

**PUBLIC FORUM
QUESTIONS/ANSWERS
13 July 2016**



Questions – Katrina Willis

Proposed Ellerton Driver Extension

- 1. Where does council propose to stockpile materials associated with construction of the proposed Ellerton Drive Extension (EDE)?**

Response – Infrastructure Services

Figure 10 to 13 of the Review of Environmental Factors show the potential stockpile and compound sites. The following locations have been identified as potential stockpile and compound sites:

- A portion of existing Ellerton Drive
 - Near the current termination point of Ellerton Drive
 - On the western edge of Jumping Creek
 - On the south-western side of the new bridge
 - White Rocks Quarry near the intersection of Edwin Land Parkway/Old Cooma Road
 - North-eastern corner of the Edwin Land Parkway/Old Cooma Road intersection
- 2. What proportion of the construction costs have been set aside for noise mitigation treatments?**

Response – Infrastructure Services

Based on the most current design and noise modelling, it is estimated that noise mitigation treatments will cost around \$10.5m.

- 3. How many residents will have noise mitigation treatments to their homes?**

Response – Infrastructure Services

Road traffic noise levels at 39 properties are predicted to remain above the NSW Road Noise Policy guideline noise limits after the implementation of the selected noise mitigation treatments (ie. quieter road pavement along the whole route and noise wall at various locations). The residents at these properties were notified in April that their homes would require additional treatment to the selected noise mitigation measures. Further consultation will take place with the owners of these properties.

- 4. Has the council downgraded the proposed mitigation walls along any section of the proposed road alignment? For example, have Hebel block walls been downgraded to timber fences? If so, why?**

Response – Infrastructure Services

Council has made the undertaking to apply the NSW Road Noise Policy (RNP) guidelines and noise limits. The effectiveness of different wall materials to provide noise reduction is

reliant on the material density and not type. Hebel concrete walls have been selected for urban areas and timber infill noise walls have been selected for rural type areas. Noting that noise walls will be visible from both the road and the properties these selections were made to suit the aesthetics of the area.

As the density of the timber infill noise walls and Hebel concrete wall are similar there are no downgrades in noise walls as both have the capability to reduce noise levels to the limits set in the RNP.

- 5. What is the estimated cost reduction of changes to noise mitigation from those measures first proposed to affected residents?**

Response – Infrastructure Services.

There has not been a cost reduction between the noise mitigation measures proposed in 2015 and those in the current design.

- 6. By how much did Council reduce the cost of the road construction following discussions with CIC?**

Response – Infrastructure Services

Council has not amended the road design as a result of discussions with CIC.

- 7. A CIC representative told the Panel Determination meeting on 30 June that CIC was contributing \$25 million towards the cost of the proposed road. Council has previously advised that CIC would pay the interest on any loan that council took on behalf of the developer for their cost of the road construction. What is the final sum that CIC will contribute towards the cost of building the EDE, including interest repayments?**

Response – Infrastructure Services

The Googong developer, along with all other developers, will pay their share of the final cost of the EDE based on a percentage determined in the Googong and Tralee Traffic Study 2031 (as updated in subsequent reviews) The EDE report to Council on 30 June, indicated a total cost of up to \$81m of which \$31m principal, plus interest, would be met by developers.

- 8. Why was the financial risk assessment for the proposed EDE not released until Tuesday, 28 June, given that staff had the document in order to write a report for the meeting the previous week?**

Response – Infrastructure Services

The final version of the Financial Risk Assessment Report was not completed until 28 June 2016.

- 9. The financial risk assessment shows that if the cost of building the EDE exceeds \$87.1 million, that council will be unable to repay the loan with section 94 contributions. What does council propose to do in such a circumstance?**

Response – Infrastructure Services

As stated in the report to the Extraordinary Meeting on 30 June:

It is important to understand the upper limit of \$37.2m stated in the financial risk assessment is based on the amounts currently included in the various Section 94 Plans and Local Planning Agreements that are attributed to the EDE.

If there was a need to recover a larger amount for the EDE, Council is able to review the S94 Plans and change the proportion of the Section 94 contribution that is attributed to the EDE. In this way, additional funds can be collected for the EDE to cover any unexpected cost overruns with the project as an increased charge per lot to make the loan repayments.

- 10. The risk assessment suggests that in the case described at question 7, other road upgrades could be deferred. Does the council propose to adopt this strategy?**

Response – Infrastructure Services

Council routinely reviews all Local Planning Agreements and developer contribution plans to accommodate changes that occur over time. Any timing, scale and financial amendments to the plans would be made available to the public for comment before they are adopted by Council.

- 11. What does the council plan to do if federal government funding for the EDE is not forthcoming?**

Response – General Manager

Council has not received any advice that the Federal funding for the EDE has been withdrawn. This would be considered at the time any advice is provided.

- 12. Has council acquired all of the land required to build the EDE?**

Response – Legal and Risk

Council has acquired all of the land of the road corridor.

- 13. If not, what land acquisition is outstanding and when is it expected to be finalised?**

Response – Legal and Risk

See question 12.

- 14. What, if any, traffic modelling has the council commissioned to ascertain the impact that the Majura Parkways has had on the conclusions of the Googong and Tralee traffic study?**

Response – Infrastructure Services

One of the inputs into the traffic model was the program of infrastructure works proposed by the ACT government within the 2031 planning horizon. The *Googong and Tralee Traffic Study 2031* included the four lane upgrade of Monaro and Airport roads as well as the extension of the Monaro Highway over Pialligo Avenue. It also included the upgrade of the highway to six lanes in 2031. The traffic study was updated in 2014 and this also included the work on Majura Parkway and its impacts have been analysed.

With the Majura Parkway improvements included in the traffic model both traffic studies recommended that Ellerton Drive Extension was required as a new road link in the network.

15. If the council has not undertaken any modelling, will it now do so? If not, why not?

Response – Infrastructure Services

See question 14.