



**MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC FORUM
HELD ON 22 JULY 2020**

1. Opening

The Public Forum commenced at 5.33pm.

2. Presentations relating to listed Items on the Council Agenda

The following presenters were heard via Zoom:

Name	Item no	Item description	For/Against/Neutral
Mr Eddie Zarb	9.1	DA.2020.1104 - Erection of a Dwelling - 82 Wickerslack Lane, Googong	Against
Ms Meg Jeffreys	12.2	Proposed Central Carpark in Bungendore	For

3. Petitions

The following petitions were tabled:

Received from	Petition title	Number of signatures	Action
Ms Meg Jeffreys	Deferral of Works for the Proposed Bungendore Car Park	- 138 paper-based - 230 online Plus - 31 local business surveys, 28 requesting a review	The petition has been made available to Councillors and will be forwarded to responsible staff for action.

4. 'Questions on Notice' from the Public

Responses to the following 'Questions on Notice' received up to 15 July 2020 were provided and tabled at the meeting (see attached for responses):

Numbers	Received from	In relation to:
1 - 7	Ms Katrina Willis	Proposed new cemetery for Queanbeyan City
8 - 10	Ms Katrina Willis	Bungendore cemetery
11 - 12	Ms Katrina Willis	CBD land sales
13 - 14	Ms Katrina Willis	Old Cooma Road duplication
15 - 17	Ms Katrina Willis	Cycleways
18	Mr Paul Hubbard	Proposed Memorial Park

5. Presentations by Invitation from the CEO/General Manager

There were no presentations.

6. Closure

As there were no further matters, the Public Forum closed at 5.43pm.



ATTACHMENT TO MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC FORUM HELD ON 22 July 2020

4 'Questions on Notice' from the Public

Responses to the following 'Questions on Notice' received up to *Wednesday 15 July 2020* were provided and tabled at the meeting

Questions submitted by: Katrina Willis

Proposed new cemetery for Queanbeyan City

1. **What other sites did the council consider for the new cemetery proposed for Old Cooma Rd?**

Response – Natural and Built Character

Council has investigated seven properties in the search for a suitable site before acquiring the current preferred site. Two were assessed in Carwoola, two in Queanbeyan and three in Googong area. All searches were within a 10-15km radius of Queanbeyan and avoided the escarpment and Googong Dam catchment.

2. **Why was the land for the proposed cemetery compulsorily acquired?**

Response – Natural and Built Character

The site was not compulsorily acquired. The property was offered for sale and acquired by mutual agreement between Council and the former property owner, following preliminary investigations into its potential suitability.

3. **Who made this decision? When?**

Response – Natural and Built Character

Council resolved to purchase the property at its meeting of 22 February 2017.

4. **What was the sum council paid to acquire the land?**

Response – Natural and Built Character

The cost of the land was \$2.3 million.

5. **Is the council still repaying a NSW government loan to cover this amount? If so, when will the loan be repaid and what is the total cost of the acquisition including the loan repayments?**

Response – Natural and Built Character

Yes, Council borrowed the total amount from NSW Treasury Corporation, and is paying interest of 3.49% on the 20 year loan. At the end of the loan period in 2039, Council will have repaid a total \$3.12 million principal and interest. The purchase and development costs associated with the new memorial park will be recouped over time through the sale of plots. Should the memorial park not proceed, it is anticipated the cost of purchase will be recouped by the subsequent sale or alternative development of the site.

6. Prior to the decision to purchase the land, what sites had council assessed for a cemetery?

Response – Natural and Built Character

As stated above, Council has investigated seven properties in the search for a suitable site before acquiring the current preferred site. Two were assessed in Carwoola, two in Queanbeyan and three in the Googong area.

7. How many burial sites is the chosen site estimated to accommodate and what is the site's expected lifespan?

Response – Natural and Built Character

It is proposed to accommodate between 10,000 and 15,000 interments over a 50-80 year period. There is potential for this to extend out to 100 years, subject to community acceptance for fixed term interments.

Bungendore cemetery

8. What is the estimated lifespan of the Bungendore cemetery?

Response – Natural and Built Character

At current interment rates and allowing for medium growth, Bungendore has adequate space for a further 20 years' service life. While it will be necessary to plan for future cemetery needs at Bungendore, it is not high risk at this stage.

9. What investigations has the council undertaken into potential sites for a new Bungendore cemetery?

Response – Natural and Built Character

Only high level preliminary review and assessment of existing capacity. See above.

10. Did the council consider a site suitable to service both the Bungendore and Queanbeyan City communities?

Response – Natural and Built Character

Combining cemeteries is difficult as the ideal location for a cemetery is within close proximity to the community it services. Allowing for future urban growth, a search area within 10-15km allows for future growth without being too far for a funeral convoy or for family to visit. The area between Queanbeyan and Bungendore is not within NSW, it is the ACT. To be on Queanbeyan side is too far for Bungendore residents and the Bungendore side is too far for Queanbeyan residents. People commonly seek to be buried within or close to their own community, not in adjoining states or townships. The location currently being assessed at Googong is close to the Queanbeyan, Jerrabomberra and Googong communities it is designed to service.

CBD land sales

11. Why did the council decide on 18 December 2019 to not progress the heads of agreement for the sale of certain properties for re-development?

Response – Chief Executive

The proponents had not delivered elements of the agreement in accord with the milestones.

12. Will the council now publicly release the heads of agreement?

Response – Chief Executive

No, as it contains commercially sensitive material. The agreement is constructed in the terms of the Unsolicited Proposals Guide published on Council's website.

Old Cooma Rd duplication

- 13. Did the Googong township developers decline to fund the cost of duplicating Old Cooma Rd from the Googong township entry to the intersection with Edwin Land Parkway, as per the relevant voluntary planning agreement/local planning agreement?**

Response –Community Connections

No.

- 14. Did the council subsequently approach the Member for Monaro to seek NSW government funding to cover the cost of duplicating the road?**

Response –Community Connections

No.

Cycleways

- 15. How many kilometres of cycleways has the council installed over the 12 months to 30 June 2020 in: Queanbeyan, Jerrabomberra, Googong, Bungendore and Braidwood?**

Response –Community Connections

Shared path:

- Ellerton Drive Extension – 5.3km
- Old Cooma Road – 4.3km
- River path (Barracks Flat and Queanbeyan CBD) – 1.2km and 0.7km

On-road cycle path:

- Ellerton Drive Extension – 10.6km
- Old Cooma Road – 8.6km
- Googong township – 1.5km

- 16. How many kilometres of cycleways does the council plan to install during the 2020-21 financial year in: Queanbeyan, Jerrabomberra, Googong, Bungendore and Braidwood?**

Response –Community Connections

Shared path:

- Environa Drive – 4.8km
- Bungendore Roundabout– approx. 120m
- Braidwood – 400m

On-road cycle path:

- Environa Drive – 7km

- 17. When did the council last consult the cycling community in the QPRC local government area about improvements to cycleways?**

Response –Community Connections

Council reviewed the Cycle Plan in 2019 when it adopted the Integrated Transport Strategy (ITS). Consultation on cycling infrastructure occurred as part of the ITS.

Question submitted by: Paul Hubbard

Proposed Memorial Park

18. Has the QPRC asked the NSW Parks and Wildlife about a portion of 2G Hoover Road, DP828275 as a possible cemetery site??

Response – Natural and Built Character

No, Council had previously assessed the site on Lanyon Dr back in 1992 and held a public inquiry. At that time Commissioner Schultheis recommended the project not proceed until further environmental assessment was conducted and an alternative site considered. In 1993 the environmental and geotechnical assessments were completed and the number of species found onsite, and the habitat present, is why the site is today managed by NPWS.