

**PUBLIC FORUM
QUESTIONS/ANSWERS
13 June 2018**



Questions – Paul Hubbard

Queanbeyan cemetery

- 1. Can you please tell me why the recommendations of the Connell Wagner, Native Vegetation Plan of Management for Portion 75 Lanyon Drive were not taken up by council, given that this report identified that 9,600 direct burials could be sequentially accommodated?**

Response – Natural and Built Character

Council was required to manage Portion 75 as a Bushland Cemetery, following an adopted Native Vegetation Management Plan. The NVMP contained areas of buffer between the surrounding residential estate and protected areas of higher conservation value. Plots for burials and ashes internment were then sold within approved areas. A purchaser acquires a legal right of burial, in perpetuity, and the family then owns that site. In 2007, due to further threatened species, Council resolved to amend the area that could be used for a cemetery. This was followed by a further tightening of federal legislation protecting Native Vegetation which resulted in Council resolving in 2009 to seek a new cemetery site. To follow the earlier recommendations would have required removing this bushland and this action was not supported by the council or community.

- 2. If another report superseded the Connell Wagner, Native Vegetation Plan, where is that report?**

Response – Natural and Built Character

No further reports, just that this report did not meet changing environmental constraints.

- 3. Has the Canberra Government been spoken to with regard to a joint Cemetery (perhaps on the land behind the ESA Training site and the Alexander Maconochie Centre)?**

Response – Natural and Built Character

Canberra's future cemetery was considered as a means of relieving pressure on Queanbeyan's Cemetery and has formed part of the cross border discussions. However, Council still has a strategic planning role to ensure cemetery options for Queanbeyan, Jerrabomberra and Googong residents within their local area. There is a strong community will to be buried in their home town and not be buried in another state or territory.

Questions – Katrina Willis

Ellerton Drive Extension – financial costs

Information provided to the public attending community meetings in May 2018 included the following: QPRC plans to spend a further \$45.511 million in financial years 2018-19 and 2019-20.

This is in addition to the sum of \$6.171 million that council spent in 2017-18.

4. Given that the total of these two amounts exceeds the \$36 million loan funding from QPRC to developers, and the council having stated the road would not cost ratepayers anything, can the council explain the proposed funding in future years:
 - What is the purpose of the funding in 2018-19 and 2019-20?
 - Does council expect to receive any reimbursement for this expenditure? If so, please provide details.

Response – Community Connections

The draft Delivery Program incorrectly duplicated expenditure from Council funds. The 2018-19 expenditure has been modified to \$28m, then a further \$8m in 2019-20.

Council allocated \$8.250m in 2017-18. Apart from some minor legal costs, all of this has been covered by the grant provided by the NSW and Federal Governments.

Ellerton Drive Extension – construction impacts on residents

5. Now that council has agreed to meet residents of Taylor Place, Greenleigh about the adverse impacts on them and their homes arising from construction of the Ellerton Drive Extension, how does the council intend to address the concerns of other residents living along the road alignment? Will council be contacting all other residents or will residents be expected to contact the council seeking a response to their concerns?

Response – Community Connections

Similar meetings with other residents along the construction site will be organised in the near future. It is proposed to hold meetings with adjacent residents regularly throughout the year so that they can voice their concerns directly with the WBHO and RMS construction team. The project will also be holding a number of community sessions in the near future. Further information regarding the dates, times and locations will be publicised as they are confirmed.

Neighbours and community members are also reminded that they are able to raise concerns at any time directly with the project team by contact them on 1800 116 337 or emailing them at ellertondrive@wbho.com.au.

As discussed at the community meeting, the process for any construction concerns or claims for damage is to direct enquiries to the project team by phoning 1800 116 337 or emailing ellertondrive@wbho.com.au. It is the responsibility of WBHO's community liaison officer to investigate the concern and involve RMS and QPRC as required. In the case of claims for damages, WBHO refer the claim to RMS for their insurance company to investigate.

6. Is the council planning to implement any further noise attenuation measures? If so, please provide details including when, where and of what type?

Response – Community Connections

All aspects of noise attenuation are outlined within the Review of Environmental Factors (REF), which includes construction noise impacts and safeguards as well as operational noise impacts.

Council has been undertaking, by way of an independent consultant, the scoping of works required for those dwelling identified within the REF as warranting at-home treatments for noise impacts associated with the operation road noise impacts. Operational noise impacts for all properties are assessed in accordance with the EPA's Road Noise Policy.

Ellerton Drive Extension – litigation

7. Can the council confirm it has reached an out-of-court settlement with the owners of Curtis Estate in the matter of their challenge to the sum paid by council to acquire land upon which to build the Ellerton Drive Extension?

Response – Organisational Capability

Yes

8. How much has the settlement cost the council?

Response – Organisational Capability

\$1m

9. How will this sum be paid; is it factored into grant funding for the Ellerton Drive Extension?

Response – Organisational Capability

This was funded from the project budget

10. Are there any other legal actions concerning the Ellerton Drive Extension in train? If so, please provide details.

Response – Organisational Capability

No

CBD Upgrade

11. Has the council sold any CBD properties to Downtown Q P/L? If so, please provide details of which property and the proposed intended future use.

Response – CEO

No

12. Is the council in negotiations with Downtown Q P/L concerning the sale of any CBD properties? If so, please provide details.

Response – CEO

Council executed a Heads of Agreement with DowntownQ PL, which requires nomination and consideration of staging of any proposed redevelopment of the council-owned CBD sites, before a contract for sale may be contemplated. Stage 1 (being part 257 Crawford and 10-16 Rutledge Streets) has been nominated by DQPL, as reported and resolved to progress at Council on 23 May 2018.

QPRC headquarters project

- 13. Further to the proposal advanced by Mayor Tim Overall at the 23 May 2018 meeting of the council to consider building a new administration building on the site of the old administration building, can the council explain why this proposal which was rejected previously is now being reconsidered?**

Response – CEO

As reported to Council on 23 May, a number of other sites (including rebuilding at 257 Crawford St) were considered, before narrowing the potential sites to the Rutledge site or Lowe carpark site. The costs to construct on the Lowe carpark or 257 Crawford sites, are similar, as the demotion of 257 Crawford is proposed in all scenarios. Council asked for a workshop to revisit 257 Crawford, and will be reported again to the 27 June meeting.

- 14. What are the implications for the Heads of Agreement signed by the council and Downtown Q P/L if the council proceeds with the option of rebuilding at 257 Crawford St, in particular for neighbouring properties that the council had earmarked for sale to Downtown Q P/L, the height limits on these properties and the uses of the sites?**

Response – CEO

Should Council choose to build the head office and smart hub at either the Lowe or Crawford sites, rather than acquire a stratum from DQPL at the Rutledge site, then plans for a 4 storey 6000m² building would be prepared in 2018/19. That height is less than the 6 storey proposed initially when a government agency tenancy occupies an additional 2 storeys, and has a lesser impact on redevelopment of the Rutledge site.

Integrated Transport Strategy

- 15. When does council expect to report on community feedback on the draft integrated transport strategy exhibited over the Christmas-New Year period?**

Response – Community Connections

Council expects the draft Integrated Transport Strategy will be placed on exhibition in July 2018.

Questions – Martin Butterfield

QPRC Waste Strategy

I note the call for members of the community to join the Waste Strategy Working Group. I am unable to make the necessary commitment to put my name forward for that role but would like to maintain awareness of the activity of the Working Group.

16. Does QPRC plan to:

- a) announce the names of members of the Group and the businesses or other organisations they represent; and/or
- b) make papers presented to the group available/or for residents information and comment?

Response – Community Connections

- a) Final selection of Working Group members will be undertaken by Council. The names of selected members (and the organisation they represent if appropriate) will be contained in the Council minutes.
- b) It is not expected that all information provided to the Working Group will be made available to the wider community. The Working Group will be part of the process to approve documentation and information that goes to the wider community for comment. It is possible that some commercial-in-confidence information will be provided by third parties. This information would not be shared with the community.

Question – Tim Wimborne

17. My question concern's QPRC's planned water use model for Braidwood and Bungendore included in the Overview of the Draft Revenue Policy. The current two-tier pricing system assists sustainable management of this limited natural resource and the proposed pricing model rewards users for increasing their water use. Can council provide me with their modelling of the effect of the proposed change on demand for water for Braidwood and Bungendore and explain how the new water pricing model will benefit rate payers and our community?

Response – Finance

In March 2011, NSW Office of Water issued a circular to local water utilities for the simplification of water pricing requirements. One of the simplifications to the Best Practice Guidelines was the:

Removal of the requirement for LWUs to adopt an inclining block tariff for their residential customers.

The circular stated

... simplifies LWU water pricing and provides greater flexibility to LWUs by removing the requirement for adopting an inclining block tariff for their residential customers. However, the existing strong pricing signals in NSW will be maintained through the requirement to raise at least 75% of residential revenue from water usage charges for LWUs over 4,000 connected properties. Smaller LWUs will continue to be required to raise at least 50% of such revenue from usage charges.

QPRC will now be fully compliant with the requirements from NSW Office of Water.

In determining the charge per kilolitre, 2.3% indexation was added to the projected income in the 2016-17 financial year for the Braidwood, Bungendore and Captains Flat area. This was then divided by the total consumption across the Bungendore, Braidwood and Captains Flat areas.