

**PUBLIC FORUM  
QUESTIONS/ANSWERS  
12 April 2017**



**Questions – Katrina Willis**

**Ellerton Drive Extension – purchase of portions of Curtis Estate**

1. Can the Council confirm that it paid the owners of Curtis Estate \$30,000 as requested by them to acquire land for the proposed EDE?

**Response – Assets and Projects**

No payment has been made to the owners of Curtis Estate for the acquisition of land. The owners have disputed the Valuer General's valuation and the compensation payable will be determined by the Land and Environment Court.

2. How much land did the Council acquire from the owners of Curtis Estate?

**Response – Assets and Projects**

Council is acquiring lots 69-88, 184-197 and lots 225 to 229 in DP 15764. An exact area has not been calculated.

3. Will construction of the proposed EDE provide access to enable housing on other parts of Curtis Estate?

**Response – Assets and Projects**

The Curtis Estate area is currently zoned E2 Environmental Conservation under the Queenbeyan LEP 2012. Development restrictions apply to this zoning.

**Ellerton Drive Extension – documenting current traffic levels**

4. How many trucks on Monaro Street come from Canberra via Canberra Avenue in peak hours and all day?

**Response – Assets and Projects**

Generally 6% of the daily traffic travelling through the Queenbeyan CBD is heavy vehicles. It is not standard practice to capture where the trucks are coming from or going to.

Observations suggest that heavy vehicles travelling between:

- a) Canberra and Bungendore currently use Canberra Avenue and Monaro Street
- b) South Queenbeyan and North/East Canberra currently use Cooma Street and Yass Road
- c) South Queenbeyan and South Canberra/Canberra currently use Edwin Land Parkway
- d) South Queenbeyan and Fyshwick currently use Southbar Road and Lanyon Drive

5. How many vehicles on Monaro Street come from Canberra via Canberra Avenue in peak hours and all day?

### **Response – Assets and Projects**

In November 2016, there were 10,900 vehicles a day travelling across the Queens Bridge heading towards Yass Road. This includes heavy vehicles. It is difficult to determine the final destinations of any vehicle without tracking each individual vehicle.

- 6. How many trucks on Monaro Street go to Canberra via Canberra Avenue in peak hours and all day?**

### **Response – Assets and Projects**

See question 4

- 7. How many vehicles on Monaro Street go to Canberra via Canberra Avenue in peak hours and all day?**

### **Response – Assets and Projects**

In November 2016, there were 11,383 vehicles a day travelling across the Queens Bridge heading towards the CBD. This includes heavy vehicles. It is difficult to determine the final destinations of any vehicle without tracking each individual vehicle.

- 8. How many trucks on Monaro Street come over the Queens Bridge towards Canberra Avenue in peak hours and all day?**

### **Response – Assets and Projects**

See question 4.

- 9. How many of those continue to Canberra? Where do the others go?**

### **Response – Assets and Projects**

See question 4.

- 10. How many vehicles on Monaro Street come over the Queens Bridge towards Yass Road in peak hours and all day?**

### **Response – Assets and Projects**

See question 4.

### **Ellerton Drive Extension – traffic estimates after the proposed EDE is built**

- 11. How many vehicles will the EDE take off Monaro Street?**

### **Response – Assets and Projects**

With the EDE operational and all other intersection improvements completed, the traffic modelling shows a reduction of 2,900 vehicles per day at the Queens Bridge when compared to the road network without the EDE in place by 2031. By 2031, the EDE is expected to be carrying approximately 7,600 vehicles per day.

As mentioned previously, the operation of the EDE is not reliant on intersection upgrades, apart from those mentioned in question 28. The other intersections referred to are required regardless of whether the EDE is built and will contribute to the performance of the overall road network.

**12. How many vehicles will the EDE take off Cooma Street?**

**Response – Assets and Projects**

By 2031 and with all intersection upgrades completed, a reduction of approximately 6,330 vehicles per day is expected at Cooma Street (north of Southbar Rd) when comparing the road network with and without the EDE in place.

**13. How many trucks will the EDE take off Monaro Street?**

**Response – Assets and Projects**

As mentioned previously, it is a requirement of the development consent for the Old Cooma Rd quarry that vehicles travelling to and from the quarry must use the Ellerton Drive Extension and not travel along Cooma St and through the CBD. It is expected that the EDE will be a route of choice with heavy vehicles preferring the traffic arrangements on the road verses those on Canberra Avenue.

**14. How many trucks will the EDE take off Cooma Street?**

**Response – Assets and Projects**

As mentioned previously, it is a requirement of the development consent for the Old Cooma Rd quarry that vehicles travelling to and from the quarry must use the Ellerton Drive Extension and not travel along Cooma St and through the CBD.

**15. If HOLCIM trucks are travelling from the quarry to Canberra Avenue or Fyshwick, how will they get there?**

**Response – Assets and Projects**

They could use Old Cooma Road/Southbar Road/Lanyon Drive/Canberra Avenue or Old Cooma Road/Edwin Land Parkway/Tomsitt Drive/Lanyon Drive/Canberra Avenue.

**16. Will non-HOLCIM trucks be forced to travel on the EDE or can they still use Cooma Street?**

**Response – Assets and Projects**

At this stage Council doesn't intend to place any limits on Cooma Street for non-Holcim trucks. Council will continue to monitor and review truck travel patterns in the future.

**17. If not, what is the reason?**

**Response – Assets and Projects**

Apart from trucks travelling to and from the Old Cooma Rd quarry, heavy vehicle movements along Cooma St are minor. Some heavy vehicles may use the route to service areas of Karabar.

**18. If non-HOLCIM trucks cannot be forced to travel on the EDE, can they still travel along Cooma Street as they do now?**

**Response – Assets and Projects**

Yes. Council will continue to monitor and review truck travel patterns in the future.

**19. If non-HOLCIM trucks cannot be forced to travel on the EDE, how will they get to Canberra Avenue or Fyshwick?**

**Response – Assets and Projects**

This is a different traffic stream to what the EDE is targeting. The objective of Ellerton Drive Extension is to provide vehicles travelling north-south an alternative route around the Queanbeyan CBD. Vehicles with a destination of Canberra Avenue and Fyshwick are unlikely to be using Cooma Street currently and they are unlikely to be using the EDE in the future.

**20. What is the traffic level on Monaro Street today, by day, Monday to Sunday on normal school days, with no public holidays?**

**Response – Assets and Projects**

In November 2016, the daily traffic volumes crossing the Queens Bridge (both directions) is as follows:

- Monday – 22,417 vehicles
- Tuesday – 22,771 vehicles
- Wednesday – 23,742 vehicles
- Thursday – 23,687 vehicles
- Friday – 25,708 vehicles
- Saturday – 19,928 vehicles
- Sunday – 16,844 vehicles.

**21. Is it true that after the EDE is built, traffic on Monaro Street will be less than it is today?**

**Response – Assets and Projects**

Queanbeyan's population is expected to grow to 56,000 by 2031 (approximate increase of 16,000 people) with the Googong development well underway and approvals and planning for Tralee well advanced. The expected population growth will inevitably bring with it a growth in the traffic volumes on all roads. The objective of the EDE is to maintain an acceptable level of service on Cooma Street and the Queens Bridge and it meets this objective by limiting the growth of traffic in these locations. As mentioned earlier, with the EDE operational and all other intersection improvements completed, the traffic modelling shows a reduction of 2,900 vehicles per day at the Queens Bridge when compared to the road network without the EDE in place by 2031. By 2031, the EDE is expected to be carrying approximately 7,600 vehicles per day.

**22. What will be the traffic level on Monaro Street after the EDE is built, by day, Monday to Sunday on normal school days, with no public holidays?**

**Response – Assets and Projects**

Breaking down traffic volumes to this degree in a traffic study is not standard practice. This information is not available.

**23. What is the traffic level on Cooma Street today, by day, Monday to Sunday on normal school days, with no public holidays?**

**Response – Assets and Projects**

In November 2016, the daily traffic volumes travelling on Cooma Street between Pindari Crescent and Alanbar Road (both directions) is as follows:

- Monday – 13,206 vehicles
- Tuesday – 13,437 vehicles
- Wednesday – 13,563 vehicles
- Thursday – 14,269 vehicles
- Friday – 15,143 vehicles
- Saturday – 13,060 vehicles

- Sunday – 10,991.5 vehicles.

**24. Is it true that after the EDE is built, traffic on Cooma Street will be less than it is today?**

**Response – Assets and Projects**

Queanbeyan's population is expected to grow to 56,000 by 2031 (approximate increase of 16,000 people) with the Googong development well underway and approvals and planning for Tralee well advanced. The expected population growth will inevitably bring with it a growth in the traffic volumes on all roads. The objective of the EDE is to maintain an acceptable level of service on Cooma Street and the Queens Bridge and it meets this objective by limiting the growth of traffic in these locations. As mentioned earlier, by 2031 and with all intersection upgrades completed, a reduction of approximately 6,330 vehicles per day is expected at Cooma Street (north of Southbar Rd) when comparing the road network with and without the EDE in place.

**25. What will be the traffic level on Cooma Street after the EDE is built, by day, Monday to Sunday on normal school days, with no public holidays?**

**Response – Assets and Projects**

Breaking down traffic volumes to this degree in a traffic study is not standard practice. This information is not available.

**26. Is it true that without upgrading 12 or more intersections, the EDE will generate additional congestion?**

**Response – Assets and Projects**

Building the EDE will not result in the need to upgrade intersections for traffic efficiency reasons. The identified intersection upgrades are required regardless of whether the EDE is built.

**27. If no, how will the EDE reduce congestion at Yass Road, Cooma Street and Edwin Land Parkway?**

**Response – Assets and Projects**

Ellerton Drive Extension provides an alternative way to travel between south Queanbeyan and Yass Road by providing motorists an opportunity to avoid Cooma Street and the CBD.

The EDE would not significantly change the traffic volume on Yass Road. Roads and Maritime Services have recently undertaken more detailed modelling works at the intersection of Yass Road/Bungendore Road/Ellerton Drive and found that the inclusion of Ellerton Drive Extension into the road network evens out the traffic on the approaches to the roundabout and prolongs the life of the roundabout.

Current traffic modelling numbers indicate that Cooma Street will experience a reduction of approximately 6,330 vehicles per day by 2031 with EDE in place.

The EDE would not significantly change the traffic volume on Edwin Land Parkway and the traffic model did not identify any traffic congestion issues along Edwin Land Parkway. There are current traffic congestion issues at the Tomsitt Drive and Lanyon Drive intersection not related to the EDE that Roads and Maritime are investigating.

**28. How many intersections need to be upgraded to make the EDE work?**

**Response – Assets and Projects**

Building the EDE will not result in the need to upgrade intersections for traffic efficiency reasons. Upgrades to the Old Sydney Road/Mowatt Street/Ellerton Drive roundabout, Tennyson Drive intersection and the Old Cooma Road/Edwin Land Parkway intersection are required to accommodate turning space for heavy vehicles and are included in the EDE project.

**29. What is the estimated cost of each of the intersections that need to be upgraded to make the EDE work?**

**Response – Assets and Projects**

Building the EDE will not result in the need to upgrade intersections for traffic efficiency reasons.

**30. What is the total estimated cost of all of the intersections plus the EDE?**

**Response – Assets and Projects**

Ellerton Drive Extension is estimated to cost \$86 million. The estimates of any intersection upgrades will be known as their designs are progressed.

**31. When will the intersections be upgraded, relative to the building of the EDE?**

**Response – Assets and Project**

Council provided a response to a similar question in the 22 March 2017 Public Forum question. Please refer to that response.

**32. Considering that the cost of the EDE appeared to be rising every month over the past four years, how can Queanbeyan/Palerang ratepayers be assured that the cost of the EDE has not risen at all since the Administrator approved the EDE and set the funding for it?**

**Response – Assets and Projects**

Tenders for the EDE construction are currently under way. Council and the RMS will assess the project in light of the tender prices received.

**33. Given that the EDE, if built, will not be completed for another two years, how can Queanbeyan/Palerang ratepayers be assured that the cost of the EDE will not rise between now and completion?**

**Response – Assets and Projects**

The contracted price for the work remains the same once it has been awarded. Subject to scope changes, extras or extensions of time, the price will not vary.

**34. If the cost of the EDE, set at \$86 million, exceeds the estimate by more than \$1 million, how will the overrun be paid for?**

**Response – Assets and Projects**

Council is responsible for securing the funding for the EDE above the \$50m grant amount. Council will recoup its share of the cost from developer contributions over the next 20 years.

**35. Has QPRC surveyed Googong residents to check that the assumptions used in the traffic study modelling bear any resemblance to reality?**

**Response – Assets and Projects**

In July 2015, Council engaged Micromex to undertake a survey of residents living in Googong, Fernleigh Park, Royalla, Burra and Mt Campbell regarding their travel patterns

and preference between the Ellerton Drive Extension and Duns Creek Road routes. The finding of the traffic preference survey support the behavioural assumptions made by Council's traffic study.

**36. If yes, what was the result, if no, why not?**

**Response – Assets and Projects**

The survey found that Cooma Street (north of Southbar Road) and the Monaro Highway are the most frequently used thoroughfares during peak periods and through the day. It was also found that residents didn't appear to choose one main route and travelled on many road combinations.

40% of residents in the study area preferred Ellerton Drive Extension. These residents were users of currently north-easterly routes and see Ellerton Drive Extension as an alternative way to get around Queanbeyan. 51% of residents in the study area preferred Dunns Creek Road. These residents are primarily those using current south-westerly routes and see Dunns Creek Road as an easier way to get to Canberra/South Canberra/Monaro Highway.

The findings of the survey support the behavioural assumptions made in Council's traffic study. The traffic study identified that 40% of residents in the southern areas of Queanbeyan will drive along the north-easterly routes and it is these residents which will largely contribute to the congestion along Cooma Street and the Queens Bridge and result in the need of Ellerton Drive Extension.

The Googong Area Traffic Preference Survey can be found on the Dunns Creek Road webpage <http://www.qcc.nsw.gov.au/Services/Council-works-and-upgrades/Dunns-Creek-Rd/Dunns-Creek-Rd>.

**Ellerton Drive Extension – cost of maintaining the proposed EDE**

**37. What is the estimated yearly cost of maintaining the EDE each year for the next 20 years?**

**Response – Assets and Projects**

Yearly maintenance costs will be determined once the EDE has been completed, however Council does not separately identify the maintenance costs of individual roads.

**38. Where will that money come from?**

**Response – Assets and Projects**

EDE maintenance will be funded from Council revenue and grants.

**39. If from general revenue, will it require rate increases? How much?**

**Response – Assets and Projects**

Councils does not intend to raise rates to cover the cost of maintaining the EDE.

**Proposed Ellerton Drive Extension – biodiversity offsets**

**40. Has the Council prepared a Biodiversity Offset Management Plan, as required under the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act?**

**Response – Assets and Projects**

Yes.



**41. If so, when will the Council release it?**

**Response – Assets and Projects**

This plan is currently being reviewed by the Commonwealth Department of the Environment and Energy.

**42. If not, when will the Council complete this plan?**

**Response – Assets and Projects**

N/A

**43. Has the Council signed a Biobanking Agreement with the NSW Government and a private landholder for the EDE biodiversity offset?**

**Response – Assets and Projects**

Council has signed a legal agreement with the private landowner to secure the portion of offset required for Ellerton Drive Extension. It is the responsibility of the private landowner to register their land as a biobanking site with NSW Office of Environment and Heritage (OEH). The Biobanking Agreement is between the private landowner and OEH. Council's role will be to provide the payment for Ellerton Drive Extension's offset requirements.

**44. How much did the Council pay the private landholder under the Biobanking Agreement?**

**Response – Assets and Projects**

This is commercial in confidence.

**45. Did the Council sign a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with Robin Pty Ltd on 25 November 2016?**

**Response – Assets and Projects**

See question 44.

**46. What was the purpose of the MoU?**

**Response – Assets and Projects**

See question 44.

**47. Why did the Council request a reduction in the size of the offset area for White Box Grassy Woodland stipulated by the Australian Government Department of Environment and Energy in its approval conditions, from 78.36 ha to 50.0 ha?**

**Response – Assets and Projects**

Council has used biobanking calculators to determine the biodiversity impacts of Ellerton Drive Extension and the offsetting requirements. The number of credits required for offsetting Box Gum Woodland equates to 50 hectares.

**Proposed Ellerton Drive Extension – loan agreement**

**48. Has the Council entered into a loan financing agreement with Googong Township P/L or any other developer contributing to the financial cost of building the proposed EDE?**

**Response – General Manager**



Council has not entered into any loan agreement with GTPL. GTPL's obligations to fund the EDE are contained within the Googong Voluntary Planning Agreement.

**49. If so, when were the agreements signed? If not, when will the agreements be signed?**

**Response – General Manager**

See 49

**50. Please list the names of the companies involved and the amount of monies each is being loaned along with the terms of the loans.**

**Response – General Manager**

See 49

### **Proposed Ellerton Drive Extension – cost overruns**

On 16 December 2015, QCC resolved (492/15 (Taylor/McLennan))

1. That Council note the report on Ellerton Drive Extension Project financials.
2. That Council discuss project overrun risks with the Minister through the local member for Monaro.

**51. Has the Member for Monaro given any undertaking to QPRC about the NSW Government meeting any cost overruns on the proposed Ellerton Drive Extension?**

**Response – General Manager**

No

**52. If so, please provide details.**

**Response – General Manager**

N/A

**53. If not, how will the Council meet cost overruns?**

**Response – General Manager**

Council is responsible to secure the funding by loan borrowing over 20 years for the EDE above the \$50m grant amount. Council will recoup its share of the cost from developer contributions.

### **Proposed Ellerton Drive Extension – call for tenders**

**54. As Roads and Maritime Services (RMS) is managing the tender process for the proposed EDE, what is the Council's role, if any, in the tender determination process?**

**Response – Assets and Projects**

Council staff will be involved in the tender evaluation process. The acceptance of a successful Contractor will be undertaken by RMS as they are the Principal of the contract. Council is not required to make a decision regarding the tender.

**55. What is the contingency plan should RMS not receive a tender within the current budget for the road?**

**Response – Assets and Projects**

Council will consider this if it occurs.

**Proposed Ellerton Drive Extension – community misunderstandings**

**56. Is Council aware that pro-EDE Queanbeyan residents, notably those who post on the closed Facebook pro-EDE page, believe that the proposed EDE will take all the trucks off Monaro St and Cooma St?**

**Response – Assets and Projects**

Council is aware of a range of misinformation regarding the Ellerton Drive Extension, from those in favour and those against the project. To address this, Council and the RMS have been preparing media releases and letters to the editor and taking out paid advertising to ensure the correct information is being circulated in the community. Council also included an article in the latest edition of QPRC News which was distributed to more than 28,000 properties. Along with this, Council also held two information sessions in Queanbeyan in early April and also had a pop-up stall in the Riverside Plaza.

**57. Is Council aware that pro-EDE Queanbeyan residents, notably those who post on the closed Facebook pro-EDE page, believe that the proposed EDE will take most of the general traffic off Monaro St and Cooma St?**

**Response – Assets and Projects**

See question 57

**58. Will Council urgently undertake to tell residents that their assumptions are wrong? If not, why not?**

**Response – Assets and Projects**

See question 57

**Proposed Ellerton Drive Extension – Googong residents' concerns**

**59. Is the Council aware that Googong township residents are concerned that the stretch of Old Cooma Rd from the entrance to Googong township to Karabar is unsafe?**

**Response – Assets and Projects**

Yes, Council is aware of the concerns and is looking at options to possibly move the upgrade forward.

**60. Can Council confirm that there have been two deaths on this stretch of road recently and two trucks overturned also?**

**Response – Assets and Projects**

Council is aware of two fatalities along Old Cooma Rd and has been provided with information regarding the contributing factors of those crashes.

Statistics show that crashes along Old Cooma Rd from Googong Dam Rd to the Edwin Land Parkway intersection have actually reduced since 2011. In 2011 there were 11 reported accidents, seven in 2012, five in 2013, three in 2014 and three in 2015.

Council has implemented a number of road safety strategies in the area over the past few years, including speed reduction, enforcement via the NSW Police and mobile speed cameras, and educational strategies such as the speed trailer.

**61. What does Council intend to do to address the concerns of residents about the state of this section of Old Cooma Rd? When will Council take any action to address the concerns of residents?**

**Response – Assets and Projects**

See question 60

**Proposed Jumping Creek Estate**

**62. What is the current timeline for public consultation on the proposal to build 280 homes in a high bushfire risk zone at Jumping Creek Estate?**

**Response – Environment, Planning and Development**

There is no development application to build any dwellings at Jumping Creek at this time. Council is progressing an amendment to its Local Environmental Plan to rezone the deferred lands at Jumping Creek for urban development. Once consultation with State Government agencies has concluded, Council will be in a position to consult with the broader community in respect of the draft plan. This is likely to occur within the next 4-6 months.

**Land acquisition 1187 – 1241 Old Cooma Rd, Royalla (Resolution 066/17)**

**63. What is the purpose of the land acquisition?**

**Response – People, Process and Technology**

The contract of sale has not been finalised as it is conditional upon certain requirements being met and it would be inappropriate to disclose the purpose until the acquisition has been completed.

**64. How much is the Council paying to acquire the land?**

**Response – People, Process and Technology**

See question 63.

**Donations policy**

**65. Under the Council's new donations policy will special events be considered with the annual applications round from community groups or will events like the Kanga Cup & Ocktoberfest continue to attract large public subsidies from ratepayers?**

**Response – General Manager**

Council is currently finalising a draft Donations Policy that will be placed on public exhibition.

**Further amendment to the Googong Voluntary Planning Agreement**

**66. Can the Council confirm that it is negotiating yet another amendment to the Googong Voluntary Planning Agreement (VPA), this time related to provision of community facilities, namely a swimming pool?**

**Response – Environment, Planning and Development**

The VPA became effective on 12 January 2012. Since that time there has only been one amendment in late 2014/early 2015 which simply related to a Deed of Novation (reflecting a change in the ownership of the parties to the VPA). This did not favour any party.

The VPA provides that either party may initiate a review of the VPA as well as for regular reviews. Recently there has been a meeting initiated by GTPL with Council staff to discuss future aquatic facilities at Googong but these have not developed into any firm position or negotiations. However, should any variation occur to this or any of other local planning agreement with Council these variations would have to be publicly exhibited in accordance with the applicable legislation before this could occur.

**67. Why is the Council negotiating this amendment? What is the proposed outcome of this amendment?**

**Response – Environment, Planning and Development**

See question 67.

**68. How many times has the Council amended the Googong VPA? How many times have amendments been in favour of Googong Township P/L?**

**Response – Environment, Planning and Development**

See question 67.

**Sale of Council-owned Queanbeyan CBD properties**

**69. Has the Council commissioned a valuation of all the properties it owns in the Queanbeyan CBD and which it is negotiating to sell to a consortium of local developers?**

**Response – General Manager**

Yes

**70. If so, who provided the valuation? When did the council seek the valuation and when did it receive the valuation?**

**Response – General Manager**

The valuations were undertaken by Hill PDA. Valuations were requested in November 2016 and they were received in February 2017.

**71. Given that the Administrator owns property in the Queanbeyan CBD, the value of which could be anticipated to increase if adjacent Council land is sold and redeveloped under current Council plans, why did the Administrator not declare a pecuniary interest and step aside from making the decision to sell the CBD land in question?**

**Response – General Manager**

No decision to sell land has been taken.

## Questions – Andrew McCarron

### Provision of services at Jerrabomberra

The Australian Bureau of Statistics census for 2015 identifies the population figures for our local region as follows: Jerrabomberra (Q-west) (13,333), Queanbeyan City (11,107), Karabar (8,960), Queanbeyan East (5,153), Braidwood (3,704)

**72. My question relates to the distribution of Council resources, which appear to be heavily invested in the Queanbeyan City area. Acknowledging the role of the Queanbeyan CBD for Queanbeyan City, I would like to question why Jerrabomberra is not afforded a level of Council resourcing and focus commensurate with Jerrabomberra's demographic statistics. Of particular interest is the lack of a high school within Jerrabomberra. The ABS figures show that Jerrabomberra has the highest proportion of children aged between 0 and 14 years of age with 22.7% of the population being aged 0-14 years. It also has the highest percentage of youth aged 15 - 24 years with 14.5%. Additionally, Jerrabomberra has no swimming pool, no library, no arts centre, and no direct bus link between Jerrabomberra and the city, and only a small and outgrown shopping centre. With the continued development of Jerrabomberra, should the residents expect greater Council focus**

### Response – Assets and Projects

The construction of the Edwin Land Parkway Extension, linking Jerrabomberra and Karabar, has increased connectivity between Jerrabomberra and the Queanbeyan CBD.

The provision of public high schools is a matter for the NSW State Government. Council has advocated for additional secondary education facilities in the south of the Queanbeyan area. The NSW State Government may require land to be set aside for a primary school although this is likely to depend on the ultimate dwelling numbers within the South Jerrabomberra development.

In regards to sporting facilities, Jerrabomberra has the same access to pools, the library and the arts centres as the rest of the residents within the Council area.

Council has recently exhibited the Draft Sports Facilities Strategic Plan. The draft Plan prioritises the Regional Sports Facility and links it to David Madew sports facilities. Council is in the process of developing plans for a Regional Sporting Complex to be located within the Poplars developments (off Tomsitt Drive). This project is in its early stages and will rely heavily on State and Federal Government funding contributions, however early plans include soccer, hockey, warm-up fields, aquatic centre and indoor sports courts.

In the past there was consideration of providing library facilities in South Jerrabomberra. However with the reduction in dwelling numbers to considerably less than what was originally proposed this was not pursued.

As with the Googong development, the size of the Jerrabomberra shopping centre has been restricted in the Queanbeyan Local Environmental Plan to ensure that it did not take away from the shops and businesses in the Queanbeyan CBD. The make-up of the shops within the centre can be determined by the centre operator, however alterations and other matters would be reliant on development consent.