



ACT
Government

DICKSON SECTION 72

APPENDIX 2 – STAGE 1
TECHNICAL SUMMARY

ENVIRONMENT, PLANNING AND SUSTAINABLE
DEVELOPMENT DIRECTORATE

JULY 2018

Table 1: Key findings

Technical Studies	Key findings	Actions & Recommendations	Gaps
<p>Infrastructure and Flooding</p>	<p>Electricity, gas, telecommunications and water networks all have capacity to serve developments without any off-site works</p> <p>The sewerage network will require upgrading. The timing, design and construction will be the responsibility of Icon Water under their ‘Developer Contributions scheme’. Any additional sewage load in Section 72 will trigger this upgrade.</p> <p>There are no stormwater issues associated with the site beyond normal pipework associated with capturing and removing stormwater off site.</p> <p>The site is not subject to flooding in the 1%AEP (1 in 100 year) flood.</p>	<p>Sewerage upgrade – upgrading an existing mains, from Northbourne Avenue, following Dickson Channel, to an existing sewer near the Dickson Tradies Club. Continued discussions with Icon are required to ensure the upgrade is designed and built before the load from Section 72 increases.</p> <p>Stormwater – A retarding basin may be required on the Dickson playing fields to address the downstream flooding issues in Lyneham. Whilst there are no flooding issues on Section 72, if the retarding basin went ahead, and a further decision made to naturalise the Dickson channel, then there could be landscape benefits for the site (subject to funding availability).</p>	<p>Subject to ongoing and future discussions with utilities service providers.</p>
<p>Contamination</p>	<p>Phase 1 and 2 contamination studies - Block 25. No areas of concern for contaminants or asbestos.</p>	<p>Standard asbestos management and unexpected finds protocols apply.</p>	<p>Contamination studies have not been undertaken for remaining opportunity sites within Section 72.</p>

Technical Studies	Key findings	Actions & Recommendations	Gaps
Ecological	There are no matters of environmental significance or triggers under ACT or Commonwealth environmental legislation in Section 72.	--	--
Traffic and Parking	Existing studies provide sufficient information to inform our understanding of current challenges. Future analysis will be required as detailed planning progresses.	<p>N-S and E-W access to precinct and connections for pedestrians and cyclists will require improvements and/or upgrades.</p> <p>Traffic volumes on Antill Street are such that any new development within the precinct will likely trigger the need to upgrade Antill Street and Rosevear Place and/or Hawdon Place intersections.</p>	<p>The various traffic impact assessment were based on differing development scenarios and assumed development on Block 25 or 25 and 26 only.</p> <p>The scope of traffic impact assessments was limited to Blocks 25 and 26 only.</p>
	Footpaths and cycle facilities are generally poorly provided in Section 72.	Antill St/Cowper St intersection may require upgrade with any new development in Section 72.	
	<p>Volumes of traffic on Antill Street at peak times are high.</p> <p>Access from Section 72 to Antill Street at morning peak can be difficult due to uncontrolled intersections.</p> <p>Traffic volumes Antill St /Cowper St intersection at (or above) capacity during peaks.</p>	Further reallocation of parking to accommodate shorter, maximum 2 hour spaces is warranted at the pool.	

Technical Studies	Key findings	Actions & Recommendations	Gaps
	<p>Parking is in high demand immediately around the pool. There is high demand for parking on Rosevear Place due to the existing land uses.</p>	<p>New development should ensure that it supplies appropriate levels of parking on-site to meet the parking demand generated by new land uses.</p>	
<p>Tree Assessment</p>	<p>The precinct is home to over 690 trees, mostly comprising species from the Eucalyptus, Pinus, Quercus, Platanus and Ulmus families.</p> <p>Significant landscape features include the linear planting of Pyrus ussuriensis on the southern boundary of Block 19, Cupressus x layandii hedge around hotel site, linear planting along drainage line.</p>	<p>The report includes a rating about works that could be carried out to reduce risk and/or improve urban amenity in relation to a number of individual trees</p>	<p>Given that the previous assessment was undertaken nearly 4 years ago, it may be prudent to update the assessment. Particularly with respect to risk and/or urban amenity within the context of future changes.</p>
<p>Heritage</p>	<p>No registered or recorded heritage places or objects within Dickson Section 72.</p>	<p>Standard unexpected finds protocols apply.</p>	<p>--</p>
<p>Community Facilities</p>	<p>The proposal is consistent with a variety of Government policy initiatives including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increasing affordable housing • Increasing housing choice • Increasing catchment population and 	<p>Consideration of heights and mix of uses should be given to increasing surveillance from this area to surrounding areas.</p>	<p>Only covers Block 22 and 25, not an integrated holistic approach. Limits trade-offs and opportunities.</p>

Technical Studies	Key findings	Actions & Recommendations	Gaps
	<p>supporting group centre, urban infill</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encouraging active travel <p>Community facilities are drawn on from across the Dickson and inner-north catchment. Community and recreation facilities are provided for the current and projected populations.</p>	<p>No additional land required for new facilities generally. Aging population increase in demand for facilities such as meeting rooms. Can be accommodated by using or expanding existing – not located on Block 22 or 25. Increased pressure on government schools expected to be negligible (subject to future demographic profiling)</p>	<p>Incremental development and need to apportion new/upgrade of facilities to cater for increased demand.</p> <p>Need to know profile of community likely to be catered for through planned changes both Common Ground II and other residential. Facilities offered will also determine likely profile.</p>
	<p>Profile:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More semi-detached / townhouses • Less units • More detached houses • More one person households in detached houses (downsize opportunity) • More expensive, affordability issues • Growing • Ageing 	<p>Need housing choice and accessible housing due to ageing population.</p>	
	<p>Dickson Community Hub is a concept and collaboration between Canberra Seniors Club,</p>	<p>Based on study of the broad context, site, existing buildings and the project brief,</p>	<p>The study was predicated on use of Block 13 for temporary car parking which was later deleted. Design</p>

Technical Studies	Key findings	Actions & Recommendations	Gaps
	<p>Northside and Majura Men’s Shed (auspice program under Northside) to share facilities and create a larger multipurpose hub.</p>	<p>Clarke Keller recommends a Community Hub at Dickson should be developed by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retaining the Majura Men’s shed building • Providing a new 2 storey building with basement carpark to accommodate Northside, CSC and other community organisations • New childcare centre • And additional shed and hardstand to meet the men’s shed needs 	<p>and siting opportunities would need to be revised to account for current context.</p>
	<p>Community sentiment on the study was overwhelmingly positive. Support for a multipurpose community hub.</p>	<p>Requires significant capital investment</p>	
	<p>Community consultation to date identified the following vision:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A mixed use precinct to build vibrancy and a sense of community • An active precinct to encourage greater surveillance and increased public safety • Renewed spaces to increase the overall appeal of the area 	<p>No new land required for new facilities generally. No need to restrict Block 22 and 25 specifically for community facilities or to retain the blocks only for purposes consistent with the current CZ6 zoning.</p>	<p>No socio-economic profiling particularly no cultural diversity analysis.</p> <p>No way of measuring and attributing cumulative impact of urban renewal / development.</p> <p>No deep understanding of existing capacity of facilities.</p> <p>Out of date data 2009 not latest census. Assessment based on</p>

Technical Studies	Key findings	Actions & Recommendations	Gaps
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Connections across the site east to west (and north south) 		<p>numbers contrasts with indicative standards.</p>
	<p>Canberra Central – includes inner North and inner South has slightly higher amount of CFZ land than ACT generally.</p>	<p>Aging population increase in demand for facilities such as meeting rooms. Can be accommodated by using or expanding existing – not located on Block 22 or 25.</p>	<p>Does not make any recommendations about ANCA and their future intentions/aspirations</p>
	<p>Comprehensive list of all community facilities in Inner North.</p>	<p>Increase on government schools negligible. Does however recommend planning for some increase and ensuring it can be catered for with E&TD</p>	
	<p>Some services and facilities for older people are already located on Section 72 and/or within the Dickson commercial centre. Efficiencies and benefits could be achieved through relocating of the Canberra Senior Citizens Centre to this area.</p>	<p>No need to provide new non-government schools in the area, childcare, community health facilities, open space sports facilities or community gardens. Should occur as part of commercial or mixed-use development.</p>	
	<p>Benefits to increasing range of housing options especially for older people. Appropriate for independent living close to services and facilities in group centre.</p>	<p>Requirement for new ambulance station site has been flagged. Keep options open to include in Section 72.</p>	