

Technical Report			
Application No:	PA20/454		
Lodgement Date:	5 June 2020	DAU Date:	
Address:	116 Warrington Road, Byford		
Proposal:	Child Minding Centre		
Land Use:	Child Minding Centre	Permissibility:	SA
Owner:	Daniel Bateman		
Applicant:	Burgess Design Group		
Zoning:	Urban Development	Density Code:	R25 – R40
Delegation Type:	12.1.1	Officer:	Haydn Ruse
Site Inspection:	No		
Advertising:	Yes		
Outstanding Internal Referrals:	No		
External Referrals:	No		
Within a Bushfire Prone Area:	Yes		

Introduction:

A planning application dated 5 June 2020 has been received for proposed Child Minding Centre at 116 Warrington Road, Byford

The subject lot is zoned Urban Development in accordance with the Shire's Town Planning Scheme No. 2 (TPS 2). A Child Minding Centre is an 'SA' use within the 'Residential' zone as designated under the LSP in accordance with the Shire's TPS2.

The proposal is reported to DAU for determination as officers have delegation to determine a Child Minding Centre use under delegation 12.1.1.

This report recommends that the Child Minding Centre as proposed be approved subject to appropriate conditions.

Background:

Existing Development:

The subject site is 19,775m² in area and is bound by Warrington Road to the east, which provides the current access point to the site. The current extent of Shepparton Boulevard abuts the site as a temporary cul-de-sac at the south-western corner of the lot. The site has been developed for residential and features a single dwelling located to the north-eastern corner of the lot and incidental development including a shed and water tank. The remainder of the site is undeveloped.

The surrounding land is comprised of large lots intended for residential development.

Initial Proposal

The application sought approval for the construction of a Child Minding Centre, which would be located to the south-western corner of the subject lot adjacent to the recently constructed Byford South East Primary School. The proposed development would occupy 2,262m² of the lot and included:

- A single storey building comprising five activity rooms, a kitchen, office/staff room, foyer with reception, one cot room, laundry/nappy change area, bathrooms and store rooms;
- A fenced outdoor play area;
- A car parking area with 20 bays;
- Construction of an access road from Shepparton Boulevard to the west; and
- Construction of an emergency access to Warrington Road to the east.

The proposed Child Minding Centre is designed to facilitate a maximum capacity of 100 children and is intended to operate between the hours of 6:30am - 6:00pm Monday to Friday. The proposed Child Minding Centre is expected to employ up to a maximum of 17 staff across the operations in varying shift times.

SAT Proceedings

On 2 November 2020 the Shire received notification of an application to the State Administrative Tribunal (SAT) seeking to review condition d (iii) of the approval. This condition requires the applicant to amend the site plan to alter the car parking layout and include additional car parking bays. Through the SAT proceeding the applicant provided a revised site plan and additional information and the parties agreed to progress the matter to a section 31 reconsideration.

Revised Proposal

The applicant's revised proposal includes an additional two car parking bays, the designation of six car parking bays for exclusive use for staff and further justification for the proposed number of car parking bays and layout of the car parking area. To facilitate the additional bays the footprint of the development area has been increased in width by 2.6m, which has also increased the open space by 132m². The revised site plan is shown below:



Revised site plan

The proposed amendments and additional information has been assessed in detail further in this report.

Community / Stakeholder Consultation:

The revised proposal has not been advertised as the modifications proposed are not considered to be a significant deviation from the initial proposal.

Statutory Environment:

- *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015*
- *Environmental Protection (Noise) Regulations 1997*
- Shire of Serpentine Jarrahdale Town Planning Scheme No.2
- Rural Strategy Review 2013
- Draft Local Planning Scheme No.3
- Draft Local Planning Strategy

- State Planning Policy 7.3 – Planning in Bushfire Prone Areas
- Local Planning Policy 1.4 – Public Consultation on Planning Matters Policy
- Local Planning Policy 1.6 – Public Art for Major Developments
- Local Planning Policy 4.11 – Advertising Policy
- Local Planning Policy 4.16 – Landscape and vegetation Policy

Planning Assessment:

Clause 67 of the Deemed Provisions lists matters to be considered in the determination of development applications.

Land Use:

The proposed development is considered to fall within the ‘Child Minding Centre’ land use category under Town Planning Scheme No.2 (TPS2), which is defined as:

‘Child Minding Centre – means land and buildings used for the daily or occasional care of children in accordance with the Child Welfare (Care Centres) Regulations, 1968 (as amended) but does not include a family care centre as defined by those Regulations, or an institutional home.’

The proposed development is intended to provide for the daily and occasional care of children and is not undertaken within a dwelling, excluding the proposal from being a family care centre.

The subject site is zoned ‘Urban Development’ under the Shire’s TPS2. Clause 5.18 of TPS2 sets out the objectives of the ‘Urban Development’ zone, as “to provide for the orderly planning of large areas of land in a locally integrated manner and within a regional context, whilst retaining flexibility to review planning with changing circumstances”. This objective is facilitated through the preparation of Structure Plans, which guides land use permissibility and development by designating the land in accordance with corresponding zonings under the TPS2.

The land falls within the ‘Residential’ designation of the Doley Road Precinct Local Structure Plan (LSP). Within the ‘Residential’ zone, a ‘Child Minding Centre’ would be an ‘SA’ use, meaning it would be capable of approval subject to advertising of the application and consideration of any submissions received.

During the advertising period, an objection received raised concern in relation to the appropriateness of the proposed land use on the grounds of inconsistency with Planning Bulletin 72/2009 – Child Care Centres. Notwithstanding this, Officers have undertaken assessment and as explained in the report consider the proposed development meets the intent of the bulletin, which aims to ensure child care centres are located appropriately in relation to their surrounding service area. By locating adjacent to an existing Primary School, the development provides a complimentary use that can capitalise on existing traffic generation.

The objection also raises concerns about oversupply of similar land uses and the potential land use conflict between the development and surrounding future residential lots if it were to be used for an alternative commercial land use. Officers note that competition is not a relevant planning consideration, having regard for those matters to be considered in assessing an application under clause 67 of the Deemed Provision. Furthermore, any future land use change would be subject to the land use permissibility for the ‘Residential’

designation under the LSP, commercial uses within the 'Residential' zone would generally require development approval and the associated impacts would be assessed at that stage.

Officers consider the proposed land use to be acceptable and capable of approval.

Under Draft Local Planning Scheme No.3 (LPS3) the proposed land use category is considered to be 'Child Care Premises', which is defined as:

'Child Care Premises – means a premises where –

- (a) An education and care service as defined in the Education and Care Services National Law (Western Australia) Section 5(1), other than a family care centre service as defined in that section, is provided; or
- (b) A child care service as defined in the Child Care Services Act 2007 section 4 is provided.'

This land use category is essentially the same as a 'Child Minding Centre' under TPS2, intended to be applied to development providing daily or occasional care for children.

The subject site is zoned 'Urban Development' under LPS3. A 'Child Care Premises' is an 'A' use within the 'Urban Development' zone under LPS3, meaning it is capable of approval subject to advertising of the application and consideration of any submissions received. As such, approval of the proposed development would not be inconsistent with LPS3.

Draft Local Planning Strategy:

The objectives under the draft Local Planning Strategy (LPS) as they apply to the Urban area of Byford, focuses primarily on preventing urban sprawl, achieving good urban design outcomes and ensuring the delivery of a variety of housing types. The built form has been discussed further in this report and is essentially considered to be acceptable subject to a condition requiring some further aspects being incorporated into the design. In terms of the prevention of urban sprawl and delivery of a diversity of housing types, Officers consider the proposed development does not pose a risk to the achievement of these objectives. The remainder of the site has been demonstrated as capable of residential development in accordance with the approved Local Structure Plan (LSP) and the development is located within an existing urban cell, not posing any risk of urban sprawl.

State Planning Policy 3.7 – Planning in Bushfire Prone Areas:

The subject site is located within a Bushfire Prone Area and subject to assessment under SPP3.7, which requires the submission of a Bushfire Management Plan (BMP) due to the proposed development being classified as a vulnerable use class. A BMP was been submitted with the application, which was subsequently referred to the Department of Fire and Emergency Services (DFES) for comments. DFES provided comment on the BMP, identifying areas in need of amendment, which were subsequently undertaken by the applicant and an amended BMP provided. Officers are satisfied with the amended plan and have recommended a condition of approval that the plan be implemented should the development be granted approval.

Local Planning Policy 1.6 - (LPP 1.6) – Public Art for Major Developments:

The objective of LPP1.6 is to facilitate public art to enhance public enjoyment, engagement and understanding of places through the integration of public art. The policy sets out the

requirements for physical and financial contributions for public art for any development valued at \$1 million or greater. If the application were to be approved, a contribution towards public art is considered capable of being dealt with by way of a condition, consistent with the policy requirements. The Officer recommendation includes a condition of approval for the provision of or contribution towards public art.

Local Planning Policy 4.11 – Advertising Policy:

The proposed development is a generally a type that involves the provision of signage to identify the use and branding of the development. The proposed development plans have not demonstrated the content of any signage. To ensure any proposed development complies with the Shire's standards for signage, a condition has been recommended for a signage strategy to be submitted and approved by the Shire. This will allow the assessment of any signage before installation.

Local Planning Policy 4.16 – Landscape and Vegetation Policy:

The proposed development is subject to landscaping requirements under TPS2 and subsequently the provisions of LPP4.16. The proposed development plans have included some indicative information in relation to proposed landscaping; however, lacks the detail required under LPP4.16. The information is sufficient to assess compliance with the Scheme requirements and Officers are satisfied the detail can be resolved as part of the condition clearance process. As such, a condition requiring a Landscape Management Plan has been recommended, which will allow the detailed design of landscape areas to be refined prior to operation.

Development Contributions (DCA1):

This development falls within the development contribution area DCA1 (Area A) and as such is required to contribution towards the cost of common infrastructure under the Byford Traditional Development Contribution Plan.

Under a Development Application (as opposed to a subdivision), contributions are calculated on the current lot area on which the development is situated, giving a lot "yield" for the site. The liability to pay the contribution is triggered at the building permit stage, and thus the DCP payment will applied as a development condition on the Building Permit.

The current lot area is 19,775.76 square metres, which gives a total lot yield of 43.95 lots (the area squared divided by 450m² (the average R20 zoned dwelling size). Under the current DCP5 the contribution value will be circa \$516,375. (Should Amendment 208 (DCP6) be in force by the time the contribution becomes due, the contribution costs will be circa \$702,640).

It is noted that, were this development to be progressed as a subdivision, which sought to cede the land identified on part of the lot as Public Open Space (POS), the landowner would be entitled to DCP credits for the POS land and the contribution area would reduce by the same POS land area.

Under a subdivision under the current DCP5, the contribution value would reduce to circa \$387,370 and the value of DCP credits earned from ceding the land would be circa \$240,874; leaving a contribution balance payable of circa \$240,874. Under DCP6 the contribution value would be circa \$527,100 and the credits earned from ceding land would be unchanged at circa \$240,874, leaving a contribution balance payable of circa \$286,227.

Car Parking:

The applicant has amended the proposed site plan to include two additional bays (22 bays in total) and designate six of the bays for exclusive use for staff to address the concerns underlying condition d(iii) of the approval. Additional information has also been provided in the form of engineering advice justifying the number of parking bays proposed, which exceeds the parking requirements under Town Planning Scheme No.2 (TPS2) by two bays.

The additional justification provides more detail on the way in which the centre operates in order to satisfy concerns about traffic and parking demand. The justification focuses on key areas including child attendance rates, staff attendance rates and average use time for parking bays across drop-off and pick-up times.

In terms of the child and staff attendance rates, the applicant has noted that it is highly unlikely the maximum capacity of 100 children and 17 staff members would occupy the premises at any one time. Data drawn by the applicant from other franchised childcare centre provides indicates such centres generally operate at 85% capacity at most times. The reasoning for this is varied and includes the following reasons (amongst others):

- Children may attend the premises on a part time basis only (i.e. only on certain days of the week).
- Children may be absent from childcare due to illness.
- Children may be absent due to family commitments.

The applicant has also noted that in circumstances where a child is unable to attend on a particular day, the enrolments in relation to capacity prevent the operator from accommodating another child.

Similarly, the maximum number of staff employed by the centre are highly unlikely to arrive at the premises at the same time. As the pick-up and drop-off time from such premises extends over a two hours period, general practice is to have a basic level of staff attending the premises from the commencement of the drop-off period, which incrementally increases up until mid-day. Similarly, staff shifts finish incrementally towards the pick-up period. On top of this the applicant has noted that these centres typically employ junior staff through traineeships, who tend to be school leavers at year 10 or year 12 levels, and below independent driving age. The proposed centre is expected to employ up to two staff in this manner reducing the expected staff parking uptake.

In terms of the usage of parking bays for pick-up and drop-off, the applicant has made reference to the average length of stay for the proposed use stated in NSW RTA - Guide to Traffic Generating Developments, which is 6.8 minutes. This has been used as there is no WA equivalent guide. Taking a conservative measure and assuming a 10 minute length of stay, across the two hour drop-off / pick-up period each bays could facilitate up to 6 vehicles. Even at maximum accommodation only 17 bays should be required to facilitate clients, leaving five bays available for staff. At the estimated operating capacity of 85% only 15 bays would be required, leaving seven bays available for staff. Taking into account the staggered staff arrival times and that some staff will not be able to attend in a personal vehicle the proposed 22 bays are considered to be sufficient.

In regard to the portion of the condition which seeks the car parking design to be amended to cater for one way movement, this is no longer required as the additional information submitted by the applicant provides clarity surrounding the utilisation of the car parking bays within the AM and PM peak times. As there will be adequate parking for patrons of the centre during these times, queuing and congestion within the parking area and along Warrington Road is unlikely to occur.

Officers therefore consider that the proposed revised plan acceptable and support the deletion of condition d(iii). Condition (f) as a result will be slightly modified to ensure the parking and access ways are designed in accordance with the updated car parking plans received on 10 December 2010 which can be viewed within attachment 2 and forms part of this report.

Development Standards and Site Requirements:

Clause 7.10 and table 2 of TPS2 sets out the development standards and site requirements for development. While the land is zoned Urban Development and there are no provisions specifically relating to that zone, consideration has been given to the requirements as they apply to the Residential zone, which the land is designated as under the LSP.

Within the Residential zone under table 2, a Child Minding Centre is required to retain a 20m frontage and achieve a 7.5m front setback, 3m side setback and 7.5m rear setback. The development must also achieve a minimum plot ratio of 0.5:1, maximum site coverage of 30% and minimum landscaped area of 50%.

The subject site has not yet been subdivided and so the proposed development would easily achieve the requirements listed above. The application has provided an indicative subdivision layout, which allows consideration of compliance with TPS2 under the expected future lot layout. Based on this, the proposed development would not comply with the rear setback, proposing 4.9m in lieu of 7.5m but would comply with the minimum landscaped area, proposing 50.41%. The initial proposal did not meet the landscaping requirements; however, as a result of increasing the site area to facilitate additional parking bays, the landscaping area would become compliant.

Under LPS3, the site requirements are listed as being per the Residential Design Codes. The subject site is identified as R25 – R40 under the LSP, which would allow the developer to select a range of R Coding (within this range) to apply across the site at subdivision stage. Considering the more restrictive requirements under R25, the development would need to be setback 6m from the street and 1.5m from other lot boundaries, which the development would comply with. The R Codes does not require landscaping; however, a minimum of 50% of the site remaining as open space would be required, which the development would comply with at 77% open space. Accounting for the proposed changes under LPS3, Officers consider the variation to the TPS2 standards to be acceptable.

The requirements under clause 7.10 of TPS2 contain provisions that relate specifically to landscaping around car parking area. Clause 7.10.2 requires a minimum landscaping strip width of 1.5m or 2m between a street boundary and car parking area. The proposed development would provide a landscaping strip between the street and car parking area of only 1.5m in width and would not comply. Officers note this requirement does not exist under LPS3 and consider the impact of a reduced landscaping strip could be mitigated through detailed design of a landscape management plan at condition clearance stage. A condition has been recommended, requiring a Landscape Management Plan prior to occupation.

Traffic:

The application was submitted with an accompanying Traffic Impact Statement (TIS), prepared by KCTT. The TIS indicates the development would generate approximately 430 trips per day, comprising 80 trips over the AM peak and 70 trips over the PM peak. The conclusions of the TIS indicate the proposed development would result in a medium impact

under current conditions, dropping to a low impact upon completion of the road network linkages and upgrades anticipated under the LSP.

As the surrounding area continues to develop the connectivity of the local road network and associated upgrades will occur concurrently. Officers are satisfied that the traffic impacts of the proposed development are not unreasonable and will not impact upon the functionality of the local road network in the short or long term.

Amenity:

A Child Minding Centre is considered to be a noise generating development, primarily in relation to early operations and noise generated from plant and equipment and outdoor play areas.

In terms of the visual impacts of the development, the proposed building covers an area of 586m² (increased under the revised proposal from 548m²) and the design incorporates habitable elements intended to reflect residential development. The design elements incorporated include: a verandah and awning, pitched roof and windows addressing the street and future residential development to the east. The proposal has orientated the outdoor play area away from nearest future residential lots to the east and also includes landscaping around the building and car parking area to mitigate the visual impacts of the development. A condition has been recommended requiring a Landscape Management Plan to ensure appropriate landscaping is provided.

Part VII of TPS2 provides general development standards. Clause 7.1 of TPS2, relating to the general appearance of buildings and preservation of amenity, requires consideration of architectural style, colour, use of materials and the general appearance of buildings to ensure the exterior design is not out of harmony with existing buildings or likely to impact the amenity of the locality. Officers consider the design, while thoughtful, is to a lower standard than future residential development in the locality.

In order to address the concerns of achieving a more visually interesting edge to the building, especially from the southern and western perspectives, Officers have recommended the following condition:

Plans submitted for a building permit are to demonstrate the elevations of the building being modified, to the satisfaction of the Shire of Serpentine Jarrahdale, to reflect the following changes:

- *The external colour and material scheme being modified to reduce the reliance on face brick through the addition of new stone and timber materials that help ground the development through mimicking the natural tones and subtleties of the surrounding landscape;*
- *The specific addition of vertical articulation treatments on the southern and western building faces which utilise natural timbers and stone work to blend with the character of the rural landscape and contrast against the face brick.*

Revised plans being submitted to and approved by the Shire of Serpentine Jarrahdale prior to the submission of a Building Permit application.

Apart from the external edges of the building recommended to be modified by the above condition, the scale and setbacks of the building are otherwise consistent with expected

future residential development and Table ii - Site Requirements of TPS2, which requires a minimum front and rear setback of 7.5m and a 3m side setback. Officers have noted that the rear setback would not meet the requirements under TPS2 if the lot were to be subdivided in accordance with the indicative lot layout displayed on the application plans. However, the site requirements are anticipated to change under LPS3, which would require setbacks be in accordance with the relevant R Coding. To this end, the setback requirement would be reduced to 1.5m, which the development would comply with.

Officers have also noted that no signage has been proposed. Signage is an expected feature of this type of development. To ensure any future signage does not result in a detrimental visual impact to the locality a condition has been recommended, requiring a signage strategy be provided prior to occupation.

The application was submitted with an accompanying Acoustic Assessment, prepared by Lloyd George Acoustics. The Acoustic Assessment notes that compliance will be achieved in the short term, prior to the surrounding area being subdivided for residential development, whereby recommendations have been made that would ensure the development remains compliant. These recommendations include construction of solid fencing around the outdoor play areas and AC plant and exhaust fans and restrictions to the use of certain parking bays before 7am. Officers have recommended a condition of approval to ensure the recommendation of the Acoustic Assessment are implemented.

In relation to the objections' concerns about the impact of traffic on the amenity of the area, traffic is generally considered as an isolated impact separate to considerations of amenity. As detailed earlier in this report, Officers consider the traffic generation of the proposed development to be acceptable.

Options and Implications:

With regard to the determination of the application for planning approval under Town Planning Scheme No. 2, Council has the following options:

- Option 1: Council may resolve to approve the application subject to conditions.
- Option 2: Council may resolve to approve the application unconditionally.
- Option 3: Council may resolve to refuse the application subject to reasons.

Conclusion:

The proposed Child Minding Centre is considered to align with the current planning framework and would be capable of approval. Notwithstanding the objections, the proposed development is considered to be appropriate within the context in which its proposed. Officers support the proposed development and recommend Council approve the application.

Attachments:

- CL67 Table

Deemed Provisions – Cl 67 Matters to be considered by Local Government

a) The aims and provisions of this Scheme and any other local	YES	NO	N/A
---	-----	----	-----

planning scheme operating within the area	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Comment: The proposed development is considered to meet the aims and provisions of TPS2. Areas of non-compliance have been considered and are deemed to be appropriate in light of the pending adoption of LPS3.			
b) The requirements of orderly and proper planning including any proposed local planning scheme or amendment to this Scheme that has been advertised under the <i>Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015</i> or any other proposed planning instrument that the local government is seriously considering adopting or approving	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
Comment: The proposed development is considered to comply with the LPS and LPS3.			
c) any approved State planning policy	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
Comment: SPP3.7 – The proposed development is considered to comply with SPP3.7			
d) any environmental protection policy approved under the <i>Environmental Protection Act 1986</i> section 31(d)	YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Comment:			
e) any policy of the Commission	YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Comment:			
f) any policy of the State	YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Comment:			
g) any local planning policy for the Scheme area	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
Comment: The proposed development has been assessed in accordance with and are considered to comply with the following LPP's: LPP1.4 LPP1.5 LPP4.11 LPP4.16			
h) any structure plan, activity centre plan or local development plan that relates to the development	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
Comment: The proposed development is considered to comply with the Doley Road Precinct Local Structure Plan			
i) any report of the review of the local planning scheme that has been published under the <i>Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015</i>	YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Comment:			
j) in the case of land reserved under this Scheme, the objectives for the reserve and the additional and permitted uses identified in this Scheme for the reserve	YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Comment:			

k) the built heritage conservation of any place that is of cultural significance	YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Comment:			
l) the effect of the proposal on the cultural heritage significance of the area in which the development is located	YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Comment:			
m) the compatibility of the development with its setting including the relationship of the development to development on adjoining land or on other land in the locality including, but not limited to, the likely effect of the height, bulk, scale, orientation and appearance of the development	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
Comment: The proposed development is considered to be compatible with the development in its setting, taking into consideration the future expected development as determined by the current and pending planning framework.			
n) the amenity of the locality including the following – I. Environmental impacts of the development II. The character of the locality III. Social impacts of the development	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
Comment: The proposed development is considered unlikely to result in any environmental or social impacts or any impacts on the character of the locality.			
o) the likely effect of the development on the natural environment or water resources and any means that are proposed to protect or to mitigate impacts on the natural environment or the water resource	YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Comment:			
p) whether adequate provision has been made for the landscaping of the land to which the application relates and whether any trees or other vegetation on the land should be preserved	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
Comment: Officers have recommended a condition of approval to address landscaping and vegetation.			
q) the suitability of the land for the development taking into account the possible risk of flooding, tidal inundation, subsidence, landslip, bushfire, soil erosion, land degradation or any other risk	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
Comment: The land is considered to be suitable for the proposed development and unlikely to be unduly affected by the potential impact of any risk listed above.			
r) the suitability of the land for the development taking into account the possible risk to human health or safety	YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Comment:			
s) the adequacy of – I. The proposed means of access to and egress from the site; and II. Arrangements for the loading, unloading, manoeuvring and parking of vehicles	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
Comment: Officers consider the proposed access and parking arrangement to be acceptable.			
t) the amount of traffic likely to be generated by the development, particularly in relation to the capacity off the road	YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>

system in the locality and the probable effect on traffic flow and safety	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Comment: The proposed development is considered to be acceptable in terms of the likely traffic impacts of the development.			
u) the availability and adequacy for the development of the following – I. Public transport services II. Public utility services III. Storage, management and collection of waste IV. Access for pedestrians and cyclists (including end of trip storage, toilet and shower facilities) V. Access by older people and people with disability	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
Comment: The proposed development is considered to be adequately serviced taking into account those matters listed above.			
v) the potential loss of any community service or benefit resulting from the development other than potential loss that may result from economic competition between new and existing businesses	YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Comment:			
w) the history of the site where the development is to be located	YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Comment:			
x) the impact of the development on the community as a whole notwithstanding the impact of the development on particular individuals	YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Comment:			
y) any submissions received on the application	YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Comment:			
Za) the comments or submissions received from any authority consulted under clause 66	YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Comment:			
Zb) any other planning consideration the local government considers appropriate	YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Comment:			