



MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC FORUM HELD ON 22 FEBRUARY 2023

1. Opening

The Public Forum commenced at 5.36pm.

2. Presentations relating to listed Items on the Council Agenda

The following presenters were heard:

	Name	Item no	Item description	For/Against
1	Hugh Cooke	9.1	Scoping Proposal PP.2022.0001 - Residential Rezoning - 141 Googong Road Googong (Sunset)	For
2	Vicki McWhirter	9.2	Development Application DA.2021.1453 - Construction of a Three Storey Boarding House - 2 Ross Road, Queanbeyan	Against
3	Jason McWhirter	9.2	Development Application DA.2021.1453 - Construction of a Three Storey Boarding House - 2 Ross Road, Queanbeyan	Against

The following written presentations were received:

	Name	Item no	Item description	For/Against
1	Gilbert Melgar	9.2	Development Application DA.2021.1453 - Construction of a Three Storey Boarding House - 2 Ross Road, Queanbeyan	For
2	John Tuckwell	10.1	Delivery Program Update – July-December 2022	Against

3. Petitions

There were no petitions submitted.

4. 'Questions on Notice' from the Public

Responses to the following 'Questions on Notice' received up to 15 February 2023 were provided and tabled at the meeting (see attached for responses):

	Received from	In relation to:
1	Sandra Young	Queanbeyan water and sewer funds.
2	Peter Walker	Hoskinstown Road
3	Peter Walker	New Council building and precinct
4-6	Queanbeyan Ratepayers and Residents Association	SRV proposal
7	Queanbeyan Ratepayers and Residents Association	Council's IPART submission
8	Queanbeyan Ratepayers and Residents Association	Googong developer contributions
9-10	Queanbeyan Ratepayers and Residents Association	Loan for EDE

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 5.45pm.



ATTACHMENT TO MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC FORUM HELD ON 22 February 2023

‘Questions on Notice’ from the Public

Responses to the following ‘Questions on Notice’ received up to *Wednesday 15 February 2023* were provided and tabled at the meeting.

Question submitted by: Sandra Young

- 1. What is the current balance of the Queanbeyan water and sewer funds?**

Response: Corporate Services

The Queanbeyan water and sewer fund balances, as at 31 December 2022 quarterly reporting, are:

- Water Fund: \$37,120,272
- Sewer Fund: \$74,450,490

Questions submitted by: Peter Walker

- 2. What has been the cost of maintenance and repairs over the last two years to date on Hoskinstown Road and what contribution has been received by Council from Canberra Sand and Gravel (the major contributor to the damage on this road and ongoing) towards these repairs?**

Response: Infrastructure Services

Routine pavement maintenance costs over the past two years (potholes, pavement failures, vegetation maintenance) is approximately \$40,000. The owners of the trucking operation referred to will pay \$90,000 per annum to Council as road damage contributions.

- 3. What was the original total estimated cost for the new Council building and precinct in Crawford Street, and what is now the similar total projected cost for the finished project?**

Response: Infrastructure Services

The original business case for the Queanbeyan Civic and Cultural Precinct indicated the total estimated cost to be \$74 million. The project has incurred delays, as a result of COVID and supply chain issues. A full report of the cost implications and delivery of the project, including leases for commercial space will be provided to a Council meeting in March.

Questions submitted by: Queanbeyan Ratepayers and Residents Association

Scenario 2 of the SRV proposal adopted by Council, commits the Council to finding savings of \$5.5M per year.

4. How will these savings be identified?

Response: Office of the General Manager

Council have directed staff to begin to prepare the budget, which includes the Operational Plan, Revenue Policy and Fees and Charges 2023-24, on the starting premise that there will not be cuts to services by closing facilities like pools, libraries or The Q. This will mean that other savings will need to be found.

Our asset maintenance levels will need to be at a level that the budget can afford, and grant funding will be directed at asset renewal. There may be some projects that were planned that will need to be deferred from the budget.

The budget documents will be prepared to go to the 26 April Council meeting seeking Council endorsement to be placed on public exhibition. The community will then be invited to make comments on these via our Your Voice page throughout May and into June.

5. Will the Council undertake a forensic review of its operations to ensure that the savings identified deliver the desired outcome?

Response: Office of the General Manager

It is not the intention of the General Manager to engage an external consultant to undertake a 'forensic review' of its operations at this stage. Reviewing Council operations, be that for individual departments or whole services is an ongoing process and the responsibility of all Management staff.

6. Will the Council notify the community of the specific details of how these savings are realised?

Response: Office of the General Manager

As the Operational Plan 2023/24 and Delivery Program 2023/36 are developed, Council will determine where savings are made. Council have requested these savings be reported to the community against a savings target in the annual End of Year Report. In addition, Council will be reporting on employee costs and the number of positions as part of the annual Operational Plan. What was evident during the SRV consultation process was the need to provide plain English financial updates to the community each quarter in the QPRC News that give a clear and accurate view of Council's financial performance and financial position.

7. Will the Council publish its submission to IPART on the QPRC website?

Response: Office of the General Manager

Council's submission to IPART will be publicly available on the IPART website when their consultation period opens in April for a period of three weeks. We will ensure that a link to the submission is provided from the QPRC website.

The following questions from the Queanbeyan Ratepayers and Residents Association were held over from the 8 February 2023 Council meeting until staff resources allowed for a response.

- 8. Could you please advise the date of the QPRC council meeting, and which resolution pertains to the Googong Developer contributions being amended from 100% to either 67% or 71.39% (whichever figure is actually accurate)?**

Response: Corporate Services

The Googong and Tralee Traffic Study 2031 establishes the basis of the payments required by all development areas for the road improvements identified in that plan. The proportions were applied to the Ellerton Drive Extension (EDE) to determine the amount required by the Googong Developers. The EDE also received grant funding of \$50m leaving the remaining amount of \$36m to be funded from developers. The Googong development area was required to fund 86% of this amount (\$30.9m) in accordance with the Googong and Tralee Traffic Study 2031 however the Googong Developer (GTPL) is only undertaking 67.45% of the development at Googong. The remainder is being done by other developers. The GTPL contribution is \$24.2m (plus interest). As there was no change to the contribution to be paid by GTPL, no further resolution of Council was required.

- 9. Could you please advise what % of the loan [for the Ellerton Drive extension] that the QPRC ratepayers are liable?**

Response: Corporate Services

Council is responsible for about 3% of the EDE loan.

- 10. Question 8 of our questions asked [for the 18 January 2023 Council meeting] about the risk assessment undertaken prior to the \$36M loan for the EDE project being taken. The response provided did not answer the question. So we ask again.**

- (a) What risk assessment was undertaken prior to the \$36M loan being taken out?**

Response: Corporate Services

A specific risk assessment for the loan was not required as it was addressed in the EDE business case and financial gateway process completed by Transport for NSW.

- (b) If such a risk assessment was undertaken, what was the conclusion?**

Response: Corporate Services

See (a)