

**PUBLIC FORUM
QUESTIONS/ANSWERS
11 October 2017**



Questions – Sandra Young

- 1. The Operational Plan Summary Overview brochure was difficult to read, can this be addressed by Council? (Perhaps a larger pamphlet with larger font size and black type only in the future for these brochures)**

Response – Community Choice

Staff will take the colouring and font size into consideration when developing next year's Overview. This document is available on our website for download.

- 2. The Operational Plan Summary Overview states that expenditure for the Ellerton Drive Extension is \$8.25m, yet \$36m in loan funding is required. Can you explain this discrepancy? (Perhaps one is the estimate for all the proposed road expenditure and the other the proposed expenditure for only the Ellerton Drive Extension)**

Response - Community Choice

The figures contained in the Overview relating to the Ellerton Drive Extension (EDE) and Queanbeyan Council Head Office were related to the expected expenditure in the 2017-18 financial year. The Operational Plan stated that the Council's component of EDE expenditure is expected to be \$8.25m (as the initial construction costs are borne by federal and state grants); while the Queanbeyan head office was expected to cost \$35m, with \$25m of that to be expended during 2017-18. The total approved project cost and timeline information is available on the website at <https://www.qprc.nsw.gov.au/Major-Works-Projects/Queanbeyan-Head-Office-and-Smart-Hub>

- 3. The cost of the Queanbeyan headquarters has increased from \$25m in the Operational Plan Summary Overview to \$57.4m with the smart hub, extra carparking etc., can you explain the increase and that this cost will not further increase in the future if this proposal is accepted?**

Response – Community Choice

At the time of the adoption of the Operational Plan, Council had allocated \$25m for the head office, however a change of the scope of the project to include an office tenancy, basement carparking, smart hub and new public domain has increased the budget required for this project.

This has taken the building to six stories, with two allocated to a major tenant and three to Council offices, Council Chambers and meeting rooms, while one storey is dedicated to the smart hub.

Council is now intending to borrow \$27.7m for the building and a further \$11.3m for the carparking and public domain (total \$39m). The remainder of the development would be

funded via contributions from the Queanbeyan cash reserves (including \$11.3m from water and sewer) and other sources as shown in the table below. The estimates are based on independent quantity surveyor assessment for the size of building and scope of public works.

Description	Budget 2017-18 \$,000	Source of funds			
		Grants & Contributions \$,000	Loans & Leases \$,000	Asset Sales \$,000	Reserves \$,000
Queanbeyan Head Office and Smart Hub - building construction and professional and application fees	41,000	0	27,700	0	13,300
Basement carparking and public domain works - Queanbeyan Head Office and Smart Hub	16,400	2,100	11,300	3,000	0

In line with the Local Government Act 1993, Council is required to publicly exhibit any significant changes it proposes to make to its adopted Operational Plan. Comments on the proposed amendment to the Operational Plan 2017-18 will be accepted from 29 September 2017 until 27 October 2017 and can be lodged via yourvoice.qprc.nsw.gov.au, email to council@qprc.nsw.gov.au, mail to PO Box 90, Queanbeyan NSW or delivered to any Council office.

4. **How confident is Council that it will be able to obtain a loan at 4% over 20 years and what are the expected total repayments, including interest?**

Response – Community Choice

As a Fit for the Future Council, QPRC has access to borrowings from the NSW Treasury Corporation which offers rates of around 4% over a 20-year period. Loan repayments, including interest, are expected to be \$2.55m per year, with that to be offset by the rent paid by the major tenant.

5. **The Interim General Manager stated at the 27 September Council meeting, that by making contributions to the buildings, the water and sewer funds would be part owners. Would not ratepayers, via QPRC administration, own these assets, with council as custodians of our assets and not water and sewage?**

Response – Community Choice

Council's general, water and sewer administrative staff will occupy the new building, therefore it is acceptable for the water and sewer funds to contribute to the cost of the building. The water and sewer funds currently have a combined \$41m in reserve. The \$11.3m contribution will not be required for another two years, during which those reserves balances are naturally expected to increase.

6. **Why does the old Queanbeyan Administration building needed to be demolished?**

Response – Community Connections

The former administration building has been unoccupied for nearly two years, largely due to the significant cost required to replace the heating and cooling system. Refurbishment options were explored, but the site was deemed to have limited scope to increase the height of the building and difficult to extend the footprint. The report to the 27 September Council meeting stated:

An option to re-site the office in the same Lowe carpark, having regard to the 2015 Carparking Strategy and 2017 QCBD Transformation Strategy, was explored following:

- discussions with the major tenant regarding their accommodation requirements
- examination of site restrictions (eg underground mains) at 257 Crawford St
- assessment of potential impacts of a sizeable building on that site on the mixed-use development prospects on the Rutledge frontage properties (ie solar access and encroaching its proposed green plaza); and subsequent impact on potential sale price

Relocating the building site to 50 Lowe Street was assessed as optimal to meet the tenant requirements; provide a discreet street frontage for the tenant; avoid the underground main; minimise delays to construction brought about by early demolition and excavation of 257 Crawford and relocations of Telstra and Essential Energy plant; provide suitable carparking; and open up the prospect of a substantial public domain capable of connecting Queanbeyan's green corridors as contemplated in the QCBD Transformation Strategy

By way of comparison, refurbishment and extension of the former office at 257 Crawford Street for the chambers and occupation by staff offices only with equivalent floor area, excluding carparking, is estimated at \$3300/m², requiring borrowings of \$20m with annual loan payments of \$1.6m.

7. **With strong foundations to allow future floors to be added to the old Queanbeyan Administrative building, why this option was not considered and/or why it was not possible?**

Response – Community Connections

See question 6

8. **If this old administrative building had to be demolished, why a replacement building could not be then built on the original footprints of this old administrative building?**

Response – Community Connections

See question 6

9. **Why has the new building seemingly been radically changed from the original proposed building (increased scope on site within Lowe St carpark) and what study was conducted that would try to prevent any adverse short and long term consequences for local business, such as Gibbs Real Estate, Walsh's Hotel etc.?**

Response – Community Connections

The scope of the project has expanded to provide for a smart hub, basement carparking and major tenancy and that concept design formed the basis of community consultation in July/August. An impact assessment will be undertaken during the development application process as required under planning legislation..

10. **With the QPRC region greatly expanding and the geographical regional centre of QPRC no longer Queanbeyan, why a Bungendore Council Administrative Building could not now be used as the main QPRC Administrative Building, with a smaller Queanbeyan Administrative Building, even if some minor**

refurbishments may be need for the Bungendore Council site to become the main QPRC administrative site.

Response – Community Connections

That option was considered. The Bungendore Office is almost at capacity with over 50 staff currently located within the building. While it is capable of expansion, it is unlikely to be able to accommodate the approximate 200 Queanbeyan-based staff on that site and allow for growth, with the restrictions of the railway nearby. Queanbeyan-based staff are currently housed in 11 buildings and cottages within the Queanbeyan CBD. While Bungendore is close to the geographical centre of the new Local Government Area (LGA), around 70% of the LGA population lives in Queanbeyan and nearby suburbs.

11. Why the Queanbeyan Bicentennial Hall could not then be sometimes used for perhaps any larger council meetings that may be needed in Queanbeyan?

Response – Community Choice

This has occurred in the past for Council meetings relating to the Ellerton Drive Extension and South Tralee development for example.

12. With rapidly escalating costs, why does not the QPRC council ask for other quotes for this Queanbeyan Headquarters costly building?

Response – Community Choice

To date, Council has not called for quotes or tenders for the construction of the Queanbeyan Head Office and Smart Hub. The \$39m estimate for the building has been provided by a quantity surveyor. As resolved at the 27 September Council meeting, the Interim General Manager will not call for tenders until a lease agreement is executed. Tenders will be assessed on a number of criteria, including cost.

13. What was the total costing for the architectural consultations for this proposed building?

Response – Community Choice

An open tender process was undertaken in earlier 2017 and the contract awarded to Cox Architecture was valued at \$700,000 for a building concept design and plans for the Lowe St carpark.

14. What happens to the old trees in the present site of council building proposal? Should not our old trees, especially in the main 2 roads around council owned buildings, in the Queanbeyan CBD be themselves heritage listed, if this has not already been proposed?

Response – Community Connections

The old trees along Crawford and Rutledge Streets are not proposed for removal. This will be further explored in the development application process.

15. What happens to a few buildings in the future, such as the old fire station and cottages, as some of these buildings seem to be presently heritage listed, so if sold, should not be then able to be demolished and redeveloped, under the present heritage listing restraints?

Response – Community Choice

The old Fire Station and Dutton's Cottage (263 Crawford St) are heritage listed and would not be demolished. Council would look to repurpose these for use as cafes or art galleries for example.

- 16. Why public car spaces that were previously donated by some local businesses for the Q car park, can now be incorporated into a council building, where they will no longer be available for 24 hour public car parking, with many probably assigned to either, council and/or tenant parking, and these car parks would then be unavailable to the public outside council hours?**

Response – Community Connections

Carparking was one of the key considerations taken into account during the development of this proposal. Public carparking will be provided in a publicly-accessible underground carpark and also via on-street carparking on the new road that will be established linking the green civic plaza to Crawford St. Two levels of basement carparking will be provided underneath the building for the major tenant and Council staff. Council staff and other employees already occupy these CBD carparks. In total, there will be more carparking than is currently available. Council is also looking at the prospect of building a multi-storey carpark within the Morisset St carpark (behind Centrelink).

- 17. What is the predicted deficit of QPRC over the coming years?**

Response - Finance

While a small surplus is forecast in 2017-18, Council is yet to prepare its 2018-2021 Delivery Program and associated Resourcing Strategy following the Council reviews of services and assets. The financial plan prepared in advance of the election proposed a number of significant capital projects and showed nett borrowings or use of reserves each year to achieve the positive operating result required of NSW councils.

- 18. Why public tender was not used for the proposed redevelopment for the Queanbeyan council administrative building?**

Response – Community Choice

An open tender was called for the concept design. This was awarded to Cox Architecture in April 2017. In regards to the final design and construction of the building, Council will be calling for tenders for design and construction from suitably qualified companies.

- 19. Why an unsolicited proposal by a consortium of seemingly one real estate/building/development group was so quickly accepted by council, without seemingly any ratepayer feedback, or other consortium groups being allowed to also tender for this large proposed expenditure of ratepayer money.**

Response – Interim General Manager

Following the endorsement of the CBD Property Feasibility Study in April 2016, Council resolved to authorise the General Manager to negotiate unsolicited and joint venture proposals for some of its CBD sites, for further report and endorsement of Council.

On 24 August 2016, Council adopted the QPRC Unsolicited Proposals Guidelines, based on NSW Government documents, which outlined the procedure for the submissions and assessment of unsolicited bids.

An unsolicited bid was presented to the General Manager in late 2016 which was assessed in line with the adopted guidelines.

The unsolicited bid was presented to Council in November 2016 where it was resolved to enter into a heads of agreement with the proponent.

Council has not contracted to the sale of any buildings at this stage. Council has received an unsolicited bid from Downtown Q for a proposed development on property that Council owns. Council has requested Downtown Q provide a master plan and information on staging of this development.

Once the plans for the Queanbeyan Head Office and Smart Hub are at DA stage, negotiations for the sale of some of the CBD sites ultimately vacated by the occupation of the new head office will commence. These negotiations will be in line with the terms of the heads of agreement and the resolution of Council to consider the sale and redevelopment on a staged and site basis. Subdivision of the current lots to accommodate a potential sale is required. The sale/s are based on independent valuations on current and potential redeveloped use, to enable negotiation on cash or public works in kind, the results of which are reported to Council for determination.

- 20. Why one seemingly independent real estate valuation of Queanbeyan owned properties can be used, rather than the use of several different real estate valuation type quotes and who would be providing this independent valuation of valuable Queanbeyan council owned assets?**

Response – Organisational Capability

In line with legal and ICAC advice, and in accord with the heads of agreement, independent market-based valuations are acceptable. Valuations were originally provided late in 2016 for several CBD sites. The valuation for the Rutledge St properties provided by HillPDA was reported to Council in September 2017.

- 21. Is it legal for ratepayer funds, that were collected and initially allocated for water and sewage, to be later transferred into helping to pay for a proposed new administrative council building and how would this fund transfer affect future proposed water and sewage works in the QPRC, as proposed new developments, which would occur with the Ellerton Drive Extension would also incur additional ratepayer costs of supplying water, sewage, footpaths etc. for these proposed new housing developments?**

Response – Community Choice

Council's water and sewer functions will be users of the new building and therefore are eligible to make a contribution towards the project. Construction of a new Sewage Treatment Plant (STP) is expected to be funded by a mix of loans, reserves and Government grants. The \$11.3m contribution to this project will not impact on the ability to complete the STP.

- 22. What would the proposed increase in rates be, after the 2020 freeze on council rate increases is lifted?**

Response - Finance

Council's Resourcing Strategy, which is yet to be adopted, forecasts a 1% increase on rates above the NSW rate peg, which is set by the Independent Pricing and Regulatory Tribunal. Council is yet to formally make a decision on this matter and will consider a new financial plan following its reviews of service and asset standards with the Delivery Program next year.

23. Can you explain how the two members of the Determination Panel for the Ellerton Drive Extension that was not from QPRC, were adequately informed of the project prior to the Determination Meeting?

Response – Community Connections

Following the appointment of the Determination Panel (including two Administrators from other councils), detailed information was provided to the Determination Panel. This information included site tours and presentations on the:

- Project history
- Review of Environmental Factors
- Species Impact Statement and Addendum
- Submissions Report

The Determination Panel was also provided with copies of relevant documents for their information, including the Determination Report, Review of Environmental Factors, Species Impact Statement and Addendum and the Submissions Report.

Questions – Katrina Willis

Proposed Ellerton Drive Extension – termite mound investigations

24. Has the council now received a report it commissioned on the investigation of viability of termite mounds not crushed or subsequently re-generating in the road alignment of the proposed Ellerton Drive Extension?

Response – Community Connections

The report is yet to be finalised, however the core outcomes have been discussed with the NSW Office of Environment and Heritage and incorporated into management strategies.

25. Will the council publish the report? If not, why not?

Response – Community Connections

As stated in the public forum in 26 July 2017, the document when finalised will be available upon request.

Proposed Ellerton Drive Extension – Design changes

26. Can the council confirm that several substantial changes have been made to the design features of the proposed Ellerton Drive Extension since the design was exhibited for public comment, in particular:
- removal of the median strip
 - removal of all lighting
 - removal of the junction with the proposed Jumping Creek Estate housing development

Response – Community Connections

Since the preliminary design was exhibited with the REF, the following changes to design were made:

- Median strip – The median strip in some locations was removed.
- Lighting – The only lighting work that remains in the project is along the existing Ellerton Drive, at the connection road near 74 Barracks Flat Road and near the intersection with Old Cooma Road.
- Jumping Creek Estate junction – This junction has been removed completely from the EDE project.

27. Where any other changes made to the design of the road? If so, please provide details.

Response – Community Connections

In addition to the changes in question 26, the following changes were also made to the design:

- Noise wall locations – noise walls along the existing Ellerton Drive were extended slightly in some locations, noise walls south of the River were relocated from the property boundary to the roadside and new noise walls were included at the rear of some Severne Street properties, near the end of Lonergan Drive and on the south east side of the bridge.
- Vertical and Horizontal alignment – shifted in some locations.
- Erosion and Sediment Control – permanent elements were added.
- Shared path – connections to some neighbourhoods were added.
- Northern Bridge Abutment – a gated maintenance access track was added.

- Screen planting – was added in some locations.
- Emergency Laybys – 3 bays were added along the alignment.

28. Who decided to make these changes?

Response – Community Connections

The project team.

29. When were these changes made?

Response – Community Connections

As the detailed design progressed.

30. Why were these changes made?

Response – Community Connections

These changes were made for various reasons including addressing community feedback, reducing the footprint, reducing cost, addressing agency comments and in the case of Jumping Creek Estate, no agreement being reached with the developer in regards to location of access or covering the costs for the intersection work.

31. What is the estimated cost saving of these design changes?

Response – Community Connections

Some changes resulted in cost savings and other items resulted in additional cost. The cost estimate for the end design fits the project budget of \$86 million.

32. Was any safety assessment undertaken before the changes were made? If so, please provide details.

Response – Community Connections

A road safety audit was undertaken by a team independent of the project before the design was finalised.

33. Did the council advise the public of these changes by way of a statement on its website, in its bulletin distributed to each household and/or to local media outlets? If so, please provide details.

Response – Community Connections

Some of these design changes were described in the SIS Addendum and was advertised on the website, Facebook page and local media during the SIS Addendum exhibition period.

In addition, a noise mitigation update letter was sent in April 2016 to adjacent property owners to advise the proposed noise mitigation measures in their area.

As stated in the public forums dated 24 June 2016, 16 December 2015 and 23 March 2016, no further exhibition periods are proposed on the design.

The exhibition of the REF and associated documents and the earlier exhibition of the concept plan in 2013, provided the community the opportunity to comment on the design. Following the public consultation periods and in consideration of feedback received and analysis, elements of the design were refined.

A set of 'for public information drawings' is provided on Council's website illustrating what works are included in the construction contract which has been awarded to WBHO Infrastructure's.

34. As the junction to the proposed Jumping Creek Estate housing development has been removed from the road design how does the council anticipate vehicular traffic will access the Jumping Creek Estate during development, if development is approved?

Response – Community Connections

If development of Jumping Creek Estate is approved, the developers will need to provide appropriate traffic management arrangements.

35. How will residents of the proposed Jumping Creek Estate housing development access the proposed Ellerton Drive Extension?

Response – Community Connections

As with other developments, the responsibility of providing suitable access into and out of the development is the responsibility of the developer. The design of the access, including location, will need to form part of the development application for assessment.

Proposed Ellerton Drive Extension – Contract

36. When did RMS advise the council of its preferred contractor to build the proposed Ellerton Drive Extension?

Response – Community Connections

Two council staff formed part of the RMS Tender Assessment Panel and were aware of the preferred contractor as the Panel made their recommendations. Senior management were advised after the Tender Assessment Report was signed off by RMS.

37. Who did RMS advise?

Response – Community Connections

See question 36.

38. Has the council signed a contract with the preferred contractor to build the proposed Ellerton Drive Extension?

Response – Community Connections

Council did not sign the construction contract for Ellerton Drive Extension as it is not the Principal. Roads and Maritime Services is the Principal under the contract and will manage the contract and construction phase.

39. If so, who signed the contract?

Response – Community Connections

See question 38.

40. When did they sign the contract?

Response – Community Connections

See question 38. Roads and Maritime Services issued the contractor a letter of award on 1 September 2017.

Proposed Ellerton Drive Extension – Project Management

Members of the public wrote to the Premier during the council election caretaker period about the stated imminent awarding of a contract to build the proposed Ellerton Drive Extension have received an email from Terry McSweeney of Transport NSW stating that:

“Delivering this project, including pedestrian facilities, is Council’s responsibility. As such, have referred your correspondence to Mr Peter Tegart, council’s General Manager, for consideration.”

The former Administrator, now Mayor, has stated that Roads and Maritime Services is responsible for the project management.

41. Who is responsible for delivering the proposed Ellerton Drive Extension?

Response – Community Connections

The Ellerton Drive Extension is being jointly delivered jointly by QPRC and Roads and Maritime Services. As detailed in question 38, Roads and Maritime Services is managing the construction contract.

42. Will council now release to the public the Memorandum of Understanding it signed with the RMS on 31 July 2017? If not, why not?

Response – Community Connections

Council is not releasing the MOU at this time.

Proposed Ellerton Drive Extension – biodiversity offset management plan (EPBC Act)

43. Has the council received approval from the Federal Department of Environment and Energy for its biodiversity offset management plan?

Response – Community Connections

Yes.

44. If approval has been granted, when did this occur?

Response – Community Connections

28 August 2017.

Proposed Ellerton Drive Extension – OEH concurrence conditions

45. Has the Council met all the conditions that the NSW Office of Environment and Heritage attached to its concurrence in 2016? Please provide details.

Response – Community Connections

Council has met all conditions required for construction to commence. Other conditions would form part of the construction work (for example, installation of fencing) or can occur in parallel with the construction work.

46. Has the council purchased land for 'biodiversity offset' to meet requirements of the NSW legislation? If so, please provide details.

Response – Community Connections

Three sites will be used to meet the project's credit requirements to offset Box-Gum Woodland, Dry Forest and Rosenberg's Goanna impacts. The approved offset package includes:

- Land to the east of Wright Park that Council already owned,
- 40A Severne Street which Council has contracted to purchase
- 732A Old Cooma Road where Council will purchase credits from the landowner (ie, landowner will retain ownership and will manage the land).

Proposed Ellerton Drive Extension – Rectification of building damage

47. In the event that road construction and/or operation of the proposed Ellerton Drive Extension damage houses and other building belonging to people living along the alignment of the proposed Ellerton Drive Extension, what is the procedure for building owners to seek rectification of any damage?

Response – Community Connections

Roads and Maritime Services (RMS) and its contractor WBHO Infrastructure Pty Ltd will minimise the effects of construction works on adjacent properties by working within the guidelines of the Environmental Protection Authority (EPA). WBHO Infrastructure will also be conducting Building Condition Inspections of properties within close proximity of the project prior to starting construction works. If a property owner believes that damage has occurred to their property as a result of construction works, the property owner is to submit to the construction team, in writing, details of the claim along with any associated evidence. The construction team will arrange for its insurance broker to inspect the property and assess the claim. The construction team can be contacted via Email – ellertondrive@wbho.com.au or Phone – 1800 116 337.

48. Who will be responsible for rectifying damage to any building along the alignment?

Response – Community Connections

Any rectification of damage would be carried out in accordance with the insurance claim process.

49. Who is the responsible entity for managing this issue?

Response – Community Connections

The construction team in association with the insurance claim process.

50. Will the council advise residents living along the alignment whom they need to contact and when?

Response – Community Connections

Residents within the Queanbeyan area should have received a flyer in the mail which included information on how residents can contact the construction team. Residents close to the project will continue to receive notifications with contact details as the project progresses.

Proposed Ellerton Drive Extension – Compensation for damages

51. Has the council reserved funds to pay compensation to residents and owners of property situated along the alignment of the proposed Ellerton Drive Extension?

Response – Community Connections

QPRC is not responsible for compensation claims regarding construction damage. An insurance policy held by Roads and Maritime Services exists that covers third party property damage, for damage resulting from construction activities for the Ellerton Drive Extension.

52. If so, how much money has council reserved?

Response – Community Connections

See question 51.

Proposed Queanbeyan Administrative building – Solar Power installation

53. Who decided not to include solar power as an integral feature of the QPRC administration building council proposed for the Lowe St car park?

Response – Community Connections

The concept design for the proposed Queanbeyan Administration buildings includes photo voltaic panels.

54. What is the estimated per annum energy use of the proposed QPRC administration building?

Response – Community Connections

One of the largest user of energy is the mechanical plant (air conditioning). The mechanical plant has not been designed yet. While Council's policy established a five-star Green Star rating, the exact implications of the Green Star component is still to be confirmed. It is expected that the annual energy consumption will be less than that of the vacated buildings.

55. What is the projected cost of the annual energy consumption over 20 years, the expected life of a solar power system?

Response – Community Connections

As indicated in the 27 February Council report, energy consumption is expected to be lower, however consumption and energy tariffs are not know 20 years in advance.

56. Is any other feature of the operation of the proposed administration building subject to receipt of a grant? IF so, please provide details.

Response – Community Choice

An application has been made for Commonwealth Smart Cities grant funding for smart lighting, smart parking, Wi-Fi and smart planning for the precinct. The delivery of the project is not subject to a successful application for grant funding

Proposed Queanbeyan Administrative building – Decision to change concept and location

The General Manager told the QPRC meeting on 27 September 2017 that a decision was made not to rebuild at 257 Crawford St (the site of the old administration

building) because the height limit required would have overshadowed the neighbouring site and reduced its market value.

57. Who made this decision?

Response – Community Connections

As reported to Council, an option to re-site the office in the same Lowe carpark, having regard to the 2015 Carparking Strategy and 2017 QCBD Transformation Strategy, was explored following:

- discussions with the major tenant regarding their accommodation requirements
- examination of site restrictions (eg underground mains) at 257 Crawford St
- assessment of potential impacts of a sizeable building on that site on the mixed-use development prospects on the Rutledge frontage properties (ie solar access and encroaching its proposed green plaza); and subsequent impact on potential sale price

Relocating the building site to 50 Lowe Street was assessed as optimal to meet the tenant requirements; provide a discreet street frontage for the tenant; avoid the underground main; minimise delays to construction brought about by early demolition and excavation of 257 Crawford and relocations of Telstra and Essential Energy plant; provide suitable carparking; and open up the prospect of a substantial public domain capable of connecting Queanbeyan's green corridors as contemplated in the QCBD Transformation Strategy. To that end, Cox were to prepare a masterplan for the Lowe precinct – again as suggested by the 2009 CBD Masterplan and 2015 Carparking Strategy.

58. When was this decision made?

Response – Community Connections

May 2017

59. What was the height limit then being considered for a new administration building at 257 Crawford St?

Response – Community Connections

Within the height limits allowed by Queanbeyan Development Control Plan 2012.

60. At the time the decision was made, had the council had any discussions with the proponent of the unsolicited proposal to purchase numerous council properties in the CBD, including the cottages adjacent to the old administration building?

Response – Interim General Manager

An unsolicited bid was presented to the Interim General Manager in late 2016 which was assessed in line with the adopted guidelines.

The unsolicited bid was presented to Council in November 2016 where it was resolved to enter into a heads of agreement with the proponent. The proponent was invited to resubmit its proposal on a staged basis and prepare a masterplan for the sites.

Proposed Queanbeyan Administrative building – tenancy and lease agreement

61. Is the council aware of public statements by the NSW Police Commissioner Michael Fuller that NSW Police do not support moving the Queanbeyan Police

from their current station to the council's proposed new administration building in the Lowe St car park?

Response – Interim General Manager

Council is aware of the public statement. However Council will continue to work with the relevant party to progress the execution of a lease agreement. To this stage, negotiations have been positive and suggest an outcome will be achieved. Council resolved that tenders for the design and construction of the building would not be called until a lease agreement is finalised.

62. What is the implication of this statement on the financial feasibility of the proposed administration building?

Response – Interim General Manager

There is no implication at this stage, based on the quantity surveyor estimates for the building component, the use of borrowings and reserves to fund the construction, and the rental expectations for the tenancy to offset debt servicing.

Queanbeyan River Festival

63. Who decided to cancel the Queanbeyan River Festival?

Response – Community Choice

The River Festival has not been cancelled, and instead has been deferred. Following a review of events held in Queanbeyan, a report is scheduled to be tabled at the 25 October meeting providing more information.

64. When was the decision made?

Response – Community Choice

The decision to defer the event was made at a meeting of key stakeholders in August.

65. Why was the decision made?

Response – Community Choice

Events is an area that must respond to changing needs and remain innovative and fresh to continue to engage and delight the community. A detailed paper with an events strategy to deliver on the goals in the Community Strategic Plan will be brought to Council for consideration.