

MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC FORUM

HELD ON 14 JUNE 2023

1. Opening

The Public Forum commenced at 5.33pm.

2. Presentations relating to listed Items on the Council Agenda

The following presenters were heard:

| | Name | ltem no | Item description | For/Against |
|---|-------------------------------|------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|
| 1 | Kerry-Anne Kwong via Zoom | 9.3 | DA.2022.1104 - Construction of Dwelling House and Detached Garage - 720 Urila Road, Tinderry | Against |
| 2 | Shane Braithwaite via Zoom | 9.3 | DA.2022.1104 - Construction of Dwelling House and Detached Garage - 720 Urila Road, Tinderry | Against |
| 3 | Elise Coorey | 9.1 | Modification to Development Application DA.2021.1628 - Telecommunications Facility - 34 Powell Drive, Carwoola | Against |
| 4 | Hayley Coorey | 9.1 | Modification to Development Application DA.2021.1628 - Telecommunications Facility - 34 Powell Drive, Carwoola | Against |
| 5 | Robert Coorey | 9.1 | Modification to Development Application DA.2021.1628 - Telecommunications Facility - 34 Powell Drive, Carwoola | Against |
| 6 | Judy Coorey | 9.1 | Modification to Development Application DA.2021.1628 - Telecommunications Facility - 34 Powell Drive, Carwoola | Against |
| 7 | Cynthia McHardy | 9.1 | Modification to Development Application DA.2021.1628 - Telecommunications Facility - 34 Powell Drive, Carwoola | Against |
| 8 | Ann Burgess | 9.1 | Modification to Development Application DA.2021.1628 - Telecommunications Facility - 34 Powell Drive, Carwoola | For |
| 9 | Tanya Jefferis | 9.1 | Modification to Development Application DA.2021.1628 - Telecommunications Facility - 34 Powell Drive, Carwoola | For |

| 10 | Helen Fritsch | 9.1 | Modification to Development Application DA.2021.1628 - Telecommunications Facility - 34 Powell Drive, Carwoola | Against |
|----|-----------------|-----|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|
| 11 | Sam Zappia | 9.1 | Modification to Development Application DA.2021.1628 - Telecommunications Facility - 34 Powell Drive, Carwoola | Against |
| 12 | Jason Green | 9.1 | Modification to Development Application DA.2021.1628 - Telecommunications Facility - 34 Powell Drive, Carwoola | For |
| 13 | Andrew Rowlands | 9.2 | DA.2022.1503 - 2461 Currawang Road, Currawang NSW - Recreation Facility (Outdoor) (Amcross Motorbike Event) | For |
| 14 | Fiona Stevens | 9.3 | DA.2022.1104 - Construction of Dwelling House and Detached Garage - 720 Urila Road, Tinderry | For |
| 15 | Jenna Gruber | 9.6 | DA.2022.1691 - 37 Reginald Road Googong NSW - Construction of Two (2) Storey Dwelling House | For |

The following written presentations were received:

| | Name | ltem no | Item description | For/Against |
|---|-----------------------------------------------------|------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|
| 1 | Sharon Baxter-Judge | 12.1 | Notice of Motion - Bungendore Community Centre | Against |
| 2 | Kerry-Anne Kwong | 9.3 | DA.2022.1104 - Construction of Dwelling House and Detached Garage - 720 Urila Road, Tinderry | Against |
| 3 | Julie Campbell | 9.2 | DA.2022.1503 - 2461 Currawang Road, Currawang NSW - Recreation Facility (Outdoor) (Amcross Motorbike Event) | Against |
| 4 | David Campbell | 9.2 | DA.2022.1503 - 2461 Currawang Road, Currawang NSW - Recreation Facility (Outdoor) (Amcross Motorbike Event) | Against |
| 5 | Mary Warner | 9.1 | Modification to Development Application DA.2021.1628 - Telecommunications Facility - 34 Powell Drive, Carwoola | For |
| 6 | Ron Schweikert | 9.1 | Modification to Development Application DA.2021.1628 - Telecommunications Facility - 34 Powell Drive, Carwoola | For |
| 7 | Bungendore Town Centre and Environs Committee | 12.1 | Bungendore Community Centre | Against |

3. Petitions

There were no petitions submitted.

4. 'Questions on Notice' from the Public

Questions on Notice were received for this meeting that related to: Crown Land in Bungendore; the Questions on Notice process; QPRC Organisational Service Review; and the proposed Queanbeyan to Bungendore water pipeline.

As advised by the General Manager, Questions on Notice from Emma Brooks Maher regarding Crown Land in Bungendore were not accepted due to the significant diversion of staff resources required to investigate and provide answers. The General Manager has informed the submitter that these questions will be responded to outside of this forum.

Questions on Notice from Shane Geisler and Peter Marshall were accepted. Responses are attached.

5. Presentations by Invitation from the General Manager

There were no presentations.

6. Closure

As there were no further matters, the Public Forum closed at 6.26pm.



ATTACHMENT TO MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC FORUM HELD ON 14 June 2023

'Questions on Notice' from the Public

Responses to the following 'Questions on Notice' received up to *Wednesday 7 June 2023* were provided and tabled at the meeting.

Questions submitted by: Shane Geisler

1. Can you please clarify how many questions a rate payer is allowed to ask per council meeting?

Response by: Office of the General Manager

In accordance with Clause 4 of the QPRC Code of Meeting Practice (2022), the General Manager is required to:

• table responses to Questions on Notice from the public on any issue relating to the Council's legislative responsibilities and activities.

There are no limits on the number of Questions on Notice that a rate payer is allowed to ask per council meeting.

For information, Council has received a total of 491 Questions on Notice since January 2022 – 209 in 2022; and 282 to date in 2023 (not including those for this meeting).

2. Can the councillors please confirm that they are comfortable with the QPRC Mayor having the ability to hide questions that may make her professional ! performance look bad to the councillors without any oversight by the councillors or the Mayor?

Response by: Office of the General Manager

The suggestion made by this question is rejected. The General Manager has determined on four occasions to date that submitted Questions on Notice presented an unreasonable diversion of staff resources, which is a relevant consideration under the *Government Information (Public Access) Act 2009* when it comes to the release of information.

Councillors were provided with a copy of the rejected Questions on Notices which were not answered at the relevant Council meeting. The subject matter of those questions was identified and made public by the Mayor and recorded in the Minutes.

Each submitter was provided with a response following the meeting. Two of the responses have generated the scheduling of an information report for a future Council meeting to ensure everyone in the community is updated on the matters of interest.

The opportunity for members of the public to lodge Questions on Notice is not governed by legislation nor the NSW Government Office of Local Government Code of Meeting Practice.

There are numerous other ways for the community to ask questions: through formal and informal GIPAA (Government Information (Public Access) Act 2009) processes; through general enquiries; in-person at regular Council Community meetings; and through numerous online functions.

3. The QPRC Organisational Service Review uncovered some spectacularly unprofessional behaviour within the QPRC, can you please specific details on what is being done to remediate this behaviour and by when?

Response by: Office of the General Manager

If the submitter has a complaint, or should they wish to raise an allegation about any breaches of the professional conduct of Council staff, the General Manager or Councillors, there is a process by which this can be lodged. Complaints are handled in accordance with the QPRC Complaint Management Policy and the QRPC Code of Conduct which are available on Council's website:

https://www.qprc.nsw.gov.au/Policies-Strategies-and-Plans/Adopted-QPRC-Policies

4. Can the QPRC Councillors please tell the ratepayers why the results of the QPRC Organisational Review were not provided to the public prior to the completion of the SRV public consultation process?

Response by: Office of the General Manager

This is not correct.

The Organisational Service Review Report prepared by MorrisonLow was published on the 'Your Voice' community engagement page on Council's website at: <u>https://yourvoice.qprc.nsw.gov.au/srv</u> prior to the completion of the SRV public consultation process. It was published along with a range of other material about the proposed SRV.

Questions submitted by: Peter Marshall

Preamble – Proposed Queanbeyan to Bungendore water pipeline - I note the project webpage and Fact Sheet, and Resolution of 12 April 2023 and the Draft Operational Plan.

5. When will council release the feasibility study presented for Closed Session Meeting on 12 April? What were the grounds for making this document confidential?

Response by: Infrastructure Services

The feasibility study contains details of the proposed route as it relates to likely affected private properties. It also contains land title information for these properties and as such is subject to strict privacy considerations.

The study was tasked with, and therefore contains, detailed cost estimates for the proposed project. In the event that the project proceeds to construction, the availability of this information in the public domain could jeopardise the competitive nature of future tender processes. Accordingly, there are no plans to publicly release the feasibility study at this time.

The item was deemed confidential for the above considerations, and the fact that landowners had not yet been contacted, therefore it remained confidential. Letters were issued to affected landowners in the days after Council resolved to endorse progress of the project to the next stage.

6. The Resolution of 12 April 2023 reads:

"That Council:

1. Endorse the development of the Queanbeyan to Bungendore bulk water supply trunk main (Palerang Communities IWCM (2019) Strategy Option 3) to tender ready stage.

2. Pursue an offer for grant funding from the NSW Government for these works under tranche 3 of the Safe and Secure Water Program.

3. Provide funds for Council's contribution toward the project from the Palerang Communities Water Fund reserves; and report back to Council via the Quarterly Budget Review Process of any supplementary vote request."

The Draft Operational Program, page 27, reads:

700294 BGD - Queanbeyan to Bungendore Bulk Water Pipeline - Survey, Investigation, Design - 1,560 [i.e. \$1.56 million] attributed to "Developer Cont" [presumably "Developer Contributions"]

Can council please explain the discrepancy in the funding sources, and clarify how the work it Resolved on 12 April 2023 to undertake will be funded.

Response by: Infrastructure Services

The works authorised in the Council resolution of 12 April 2023 will be funded from s.64 developer contributions and grants (as they become available).

7. From what source was the feasibility study presented to the 12 April 2023 Council Meeting funded?

Response by: Infrastructure Services

The feasibility study was conducted as part of the Palerang Communities Integrated Water Cycle Management review. Accordingly, it was funded through a combination of Water Fund Reserve and Safe and Secure Water Program (SSWP) grant funds.

8. If any funds from the Palerang Communities Water Fund (PCWF) are being used for this pipeline, what projects that were intended to be funded by the PWCF will now not be funded?

Response by: Infrastructure Services

There are no works that have been deferred or not funded as a result of the investigation or design works associated with the pipeline project.

9. Is it legal to use the PCWF to fund projects that it was not collected for? Has council sought legal advice on this?

Response by: Infrastructure Services

Water reserve funds may only be used for projects (operational, maintenance, renewal or capital) related to the fund. Developer contribution reserves are more constrained in that they must be used for headwork capacity-related projects that support the developments from which they are drawn.

10. Will council assure residents and ratepayers that the ongoing costs of the pipeline (operation and maintenance, depreciation and renewal/replacement); will be borne by new developments, and not by the existing residents of Bungendore, Braidwood and Captains Flat

Response by: Infrastructure Services

Council is yet to make a final decision on this project. A decision won't be made until the investigation, survey and design are completed; grant funding sourced; and agreement is reached between Commonwealth, ACT and NSW governments to amend the Queanbeyan Water Supply Agreement.

If Council proceeds with the project, as with any capital works, customers of the scheme will fund the ongoing operational expenses.