

**PUBLIC FORUM
QUESTIONS/ANSWERS
23 January 2019**



Questions – Davina Nagle

Animal services

- 1. Where does the funding for the pound come from, i.e. is it council rates and/or state government?**

Response – Community Choice

Council's Animal Services program is funded from a number of sources, including Council rates, infringements, fees and charges and animal registration (via NSW Government).

- 2. What were the operating costs of the pound in 2017-18 and are you able to provide me with a breakdown?**

Response – Community Choice

Expenses

Employment Expenses - \$313,814

Materials & Contacts - \$67,532

Other Expenses - \$8,887

Internal Labour & Plant - \$12,270

Total Expenses \$402,503

Income

Infringements - \$44,030

Impounding Fees \$74,870

Animal Registrations - \$34,351

Other Income - \$419

Total Income – \$153,670

Net Cost of Services - \$248,833

- 3. Does the pound rely on community volunteer support as well as government funding? if so, what other support does the pound receive?**

Response – Community Choice

The Animal Management Facility does not rely on volunteer or government support, however it has taken on volunteers in the past and will apply for grant funding for specific projects and programs as applicable.

- 4. What were the kill rates of dogs and cats in 2017-18 and is this an increase or decrease from previous years? If financial year figures are not available, can you please provide by calendar years?**

Response – Community Choice

The facility has managed to achieve a low euthanasia rate of 3% - dogs and 9% - Cats. This has decreased significantly since 2007 where average annual euthanasia rates were approx. 20–40% for dogs and cats.

- 5. How long may dogs and cats may stay at the pound (awaiting adoption) before they are euthanised? Who sets and reviews this policy?**

Response – Community Choice

The Animal Management Facility hold animals for 21 days, depending on the animal's temperament and health status. If there are options for the animals which require further time, the animal will be held longer to accommodate rehoming and rescue options. There is no policy in relation to euthanasia and holding times. The Companion Animals Act 1998 stipulates what can be done with feral, infant, injured and sick animals.

The Facility has guidelines and procedures in place to assure that all animals are treated and assessed equally and fairly and given the chance to find suitable homes/rescue. Staff work hard to find homes and rescue options for all animals entering the facility prior to considering euthanasia.

- 6. What is the standard or care that dogs/cats should receive while impounded and who sets and reviews this policy?**

Response – Community Choice

The NSW Office of Local Government sets the standards for the care of dogs and cats while at animal management facilities. The OLG has commenced a review of these standards, with a draft provided to councils for comments.

- 7. What happens to animals that are surrendered to the pound when it is full?**

Response – Community Choice

If the Facility is full, no further surrenders will be accepted until space is available to give animals an ample chance to be rehomed or rescued.

If the Facility's capacity is reached, surrendered animals already housed within the facility are the first to be considered for euthanasia as they are Council owned and other animals must wait the required legal time prior to any movement able to be considered by Council to accommodate further animals.

Questions – Katrina Willis

Ellerton Drive extension

8. How many properties along the EDE alignment have:
- been identified for and
 - received noise treatments?

Response – Community Connections

Forty-two properties have been identified as needing noise treatments at their property. Of these properties, two have had their property noise treatment finalised. Council is continuing to work with the other owners to complete their property noise treatments.

9. How many claims for rectification works have been made by people living in homes along the EDE alignment?

Response – Community Connections

Six

10. How many claims have been settled?

Response – Community Connections

Roads and Maritime Services and its insurer are continuing to work with relevant property owners in regards to individual claims. Currently these claims are not yet resolved.

11. Has any rectification work commenced?

Response – Community Connections

See Q10

12. Has any rectification work been completed?

Response – Community Connections

See Q10

13. Has the council had any discussions with developers of the Jumping Creek Estate about constructing a junction for that estate and the EDE?

Response – Community Connections

Yes

14. If so, what was the outcome of those discussions?

Response – Community Connections

As stated in the Public Forum response of 11 October 2017, no agreement could be reached with the developer in regards to location or covering the costs for the intersection work.

15. Has a cost estimate for constructing a junction been prepared? If so, what was the estimate?

Response – Community Connections

As stated in the Public Forum response of 11 October 2017, the responsibility of providing suitable access into and out of the development is the responsibility of the developer and would form part of any future development application.

Queanbeyan River pollution event

16. Has the council investigated the causes of high sediment loads entering Queanbeyan River following rainfall events in December 2018?

Response – Natural and Built Character

There are a number of potential sources of sediment likely to contribute to sediment load in the Queanbeyan River. Downstream of Googong, the major contributing sources are from south to north:

- a. Googong – Urban development at the new Googong Township which discharges to the river through two significant creek lines running through the development area. Construction activity has sediment controls on sites to reduce impacts.
- b. Jumping Creek – Some of the undeveloped rural and bushland land in the Creek catchment is steep and/or in poor condition and subject to erosion.
- c. EDE Construction Site – All major roadworks have the potential to contribute sediment although strict controls to reduce impacts are in place.
- d. Glenrock Creek – Drains a large area of Karabar that can contribute to sediment loads.
- e. Rutledge Street drain – Drains a large area of south/central Queanbeyan and parts of Queanbeyan West that can contribute sediment loads.
- f. Buttles Creek – Drains large parts of Queanbeyan East, both urban and rural, and contributes sediment to the River
- g. Drain near Riverside Oval – Drains a large area of north central Queanbeyan and Crestwood that can contribute sediment loads.

Sediment will always flow into the River following prolonged or intense rain events. However, sites which have the potential to contribute excess sediment are required to minimise pollution impacts.

Council is the responsible authority for all of the above sources except for the EDE construction site which is monitored by the EPA.

Council's main focus is on the Googong development area and it is currently conducting investigations into an incident which occurred in Googong during the December rains.

17. If so, has the council identified the sources of the sediment loads?

Response – Natural and Built Character

The major sources of sediment are listed in Question 16 above.

18. If yes, what were the sources?

Response – Natural and Built Character

The major sources of sediment are listed in Question 16 above.

19. Has the council conducted any water testing to ascertain the impact of the sediment loads on water quality in the river?

Response – Natural and Built Character

Council takes monthly samples of six sites along the Queanbeyan River to monitor basic water quality parameters, although this frequency depends on available resources.

20. If so, what were the results of the testing?

Response – Natural and Built Character

Results can be found on Council's website under the Queanbeyan Waterways Data page (www.qprc.nsw.gov.au/Services/Water-and-Sewer#section-4) with results going back to 2011.

New Administration building

21. Why was the original contractor responsible for demolition of the old QCC administration building replaced with a new contractor?

Response – Community Connections

The original contractor entered voluntary administration and was unable to complete the works.

22. What is the estimated delay in the project arising from the appointment of a new contractor to undertake the demolition work?

Response – Community Connections

The demolition of 257 Crawford St has been delayed approximately two months. The delay in demolition will not affect the timeline for the development of the new Council headquarters as concept design is still ongoing.

23. When does the council anticipate the demolition work to be completed?

Response – Community Connections

The new contractor is expected to take over the site in January with demolition of the structure planned to recommence in February and is expected to be complete by mid-March 2019.

24. Has the replacement of the original contractor incurred any financial costs to the council?

Response – Community Connections

The final cost to replace the original contractor will not be known until the demolition works are complete.

25. If so, what are those costs?

Response – Community Connections

See response to question 24.

CBD land sales

26. What is the council's intention for future land use of the Morisset St car parking site, which was removed from the original heads of agreement proposal?

Response – Community Connections

As shown in the adopted Queanbeyan Car Parking Strategy, Council intends to construct a four-five level decked car park on the Morisset St car park (behind the Royal Hotel). The site will also contain some public domain elements with an aim to provide a second frontage for shops along Monaro St.

27. Does the council still intend to sell the site?

Response – Community Connections

No.

Queanbeyan cinema

28. Can the council advise whether the cinema development it approved for Queanbeyan is proceeding?

Response – Natural and Built Character

Yes. Council understands that some demolition and internal works have commenced.

Old nursery site

29. What does the council intend to do with the old nursery site in Morisset St, which has been unoccupied for several years?

Response – Organisational Capability

Long term it is expected that this site will be developed but there are no specific proposals for development at this time.