fee/Charge per Unit 2009/10 (excl. GST)</th>
<th>GST 10% applicable Yes/No</th>
<th>Total Fee/Charge per Unit 2009/10</th>
<th>Fee/Charge per Unit 2010/11 (excl. GST)</th>
<th>GST 10% applicable Yes/No</th>
<th>Total Fee/Charge per Unit 2010/11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E14</td>
<td>Principal Certifying Authority Nomination/Notice to Commence (PCA - Council)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E17</td>
<td>Development Application – Subdivision (s.249 EPA Reg 2000 Certificate Release)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E17.1. 1</td>
<td>Application for Subdivision Certificate base fee</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E17.1. 2</td>
<td>Application for Subdivision Certificate fee for each allotment</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E17.2. 1</td>
<td>Application for Strata Subdivision Certificate</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E17.2. 1</td>
<td>Application for Strata Subdivision Certificate</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E17.3</td>
<td>Termination of strata scheme</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E17.4</td>
<td>Signing or endorsement of 88B instrument</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E17.5</td>
<td>Amended 88B instrument - applicant's mistake</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E17.6</td>
<td>Re-signing of document</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Attachment 2. Proposed amendment to page 15 - adopted fees and charges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref No.</th>
<th>Description of Service</th>
<th>Pricing Policy Category</th>
<th>Fee/Charge per Unit 2009/10(excl. GST)</th>
<th>GST 10% applicable Yes/No</th>
<th>Total Fee/Charge per Unit 2009/10</th>
<th>Fee/Charge per Unit 2010/11(excl. GST)</th>
<th>GST 10% applicable Yes/No</th>
<th>Total Fee/Charge per Unit 2010/11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E20</td>
<td>Compliance Certificate – Subdivision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E20.1</td>
<td>Quotation based on hourly rate (minimum 1 hour) – (Inspection of Works) where Council is the Principal Certifying Authority</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>136.4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Attachment 3. Proposed amendment to page 21 – adopted fees and charges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref No.</th>
<th>Description of Service</th>
<th>Pricing Policy Category</th>
<th>Fee/Charge per Unit 2009/10(excl. GST)</th>
<th>GST 10% applicable</th>
<th>Total Fee/Charge per Unit 2009/10</th>
<th>Fee/Charge per Unit 2010/11(excl. GST)</th>
<th>GST 10% applicable</th>
<th>Total Fee/Charge per Unit 2010/11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G7</td>
<td>Registered Accredited Certifier Engineer Fees - Subdivision and other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Civil Engineering Works - Principal Certifying Authority (Council PCA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. Design Certification (Checking of plans &amp; specifications submitted by suitably qualified designers, and general advice on documentation requirements review and response prior to issue of Construction Certificate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G7.6</td>
<td>Entrances</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>94.2</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G8</td>
<td>B. Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G8.1</td>
<td>Audit and Surveillance Services</td>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>94.2</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Attachment 4. Proposed amendment to page 19 - adopted fees and charges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref No.</th>
<th>Description of Service</th>
<th>Pricing Policy Category</th>
<th>Fee/Charge per Unit 2009/10 (exc. GST)</th>
<th>GST 10% applicable</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Total Fee/Charge per Unit 2009/10</th>
<th>Fee/Charge per Unit 2010/11 (excl. GST)</th>
<th>GST 10% applicable</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Total Fee/Charge per Unit 2010/11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E35</td>
<td>Private Work - Noxious Plant Weed control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E35.3</td>
<td>Weed control notice administration fee</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>$90.91</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E35.4</td>
<td>Weed control notice inspection fee</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>$154.55</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>$170.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Item 10.2. Proposed Woodlawn bioreactor expansion

**Synopsis**
Veolia Environmental Services Pty Ltd has lodged a major project application and environmental assessment (EA) under part 3A of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979* for the expansion of the Bioreactor facility. The EA was publicly notified from 23 September to 25 October 2010. This report presents a submission on the project. Council has been given an extension to 5 November 2010 to lodge the submission.

**Recommendation**
Recommended that Council lodge the submission provided within this report with the NSW Department of Planning.

**Report**
Veolia own and operate the Woodlawn Bioreactor and the Crisps Creek Intermodal Facility (IMF). The Bioreactor is a major putrescibles landfill that services the Sydney region and is located within the void of the former Woodlawn Mine (located in Goulburn-Mulwaree LGA). The IMF services the Bioreactor by transferring containers from rail to road and is located at Tarago 8 km from the Bioreactor. Both facilities were approved by the Minister in 2000 and operations commenced in September 2004.

Veolia is seeking approval to increase the maximum input rate from 500 000 tonnes per annum to 1.13 million tonnes per annum, and to increase the throughput of the IMF to 1.18 million tonnes per year. Veolia is also seeking approval for additional lighting at the Bioreactor, an increase in hours of operation at the Bioreactor and the IMF, an increase in the number of truck movements to transport the waste from the IMF and regional centres.

The NSW Minister of Planning is the consent authority for the project.

**Current Approvals**
The approvals for 500 000 tonnes per annum consist of 450 000 tonnes from Sydney via the IMF and 50 000 tonnes per annum from regional centres by road (including 10 000 from Palerang Council). As well there is an approval for an additional 280 000 tonnes from Sydney via the IMF (240 000 of which is for sorting and processing and 40 000 of which is for composting – with residual waste to be delivered to the Bioreactor).

**Transport of waste through Palerang LGA**
It is expected that the greatest impacts of this proposed development on the Palerang LGA will result from the heavy vehicle movements across Palerang, associated with the
transport of waste to the Bioreactor. Chapter 12 of the Environmental Assessment (EA) describes and assesses these traffic and transport impacts.

The increase in putrescibles waste from the approved 500 000 tonnes per annum to the proposed 1 130 000 tonnes per annum will be made up of 1 000 000 tonnes by rail from Sydney and 130 000 tonnes by road from regional areas, adding an additional 80 000 tonnes from regional areas.

The Bioreactor has a capacity of 25 000 000 cubic metres and based on the increased maximum input rate has a projected remaining life of 25 years.

While the majority of the waste will come by train and be offloaded onto trucks that will travel roads not within Palerang LGA, there will be a large percentage of the 1 30 000 tonnes per annum regional component that will be transported through Bungendore and along Tarago Road to the Bioreactor.

Table 12-4 of the EA, produced below, indicates the waste tonnages per annum from each regional area and the number of heavy vehicle movements based on 19 tonnes per vehicle. There are however a number of mistakes in the table. The report indicates that it was intended that the truck movements would be assessed on the worst case scenario of transport over 5 days. This was done for the approval of the 50 000 tonnes but 6 days was used for the ACT waste and 80 000t total. The Palerang figures indicate 4 (8) truck movements but should be 2 (4) movements per day. Therefore an adjustment to the numbers in the table is needed.

Table 12-4  Regional Vehicle Movement Impact Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council</th>
<th>Waste (tpa)</th>
<th>Annual Trucks</th>
<th>Daily Trucks One Way (Two-Way)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goulburn Mulwaree</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>1,053</td>
<td>4 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palerang</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>4 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queanbeyan</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>2 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bega Valley</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>2 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>2,632</td>
<td>10 (20)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional 80,000 tpa proposed under this Environmental Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council</th>
<th>Waste (tpa)</th>
<th>Annual Trucks</th>
<th>Daily Trucks One Way (Two-Way)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper Lachlan</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yass Valley</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eurobodalla</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>1,105</td>
<td>4 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT(^2)</td>
<td>53,000</td>
<td>2,789</td>
<td>9 (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>4,210</td>
<td>15 (30)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


2. ACT figures based on 50% of total Commercial, Industrial and Private Waste Volumes, (ACT SoE Report, 2006/7)

Figure 12-3 of the EA (attached) shows the intended haulage routes from the various LGAs. This map indicates some surprising proposals that adversely and unnecessarily impact on Bungendore and Tarago Road through Palerang LGA, such as;

- The EA proposes that Eurobodalla (and Bega Valley) waste be transported by the Kings Highway to Bungendore and then along Tarago Road. The question must be
asked why it would not be more efficient to travel the shorter length available from the Kings Highway via the Goulburn Road (MR 79) to Tarago,

- It is also proposed that Upper Lachlan (and Yass Valley) waste be transported via a mainly gravel road from Gunning to Collector, south along the Federal Highway to Sutton, south along the Sutton Road (MR 52) to Queanbeyan, north along the Kings Highway to Bungendore and then along Tarago Road. It would be more efficient to travel the shorter distance and better roads from Gunning via the Hume Highway to Goulburn and then along the Goulburn Road (MR 79) to Tarago.

Under the EA proposals there would be 16 extra truck movements each way (80 000 tonnes) through Bungendore added to 8 truck movements each way (30 000 tonnes) under the already approved modification to the Bioreactor operation.

If the more efficient routes suggested above were used the numbers would reduce to 11 extra truck movements each way (53 000t) added to 4 truck movements each way (18 000 tonnes) including Palerang’s movements.

The expected impacts of haulage

The only Palerang Council controlled road affected by the waste haulage will be Tarago Road. This road within the Palerang LGA is bitumen sealed ≥ 7.0m wide for the first 11.35 kms from the Kings Highway however the seal reduces to between 5.8-6.6 Vm wide with narrow shoulder areas for the remaining length. The impacts of the waste haulage will be;

a. more trucks on roads in Palerang and travelling through the village area of Bungendore

Up to 16 extra semi-trailer truck movements in each direction will be passing through Bungendore will have some impact on the existing amenity of Bungendore adding increased noise and potential conflicts with other traffic. Travel times restricted to normal business hours would keep these impacts to a minimum.

b. pavement damage caused by haulage movements

The extra truck movements on Tarago Road, a regional road and Council asset, will result in extra wear and tear and consume pavement life that will involve higher levels of maintenance and repair, and will bring forward the need for pavement renewal by Palerang Council.

It is important that Palerang Council receives financial assistance with these costs that will be ongoing. The haulage of waste is analogous to the operation of the sand quarries on Tarago Road and it is proposed that s.94 be applied under similar arrangements to provide funding to Council to assist with the resulting higher costs of the road’s upkeep.

Based on s 94 arrangements imposed by the Land & Environment Court in 1995 on the last of the quarries to receive approval (D 228/92 Hart Bros), a contribution rate of 6.43 cents per tonne per km, indexed for inflation from the date of approval would be appropriate. At current date, this is equivalent to approximately 10 cents per tonne km. The figure would need to be further indexed in subsequent quarters. The s 94 contribution rate was set by the court following reference to Council’s Section 94 Plan No 2.

The length of Tarago Road within Palerang is 18 km. Based on the subject DA and this contribution rate, annual payments to Palerang Council of between $144 000 (based on 80 000t through Bungendore as proposed in EA) and $95 400 pa (based on only ACT waste passing through Bungendore and along Tarago Road as proposed in this report).
For the accumulated impact of both DAs the amounts would be $198 000 (based on 110 000 tonnes as proposed by the EA) and $127 800 tonnes (based on 71 000 tonnes as proposed in this report).

These amounts are considered to be reasonable to allow Council to undertake the necessary repairs and contribute to intermittent pavement rehabilitation that will be required over the years.

It is further proposed that the s 94 amount be added to the gate fees at the Bioreactor and dispersed to Palerang Council and each other council that is similarly affected by haulage of waste over roads for which they have primary responsibility. This would involve contributions towards the upkeep of Tarago Road (MR 268) for Palerang Council and Tarago Road (MR 268) and Collector Road (between Tarago Road and the Bioreactor) for Goulburn-Mulwaree Council per annum.

It is not proposed that s 94 contributions apply to the state and national route network including Kings Highway (MR 51), Goulburn/Braidwood Road (MR 79), Federal Highway, Hume Highway nor Sutton Road (MR 52), all of which are maintained at state/national level through the RTA.

By way of example, for waste being hauled from the ACT, the gate fee at the Bioreactor would include an amount of 32 km @ $0.10 = $3.2 per tonne, with 18km @ $0.10t/km x 53 000 t = $95 400 pa being dispersed to Palerang Council and 14x0.1x53 000 = $74 200 being dispersed to Goulburn-Mulwaree Council.

If applied to the current approval, Palerang Council carting from the Bungendore Waste Transfer Station (WTS) and transferring the full allowance, would pay 30x0.1x10,000 = $30 000 of which 16x0.1x10,000 = $16 000 would come back to Palerang Council and 14x0.1x10,000 = $14 000 would go to Goulburn-Mulwaree Council. It is to be noted that should waste from the future Braidwood WTS be transported directly to the Bioreactor via Goulburn Road and Tarago a different set of calculations would apply based on distances involved. Council's payment would come from its waste budget but would be paid back to its general fund.

This arrangement should be simple to administer as the trucks are weighted and their origin will be recorded by the operators for each delivery at the entrance to the Bioreactor.

c. Increase in road safety concerns with increase in truck movements in the areas of narrow pavement

While the EA indicates that the current level of service will not be affected by the increase in traffic generated by the development, there will however be many more truck passing movements along Tarago Road that raise some extra concerns from a road safety point of view, especially on the narrow seal sections towards the Palerang/Goulburn-Mulwaree LGA boundary. Two trucks or a truck and a car travelling at the speed limit from opposite directions and meeting at these locations will be hazardous. Ideally the road needs to be widened to have a minimum 7.0 m wide seal with minimum 1.0 m wide shoulders over its entire length. Serious edge break is already evident in these narrow areas. The placement of guardrail would also be desirable along the higher embankments and where large trees are close to the road.

While it would be unreasonable for the Bioreactor development alone to have to undertake the construction of all the road widening needed, it would not be unreasonable
to expect it to contribute to these works. This could be in the form of an increase in the s 94 contribution rate suggested above for pavement upkeep.

To further improve the safety of the increased truck movements on the roads leading to the bioreactor, it is proposed that a ‘Transport Code of Conduct’ as required for the recent approval of Major Project-0012, be also required for this development.

**Option for Alternative Waste Haulage Route**

With reference to fig 12.3 of the EA, transport distances from some of the LGAs delivering waste to Woodlawn would be significantly reduced and the numbers of haulage trucks passing through Bungendore and Tarago would be much lower if Collector Road from the Federal Highway directly to Woodlawn was utilised as a main haulage route. Waste from Goulburn, Upper Lachlan, Yass, Queanbeyan, the ACT and possibly Bega Valley could all be transported to and along this link route via the National/State road network.

This would result in lower costs of haulage for many of the local government bodies and would obviously have less impact on Tarago Road which is deficient in some sections and less impact on the amenity of the towns at each end.

However, it would require that Collector Road be upgraded and bitumen sealed its entire length, where there is currently about 7 km unsealed.

While there will be significant costs involved it is considered that the proposal should at least be further investigated including an approach being made to NSW Industry and Investment for financial assistance.

**Conclusion**

The increased haulage of waste by road through the Palerang Council area to the Bioreactor will impact on local roads and increase maintenance costs for Palerang Council. It is recommended, therefore, that a copy of this report be forwarded to the NSW Department of Planning with a request that an alternative waste haulage route to the bioreactor, via an upgraded Collector Road from the Federal Highway, be investigated.

In the event that this alternative route proposal is deemed unfeasible then the Department of Planning be requested to apply the following conditions to any approval that may be given to the development:

1. **Haulage Routes Upkeep**

   That Section 94 of the *Environmental Planning & Assessment Act 1979* be applied to haulage operations on MR 268 and Collector Road to compensate the councils responsible for the upkeep of these roads for damage to pavements that is likely to result from this haulage, with the following arrangements to apply:

   a. The contribution rate to be set at not less than 10cents/tonne/km at September quarter 2010 and indexed quarterly in keeping with movements in the RTA’s Road Cost Index,

   b. The operator of the Bioreactor is to keep a record of tonnes hauled and the origin of each load and is to collect the s 94 contributions by forwarding a tax invoice as part of the process for billing gate fees,

   c. The operator of the Bioreactor is to forward the contributions collected each quarter to Palerang Council and Goulburn-Mulwaree Council in accordance with the recorded haulage along each council’s roads.
2. Haulage Route Upgrading
The applicant be required to contribute to the road widening/upgrading works on Tarago Road to address safety concerns along sections where the bitumen seal is currently less than 7.0 m wide. This could be achieved by the applicant being required to undertake certain projects to address the worst sections or could be covered by the applicant collecting an agreed extra s.94 contribution per tonne per km for the purpose, from the local government bodies hauling to the bioreactor.

3. Approval of haulage Routes
That haulage from each LGA be restricted to the following routes;
   a. Yass Valley Council and Upper Lachlan Council waste principally via the Hume Highway and MR 79 to MR 268 and Collector Road,
   b. Eurobodalla waste via the Kings Highway (MR 51) and MR 79 to MR 268 and Collector Road,
   c. Bega Valley waste via the Kings Highway (MR 51) and MR 79 to MR 268 and Collector Road, or via Browns Mountain to Kings Highway, MR 268 and Collector Road,
   d. Queanbeyan and ACT waste via Kings Highway, MR 268 and Collector Road,
   e. Goulburn-Mulwaree waste via MR 79 to MR 268 and Collector Road.

4. Waste Haulage Times
That waste haulage be restricted to between 7.00 am - 6.00 pm Monday to Friday and 8.00 am - 1.00 pm Saturdays

5. Requirement for Transport Code of Conduct
The applicant be required to prepare and implement a Transport Code of Conduct for the project to the satisfaction of the Director-General including measures to:-
   a. minimise the impacts of the development on the local and regional road network including traffic noise; and
   b. minimise conflicts with other road users e.g. school bus operators

Financial considerations
The increased haulage of waste by road through the Palerang Council area to the Bioreactor will impact on local roads and increase maintenance costs for Palerang Council. It is considered necessary therefore that s.94 contributions be applied to the development and returned to Palerang Council to cover the increased costs of road maintenance that will result from the development.

Policy implications
NIL

Social implications
NIL

Environmental considerations
NIL
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1.3 Project Components and Definition

Table 1-1 provides a summary of the proposal and the terms used throughout this EA along with a description of the areas to which they refer. Each of the areas referred to in Table 1-1 is shown on Figure 1-1 and/or Figure 1-2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Terminology Used in this EA</th>
<th>Refers to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Woodlawn Expansion Project</td>
<td>The proposal to which this EA relates, comprising:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• bioreactor annual receiving capacity increase from its maximum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>assessed input rate of 500,000 tpa to 1.13 million tpa and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crisps Creek IMF annual receiving capacity increase from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>760,000 tpa to 280,000 tpa from the Bioreactor consent and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>260,000 tpa from the AVT consent to 1.18 million tpa;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• installation of additional lighting at the Bioreactor site, an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>increase in the Bioreactor and IMF hours of operation, and an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>increase in the number of truck movements to transport waste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>from the IMF and regional areas; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• replacement of DA-31-C2-99 through the provision of a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>consolidated project approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Also referred to as 'the Project' or the 'proposed Project'.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key Areas and Facilities

Woodlawn Eco-Precinct

An area of just over 5,000 hectares comprising two properties "Woodlawn" & "Pylara". The Eco-Precinct includes:

• Special Mining Lease - SML 20;
• the Woodlawn Bioreactor;
• the Alternative Waste Technology Facility (AWT) (approved, not yet built) comprising Woodlawn Alternative Sorting and Processing (WASP) facility and Composted Organics and Green waste (WOCOG) facility; and
• the Woodlawn Wind Farm (approved, not yet built).

Woodlawn Bioreactor

The Bioreactor site receives containerised waste by road from the Crisps Creek Intermodal Facility. The total area of the Lot and DP numbers that comprise the site is 395 hectares. The operating area of this site is 70 hectares and consists of the following key components:

• mine void;
• evaporation dam 3;
• access road, administration offices, workshop and power generating infrastructure; and
• leachate pipes, leachate dams and associated infrastructure.

Crisps Creek Intermodal Facility (IMF)

Dedicated facility which accepts containerised waste, via rail, from the Sydney region which is then transported by road to the bioreactor facility.

Alternative Waste Technology (AWT) Facility

Alternative waste technology facility designed to receive up to 280,000 tonnes of waste per annum, of which 240,000 tonnes per annum will be sent to the WASP facility and 40,000 tonnes per annum to the WOCOG facility. Approved, not yet built.

Woodlawn Alternative Sorting and Processing (WASP) facility

Sorting and processing facility designed to receive 240,000 tonnes of waste per annum.

Woodlawn Composted Organics and Green waste (WOCOG) facility

Organics and green waste facility designed to receive 40,000 tonnes of waste per annum.
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Figure 12-3  Haulage Routes for Regional Areas
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