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1. Introduction

This report presents a series of reform options for local government elections in the Northern Territory.

The report has been prepared as part of an expert consultancy commissioned by the Northern Territory Department of Housing, Local Government and Regional Services, which is conducting a review of the Territory’s local government voting system.

In 2010, following considerable discussion of the 2008 local government elections and their outcomes, the Minister for Local Government initiated a formal review of the voting system used for local government elections in the Northern Territory.

The aim of the review is to assess whether the current voting system for local government in the Northern Territory is the most appropriate or whether there is valid reason and justification for it to be changed.

As part of the review process it was identified that expert opinion on the applicability of different voting systems to the Northern Territory local government sector would be sought.

This report constitutes this expert advice to the Department.

2. Background

The Northern Territory has undergone significant local government reform in recent years. A new structure of local government representation was implemented in the Northern Territory on 1 July 2008. The new local government structure consists of municipal and shire councils, many of which are further divided into wards, some of which are single member and some of which are multi-member in structure.
In October 2008 the Northern Territory conducted inaugural elections under the new municipal and shire council system. The elections were held across large remote-area shires which had been created by the amalgamation and replacement of much smaller ‘community government’ or ‘association’ local government councils.

Following these inaugural elections, a review of the elections was conducted by the Department of Housing, Local Government and Regional Services. This review received considerable comment about the appropriateness of the voting system, known in the Territory as an “exhaustive preferential voting system”, in part because the Territory system, unlike that used in other Australian jurisdictions, combines the same method of counting votes across both single-member and multi-member electoral districts.

As I will discuss, it is this unusual combination of a common vote counting method applied to very different district magnitudes that lies at the heart of the workings, or lack thereof, of the current local government electoral system. Moreover, the scope of works for this consultancy makes it clear that the advice being sought specifically refers to voting systems that are able to be used in both single and multi member wards, as local government in the Northern Territory has a mixture of both formats. The scope of the consultancy does not include an assessment of changes to the current ward structure.

As a result, it is important to recognise from the outset that many potential electoral reform options are in reality constrained by the Territory’s relatively unusual combination of single-member and multi-member wards, and that any practical reform must be applicable across both district structures.

3. Structure

As per the scope of services, the objective of this report is to provide a recommendation on what is the most appropriate vote counting system for local government in the Northern Territory. This involves an assessment of the suitability of the existing preferential voting system and the applicability of alternative voting systems to the local
government structure in the Northern Territory. As stated above, the scope of services explicitly envisages that a common voting system is to be used for all councils in the Northern Territory in both single and multi-member wards.

The key issues covered by this report are:

- Basic principles of electoral system design
- The advantages and disadvantages of the current voting system;
- The advantages and disadvantages of alternative voting systems
- The applicability of these voting systems to the Northern Territory local government context;
- Suggestions on the most appropriate voting system for Northern Territory local government elections, evidenced by the above research;
- An assessment of the advantages and disadvantages of these options; and
- A conclusion recommendation for reform.

4. Basic principles of electoral system design

Electoral systems are the rules and procedures via which votes cast in an election are translated into seats won in a parliament or some other assembly or office. Any electoral system is intended to do three main jobs. First, it will translate the votes cast by the electorate into seats won. Second, because of this, electoral systems act as the conduit through which the people can hold their elected representatives accountable. Third, different electoral systems give incentives for those competing for power to couch their appeals to the electorate in distinct ways. In regionally distinct societies, for example, particular electoral systems can be designed to ensure that each region has its own local member, or can be designed so that members are elected on an 'at large' basis with no local representation, or can fall somewhere between these two extremes.
Some of the most common criteria for electoral system design include the following objectives:

- Simplicity;
- Providing fair representation;
- Making elections accessible and meaningful;
- Holding individual representatives accountable; and
- Fostering the legitimacy of the democratic process and the wider system of representation.

It needs to be understood at the outset that not all of these criteria are mutually reinforcing, and that in practice trade-offs inevitably have to be made. For instance, a system may be relatively simple to operate, but this simplicity may create problems of representation which undermine the fairness or legitimacy of election outcomes. This is, in fact, one of several problems of the current Northern Territory local government electoral system.

### 5. Types of Electoral Systems

A standard approach to the description and categorization of electoral systems is to group them according to how proportional they are: that is, how closely the ratio of votes to seats is observed in electoral outcomes. Such a classification gives three broad families: plurality-majority systems; semi-proportional systems; proportional representation (PR) systems; and mixed systems. These constitute virtually all the electoral systems used for elections in the world today.

**Plurality-majority systems**

The five types of plurality-majority systems comprise two plurality systems (first past the post and the block vote), and three majority systems (the two-round runoff, the
alternative vote and the supplementary vote). While plurality systems are won by those who win a plurality of the vote (i.e. more than any other contestant), a feature of majority systems is that they are structured so as to ensure that the winning candidate gains an absolute majority (i.e. more than 50 percent) of eligible votes. The Northern Territory Local Government electoral system falls into the latter of these categories.

Under *first past the post* systems, the winner is the candidate who gains the most votes, but not necessarily an absolute majority of the votes, in single-member districts. Such elections are typically presented as a contest between candidates, rather than parties. Voters choose their favoured candidate with a tick or a cross on the ballot paper, and the winner is simply the candidate who gains more votes than any other. This is the world’s most commonly-used electoral system.

The *block vote* is the application of plurality rules in multi-member rather than single-member electoral districts. Voters have as many votes as there are seats to be filled, and the highest-polling candidates fill positions sequentially regardless of the percentage of the vote they actually achieve.

The most common form of majority system, the *two-round system*, takes place in two rounds of voting, often a week or a fortnight apart. The first round is conducted in the same way as a normal plurality election. If a candidate receives an absolute majority of the vote, then he or she is elected outright, with no need for a second ballot. If, however, no candidate has an absolute majority, then a second round of voting is conducted, usually as a runoff between the two highest polling candidates from the first round, and the winner of this round is declared elected.

The dominant electoral system model used in Australia, *preferential voting*, is another type of majority system. Electors rank candidates in the order of their choice, by marking a ‘1’ for their favoured candidate, ‘2’ for their second choice, ‘3’ for their third choice, and so on. If no candidate has an absolute majority, a process of sequential transfer of votes is used until a majority winner emerges. This system is currently used for parliamentary elections in most jurisdictions in Australia, including for Northern
Territory Local Government elections. The main areas of variation in these systems across other Australian jurisdictions are where preference marking is “optional” (as in NSW and Queensland state elections) or “compulsory”, and if so whether all preferences must be marked (as in Federal and Northern Territory Legislative Assembly elections) or whether some lesser number is required (as is the case for Tasmanian State elections).

In virtually all cases, however, this system is applied only in single-member electoral districts. When multi-member districts are used, a form of proportional representation, the Single Transferable Vote, described below, is almost always applied. In the Northern Territory, however, the same system of preferential vote counting is currently being applied in both single-member and multi-member contexts.

Expert Comment: the current Northern Territory Local Government voting system combines a preferential voting system designed for use in single-member districts with a multi-member ward structure. This inappropriate combination of a single-member counting system with a multi-member district structure is a key to the various problems evident in the workings of the current system, discussed below.

Proportional representation (PR) systems

The rationale underpinning all proportional representation (PR) systems is the fair translation of each party’s or candidate’s share of the votes at an election into a corresponding proportion of seats in an elected body. For instance, a party that wins 20 percent of the votes should gain about 20 percent of the seats under a PR system, whereas the same vote share under most majoritarian systems would result in no seats at all.

There are three major types of PR system—open list, closed list, and single transferable vote systems. All of these systems require the use of electoral districts with more than
one member: it is not possible to divide a single seat elected on a single occasion proportionally. As a result, multi-member electorates are essential to any PR model.

Closed list PR, the most common type of proportional representation system, requires each party to present a list of candidates to the electorate. Electors vote for a party or list rather than for individual candidates; and parties receive seats in proportion to their overall share of the national vote. Winning candidates are taken from the lists in order of their respective positions on it, meaning that the order of candidates elected from that list is fixed by the party itself, and voters are unable to express a preference for a particular candidate. Open list PR, by contrast, allows voters to choose not just a party but also a particularly candidate from a party list or, in some cases, more than one list. Many countries use examples of one or the other of these systems.

However, the applicability of such systems for Northern Territory Local Government elections is questionable, as they require voters to choose between political parties or party lists rather than individual candidates. They are therefore not appropriate for systems where voters have to choose between individuals rather than parties, as is the case in most local government elections.

The only form of proportional representation that does involve voting for individual candidates is the single transferable vote (STV) form of proportional representation. This system is used to elect the Australian Senate, and also for elections to the Tasmanian House of Assembly, the ACT Legislative Assembly and various upper house and local government elections. It is also used in Ireland and Malta internationally.

Under STV, voters rank candidates in order of preference on the ballot paper, in the same manner as other preferential voting systems. After the total number of first-preference votes for each candidate is tallied, the count then begins by establishing the quota of votes required for the election of any candidate. The quota is usually calculated by the formula:

\[
\text{Quota} = \frac{\text{votes}}{\text{Seats to be elected}} + 1
\]
For instance, in a 4-member ward with 200 votes cast, the quota of votes required for election would be $200/5 + 1$, that is 41 votes. Any candidate who gains at least this many votes, either outright or through the distribution of preferences, is declared elected.

The overall result is determined through a series of repeated counts. At the first count, the total number of first-preference votes for each candidate is ascertained. Any candidate who has more first preferences than the quota is immediately elected. In second and subsequent counts, two processes of exclusion and redistribution of preferences takes place. First, the surplus votes of elected candidates (i.e. those votes above the quota) are redistributed according to the second preferences on the ballot papers. For fairness, all these ballot papers are redistributed at a fractional percentage of one vote, so that the total redistributed vote equals the candidate’s surplus. The formula used to determine the transfer value is calculated by dividing the surplus by the candidate’s total number of votes, and then multiplying all votes transferred by this formula. For instance, in the example above, if an elected candidate had 50 first-preference votes, his or her second preferences would be transferred at the fractional value of $9/50$ or 0.18 of a full vote.

At the same time, after any count, if no candidate has a surplus of votes over the quota, the candidate with the lowest total of votes is eliminated. His or her votes are then redistributed, at full value, to the candidates left in the race according to the second and then lower preferences marked on the ballot. This process of successive counts, after each of which surplus votes are redistributed or a candidate is eliminated, continues until either all the seats for the electoral district are filled by candidates who have received the quota, or the number of candidates left in the count equals the number of seats to be filled.

**Expert Comment:** With the exception of the Single Transferable Vote (STV), other forms of proportional representation require electors to vote for parties rather than candidates, making them inappropriate for Northern Territory elections. STV does not suffer from this problem: it requires candidate rather than party-centred voting, is designed for multi-member districts, and produces proportional and
logical results. However, while STV is a very fair system, it can also (as the extended description above indicates) be quite complex to administer, especially in terms of the conduct of the count. This may be relevant for Northern Territory local government elections, where simplicity may be an important requirement.

Mixed Systems

Mixed electoral systems attempt to combine the positive attributes of both plurality/majority and proportional electoral systems. In a mixed system there are two electoral systems using different formulae running alongside each other. Votes are cast by the same voters and contribute to the election of representatives under both systems: typically, a district-based system, often utilising single-member districts, and a proportional list, often elected on a district-wide basis.

Mixed systems have been a particularly popular choice in new democracies in recent years -- perhaps because, on the face of it, they appear to combine the benefits of proportional representation with those of local district representation. Mixed systems can be divided into two broad categories, mixed member proportional (MMP) and mixed-member majoritarian (MMM) systems.

Mixed member proportional systems are designed so that part of the elected assembly is elected from single-member districts, while the remainder is elected from PR lists. Voters can be given a separate vote for each or only one vote. MMP systems then use the PR list seats to compensate for any disproportionality produced by the district seat results. Such systems deliver truly proportional election results and are thus often categorised as a form of PR.

Mixed member majoritarian systems, by contrast, use both PR party lists (see below) and local districts running side-by-side, but with no compensatory provisions. Part of the assembly is elected by proportional representation, part by some type of plurality or majority method. MMM systems are thus often referred to as 'parallel' systems.
Other forms of mixed-member system can be constructed by combining two separate electoral system models. One approach, which may be suitable for the Northern Territory, is to combine the use of preferential voting in single-member districts (that is, the current system) with STV in multi-member districts (as described in the preceding section). This appears to be the recommendation made by Alastair Heatley in his 1997 report. While this makes eminent sense in terms of a combination of two suitable (and related) electoral system models, it may suffer from the same problems of complexity identified for STV elections more generally.

**Expert comment:** Mixed systems have the advantage of combining both single-member and multi-member district structures, as is the case in the ward structure used for Northern Territory local government elections. However, in most variations, they require voters to choose not just between candidates but also between political parties. This makes such systems inappropriate for use at local government elections in the Northern Territory.

The exception to this comment would be a mixed preferential voting (in single-member districts) and single transferable vote (in multi-member districts) model. Such systems are well placed to be combined as one is actually a variant of the other, and both follow a common logic. However, such a combination could also face the same problems of counting complexity for STV systems identified in the previous section.

**Other Systems**

In addition to the plurality/majority, proportional representation and mixed systems there are a number of other systems that do not fall neatly into any particular category. Amongst these are the Single Non-Transferable Vote, the Limited Vote and the Borda Count. These systems tend to translate votes cast into seats in a way that falls somewhere between the proportionality of PR systems and the results of
plurality/majority systems. Each offers some potential reform options for the Northern Territory.

Under the Single Non-Transferable Vote (SNTV), elections are held in multi-member districts. Each voter casts one vote for a candidate only, with no preference permitted. The candidates with the highest vote totals win the seats.

This has several advantages. In particular, an important difference between SNTV and the plurality/majority systems described earlier is that SNTV will usually better facilitate the representation of minority groups and candidates. The larger the district magnitude (i.e., the more seats elected in the constituency), the more proportional the system can become. However, there are also disadvantages. As with any system where multiple candidates of the same party are competing for one vote, internal party fragmentation and discord may be accentuated. In addition, as SNTV gives voters only one vote, with no preferences, the system can give rise to many wasted votes, and/or enable the election of candidates with only limited support.

Like SNTV, the Limited Vote is another semi-proportional system which is used in multi-member electorates. Unlike SNTV, electors have more than one vote, but fewer votes than there are candidates to be elected. Counting is identical to SNTV, with the candidates winning the highest vote totals winning the seats. Limited voting can also be applied in other contexts, including those using preferential voting (see discussion of reform options below).

The Limited Vote has similar advantages and disadvantages to SNTV. It is simple for voters and relatively easy to count. However, it tends to produce less proportional results than SNTV. Many of the arguments relating to the problems of intra-group competition and fractious politics also apply to LV in a similar way as to SNTV.

A final example of electoral system design is the Borda Count used in the Pacific Island state of Nauru. This can be used in both single- and multi-member districts. The Borda Count is a positional voting system in which electors rank candidates in a similar manner as is the case with preferential voting. However, in contrast to the elimination
system used for preferential elections in Australia, under the Borda Count there are no eliminations. Instead, preferences are simply tallied as ‘fractional votes’: in Nauru, a first preference is worth one, a second preference is worth half, a third preference is worth one-third and so on. These are summed and the candidate(s) with the highest total(s) are declared the winners.

Expert comment: All of these systems have two important advantages: they are relatively simple for voters, and can be used in both single-member and multi-member electorates. In addition, unlike most forms of proportional representation, all are based on the principle that voting is candidate rather than party-based. For this reason, all offer some feasible options for Northern Territory Local Government elections. However, none are directly applicable in toto to the existing Northern Territory system, which combines preference marking with both single and multi-member districts. This system is discussed below.

6. The Northern Territory Local Government Electoral System

The system introduced for local government elections in the Northern Territory is a variation of one of the systems described above, the preferential vote. As such, it has much in common with the voting systems used in other Australian jurisdictions, but with one crucial difference: the system, which elsewhere is used to elect one representative from single-member electoral districts, is in the Northern Territory predominantly used to elect more than one representative from multi-member electoral districts.

This application of a plurality/majority system designed to be used in single-member districts in a context for which it was not designed – multi-member districts – leads to perverse, unrepresentative and socially undesirable outcomes. Such problems have tended to recur whenever this model of elections have been used, and were certainly in evidence at the 2008 Northern Territory local government elections. These election outcomes have been analysed at some length by Will Sanders in his paper “Fuelling
Large Group Dominance” (see references) and I do not intend to replicate his arguments here, other than saying that I agree with his analysis.

Rather, I wish to focus on the reasons for these perverse outcomes, which are essentially twofold. First, while a system of majority (rather than quota) preferential voting will produce predictable and logical results in single-member districts, where it correctly identifies the majority choice after the distribution of preferences, it does not do so when applied in multi-member districts. In such cases, election outcomes are neither predictable nor logical, and often work to elect those with a minority (or deny election to those with a majority) of voter support.

The reason for this is a flaw in the counting rules: the current system treats elected candidates in the same way as excluded candidates. In both cases, it distributes the preferences of elected candidates at full value, rather than the fractional value assigned to them in a quota-preferential PR-STV system. As such, voters whose first preference choice is elected are effectively given an additional vote, and potentially multiple additional votes after that, to add to the count. As a result, a bare majority of voters (and even, in some cases, a minority) can actually elect every seat. The randomness and blatant unfairness of this process is indefensible.

The combination of these two factors produces highly irregular election results which do not reflect voter preferences or the popular will. Rather, as the 2008 election showed, such a system often amplifies the majoritarian nature of a standard preference voting system, creating ‘mega-majoritarian’ or ‘winner-take-everything’ outcomes in which a subset of voters (those who have cast their votes to an already-elected candidate) are given the further advantage of having their votes counted at full value several more times. This distinguishes the operation of the system in multi-member compared to single-member districts, where only one member is elected in any district, and where the winning candidate’s preferences are thus never distributed.

In the Northern Territory, by contrast, because a winning candidate’s preferences can be distributed multiple times, members of an aligned group, or clan, or tribe, or party
can easily win every seat. The reasons for this are simple: in cases (like the current Northern Territory system) where voters are obliged to number every preference in order to effect a valid vote, any form of disciplined preference marking will lead to the systematic over-representation of some voters at the expense of others. In effect, as long as voters are prepared to express their preferences in a consistent manner (eg for one group, or clan, or tribe, or party), such a system will often result in the dominant clan, party or group winning every seat in a district; in other cases, it can lead to minority groups gaining much greater representation than they could have otherwise expected.

This is one of the key problems occurring in the Northern Territory, as detailed in Will Sanders’ paper. The combination of a flawed counting system and disciplined preference marking is leading to lop-sided electoral results that would not be possible under a more rational voting system. Sanders provides the following example from the 2008 election in the Anmatjere ward of Central Desert Shire in 2008, in which four candidates from two settlements – Haines, Dixon, Glenn and Hennan – were elected. As Sanders (2009:4) notes, assuming that most voters “would vote for candidates from their own settlement, it was perhaps to be anticipated that some of the larger, more populous settlements would come out towards the top in the count of primary votes”. In the end, however,

“it was in fact two candidates from well down the field in terms of primary votes who came through to win the third and fourth positions in this Anmatjere ward of Central Desert Shire. The Ti Tree triangle ended up with two representatives and Laramba and Yuelumu to the south west ended up with one each. However the south eastern settlements of Engawala and Mulga Bore/ Angula all missed out” (Sanders 2009:4).

Table 1 sets out the results of the 2008 Anmatjere ward election.
Table 1. Anmatjere Ward, 4 vacancies, actual 2008 results (Existing System)

Candidates, Results, Primary Votes and Places of Association.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate/ Elected (N)</th>
<th>Primary Votes</th>
<th>Place of Association</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Haines, Jasper (1)</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>Nturiya/ Ti Tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixon, Adrian (2)</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>Laramba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frances, Ant</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Pmara Jutunta/ Ti Tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bird, Benedy</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Mulga Bore/ Angula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lechleitner, Walter Japangardi</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Yuelumu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloomfield, Patrick</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Engawala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenn, James Jampajimpa (3)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Ti Tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heenan, Noel (4)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Yuelumu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carter, Ted</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Ti Tree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Formal Votes 415 F/T 74.5%
Informal Votes 142
Total Votes 557 T/E 55.8%
Enrollment 998

Source: Sanders 2009.

It will be readily apparent that, under the current system, two candidates (Glenn and Heenan) were elected from smaller population areas, despite having only a small proportion (less than five percent) of the first-preference vote, while more popular candidates from other more populous regions missed out. This result is very much an artifact of the current electoral system, and highlights one of the recurring problems of the system – its propensity to turn minority support into electoral victory.

By contrast, the results would have been quite different if a different electoral system had been in place. If, for example, a single non-transferable vote system had been in effect (or a limited preference system, whereby voters simply express their first preference but no others), then the four leading candidates on first preferences would have been elected. This would have seen candidates Haines and Dixon still winning the first two seats, but different candidates with considerably greater support levels - Frances and Bird - elected to the third and fourth seats, rather than Glenn and Heenan – see Table 2.
Table 2. Anmatjere Ward, 2008 results under Single Non-Transferable Vote

Candidates, Results, Primary Votes and Places of Association.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate/ Elected (N)</th>
<th>Primary Votes</th>
<th>Place of Association</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Haines, Jasper (1)</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>Nturiya/ Ti Tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixon, Adrian (2)</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>Laramba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frances, Ant (3)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Pmara Jutunta/ Ti Tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bird, Benedy (4)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Mulga Bore/ Angula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lechlieitner, Walter Japangardi</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Yuelumu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloomfield, Patrick</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Engawala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenn, James Jampajimpa</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Ti Tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heenan, Noel</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Yuelumu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carter, Ted</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Ti Tree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Formal Votes 415 F/T 74.5%
Informal Votes 142
Total Votes 557 T/E 55.8%
Enrollment 998

Source: Sanders 2009.

As can be seen from the above table, this very simple electoral system would have also achieved a better geographic spread of elected representatives in the Anmatjere ward in 2008 than the actual election delivered.

Another scenario worth considering is the “preferential first-past-the-post” system suggested by Dr Sanders, in which the same counting process as the current system is used, with the important exception that the votes of elected candidates are not transferred. Rather, the sequential process of elimination and redistribution of preference votes from losing candidates continues until there are as many candidates left in the count as there are vacancies, at which point those candidates are declared elected. As the hypothetical preference distribution at Table 3 shows, this would also deliver fairer results than the current system.
Table 3. Anmatjere Ward, 4 Vacancies

Hypothetical Results Under Preferential First-Past-The-Post

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate/ Elected (N)</th>
<th>FPTP Preference Distribution</th>
<th>Place of Association</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Haines, Jasper (1)</td>
<td>103 106 109 127 128 157</td>
<td>Nturiya/ Ti Tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixon, Adrian (2)</td>
<td>84  84  86  88  91 105</td>
<td>Laramba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frances, Ant</td>
<td>45  54  54  55  55</td>
<td>Pmara Jutuna/ Ti Tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bird, Benedy (3)</td>
<td>41  42  42  43  81  88</td>
<td>Mulga Bore/ Angula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lechleitner, Walter Japangardi (4)</td>
<td>40  40  56  60  60  65</td>
<td>Yuelumu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloomfield, Patrick</td>
<td>37  38  39  42</td>
<td>Engawala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenn, James Jampajimpa</td>
<td>25  26  29</td>
<td>Ti Tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heenan, Noel</td>
<td>24  25</td>
<td>Yuelumu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carter, Ted</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Ti Tree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Formal Votes 415

Source: Sanders 2009.

Finally, what if a Single Transferable Vote system or Borda count had been used? Unfortunately, it is not possible to fully model the outcome under these systems using the election results supplied, as the full preference flows of elected candidates are needed. However, it is possible to make an informed guess. As Sanders shows, “as a result of the more uneven spread of primary votes, the count under STVPR would diverge almost immediately from that under the simpler reform alternative of preferential first-past-the-post, as represented in Table 10. As the minority quota for the election of four candidates under STVPR would, in this instance, be 84 votes, both Jasper Haines and Adrian Dixon would immediately be declared elected at the end of the primary vote count … although we cannot definitively determine who would win the third and fourth seats in Anmatjere ward in 2008 under STVPR, it is clear that this will be a three way struggle between Frances, Bird and Lechleitner” (see Table 4).

Most likely, under a Borda count, there would likely be a similar outcome: Haines and Dixon would probably win the top two seats on the basis of their overwhelming lead on first preferences, with candidates Frances and Glenn probably taking the third and fourth seats, based on their sold first-preference scores and large numbers of
secondary preferences. However, without knowing the full preference scores, it is impossible to be sure: it may be the case that other candidates would received a relatively small number of first preferences but many second or third preference votes could also come through the field to win these seats. As we do not have access to the ballot paper themselves, it is not possible to be sure about this.

Table 4. Anmatjere Ward, 4 Vacancies

Hypothetical Results Under STV Proportional Representation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate/ Elected (N)</th>
<th>Beginnings of STVPR Count</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Haines, Jasper (1)</td>
<td>103 E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixon, Adrian (2)</td>
<td>84 E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frances, Ant (3)</td>
<td>45 +22(.184)=49.05</td>
<td>+9=58.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bird, Benedy (4)</td>
<td>41 +3(.184)=41.55</td>
<td>+1=42.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lechleitner, Walter Japangardi</td>
<td>40 +2(.184)=40.37</td>
<td>+0=40.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloomfield, Patrick</td>
<td>37 +9(.184)=38.66</td>
<td>+1=39.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenn, James Jampajimpa</td>
<td>25 +58(.184)=35.67</td>
<td>+4=39.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heenan, Noel</td>
<td>24 +9(.184)=25.66</td>
<td>+1=26.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carter, Ted</td>
<td>16 +0(.184)=16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Formal votes in Count 415
PR Quota for election 84

Source: Sanders 2009.

The key point of this modeling exercise is simple: any of the suggested alternatives – SNTV, preferential first-past-the-post, STV or Borda – would have produced a fairer and more geographically representative result than the actual outcome in Anmatjere Ward in 2008.

This finding is not surprising if the historical record of the current Northern Territory system in other Australian elections is examined. Earlier in the 20th century, multi-member preferential voting systems that were essentially identical to the current Northern Territory Local Government model were tried in a number of Australian
jurisdictions, including for State-level elections in South Australia between 1929 and 1935, and for elections to the federal Senate between 1919 and 1946. In each case, the system was abandoned after its deleterious effects on fair representation became obvious (see Reilly and Maley 2000).

The Senate experience, which replicates both the systemic drawbacks and also the pattern of results produced at the 2008 Northern Territory Local Government elections, is a good illustration of the dangers of using a majority electoral system in multi-member electorates over time. As in the Territory, for the 1919-1946 Senate system each seat was effectively filled by a separate election, but with the same electorate voting at each. Because of the combination of compulsory preference marking and the stability of party support in the electorate, this procedure displayed a strong tendency to produce an outcome under which the same party won every seat in a state. Of the 60 occasions on which a state-based Senate election was held under multi-member exhaustive preferential voting, 55 produced such an outcome.

The system’s configuration meant that it generated virtually no incentive for minor parties to participate in Senate elections. At House of Representatives elections during the same period, it was from time to time possible for party dissidents to win election as independents or as representatives of new parties, particularly if they had a geographically-concentrated base of support. At Senate elections, however, minor party representation was impossible. This created periods of such sustained and nationwide dominance by one party that on a number of occasions the Senate was scarcely workable as a legislative body, let alone as a house of review: in the period from 1947 to 1950, for example, there were only three opposition Senators — a leader, a deputy leader, and a whip — facing 33 government Senators.

This level of system dysfunction and extreme disproportionality meant that the electoral system itself was primarily responsible for the erosion of public confidence in, and the legitimacy of, the federal Senate. Multi-member exhaustive preferential voting was replaced with the single transferable vote in 1948 which, having been designed for multi-member constituencies, has operated in a far more logical way. The
inappropriateness of multi-member exhaustive preferential voting evidenced by the Senate case was such that no proposal for multi-member exhaustive preferential voting has ever again been forthcoming in Australia at the federal level.

Expert comment: The Northern Territory Local Government system suffers from a fundamental problem, mistakenly applying rules designed for single-member elections in a multi-member context. When exhaustive preferential voting is used in multi-member districts, and where elected candidates are treated the same way as ‘excluded’ candidates, the system fails to represent the will of the voters. In cases of disciplined group voting, the legal requirement to mark all preferences greatly exacerbates this problem. In such cases, the majoritarian features of the system become overwhelming, systematically advantaging the largest group of voters and under-representing all others.

Where voting is based on party or organizational identification, this system will typically result in the same party or group winning all or nearly all seats with only a bare majority of the vote. Thus in cases where voting is based on clan, tribe, region or other forms of identity, this system will typically result in the domination of the largest group, with minorities being excluded from representation. There is evidence of both patterns of results from the historical (eg Senate) and contemporary (2008 Northern Territory Local Government) experience of such elections.

These effects – the over-representation of some parties or identity groups, and the under- or non-representation of others – can contribute to highly unbalanced outcomes which call the legitimacy of the election results into question. Both tendencies appear to be evident in the use of exhaustive preferential voting at the 2008 Northern Territory local government elections.

Given the extremely lop-sided and disproportional results in evidence at these elections, it is possible that repeated iterations of the system could, over time, stimulate widespread dissatisfaction with the electoral process and even
generate social conflict as some groups are repeatedly over-represented while others are systematically excluded.

For all of these reasons, my expert opinion is that the system must be changed immediately, before any further elections are held and these potential problems become a reality. The following section therefore suggests some reform options which may help redress some of the key problems of the existing system.

7. Reform Options

As the preceding discussion makes clear, the current Northern Territory Local Government electoral system suffers from a variety of deficiencies and pathologies. While superficially similar to the use of preferential voting in other Australian jurisdictions, the application of preferential voting rules designed for single-member electorates in a context of mostly multi-member districts is responsible for many of these pathologies. As such, one obvious recommendation would be to simply revert to single-member districts for all elections. However, it has been made clear that “changes to ward structure are out of scope of the research, as we are looking at the structure of local government as it currently exists.”

Given this, we need to focus on voting reforms that are able to be applied in both single and multi member wards, as local government in the Northern Territory has a mix of both and any reforms need to be congruent with both structures. Taking this provision as a starting point, I think there are at least five possible reforms that which may help to address the pathologies in the system as it stands.

These reform options are outlined below, in descending order, from the simplest to the most complex (and from least to most consequential) possible reforms. It needs to be emphasised that the simpler reforms are likely to be easier to administer and implement, but may also be less consequential and far-reaching in their impact on the problems identified, than more complex reforms.
The five possible reforms to the existing system, from simplest and least consequential to most ambitious and most consequential, are as follows:

a. A change in the counting rules to distribute preferences from excluded candidates only
b. A change to optional rather than compulsory preference marking
c. The introduction of limited preferential voting
d. The introduction of single transferable vote counting rules
e. A change in the electoral system to the Single Non-Transferable Vote, Borda Count or some variation of the same

Let me discuss each of these in turn:

a. A change in the counting rules to distribute preferences from excluded candidates only.

This is the simplest means of addressing the current problem. Under the current rules, elected candidates are treated in the same manner as excluded candidates, with their preferences distributed to the next non-excluded candidate marked as part of the count. This is unfair, as those electors who voted for an elected candidate effectively get to add additional votes of equal value to the count. Depending on preference flows, this can lead to highly lop-sided and unrepresentative election outcomes.

A change in the counting rules could eliminate this problem by only distributing the preferences of excluded (not elected) candidates. Under this proposal, the sequential elimination of the lowest-polling candidates proceeds as normal, with losing candidates serially eliminated, until there are only as many candidates remaining in the count as there are vacancies to be filled. In other words, the system would be the same as the current one except that winning candidates would not be able to pass their preferences on to others once elected. Rather, the process of eliminating the candidate with the lowest number of votes and redistributing their votes in accordance with expressed preferences would continue until there were the same numbers of candidates remaining as vacancies available.
This same idea, which he called “preferential first-past-the-post”, was proposed by Dr Sanders in his 2009 report. As his analysis suggests, while such a change would be unlikely to make a major difference to many electoral outcomes, it would eliminate the problem of majority vote cumulation and enable a much greater representation of minority candidates than the existing system, and (to the extent that first preference votes were shared between candidates) would more accurately reflect voter preferences.

However, such a change in counting rules may create other problems of representation, particularly if a very popular candidate receives an overwhelming number of first preference votes. In such a situation, this proposal would lead to the favoured candidate’s election but leave only a relatively small number of voters to elect the other candidates. While this would usually be a lesser problem than the current one of minority exclusion, it is important to be aware of this potential for further unintended consequences.

b. A change to optional rather than compulsory preference marking

This would be another relatively simple reform, requiring only minor legislative and procedural changes. Under the proposed reform, the existing requirement for voters to number all preferences would be discarded, and voters would have the option of numbering only a few preferences or none at all – that is, only marking a “1”, and leaving all other squares blank. While voters could express additional preferences if they wanted to, they would not be compelled to do so in order to cast a formal vote.

Such a change would be likely to minimize but not eliminate the problem of preference cumulation that is at the heart of the current system, and would be congruent with the approach to preference marking taken in other Australian jurisdictions such as Queensland and NSW, where such “optional preferential” voting is already in use at state elections.

The disadvantage of this approach is that it may have only limited impact on addressing the problem of unrepresentative results. To the extent that most voters would be content
to just express a single preference, the change would likely have a positive impact, opening up space for minority candidates and reducing the problem of large-group dominance. But if voters choose to keep numbering most or all preferences, and to keep cumulating these optional preferences upon members of their existing clan, tribe or locality, the same problems that are currently evident may well persist. Much depends on the extent to which voter behavior would change (or not) as a result of such a reform.

c. The introduction of limited preferential voting

This is a stricter variation of option b. above, with which it could be combined if necessary. It would effectively limit the number of preferences each voter could express to a certain number – for instance, no more than two or three preferences in total. This would restrict the ability of voters to cumulate their preferences, which is one of the sources of the current problems, by only allowing them to express a limited number (eg two or three) preferences in total. (At an extreme, preferences could in theory be restricted to a single “1” vote, which would solve the current problems of cumulation entirely, but also change the nature of the electoral system to a first-past-the-post style single non-transferable vote contest.)

Like the previous recommendations, this proposal would be simple and cost-effective, and has some experience in other jurisdictions (a limited 3-preference voting system is currently used in Papua New Guinea, for instance). However, like the previous recommendation, the effectiveness of this proposal remains open to question. It is possible that voters for successful candidates could still have their ballots counted twice or three times, depending on the limit applied, which would reduce but hardly eliminate the current problem of excessive accumulation of votes which then cascade down to elect related candidates.

d. The introduction of single transferable vote counting rules

This is the recommendation made by Will Sanders and Alastair Heatley, and is the optimum change from a pure electoral systems viewpoint. Such a change would require
no change to existing procedures in the single-member districts, as preferential voting is effectively the application of STV in a single-member election, with a 50% quota. However, the application of single-transferable vote PR in multi-member districts would accurately reflect the intention of the voters and would result in fair, legitimate and balanced election outcomes. It would also be in keeping with the approach used for other elections in the Territory and elsewhere in Australia, and in other jurisdictions which combine single-member and multi-member electorates. Voters should have no problems understanding the system, as they would vote, and mark preferences, in exactly the same manner as they do now.

However, such a move would inevitably increase the complexity of electoral administration, particularly the vote-counting process in multi-member districts. In such districts, a ‘quota’ for election would have to be calculated for each multi-member ward or municipality, and each elected candidate’s ballot papers would need to be re-examined and their preferences transferred to remaining candidates at a fractional transfer value, as described in section 4 above, in order to effect the count.

While complex, this process is logical and straightforward, requiring basic administrative and mathematical competence of the electoral administrators but not a change in the current processes for electors. The burden of such a change would therefore fall almost entirely on those counting the votes rather than those voting. However, it is possible that the increased complexity and the time needed to conduct the count could also generate some adverse reactions, depending on how many candidates and hence preference transfers (and hence, time to complete the count) is required.

e. A change in the electoral system to the Single Non-Transferable Vote, Borda Count or some variation of the same

This is a more ambitious option, requiring more radical changes to the current electoral law. Under this approach, a new electoral system more suited to the Northern Territory local government structure and circumstances could be designed and introduced. Two options discussed above include the single non-transferable vote (which would
eliminate the use of all preferences entirely) and the Borda Count (which would keep the current system of preference marking, but count them differently). Both of these systems have the advantage of being able to be applied in both single-member and multi-member contexts, and both would likely result in fairer outcomes that more accurately reflected the will of the electorate than the current system. SNTV (but not Borda) is also quite a simple system, effectively being a first-past-the-post count of only one preference in multi-member electorates.

The disadvantage of these (and other) systemic changes is that they would effectively introduce an entirely new electoral system for Northern Territory Local Government elections which would be distinct from the electoral procedures that apply at Territory and Federal level elections, and which has no record of use in Australia. They would also require fairly extensive re-writing of existing legislation and procedures. However, they would also be simpler to administer and count than the mixed preferential voting-STV option described above.

8. Conclusion and Recommendations

The existing Northern Territory electoral system should be changed. It delivers patently unfair election results in multi-member districts, and will continue to do so as long as the current ward structure remains in place.

My recommendation would be to give close consideration to several reform options. The optimal reform from an electoral system standpoint would be the introduction of Single Transferable Vote counting system, as outlined in option d. above. Such a system would require no change to existing procedures in single-member electorates, would be congruent with other Australian jurisdictions, and would produce fair results overall. It is notable that two other investigations of the Northern Territory Local Government electoral system, by Alistair Heatley and Will Sanders, came to this same conclusion. My expert opinion, in line with these other experts, is to adopt STV for all seats (noting that this will effectively leave the current procedures for any single-member seats
unchanged, as STV in single member seats works exactly the same as the current system).

However, the cost and administrative implications of adopting STV require careful consideration. The main issue for electoral administration is the complex calculations that are required when surplus preferences are distributed from elected candidates under a fractional transfer value, as described in section 5 above. In response to these challenges, the Australian Electoral Commission (AEC) and some state and territory level bodies (such as Tasmanian and ACT Electoral Offices) have adopted computer technology to assist with the process of STV counts.

There are two primary variants of this technology. The first is the use of computer assisted counting, as used at Senate elections by the AEC, in which the preference rankings on each ballot paper are entered into a computer program, which then automatically calculates the required fractional transfers and indeed the end result, a process which has significantly shortened the time needed to conduct a Senate count. The second approach, as used in the ACT, takes this a step further and asks voters to enter their preferences directly onto a touch screen computer. Both approaches enable the final result to be calculated instantly once all preferences have been recorded, which reduces greatly the complexity issues associated with an STV count. However, the use of computer technology introduces new issues such as the need for laptops, understanding of the relevant programs, and of course availability of power supply etc which may an issue for remote-area elections in particular.

In contrast to these options, a single non-transferable vote count is much simpler than the existing system, as there are no preferences to distribute and counting does not require any computer technology. The system is, as described above, effectively a first-past-the-post contest in multi-member electorates, but with voters having only one vote. The Borda Count option sits somewhere between the two, being less complex than STV but more complex than SNTV. It could also utilise computer technology effectively, but the fact that no other Australian jurisdictions currently use this systems means that
relevant programs would not be available "off the shelf", in contrast to the already-available STV counting programs.

Finally, if only minimalist change to existing legislation and procedures is a primary aim, then I would recommend considering some combination of only distributing preferences from excluded candidates, changing from a compulsory to an optional preference marking system, and/or limiting the number of preferences that can be marked – that is, some combination of options a., b. and c. above. However, while simpler in both legal and administrative terms, none of these options will necessarily solve the problems of the current system, or are guaranteed to deliver fair and consistent outcomes. For this reason, my overall recommendation would be for the Northern Territory to adopt the STV system, thus bringing Territory elections into line with other Australian jurisdictions in which multi-member electorates are used.
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Dear John,

With reference to the letter re funding repairs at the Museum site, to Block A:-

Replace door frame pieces as appropriate and fit new locks to both external doors. This is urgent as a person/persons continue to remove fittings from the building- presumably to build their own dwelling.

Major task is to cover the asbestos sheeting with metal sheeting as has been done with the other building- Block B. -

Replace the timber rafters and wall noggins where applicable- whiteant and tree fall damage.

These two jobs will be in tandem and at the outset, as that corner is one of the largest areas to cover

Replace or straighten roof sheeting damaged by fallen tree..

Broken fibro sheeting lying on the ground will be picked up and placed in a asbestos remnants bag already obtained from Mc Mahon Services. Safety precautions will be taken- see end.

Replacement of missing external wall louvres.

Replace external fly wire to window areas.

Repair internal walls. The sooner we can lock the premises the less this will be.

Where wardrobes removed sheeting will be required.

Cleaning of architraves and floors within. Volunteer labour for some if not all of this.

Seal floors.

Paint walls and architraves.
Electrical inspection to lighting, fans and power points; exit signs. There will need to be a full assessment of the electrical supply as the mains box is located on this building. Electrical supply to the other buildings will also need to be available.

The plumbing has been severely compromised by vandals removing copper pipes etc. The capping (as most connections will not be required) supply to sink and bathroom has been undertaken by Michael McIlwee.

Location of external pipes was ascertained by ground radar detection so the main lines are known.

There needs to be a sign erected to identify the building and provide information updates on progress.

The repairs and renovations required have been assessed by an estimator and the requirement to implement the repairs estimate is $35000.

This renovation needs to start now, as the intention is to have the museum open in the early part of 2012 for the centenary celebration.

A Heritage grant has been applied for to get funding for Block B

A Museum Grant has been applied for to develop the exhibitions.

All jobs can happen simultaneously.

With reference to health and safety, it is envisaged that contractors will ensure their required safety clothing and procedures are followed.

With regard to volunteers they will be asked to wear appropriate clothing, gloves etc as required.

Specifically the asbestos pieces will be removed by myself wearing the gear advised by my adviser Kyle Hercus Manager of Mc Mahons. As this material has been lying around and prodded at by various vandals for some years now, I think this is a reasonable solution.

The material will be placed in the bags provided by Mc Mahons and taken to them for disposal.
I trust these points meet your queries,

Jan Hills
BATCHelor MUSEum
DEVELOPMENT association
incorporated

A STRATEGIC PLAN FOR THE FUTURE INTERPRETATION OF THE
BATCHelor MUSEum

March 2011

This Plan was developed with the generous funding assistance of the Northern Territory Government through its Regional Museums Grant Support Program 2010 – 2011.
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SECTION A:
MUSEUM SCOPE AND CONTENT

The Rum Jungle Single Women’s Quarters, built in the early 1950s and located in the town of Batchelor, are a tangible reminder of the urgency and commitment shown by the Australian Government to develop the mining and processing of uranium ore for the supply of uranium oxide to the United States of America and the United Kingdom for Atomic Weapon Development Programs during the 1950s and 1960s.¹

1. INTRODUCTION

In July 2008, the Batchelor Museum Development Association (BMDA) was incorporated under the Northern Territory Associations Act. The purpose of the BMDA is:

- To establish and maintain a museum in Batchelor;
- To promote and educate members of the public regarding the history and diversity of the Batchelor region;
- To collect and present information regarding the history and diversity of the Batchelor region in an educational and interactive manner;
- To affiliate or otherwise associate with such associations, clubs or other organisations deemed to have the same or like objectives;
- To develop and participate in activities which promote interest in the history and diversity of the Batchelor region; and
- To apply for Territory and Commonwealth grants or funding and otherwise undertake fundraising activities in order to establish and maintain a museum in Batchelor.²

¹ Dr Brian Reid, Chairman, Heritage Advisory Council, Proposed Recommendation Section 24 Heritage Conservation Act 1991, Northern Territory Government, January 2011
² Schedule to the Constitution, Part 1, Clause 2 Objects and Purposes, Constitution of Batchelor Museum Development Association Incorporated, Northern Territory, 2008
The BMDA identified an important historical site in the town of Batchelor as a suitable facility to house the proposed Batchelor Museum. The site comprises two historic buildings known as the former **Rum Jungle Mine Single Women’s Quarters**. The buildings are also known colloquially as the “Virgin Villas”. Adjacent to the two blocks is a modern addition that has served a variety of mixed uses and purposes including offices and provided temporary amenities.

The BMDA negotiated during 2009 and 2010 to lease the site from the Northern Territory Government under a Crown Lease arrangement and formed a Committee to oversee the strategic planning and development of the proposed Batchelor Museum.

In May 2010 the BMDA applied to the Northern Territory Government’s Regional Museums Grant Support Program 2010 – 2011 (RMGSP) for funding to assist with the development of the proposed Batchelor Museum. Grant funding was approved but not released to the BMDA until February 2011. This has required a reconsideration of timelines and has impacted on the BMDA’s ability to commence the next stages that are the building blocks to the development of the proposed Batchelor Museum, such as accessing additional grants funding and implementing marketing programs and strategies to secure private sponsorship.

The original RMGSP application outlined the project as follows:

1. Develop a plan for three specific areas unique to Batchelor to be interpreted;

2. Ensure good practice is established from the outset;

3. A professional plan to guide the BMDA to best develop the record and document the history relevant to the site;

4. To develop an educational facility and important tourism attraction for access by Territorians and visitors; and

5. The project is to involve the Batchelor and wider community in the development process.
2. A HISTORY OF BATCHelor

The town of Batchelor in the Northern Territory is well-known today as the entryway to Litchfield National Park. Tourism became an important industry in Batchelor following the declaration of Litchfield as a National Park in 1986.

The town also accommodates an important residential tertiary college, the Batchelor Institute of Indigenous Tertiary Education, catering specifically to Aboriginal students.³

Batchelor was named after the South Australian Labour politician Egerton Lee Batchelor (1865-1911) who became Minister for the Northern Territory in 1911. An experimental farm was established in Batchelor in 1912 during the Gilruth Administration. The industries of agriculture and mining determined the character and pace of Batchelor until World War II when it was transformed into an Allied Air Force base. In 1941, the 1930s airstrip was extended to accommodate the large US B-17 flying fortress aircraft, which operated in the Northern Territory following the attack on Pearl Harbour.

In 1949 significant uranium deposits were identified at Rum Jungle by prospector Jack White, approximately 10km north of the town of Batchelor and this discovery would have substantial impact on the town’s future.

Popular folklore suggests that Rum Jungle gained its name after a disorderly incident in 1871 when a bullock-wagon laden with rum became bogged near jungle in the East Finniss River area. The bullockies resorted to consuming some of the liquor. The night was so memorable (well perhaps for those who did not overindulge excessively) that the place was so-called after their binge.⁴

In 1952, Rum Jungle acquired the honour of being the Northern Territory’s largest construction project. The Australian Government had established a uranium oxide mine and treatment plant which supplied, under contract, uranium oxide concentrate to the joint UK-US Combined Development Agency from 1953 until 1962. Responsibility for the mine rested with the Australian Atomic Energy Commission (now known as the Australian Nuclear Science and Technology Organisation (ANSTO) ). In order to accommodate mining workers and management, the town of Batchelor underwent rapid construction and infrastructure development.

As mining began and developed the town of Batchelor grew correspondingly. By 1971, the mine (1963) and treatment plant had closed.

⁴ Rum Jungle, Place Names Register Extract, Department of Lands and Planning, Northern Territory Government.
Today, Batchelor is renowned for its charm, appealing architecture and tropical garden-scapes and provides service and facility to visitors preparing to explore Litchfield National Park as well as offering important respite for travellers on their way to and from Darwin and beyond.

What is apparent to the casual visitor conceals a complex and fascinating social and economic history of the town and its influence on the Northern Territory and Australia that demands to be revealed and explored in an in-depth and engaging manner and shared with a broad audience.
3. THE LOCATION

The town of Batchelor is located 98 kilometres south of Darwin, to the west of the Stuart Highway.

The Batchelor area has been used for a number of purposes including, farming, agriculture, mining, teamsters and railway gangers camps, and also provided important resources for food gathering and customary activities and practices of the Traditional Owners of the area.

Today, Batchelor is a small residential community, with a major educational facility providing a prime focus. Mining and mixed-purpose farming, including horticulture and animal husbandry continue as important industries in the surrounding area. Tourism is crucial to the town and provides a source of employment and key economic activity. The town also accommodates a range of Government services and facilities.

The town of Batchelor can be accessed from the east, west and south. For those travelling in a northerly or southerly direction along the Stuart Highway, the town can be approached via Batchelor Road, which extends from the Stuart Highway. It is well signed and the road is accessible for most of the year. A small section of Batchelor Road can be covered by water from Coomalie Creek during the wet season. From the south, access is via an alternative and newly bituminised route. From the west, the town can be accessed via Litchfield Park Road. This road is partially sealed with a large proportion being gravel road to the west and north of Litchfield National Park. Litchfield Park Road is accessed from the north via the Cox Peninsula Road. During the majority of the wet season, the road is impassable at the Lower Finnis River Crossing.
Batchelor supports a number of tourist accommodation facilities, including bed and breakfast, resort style accommodation and motel accommodation and is in close proximity to caravan and camping grounds at Litchfield National Park, Adelaide River and Lake Bennett Resort.

The area is managed by the Coomalie Community Government Council.
3.1 History of the Site

The Rum Jungle Single Women’s Quarters comprise two dormitory style accommodation blocks, each with six bedrooms, kitchen and dining areas and ablution facilities. The buildings were constructed in the 1950s to accommodate single women employed at the Rum Jungle uranium mine. A more modern amenities addition is adjacent to the complex.
3.2 Heritage Significance, Status and Statement of Value

There are two complementary buildings located on Lot 00293, Town of Batchelor, known as the “Virgin Villas” or more appropriately, the former Rum Jungle Mine Single Women’s Quarters, Blocks A and B.

At the time of preparing this Plan (March 2011) the Northern Territory Government, through its Minister for Environment and Heritage, was considering a recommendation from the Heritage Advisory Council to declare the former Rum Jungle Mine Single Women’s Quarters, Block B, Lot 00293 Town of Batchelor, a heritage place pursuant to section 26 (1) of the Heritage Conservation Act 1991. Block A was not included in the Heritage Advisory Council’s recommendation for declaration as a heritage place as the degree of building fabric that required replacement compromised the building’s structural integrity and the “quality of its intactness”.

Dr Reid said the former Rum Jungle Mine Single Women’s Quarters Block ‘B’ was built in the early 1950s to suit the climatic conditions of the tropics, including the use of lightweight materials, louvre windows and air circulation through gable and eave mounted vents to cool the quarters.

---

5 Single Womens Quarters, Batchelor, Northern Territory Heritage Register, Department of Natural Resources, Environment, the Arts and Sport, Northern Territory Government.
6 Media Release, Seeking Public Comment on Proposed Heritage Listings, Northern Territory Government, 14 January 2010 (sic) 2011
The following **Statement of Heritage Value** comprises the Heritage Advisory Council’s proposed recommendation to the relevant Minister:

*The Rum Jungle Single Women’s Quarters, built in the early 1950s and located in the town of Batchelor, are a tangible reminder of the urgency and commitment shown by the Australian Government to develop the mining and processing of uranium ore for the supply of uranium oxide to the United States of America and the United Kingdom for Atomic Weapon Development Programs during the 1950s and 1960s.*

*Although not exceptional in their design the dormitory style quarters were built to suit the climatic conditions of the tropics, which included the use of lightweight materials such as fibre cement sheeting, corrugated iron roofing and an extensive use of louvre windows to maximise cross flow ventilation. Air circulation via gable and eave mounted vents aided cooling of quarters.*

The heritage significance and value of the building is not a unique attribute as there exist in Batchelor and the surrounding area a number of buildings and places that have been recognised for their intrinsic heritage value and have been admitted to the Northern Territory Heritage Register. These are St Barbara Catholic Church, Former Rum Jungle Mine Manager’s House, the Former Batchelor Primary School and WWII No. 1 RAAF

---

7 Dr Brian Reid, Chairman, Heritage Advisory Council, Proposed Recommendation Section 24 Heritage Conservation Act 1991, Northern Territory Government, January 2011
Medical Receiving Station. At Appendix 4 is a listing and corresponding Statement of Heritage Value for each of these sites.

The residents of Batchelor share an acute appreciation of the heritage significance and attributes of the town and its surrounds and have been actively involved in maintaining and preserving structures and places. A number of places have also been recommended to the Heritage Advisory Council for admission to the Northern Territory Heritage Register, such as the Rum Jungle Single Persons Quarters and St Francis Anglican Church. However, it was determined that these places were not of outstanding heritage significance and the buildings’ meaning and import were of localised value only.

The town’s places of interest are well signed and interpreted and a number of dedicated information and interpretation panels are located in the centre of the town, adjacent to the Visitor Information Centre. Visitors to Batchelor are encouraged to explore the town and learn about its history in order to appreciate its current atmosphere and character.
4. CONCEPT

The town of Batchelor possesses a relaxing charm and its tropical gardenscapes are of great appeal. It is characterised by well kept residences and buildings of splendid architectural design. It boasts a complex and varied history, of both local and national importance, and the town itself is of a size and scale that enables it to be explored and appreciated on foot.Whilst the Visitor Information Centre serves as an information hub to guide visitor experiences of the town and its surrounds, there is no dedicated facility within the town for visitors to gain a full appreciation of the multifaceted history and makeup of Batchelor.

More importantly, there exists in Batchelor a citizenry who are acutely aware and appreciative of the town’s history and significance and the influence of these factors on Batchelor’s contemporary condition. A central facility for sharing and collating the town’s history would also serve important social, recreational and cross-generational purposes, in addition to contributing to the town’s economy.

A central knowledge repository and interpretation facility would also provide opportunity for the citizenry of Batchelor to engage with the student body of the Batchelor Institute of Indigenous Tertiary Education (BIITE). Involvement could include a range of participatory activities, from primary and secondary research and information gathering, to interpretation and public programs.

Each year, approximately 300,000 visitors travel to Litchfield National Park to explore and enjoy its natural wonders.
Visitors, including locals and tourists, arrive in the main by road and comprise independent travellers, families and tour groups. The duration of a visit is anything from a day trip to an overnight stay of two nights or more. The majority of visitors travel to Litchfield National Park via the Stuart Highway and Batchelor Road, and stop in Batchelor for either a casual or more formal visit. Visitors to Batchelor may stay for an hour or two for refreshment and out of curiosity read interpretative signage, access the Visitor Information Centre or take in local sites, or overnight in the town in one of its many accommodation facilities and complete day trips to the Park.

Hence, the development of a Batchelor Museum would not only serve the social, educational, economic and recreational requisites of the Batchelor community but also service an existing audience and provide visitors with a more meaningful casual, short or longer term stay in the town.
5. CONTENT SCOPE

Whilst the proposed Batchelor Museum will be housed in the heritage significant Former Rum Jungle Mine Single Women’s Quarters buildings, the proposed museum will not be limited to the history of the site, the extant buildings, or the former Rum Jungle Mine.

The thematic and chronological coverage of the proposed Batchelor Museum will be informed by the purposes of the BMDA as articulated in the Association’s Schedule to the Constitution. That is, “to collect and present information regarding the history and diversity of the Batchelor region in an educational and interactive manner”.8 (Author’s emphasis).

5.1 Content Structure

5.1.1 Introduction
This section will provide a welcome and orientation to the proposed Batchelor Museum and provide a historical and contemporary context to the facility, the town and surrounds and its residents.

5.1.2 Aboriginal History and Heritage
This section will provide an important acknowledgement of the Traditional Owners of the area and the meaning, importance and value of the region to traditional peoples. It will provide a comprehensive social and political history of the area’s Traditional Owners, and customs and practice and contemporary nature. It will be a topic that will benefit from the involvement of students and academics from BIITE and the local community.

5.1.3 Batchelor
This section will explore the arrival of non-Indigenous people to the area, examine early activities and provide chronological, political and regional reference points for the development of the area and the town.

5.1.4 1912 : Batchelor Experimental Farm
This section will explore the establishment and performance of the experimental farm under the Gilruth Administration. It will also examine the social, political and cultural influences of the farm on the surrounding population.

5.1.5 The Military Build-up and World War II
This section will provide a broader historical context for the events preceding WWII and will link the town and surrounds with the fortification of Darwin and the development of strategic defences

---

8 Schedule to the Constitution, Part 1, Clause 2 Objects and Purposes, Constitution of Batchelor Museum Development Association Incorporated, Northern Territory, 2008
throughout the Top End during WWII. It will examine the extension of the airstrip and the important role the town fulfilled during this period in accommodating the USAAF 19th Bombardment Group. Surrounding locales such as the No. 1 Medical Receiving Station and anti-aircraft defences will also be featured.

5.1.6 WWII, General Douglas MacArthur and US - Australia relations
This section will recount the unique distinction Batchelor enjoyed on 17 March 1942 when Batchelor Airfield was utilised by General MacArthur for his arrival in Australia from the Philippines. It will document the history of the many Squadrons that utilised Batchelor Airfield as a base during the hostilities. This section will also examine early US – Australia relations, foreshadowing the role Batchelor would play in future US – Australia relations through the UK-US Combined Development Agency.

5.1.7 Discovery of Uranium and the Rum Jungle Mine
This section will document the Australian Government’s objective to locate uranium deposits, prospector Jack White’s discovery, and the development of uranium oxide extraction and treatment. It will also document and analyse Australia’s international relationships through the activities of the Australian Atomic Energy Commission.

5.1.8 Mine Managers and Miners
This section will chronicle the development of the Rum Jungle Mine, profile its parent company and their present-day structure and activities, and provide analytical narrative of the rapid development of the town, its infrastructure, architecture, influences and style, and the impact on social order, protocols and relations.

In 1962 the Rio Tinto Company merged with the Australian firm Consolidated Zinc to form the Rio Tinto – Zinc Corporation (RTZ) and its main subsidiary, Conzinc Riotinto of Australia (CRA). RTZ and CRA were separately managed and operated, with CRA focusing on opportunities within Australia and region.

Energy Resources of Australia Ltd (ASX: ERA) is a subsidiary of the Rio Tinto Group and is the world's third-largest uranium producer, through the Ranger Uranium Mine in the Northern Territory. It also owns the nearby Jabiluka ore body.

5.1.9 Protocol and Tradition
This section will provide an account of ceremonial visits and celebrations (for example the visit by the Duke of Edinburgh), and provide an alternative viewpoint to the social hierarchies and conventions observed by both non-Indigenous and Indigenous residents.
5.1.10 Women Workers
This section will explore the reality of single women workers at the Rum Jungle Mine, and also examine their relationship with the women and families of Batchelor.

5.1.11 Heritage Values and Interpretation and the Architecture of Batchelor
This section will examine the design, architecture and heritage significance of the buildings and the site.

5.1.12 Closure of the Mine and Treatment Plant
This section will document the closure of the mine and later the treatment plant and analyse the impact on Batchelor’s economy and social order. It will also examine alternative industries, such as tourism.

5.1.13 Contemporary Issues – Rum Jungle Dam
This section will examine the rehabilitation of the Rum Jungle Dam and surrounding waterways, analyse the social, economic and environmental impact of mining on the area and examine additional activities in the region.

This section will be regularly updated to ensure the museum maintains a present-day focus and relevance. It will also be an important educative and interpretive mechanism to remind the visitor that history is constant and created in the present.

This section will also provide an important entrée to the Community – Education Centre.
5.2 Community – Education Centre

The Community – Education Centre will be a discrete space accommodating office and meeting room facilities. It will house the BMDA’s records and archives and also provide a facility for school groups and volunteers to gather, participate in discussions or work on group activities.

South elevation of the adjacent amenities or Common Room.
Source: BAMS, Northern Territory Government.

West elevation of the adjacent amenities or Common Room.
Source: BAMS, Northern Territory Government.
6. COLLECTIONS

The proposed Batchelor Museum is not intended to be an object rich display facility or a collecting organisation. It will seek to stimulate and encourage community history generation, collection and documentation.

Its displays will rely on facsimiles of documentary artefacts, copy photography, graphics, objects that are deemed non-museum quality and replica material.

Research and promotion activities for the proposed Batchelor Museum will unearth photographs, archival materials and artefacts that are important to the preservation and understanding of the history of the Batchelor region.

It is important for all such material to remain in the Northern Territory where it can be accessed and valued by future generations. In the course of museum development, when such materials and items come to light, it is recommended that consideration be given to alerting appropriate collecting agencies to their existence for acquisition consideration. For example, many items will be of relevance to the collections of the Museum and Art Gallery of the Northern Territory, the Darwin Military Museum, the Aviation Heritage Centre, Northern Territory Library, or the Northern Territory Archives to name but a few. Mutually beneficial arrangements may be entered into for material identified by the BMDA such as the provision of facsimiles following the deposit of the original item.

Conversely, the above named agencies, in addition to national and local agencies, are also rich and relevant sources of photographs, archival materials, research and collection materials that will prove invaluable to the BMDA in the research and development of the proposed Batchelor Museum.
7. AUDIENCE AND MARKETING

Total annual visitation figures to the Litchfield National Park are in the order of 300,000 visitors. This provides an impressive potential audience base for the proposed museum.

Annual visitation figures for comparable regional museums and interpretation centres with similar tourism flow patterns, suggest an annual visitation target for the proposed Batchelor Museum of 20,000 to 30,000 pax per annum once the facility is established and operational, as reasonable.

The visitor profile of those likely to be interested in accessing a museum of this nature can be described as the following:

- Local residents and students
- Territorians seeking a day or weekend visit to Batchelor
- Tourism Markets, particularly independent travellers to Litchfield National Park by road
- Organised Tour Groups
- Education Markets
- History and Military history interest groups
- Descendants of mine workers and town residents and defence force personnel deployed in the region

Audiences will approach the museum with varying needs, expectations and interests, including:

- History and heritage enthusiasts seeking authoritative, localised information
- Descendants seeking to make a connection
- Students wishing to actively participate in activities
- Students and admirers of architecture and design seeking inspiration from the period
- Individuals with an interest in environmental issues wanting to understand the history of mining and nuclear energy and Australia’s role
Marketing and promotion of the proposed museum needs to link with regional tourism and promotional bodies (such as Tourism Top End and Travel NT) to maximise all opportunities. Strategic linkages with relevant and comparable facilities both in the region and in Darwin also need to be brokered and fostered to reach interested and like-minded audiences who would be motivated to visit a facility that was thematically closely aligned to their interests.

For example, relationships and cross promotion would need to be developed with the following:

- Museum and Art Gallery of the Northern Territory
- Aviation Heritage Centre
- Darwin Military Museum
- Defence of Darwin Museum (proposed)
- Northern Territory Library
- Northern Territory Archives
- Adelaide River Railway Museum

In addition, the BMDA should engage actively in discussions and planning by the Northern Territory Government regarding its 10 Year Plan for the museum and gallery sector in the Northern Territory. (Refer to Appendix 5 for a copy of the Plan).

Co-operative working relationships also need to be developed with agencies that will prove beneficial to the marketing and promotion of the facility and open pathways to potential sponsorship for growth programs. These organisations include:

Heritage Advisory Council of the Northern Territory
National Trust, Northern Territory
Museums Australia, Northern Territory Branch
Coomalie Community Government Council
Batchelor Institute of Indigenous Tertiary Education
Rio Tinto
Energy Resources of Australia

As well as local businesses, enterprises and community organisations.

A suggested Communications Strategy for the development phase of the proposed Batchelor Museum is located at Appendix 6.
8. HERITAGE, DESIGN AND FUNCTIONAL ISSUES

At the time of preparing this Plan (March 2011) it is unknown if the proposed nomination for heritage listing and admission to the Northern Territory Heritage Register will be successful.

Should the proposed nomination succeed, this will lead to a number of policy and procedural matters that the BMDA will be required to consider and attend to. For example, confirmed heritage status of a building or place will determine future use, maintenance regimes, expansion and development plans, and the type of activities that can be conducted within the buildings themselves and the surrounding grounds.

It will also require the development of a specific Conservation Management Plan.

In the planning, design and development of the proposed Batchelor Museum, the BMDA should develop a series of principles that will inform its activities, regardless of whether the buildings achieve heritage listing status. Suggested principles are outlined below:

- The primary aim of conservation or restoration works should be to preserve the fabric and integrity of the buildings
- Adaptive reuse for a museum facility should ensure all works avoid physical disturbance or compromise the buildings’ particular aesthetic or sense of history
- Modern intrusions and signage should be temporary and sympathetic to the design and heritage value of the buildings
- Introduced trees and weeds should be removed from around the buildings and the grounds and original plantings and amenity preserved as much as possible
- The provision of necessary visitor amenities and facilities should not compromise the integrity of the buildings
SECTION B: MUSEUM DESIGN AND FUNCTIONAL BRIEF

1. INTRODUCTION

The proposed Batchelor Museum will be an important interpretive, educational, recreational and tourism facility for the town of Batchelor. Accommodated in the Former Rum Jungle Single Women's Quarters, the facility will be located near the centre of the town of Batchelor, in close proximity to the Visitor Information Centre, and walking distance from Jack White Park and Bicentenial Park.

2. ACCESS AND ARRIVAL

The museum site is located on the corner of Mardango Crescent and Tarkarri Road, Batchelor. Tarkarri Road is utilised by many visitors as the main thoroughfare through Batchelor to Litchfield National Park. Tarkarri Road is accessed from Batchelor Road, the main access point from the Stuart Highway, and leads travellers to a fuel station and amenities, such as public conveniences, take away food and a convenience store.

View from the western entrance.
Source: BAMS, Northern Territory Government.

Travellers utilising this thoroughfare pass directly in front of the museum site.
An alternative route to Litchfield National Park is for visitors to travel along Batchelor Road and then turn into Rum Jungle Road, avoiding the town centre. This route also connects to the Litchfield Park Road. The Rum Jungle Road route passes directly by Havlik Park, a popular tourist stop and photo opportunity. Havlik Park is located diagonally across Tarkarri Road from the museum site.

Visitors can access the museum site either directly, by arriving in Batchelor through the town centre route or indirectly, via the town centre “by-pass”. The museum site has an advantageous and well placed position, and is clearly visible from either access route.

3 SIGNAGE

The town of Batchelor is well signed and also includes interpretive signage bays in the town centre. To market the museum site and provide clear direction to it, a system of directional signage needs to be installed for visitors travelling from the east and west along Rum Jungle and Batchelor Roads.

Destination signage also needs to be installed along Tarkirri Road and Mardango Crescent as well as heritage interpretive signage.
4 CAR AND BUS PARKING

The museum site will be accessed by independent travellers via private transport (car), 4WD and Campervan/Caravans, and tour and school groups via coach and bus.

The museum site has modest provision for car parking within its boundary and additional car parking is available along Mardango Crescent.

Coach and bus, and campervan or car and caravan parking is available along Tarkirri Road. Whilst these amenities are not on or immediately adjacent to the museum site, they are in close, comfortable walking distance to the museum site, and should not present an impediment to visitation or visitor access.

5 WELCOME AND ORIENTATION

The two buildings to be utilised to accommodate the museum are modest in size. Given the range of thematic and chronological content that is proposed for the museum, the visitor would benefit by accessing general welcome and orientation information outside the building. This could be made available on a sheltered structure within the grounds of the museum site, prior to visitors entering the interpretation spaces of the museum. This will enable the buildings to be utilised as much as possible for the provision of museum content and the necessary visitor amenities, such as toilet facilities.

An external welcome and orientation portal would also serve as an after-hours information and interpretive signage facility for the museum and its buildings and grounds. The portal could also be utilised to acknowledge important sponsors and supporters, and provide additional promotional information for forthcoming activities and events.
6  MUSEUM GALLERIES

The two buildings that are to be utilised for the museum galleries are identical in design, layout and scale.

Both are rectangular in shape with an open plan mixed use kitchen and dining area occupying the first space. A corridor leads from this space along one side of the building, providing access to six small individual bedrooms. The corridor connects to another mixed use space at the end of the building, accommodating a laundry, toilets and shower facilities.

Both buildings will be utilised as the museum space and house museum “galleries”.

Whilst Blocks A and B are identical in design, at the time of preparing this Plan (March 2011) it was proposed to nominate only one structure, Block B, for heritage listing and inclusion in the Northern Territory Heritage Register.
As Block B is deemed to manifest greater heritage attributes, it is proposed to utilise one of the bedrooms in Block B (bedroom 3) to interpret the experience of women in the quarters, and to endeavour to replicate as much as possible, a tableaux of a typical bedroom. Bedroom 3 is largely intact, with wardrobes, basin, shelf and cupboards and lattice and provision to reinstate internal louvres.

The ablution area in Block A will be altered to accommodate modern public facilities, including the provision of disabled access toilet facilities.

The thematic and chronological coverage outlined in the Content Structure above, Section A, Item 5, will be accommodated in the spaces as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block A</th>
<th>SPACE</th>
<th>CONTENT</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kitchen/Dining Area</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>Interpretive panels, photography, possible audio scapes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bedrooms 1 - 6</td>
<td>Aboriginal Heritage and History</td>
<td>Interpretive panels, photography, possible audio scapes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batchelor Experimental Farm</td>
<td>Original louvre windows/walls from the bedrooms have been removed. In order to create a sense of the louvre windows/walls, some cavities may be filled with transparent fabrics or acrylic suspended in openings that will also be utilised as interpretive panels or depict images relevant to the thematic foci of the space. Provision will also be made to enable visitors to contribute comments or provide additional information.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Build-up and WWII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWII, General Douglas MacArthur and US – Australia relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laundry</td>
<td>Interpretive panels and photography. Extant infrastructure will also be interpreted.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ablutions Area</td>
<td>Area will be adapted to include provision of modern public conveniences, including disabled access toilet facilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block B</td>
<td>SPACE</td>
<td>CONTENT</td>
<td>COMMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen/Dining Area</td>
<td>Interpretive panels, photography, possible audio scapes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedrooms 1 - 6</td>
<td>Discovery of Uranium and Rum Jungle Mine, Mine Managers and</td>
<td>Interpretive panels, photography, possible audio scapes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miners Protocol and Tradition</td>
<td>Bedtime 3 will be utilised to create a realistic tableau of a single woman’s bedroom from the 1950s utilising original fixtures and replica additions.</td>
<td>Provision will also be made to enable visitors to contribute comments or provide additional information.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women Workers</td>
<td>Heritage Values and Interpretation and the Architecture of Batchelor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closure of the Mine and Treatment Plant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Laundry | Contemporary Issues | Interpretive panels, photography, reproduction newspaper articles, and reports. |
| Ablutions Area | Contemporary Issues | Interpretive panels, photography and reproduction news articles and invited commentary. This area will change on a semi-regular basis to maintain current and topical content of relevance to the region. |

The physical design of Blocks A and B lend themselves to a linear experience of the museum’s content, with all visitors entering buildings at one end and moving in a direction that leads them through the thematic and chronological narrative, accessing each interpretive gallery or “bedroom” from the corridor. Visitors can of course move back and forth throughout the space and not be limited to a unidirectional experience of the museum.

By combining thematic and chronological narratives and interweaving these through the spaces, the museum will be easily read and make sense to any visitor who chooses to dip into galleries in an ad hoc manner as well as the enthusiast, who will experience the museum by ritually following one gallery to another, and build upon their understanding.
The museum experience will therefore be one the visitor can control, adjusting the pace of physical and intellectual experience of their visit to suit their interest, time availability, or concentration levels.

7 COMMUNITY – EDUCATION CENTRE

The Community – Education Centre will provide an important social interaction opportunity, information exchange space and resource centre.

It could offer visitors access to refreshments (coffee and tea making facilities, and single controlled portion biscuits per gold coin donation).

The Community – Education Centre will also be a vibrant space for visitors, staff, BMDA members and students to exchange information and ideas and share new perspectives.

The space will also operate after hours as a meeting place.

Building layout plan, former Common Room.
Source: BAMS, Northern Territory Government.
8 VISITOR AMENITIES

The museum site will offer internal public amenities, including universal access facilities for wheelchairs, visitors reliant on walkers and individuals with prams or strollers.

9 EXTERNAL SPACES AND GROUNDS

The attractive garden surrounds will also provide an important dimension to the physical experience. The gardens display some heritage plantings (such as crotons) and with the assistance of community and volunteer labour and expertise, could be enhanced to offer visitors a memorable experience of Batchelor. The BMDA have salvaged hand basins from the many bedrooms and are planning to incorporate these in the museum grounds and utilise them as bird baths and bird feeders. Attracting additional birdlife, and sensitive, complementary plantings, will create an external space that will be an enjoyable place for visitors and locals alike, to relax and rest, have a picnic or reflect on what they have learned of the fascinating and complex history of the town of Batchelor and its surrounding region.
NORTHERN TERRITORY OF AUSTRALIA

PROPOSAL TO AMEND NT PLANNING SCHEME
PA2011/0061

The Minister for Lands and Planning has initiated an amendment to the NT Planning Scheme that aims to clarify the measurement of residential building height.

Attached are:

- the Notice of Exhibition under section 17 of the Planning Act;
- extracts from the NT Planning Scheme followed by the corresponding clauses with the proposed changes highlighted.

The exhibition period is from Friday 20 May 2011 to Friday 17 June 2011.

Written submissions about the proposed planning scheme amendment are to be received by 4.00pm on Friday, 17 June 2011 and made to:

Michael Holmes
Senior Planner
Strategic Lands Planning
Department of Lands and Planning
GPO Box 1680
DARWIN NT 0801; or

Email: planning@nt.gov.au

Fax: (08) 8999 7189 or

Hand delivered to:

- Ground Floor, Cavenagh House, 38 Cavenagh Street, Darwin;
- Level 1, Alice Plaza, Todd Mall, Alice Springs;
- Level 1, Government Centre, 5 First Street, Katherine; and
- Regional Office, Leichhardt Street, Tennant Creek.

For more information please telephone 8999 8963.
NORTHERN TERRITORY OF AUSTRALIA

Planning Act

NOTICE OF EXHIBITION OF PROPOSAL
TO AMEND NT PLANNING SCHEME
PA2011/0061

I, GERALD FRANCIS MCCARTHY, the Minister for Lands and Planning give notice under section 17 of the Planning Act (the Act), of the following:

(a) a proposal to amend the NT Planning Scheme, numbered PA2011/0061 as referred to in (e), is to be exhibited under Division 3 of Part 2 of the Act;

(b) the amendment is to be exhibited at the following offices of the Department of Lands and Planning:
   - Ground Floor, Cavenagh House, 38 Cavenagh Street, Darwin;
   - Level 1, Alice Plaza, Todd Mall, Alice Springs;
   - Level 1, Government Centre, 5 First Street, Katherine; and
   - Regional Office, Leichhardt Street, Tennant Creek.

(c) the period of exhibition is for 28 days, commencing upon first newspaper publication of the notice required by section 17(1);

(d) written submissions in respect of this exhibition should be made to:

   Michael Holmes
   Senior Planner
   Strategic Lands Planning
   Department of Lands and Planning
   GPO Box 1680
   DARWIN NT 0801 or

   Fax: (08) 8999 7189 or
   Email: planning@nt.gov.au

(e) the proposed amendment to the NT Planning Scheme aims to clarify the measurement of building height by:
   - defining 'ground level' in the NT Planning Scheme as the ground surface level that exists on a site prior to the commencement of earth or construction works associated with the development of a building;
• clarifying that height is measured above ground level in the zone purpose statements in clauses 5.2, 5.3 and 5.4, and within the general building height controls at clauses 6.1 and 6.2;

• clarifying that a single dwelling is not to contain any part of a room (habitable or otherwise), verandah or balcony seven metres above ground level, without consent (clause 7.1, sub-clause five);

• clarifying that where a room does not have a horizontal ceiling, a normal ceiling envelop of 2.7 metres shall be applied to the subject storey. Anything above the 2.7 metre envelop will be considered air space and should not be inhabited, unless consent is otherwise granted in clause 7.1, sub-clause five;

• clarifying that a topographical survey may be required to determine ground level (clauses 6.1 and 7.1.2); and

• improving the useability of clause 7.1, by separating building height and density requirements.

Dated 20th April 2011.

Gerald Francis McCarthy
Minister for Lands and Planning
Proposed Northern Territory Planning Scheme Amendment - Clarification of Residential Building Height Measurement

The Minister for Planning and Lands is seeking comments on a proposal that will clarify the measurement of building height. Comments can be made during the exhibition period from Friday 20 May 2011 until Friday 17 June 2011.

The Department of Lands and Planning has been informed that sub-clauses three and five of clause 7.1 – Residential Density and Height Limitation are difficult to use as:

- sub-clause three does not clearly define if building height should be measured from ground level of the site before construction or from the floor level of the proposed building; and
- sub-clause five does not clearly articulate that a seven metre height limit applies to habitable room floor space.

This proposal aims to address these matters by:

- defining “ground level” in the Planning Scheme as the ground surface level that exists on a site prior to the commencement of earth or construction works associated with the development of a building;
- clarifying that height is measured above ground level in the zone purpose statements in clauses 5.2, 5.3 and 5.4, and within the general building height controls at clauses 6.1 and 6.2;
- clarifying that a single dwelling is not to contain any part of a room (habitable or otherwise), verandah or balcony 7m above ground level without consent (clause 7.1, sub-clause five);
- clarifying that where a room does not have a horizontal ceiling, a normal ceiling envelop of 2.7m shall be applied to the subject storey. Anything above the 2.7m envelop will be considered air space and should not be inhabited, unless consent is otherwise granted clause 7.1, sub-clause five);
- clarifying that a topographical survey may be required to determine ground level (clauses 6.1 and 7.1.2); and
- improving the useability of Clause 7.1 by separating building height and density requirements.

The following pages include extracts from the NT Planning Scheme followed by the corresponding clauses with proposed changes in red.
Introduction of a new definition of Ground Level to clause 3

A definition of Ground Level has been introduced to clause 3 in order to clarify that building height measurements are taken from the ground surface level.

"ground level" means the ground surface level that exists on a site prior to the commencement of earth or construction works associated with the development of a building;

Clauses 6.1 and 7.1 refer to the measurement of residential building height.
5.2 **ZONE MD – MULTIPLE DWELLING RESIDENTIAL**

1. The primary purpose of Zone MD is to provide for a range of housing options to a maximum height of two **storeys**.
2. The scale, character and architectural style of infill development should be compatible with the streetscape and surrounding development.

5.3 **ZONE MR – MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL**

1. The primary purpose of Zone MR is to provide for a range of housing options to a maximum height of four **storeys**.
2. The availability of future availability of services, size of lots and proximity to major roads, schools and other community facilities should be sufficient to support **multiple dwelling** residential development.
3. The scale, character and architectural style of infill development should be compatible with the streetscape and surrounding development.
5.4 ZONE HR – HIGH DENSITY RESIDENTIAL

1. The primary purpose of Zone HR is to provide high density housing options close to major roads, schools and other community facilities.

2. The availability of services should be sufficient to accommodate high density residential development.

3. Development is generally not expected to exceed eight storeys.
Revised purpose statements for Zone MD (Multiple Dwelling Residential), Zone MR (Medium Density Residential) and Zone HR (High Density Residential)

The purpose statements for Zone MD, MR and HR have been amended to clarify that residential building height is measured above ground level.

5.2 ZONE MD – MULTIPLE DWELLING RESIDENTIAL

1. The primary purpose of Zone MD is to provide for a range of housing options to a maximum height of two storeys above ground level.

2. The scale, character and architectural style of infill development should be compatible with the streetscape and surrounding development.

5.3 ZONE MR – MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL

1. The primary purpose of Zone MR is to provide for a range of housing options to a maximum height of four storeys above ground level.

2. The availability or future availability of services, size of lots and proximity to major roads, schools and other community facilities should be sufficient to support multiple dwelling residential development.

3. The scale, character and architectural style of infill development should be compatible with the streetscape and surrounding development.

Undefined uses are prohibited in this zone. See clause 2.2(3) & (4).

Demountable structures require consent.

Clause 6.14 refers to land subject to inundation.

Clause 7.10.2 refers to caravans.

Clauses 11.1.1 and 11.1.2 refer to subdivision lot size and 11.2 to subdivision standards.

Clause 13.5 refers to the erection of mobile telecommunication structures.
5.4 ZONE HR – HIGH DENSITY RESIDENTIAL

1. The primary purpose of Zone HR is to provide high density housing options close to major roads, schools and other community facilities.

2. The availability of services should be sufficient to accommodate high density residential development.

3. Development is generally not expected to exceed eight storeys above ground level.
Extract of current clauses 6.1 and 6.2

6.1 GENERAL HEIGHT CONTROL

1. The purpose of this clause is to ensure that the height of buildings in a zone is consistent with development provided for by that zone.

2. This clause does not apply within Zones CB or DV or TC or to education establishments within zones CL or CP or, subject to clause 7.1, Zone C.

3. The height of any point of a building is to be measured from ground level vertically below that point and includes the height of a mound specifically provided or made to elevate the building.

4. Unless expressly provided by this Planning Scheme, the height of any part of a building is not to exceed 8.5m above the ground, unless it is:
   (a) a flag pole, aerial or antenna; or
   (b) for the housing of equipment relating to the operation of a lift.

6.2 BUILDING HEIGHTS IN ALICE SPRINGS

1. The purpose of this clause is to maintain the low-rise character of development in Alice Springs.

2. Despite anything to the contrary in this Planning Scheme, the height of a building within the Municipality of Alice Springs is not to exceed the height specified in the table to this clause except for education establishments in Zone CP.

3. The height of any building or structure forming part of an education establishment is not to exceed three storeys or 14m.

4. The height of a building is to be determined as in sub-clause 6.1.

5. The consent authority must not consent to development that is not in accordance with this clause.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE TO CLAUSE 6.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB, C, SC, TC and MR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other zones</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clause 6.2 limits the height of buildings within the Municipality of Alice Springs.

Clause 6.3 controls the height of buildings in central Darwin.

Clause 7.1 controls the height of dwellings in some zones.

The NT Defence (Areas Control) Regulations restrict building height for land in the vicinity of RAAF Base Darwin.
Revisions to clauses 6.1 and 6.2

A note in the margin indicates that a topographical survey may be required to accurately determine the ground level of the site. The term 'ground level' appears in bold denoting that it is now a defined term.

6.1 General Height Control

1. The purpose of this clause is to ensure that the height of buildings in a zone is consistent with development provided for by that zone.

2. This clause does not apply within Zones CB or DV or TC or to education establishments within zones CL or CP or, subject to clause 7.1, Zone C.

3. The height of any point of a residential building is to be measured from ground level vertically below that point and includes the height of a mound specifically provided or made to elevate the building.

4. Unless expressly provided by this Planning Scheme, the height of any part of a building is not to exceed 8.5m above the ground level, unless it is:
   
   (c) a flag pole, aerial or antenna; or
   
   (d) for the housing of equipment relating to the operation of a lift.

6.2 Building Heights in Alice Springs

1. The purpose of this clause is to maintain the low-rise character of development in Alice Springs.

2. Despite anything to the contrary in this Planning Scheme, the height of a building within the Municipality of Alice Springs is not to exceed the height specified in the table to this clause except for education establishments in Zone CP.

3. The height of any building or structure forming part of an education establishment is not to exceed three storeys or 14m above ground level.

4. The height of a building is to be determined as in sub-clause 6.1.

5. The consent authority must not consent to development that is not in accordance with this clause.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE TO CLAUSE 6.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB, C, SC, TC and MR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other zones</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clause 6.2 limits the height of buildings within the Municipality of Alice Springs.

Clause 7.1 controls the height of dwellings in some zones.

A topographical survey may be required to accurately determine ground level.

Clause 7.1 controls the height of dwellings in some zones.

The NT Defence (Areas Control) Regulations restrict building height for land in the vicinity of RAAF Base Darwin.

Clause 6.1 controls building heights generally.

The NT Defence (Areas Control) Regulations restrict building height for land in the vicinity of RAAF Base Darwin.

A topographical survey may be required to accurately determine ground level.

Structures below ground level should consider the Alice Springs Town Basin aquifer.
Extract of current clause 7.0

7.0 RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT PERFORMANCE CRITERIA

7.1 RESIDENTIAL DENSITY AND HEIGHT LIMITATIONS

1. The purpose of this clause is to ensure that residential development is:
   (a) of a density compatible with the existing and planned provision of reticulated services and community facilities which will service the area;
   (b) consistent with land capability; and
   (c) of a height compatible with adjoining or nearby existing development or development reasonably anticipated.

2. The height of any point of a residential building is to be measured from ground level vertically below that point and includes the height of a mound specifically provided or made to elevate the building.

3. The maximum number of dwellings and, subject to clause 6.2, the height of residential buildings that may be constructed on a site are to be determined in accordance with tables A, B, C or D (as the case requires) to this clause.

4. A residential building in Zone MR that:
   (a) abuts land in Zone SD; or
   (b) has frontage to a street with a reservation width not exceeding 18m on the opposite side of which is land in Zone SD;
   (c) is not to exceed a height of 3 storeys above ground level; or
   (d) subject to clause 6.2, in any other circumstance 4 storeys above ground level.

   The consent authority must not consent to a development that is not in accordance with this sub-clause.

5. Single dwellings in Zones SD, MD, CL, CV, RR, RL, FD and T are not to contain any space capable of being occupied in that part of the building that exceeds a height of 7m without consent.
### Table A to Clause 7.1 - Dwelling Density in Certain Zones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Dwelling Density</th>
<th>Maximum Number of Storeys Above Ground Level for Residential Buildings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SD and for a single dwelling in Zones CL, CV and T</td>
<td>1 single dwelling per lot and may include a dependant unit.</td>
<td>2 – to a maximum height of 8.5m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD and for multiple dwellings in Zones CL, T</td>
<td>1 or 2 storeys 300m²</td>
<td>2 – to a maximum height of 8.5m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR</td>
<td>1 per 0.4ha or 1ha in Litchfield Shire</td>
<td>2 – to a maximum height of 8.5m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RL</td>
<td>1 per 2ha</td>
<td>2 – to a maximum height of 8.5m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>1 per 8ha or 40ha in the Alice Springs and Tennant Creek municipalities.</td>
<td>2 – to a maximum height of 8.5m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1 per storey 400m² 2 storeys 1 per 200m² 3 storeys 1 per 133m²</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table B to Clause 7.1 - Dwelling Density in Zone MR Other Than in Alice Springs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Storeys</th>
<th>1 or 2 Bedrooms</th>
<th>3 Bedrooms</th>
<th>4 Bedrooms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>155m²</td>
<td>180m²</td>
<td>215m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>125m²</td>
<td>170m²</td>
<td>210m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>95m²</td>
<td>130m²</td>
<td>180m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (maximum)</td>
<td>85m²</td>
<td>130m²</td>
<td>140m²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clause 11.1.2 allows for provision of higher densities of single dwellings as part of integrated residential developments in Zone SD.

Clause 11.4.5 refers to lot sizes in Zone RR.

Clause 7.1(a) limits building heights in certain circumstances.
### Table C to Clause 7.1 – Dwelling Density in Zones MR and TC in Alice Springs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Storeys</th>
<th>Dwelling Density</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>400m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>200m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (maximum)</td>
<td>133m²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clause 6.2 limits building heights in Alice Springs.

### Table D to Clause 7.1 – Dwelling Density in Zone HR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Storeys</th>
<th>1 or 2 Bedrooms</th>
<th>3 Bedrooms</th>
<th>4 Bedrooms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>125m²</td>
<td>170m²</td>
<td>210m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>95m²</td>
<td>130m²</td>
<td>160m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>85m²</td>
<td>130m²</td>
<td>160m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>80m²</td>
<td>110m²</td>
<td>130m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>75m²</td>
<td>105m²</td>
<td>130m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>75m²</td>
<td>100m²</td>
<td>125m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>70m²</td>
<td>100m²</td>
<td>120m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8+</td>
<td>70m²</td>
<td>95m²</td>
<td>120m²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The consent authority may **consent** to a development application for a building that exceeds 8 **storeys** in height in Zone HR only if it is satisfied that special circumstances justify the giving of **consent**.
Revisions to clause 7.1

Clause 7.1 has been split into a sub-clause for density requirements and a sub-clause for building height. This is aimed at improving the useability and understanding of these requirements. The term ‘ground level’ appears in bold denoting that it is now a defined term.

7.0 Residential Development Performance Criteria

7.1.1 Residential Density Limitations

1. The purpose of this clause is to ensure that residential development is:
   (a) of a density compatible with the existing and planned provision of reticulated services and community facilities which will service the area; and
   (b) consistent with land capability.
2. The maximum number of dwellings that may be constructed on a site are to be determined in accordance with tables A, B, C, D and E (as the case requires) to this clause.

### Table A to Clause 7.1.1 – Dwelling Density in Certain Zones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Dwelling Density</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SD, RR, RL, R and for a single dwelling in CL, CV and T</td>
<td>1 single dwelling per lot and may include a dependant unit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD and for multiple dwellings in CL and T</td>
<td>1 per 300m²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table B to Clause 7.1.1 – Dwelling Density in Zone MR Other than in Alice Springs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Storeys Above Ground Level</th>
<th>1 or 2 Bedrooms</th>
<th>3 Bedrooms</th>
<th>4 Bedrooms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>155m²</td>
<td>180m²</td>
<td>215m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>125m²</td>
<td>170m²</td>
<td>210m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>95m²</td>
<td>130m²</td>
<td>180m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>85m²</td>
<td>130m²</td>
<td>140m²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table C to Clause 7.1.1 – Dwelling Density in Zones MR and TC in Alice Springs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Storeys Above Ground Level</th>
<th>Dwelling Density</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>400m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>200m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>133m²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amendment 122 gazetted 31.03.2010 omits and substitutes Table C to clause 7.1

Clause 6.1 limits the height of buildings generally.

Clause 6.2 limits the height of buildings in Alice Springs.

Clause 11.1.2 allows for provision of higher densities of single dwellings as part of integrated residential developments in Zone SD.

Clause 11.1 refers to minimum lot sizes and other associated requirements.

Clause 7.1(a) limits building height in certain circumstances.

Clause 6.2 limits building height in Alice Springs.
### Table D to Clause 7.1.1 – Dwelling Density in Zone HR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Storeys Above Ground Level</th>
<th>1 or 2 Bedrooms</th>
<th>3 Bedrooms</th>
<th>4 Bedrooms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>125m²</td>
<td>170m²</td>
<td>210m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>95m²</td>
<td>130m²</td>
<td>160m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>85m²</td>
<td>130m²</td>
<td>160m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>80m²</td>
<td>110m²</td>
<td>130m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>75m²</td>
<td>105m²</td>
<td>130m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>75m²</td>
<td>100m²</td>
<td>125m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>70m²</td>
<td>100m²</td>
<td>120m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8+</td>
<td>70m²</td>
<td>95m²</td>
<td>120m²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table E to Clause 7.1.1 – Dwelling Density in Zone C for Residential Buildings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Storeys Above Ground Level for Residential Buildings</th>
<th>Dwelling Density</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 storey</td>
<td>1 per 400m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 storeys</td>
<td>1 per 200m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 storeys</td>
<td>1 per 133m²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clause 7.9 limits residential development at the ground floor level in Zone C.
7.1.2 **Residential Height Limitations**

1. The purpose of this clause is to ensure that residential development is of a height that:
   - (a) is compatible with adjoining or nearby existing development or development reasonably anticipated; and
   - (b) does not unduly overlook adjoining properties.

2. The height of any point of a **residential building** is to be measured from **ground level** vertically below that point and includes the height of a mound specifically provided or made to elevate the building.

3. Subject to clause 6.2, the height of **residential buildings** that may be constructed on a **site** are to be determined in accordance with the table to this clause.

4. A **residential building** in Zone MR that:
   - (a) abuts land in Zone SD; or
   - (b) has frontage to a street with a reservation width not exceeding 18m or the opposite side of which is land in Zone SD;
   - (c) is not to exceed a height of 3 **storeys** above **ground level**; or
   - (d) subject to clause 6.2, in any other circumstance 4 **storeys** above **ground level**.

   The consent authority must not **consent** to a development that is not in accordance with this sub-clause.

5. **Single dwellings** in Zones SD, MD, CL, CV, RR, RL, FD and T are not to contain any part of a room (habitable or otherwise), verandah or balcony 7m above **ground level** without **consent**. Where a room does no: have a horizontal ceiling, a normal ceiling envelop of 2.7m shall be applied to the subject **storey**. Anything above the 2.7m envelop will be considered air space and should not be inhabited, unless **consent** is otherwise granted.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Maximum Number of Storeys Above Ground Level for Residential Buildings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SD and for a <strong>single dwelling</strong> in Zones CL, CV and T</td>
<td>2 – to a maximum height of 8.5m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD and for <strong>multiple dwellings</strong> in Zones CL, T</td>
<td>2 – to a maximum height of 8.5m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR other than in Alice Springs</td>
<td>4 maximum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR and TC in Alice Springs</td>
<td>3 maximum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>8+*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR</td>
<td>2 – to a maximum height of 8.5m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RL</td>
<td>2 – to a maximum height of 8.5m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>2 – to a maximum height of 8.5m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The consent authority may **consent to** a development application for a building that exceeds 8 storeys in height in Zone HR only if it is satisfied that special circumstances justify the giving of **consent**.

Clause 6.2 limits building heights in Alice Springs.

Clause 7.9 limits residential development on the ground floor in Zone C.
Lingalonga Festival Committee  
Post Office  
Batchelor NT 0845  

Coomalie Community Government Council  
141 Cameron Road  
Batchelor NT 0845  

8th June, 2011  

Dear John and Council Members,  

On behalf of the Lingalonga Festival Committee I would like to express our thanks for the continued support the Coomalie Council gives to our annual community festival which will be held on 30th July from 9am to 6pm in 2011.  

Thank you for incorporating the Lingalonga Festival under the CCGC insurance banner for markets and festival day and also applying for the Centenary Grant for $5000 to be used for music, sound and other performances.  

We would like to request Council support with mowing the oval, removal of rubbish to the dump, supply of cleaning products and toilet paper for the public toilets throughout the day. The Festival Committee is aware of the depleted number of Council employees available to clean toilets thru the day and will cover this with committee members. Also power usage for market stalls and removal of the swings to make room for the giant sandpit once again kindly sponsored by HAR Mining. Could the pool and pool toilets be opened throughout the day?  

The Festival would like the use of council trestle tables – we have spoken with Lola and also the REL Week people in regard to this. Can we utilize the Council trailer to pick up a portion of the stage(if needed) and chairs from school the morning of 30th July.  

The Committee requests use of the Community Bus and a driver to transport students involved in the Choir group from Taminmin College or Good Shepherd Lutheran College on the festival day and return in the afternoon.  

We ask the Coomalie Council to consider making a financial contribution to the 2011 Lingalonga festival.  

Thank you. I look forward to your reply,  
Yours sincerely,  

Marilyn Morris  
Festival Director