

**PUBLIC FORUM
QUESTIONS/ANSWERS
9 August 2017**



Questions – Katrina Willis

Proposed Ellerton Drive Extension (EDE) – road and bridge design

1. Can the council confirm that it is reviewing the design of the EDE road and bridge, in particular on the Barracks Flat side of Queanbeyan River?

Response – Community Connections

Council is not reviewing the design of the EDE.

2. Why is this being done?

Response – Community Connections

See question 1.

3. Can the council confirm it is considering removing the off ramp for Barracks Flat residents?

Response – Community Connections

Council is not considering the removal of the off ramp at Barracks Flat Drive.

4. Who proposed this change?

Response – Community Connections

See question 3.

5. How much money would this save?

Response – Community Connections

See question 3.

6. How much money would this save?

Response – Community Connections

See question 3.

7. Will the council be re-exhibiting the road design?

Response – Community Connections

See question 3.

8. Has the council spoken to residents at Barracks Flat about this matter?

Response – Community Connections

See question 3.

Proposed Ellerton Drive Extension – Memorandum of Understanding

9. Has the council signed the memorandum of understanding (MoU) with Roads and Maritime Services (RMS) to appoint RMS to manage the proposed EDE project on behalf of the council?

Response – Community Connections

Yes.

10. If so, when was it signed? Will the council publish a copy of the MoU on its website?

Response – Community Connections

31 July, 2017. Council does not intend to publish a copy of the MOU at this time.

Proposed Ellerton Drive Extension – technical working group meetings

11. Can the council confirm it has no record of the first meeting of the technical working group on the proposed EDE?

Response – Community Connections

Council advised a previous GIPAA request that there was no record. A subsequent GIPAA request has been received and Council is re-examining the hard and soft copy records.

12. Can the council advise the date on which the first meeting of the technical working group was held and who was invited to the meeting?

Response – Community Connections

See question 11

Proposed Ellerton Drive Extension – financing

13. Further to responses to the 26 July Public Forum, what section 94 plans other than the Googong section 94 plan contribute to funding the non-government share of the cost to build the proposed EDE?

Response – Community Connections

- Googong Section 94 Plan (2015)
- Queanbeyan Section 94 Plan (2012)
- South Jerrabomberra Section 94 Plan (yet to be adopted by Council)

Proposed Ellerton Drive Extension – noise mitigation

In responses presented to the 28 June 2017 Public Forum, the council stated it was awaiting advice from a designer before responding to a question about the industry specifications and details of flammability of timber in-fill walls versus Hebel noise walls, the former now being proposed for installation along the section of the proposed EDE running behind Greenleigh

14. Can the council now provide this information?

Response – Community Connections

The Construction of Noise Walls specifications for the project state:

Use suitable weather exposed (as defined in AS 3959) fire-retardant-treated timber. The fire retardant coating product must not only have met with the performance requirements of the AS3837 testing but must also have passed the Accelerated Weathering Test ASTM D 2898 method B and then, after weathering, have been subjected to the AS 3837 testing and met with the fire retardant performance requirements of the same.

- 15. Did the council ascertain the cost of Hebel noise walls and the cost of timber in-fill noise walls? If so, what were the relative costs for installing each type of noise wall along the Greenleigh section of the proposed EDE?**

Response – Community Connections

Actual rates of the noise walls would be commercial in confidence with tenderers and will not be made public. As per the response provided for the 28 June 2017 public forum, Timber infill walls were selected along the section through Greenleigh to blend into the natural landscape of the area.

Googong development focus

- 16. Has the council had discussions with Googong township developers about shifting the focus from developing Googong South to development proceeding north of Googong? If so, please provide details.**

Response – Natural and Built Character

Council has recently held preliminary discussions with the owners of land to the north of Googong Dam Road in respect of progressing development on site. However this is unrelated to the development being undertaken by Googong Township Pty Ltd to the south of Googong Dam which will continue to progressively develop to the south into the future.

- 17. Has the council had discussions with Googong Township P/L about moving the public high school earmarked for Googong township to another location in Queanbeyan? If so, please provide details.**

Response – Natural and Built Character

No.

Queanbeyan CBD redevelopment

- 18. How does the council plan to fund the construction of the new administration building and associated works (underground parking and public open space precinct)?**

Response – Interim General Manager

The estimated \$35m budget would include the construction and fit out of Council's Queanbeyan offices, including basement car parking, the demolition of 257 Crawford St, construction of temporary car parking on the site of the former building and some public domain work. The remaining public domain work, including a public basement carpark, will be funded from the sale of Council-owned properties, or incorporated into a planning agreement. As we are only at the concept phase, it is likely that the price of the development will be adjusted as the design progresses. The project will be funded via a \$35m loan and will be offset by the rent received from the major tenant of the Council building.

- 19. Will the council be borrowing to fund the work? If so, please provide details.**

Response – Interim General Manager

Yes – loan funding will be obtained for this project. A fixed-rate low-interest loan will be sought via NSW Treasury.

20. Will the council publish the business case for this project? If not, why not?

Response – Interim General Manager

A feasibility report was considered by Council in April 2016, followed by the report on the Queanbeyan Heads of Agreement to assist funding. Once costs are firmed up with designs, further report will be presented to Council.

21. When did the council advise the Queanbeyan senior citizens group and QBN FM they would need to vacate the premises to make way for demolition of the administration building? How was the information conveyed?

Response – Community Choice

Council has been in discussions with the senior citizens and Queanbeyan FM over the past few months. This will be followed by formal notice to vacate, which will be undertaken prior to demolition of buildings. Both groups have supported relocation to Letchworth Community Centre.

22. Did the Administrator meet members of the senior citizens group to discuss the matter? If so, when?

Response – Community Choice

Staff from Council's Community Choice portfolio met with members of the senior citizens during July. The Administrator, together with staff, attended the monthly meeting of senior citizens in July.

23. Has the council made arrangements for the meals on wheels group, which uses the senior citizens group's facilities, to move to another building near the CBD? If so, please provide details.

Response – Community Choice

Yes. The meals on wheels group will use the Riverside Football Clubhouse kitchen and facilities.

24. Why is the council moving the senior citizens group to Letchworth community centre rather than finding a building in or near the CBD for the group to use?

Response – Community Choice

As reported to Council in July, no ideal location (within the CBD) is currently available to provide the senior citizens with similar amenities they currently enjoy, as many of the options will either be demolished or needed for office accommodation. The Letchworth Community Centre has been put forward as a site that will provide for their stated requirements, however it is located just outside the CBD area. Opportunities for transport for senior citizens to offer a drop in amenity will be discussed and considered. Council agreed to source a dedicated CBD space, such as the Visitor Information Centre (or similar accommodation suitable for the Senior Citizens Centre) on the completion of the new Council head office redevelopment.

25. How can the senior citizens group continue to offer a 'drop in' service if it is tucked away in Miller St, a cul-de-sac in a suburb?

Response – Community Choice

Given the quiet nature of the area, a drop-off service would still be able to be provided.

Questions – Paul Hubbard

Proposed Memorial Park

I have continuously asked about which parcels of land were selected as potential sites for the new Cemetery and Crematorium. To date you refuse to tell me. I suspect you are not telling me the whole truth. If you did have other parcels of land in your sights:

26. Where were they?

Response – Natural and Built Character

As previously stated, Council negotiated with property owners or managers at Carwoola and Googong/Royalla, however, Council is unable to provide the exact details of the properties as Council does not own them. An overview of selection criteria and sites will be available on the Council website.

27. How did you short list them?

Response – Natural and Built Character

As previously advised, properties were assessed against a selection criteria, including distance from the urban area to be served, availability of land, minimum 35Ha, good road access, vegetation type and outside the Googong dam catchment or high conservation areas.

28. How were they assessed?

Response – Natural and Built Character

Staff conducted initial assessment against the criteria and where appropriate engaged consultant geotechnical engineers.

29. Is there any evidence?

Response – Natural and Built Character

Documents that are not commercial in confidence have been placed on Council's website for public viewing.

You have told me that in 2007 further threatened species were identified on the land previously known as Portion 75 (Bushland Cemetery).

30. Can you give me the evidence of that?

Response – Natural and Built Character

Fauna and Flora Surveys of Portion 75 identified a number of species that were, at the time, considered regionally significant. Periodically species get added to the Threatened Species lists, as do habitats and threatening processes. The list is dynamic and is regularly being updated. In 2007 Council reviewed the Vegetation Management Plan for Portion 75 and resolved to revise the document.

Following on from the question above you go on to say, this was followed by a further tightening of federal legislation protecting Native Vegetation.

31. Can you give me the evidence of that?

Response – Natural and Built Character

Management of Council land is governed in part by the Native Vegetation Act 2003 and its Regulations and the Threatened Species Act 1995 and the associated Regulations. Various changes to Regulations occurred between 2007 to date.

You tell me there is a Native Vegetation Management Plan for Portion 75 (I assume).

32. Can you give me the evidence of that?

Response – Natural and Built Character

The Native Vegetation Plan of Management for Portion 75 was adopted by Council in 2000 and amended in 2003 and again in 2007. In 2009 Council resolved to take no further action in regard to Portion 75 and to seek an alternative Cemetery site.

I refer to my question 2 last fortnight (Public Forum Questions/Answers 26 July 2017) where once again you missed the point.

33. How many other areas zoned E (1-4) have had alterations or amendments to their schedule 1?

Response – Natural and Built Character

Queanbeyan Local Environmental Plan 2012 has a total of 23 items listed in Schedule 1 'Additional Permitted Uses'. Of these 10 items are to provide for additional permitted uses on lands zoned E1, E2, E3 or E4.

You tell us the council will upload Gateway Document to the Department's LEP Tracking system.

34. Have you raised and submitted the Gateway Documentation yet?

Response – Natural and Built Character

No.

35. If not when do you plan to do so?

Response – Natural and Built Character

Council staff are currently preparing the relevant documentation and are likely to forward a planning proposal to the Department of Planning and Environment over the next few weeks.

Amendments to Development Control Plan

Following on from my question 3 last fortnight (Public Forum Questions/Answers 26 July 2017).

36. Does the QPRC Administrator live in Greenleigh?

Response – Interim General Manager

Yes. Council is unable to release the specific address of any staff or elected representatives, including the Administrator.

You tell me it is proposed to remove existing site-specific controls for a number of localities from the Development Control Plan.

37. Can you please point me to any other than the proposed Greenleigh amendments?

Response – Natural and Built Character

In addition to Greenleigh Estate, the draft development control plan when adopted will remove site-specific controls for Cookes Estate, lands above Delmar Crescent, Jerrabomberra Heights, North Terrace, Jerrabomberra Park, Golf Links Estate, Carwoola Heights, North Lochiel Street and Kensington Gardens. This has been done as these areas have now largely been developed. Where necessary, relevant provisions have been retained and moved to more appropriate sections of the draft plan.

Merger funding

I am led to believe that the QPRC was given \$30m as part of the amalgamation deal.

38. Can you please give me a breakdown of how the \$30 million has been spent?

In announcing the merger, the NSW Government provided Queanbeyan-Palerang Regional Council with \$5m to assist with the costs of the merger, including software integration and other merger-related costs as outlined in Council's adopted Transition Plan. The Transition Plan can be viewed via the link below.

https://www.qprc.nsw.gov.au/files/assets/public/plans/transition_plan_2016-2019.pdf

A further \$10m was provided under the Stronger Communities Fund. Of that, \$1m was allocated to local community organisations and not-for-profit groups who were invited to apply for up to \$50,000 in funding. This funding was allocated in October 2017 and the full list can be seen via the link below.

<https://www.strongercouncils.nsw.gov.au/new-councils/queanbeyan-palerang-regional-council/>

The remaining \$9m was allocated to significant infrastructure projects across the Local Government Area. A list of projects was developed by staff based on asset management plans and community input. Shortlisted projects were presented to the community for feedback in February 2017 and the final list of project was approved in March 2017. The full list of projects can be see via the link below.

<https://www.strongercouncils.nsw.gov.au/new-councils/queanbeyan-palerang-regional-council/>

Questions – Peter Marshall

Rules around 'Electoral Matters' and the Caretaker Period

39. At what date will the Administrator cease to be paid by council (ratepayers)?

Response – Interim General Manager

The Administrator is appointed until the first meeting of Council. Council must hold its first meeting within two weeks of the poll being declared.

40. Does the position of Administrator remain a full-time position until that date, and are there expected hours of work or are these hours unregulated?

Response – Interim General Manager

See question 39.

41. Is the Administrator required to take leave, and is that paid or unpaid, when engaging in campaign activities (for example Tuesday 1st August)?

Response – Interim General Manager

No

42. To whom is the Administrator accountable?

Response – Interim General Manager

Administrators are accountable to the NSW Government, via Department of Premier and Cabinet and submit regular reports to the Department of Premier and Cabinet. In recent weeks, this has changed to the Office of Local Government.

43. Who does he request leave from?

Response – Interim General Manager

Administrators advise DPC of planned absences and alert the Interim General Manager for administrative purposes.

44. Who oversees that the Administrator is continuing to perform his Administrator duties?

Response – Interim General Manager

See response to question 42.

45. What steps will QPRC be taking to ensure that the "Electoral Matters" (40 days) and Caretaker Period (28 days) requirements are met, e.g. removing the Administrator's name from all publications, including newspaper columns and advertisements, the superfluous inclusion of the Administrator's name in the footer of all Business Papers and Minutes, etc. I understand that the requirements of Caretaker Period are set down by the NSW Government, but there may be more specific actions QPRC plans to take given that the Administrator is a candidate, and it is not the more usual circumstance of an elected council continuing during Caretaker Period.

Response – Interim General Manager

The caretaker period is no different to the 4 weeks prior to a normal council election. However, Administrators intending to stand for election should not allow their name or image be published in material issued by council, defer making any contentious decisions and avoid officiating at council events for 40 days prior to election.

46. If a member of the public has concerns about any perceived breaches of the "Electoral Matters" and the Caretaker Period, either by council or by the Administrator, to whom should they direct their concerns?

Response – Interim General Manager

The NSW Office of Local Government.