

Summary and Consideration of Community Submissions Planning Proposal for a Memorial Park, Googong

Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 3.34 and Schedule 1 (Division 3.4) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*

Common Issue Topic	Submission Number	Submission Details	Response	Action
Aboriginal Heritage	3, 28, 59	3 submissions questioned whether the potential impacts of the proposed development on Aboriginal heritage values had been appropriately considered.	<p>An Aboriginal Archaeological Due Diligence Assessment was prepared to support the planning proposal.</p> <p>That assessment recommends further detailed archaeological investigation be carried out prior to any works being undertaken within 100m of Church Creek. It also recommends identified sites be protected, and, that any further sites identified during development be brought to the attention of the State Government.</p>	No change as a result of this submission.
Accessibility /Traffic	1, 5, 7, 15, 19, 25, 26, 29, 30, 40, 43, 48, 55, 59, 63, 66	<p>16 submissions raised concerns about the potential impacts of the cemetery/memorial park development on traffic flows and access, including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of availability of public transport. • Hazards associated with presence of wildlife on the road. • Extra traffic generation and impacts on existing roads. • Need for road improvements such as widening, roundabout and traffic lights. 	<p>A Transport Impact Assessment Report was prepared to support the planning proposal.</p> <p>That report concluded the proposed cemetery/memorial park was unlikely to have an impact on existing traffic flows.</p> <p>The additional traffic generated is not considered significant and the transport study recommends a number of traffic management improvements to ensure there is no adverse impact.</p> <p>Recent improvements and upgrades have also been carried out on Old Cooma Road significantly increasing its capacity.</p>	No change as a result of this submission.

**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 3.34 and Schedule 1 (Division 3.4) of the
Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979**

Common Issue Topic	Submission Number	Submission Details	Response	Action
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns that traffic study relies on 2017 data and has not taking into consideration future residential growth. 	<p>Whilst the traffic study is based on 2017 data, it also uses Council's traffic modelling which estimates a yearly growth of 6%/year (mainly from Googong but also the rural subdivisions at Burra and Mount Pleasant).</p> <p>The study concludes that the intersection of Burra and Old Cooma Roads will continue to operate well with minimal queues on all approaches to 2031 taking into consideration the 6% growth per year in traffic.</p>	
Against General	1, 3, 7, 12,13, 14, 15, 26, 28, 30, 40, 44, 47, 48, 51, 52, 54, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 63, 64, 65, 67	<p>26 submissions were specifically against the proposal in general. Reasons include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cost of infrastructure to develop the site. Detrimental impact on the amenity of the locality A cemetery/memorial park or crematorium is not suitable at this location as too far from existing cemetery, can be impacted from noise from surrounding rural properties such as motorbikes, chain saws, dogs etc. Should expand Lanyon Drive Cemetery. Proximity of rural residential developments. Constraints such as the creek and requirement for buffer zones leave only a small suitable area for interments wasting ratepayers' money. 	<p>It is intended the long-term costs of infrastructure required for the cemetery/memorial park will be recouped from its operations.</p> <p>Significant landscaping and vegetation screening are proposed to minimise visual impacts on adjoining areas.</p> <p>Screen planting and landscaping will also help to mitigate potential noise impacts.</p> <p>Sites adjacent to the Lanyon Drive cemetery/memorial park are not suitable due its environmental qualities.</p> <p>The site is relatively close to the urban release area of Googong. There are no other identified sites closer to the centre of Queanbeyan that are considered appropriate.</p> <p>Approximately 11ha of land suitable for interment.</p>	No change as a result of this submission.

**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 3.34 and Schedule 1 (Division 3.4) of the
Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979**

Common Issue Topic	Submission Number	Submission Details	Response	Action
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adverse impact on amenity and lifestyle of E4 zone due to visual impact as well as noise. Residents were not able to have input into the studies. Business might not be viable due to bad internet at the locality 	<p>Council has engaged suitably qualified consultants to prepare the supporting studies.</p> <p>Internet connectivity will be considered more broadly as part of the business plan.</p>	
Alternative sites	1, 10, 15, 19, 20, 23, 28, 35, 37, 47, 59, 60, 65	<p>13 submissions received argued other alternative sites were more suitable for a cemetery/memorial park including as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suggests land known as Portion 75 to extend the Lanyon Dr cemetery which is unkempt with rubbish everywhere. Land could be transferred from NSW Parks and Wildlife across Lanyon Drive. Resurrect Captains Flat cemetery. Conservation values and aboriginal artefacts issues exist at proposed cemetery/memorial park site. Subject site is located too close to current and future residential areas and people should be happy to drive up to 45 mins. The subject site has already been rejected by the community. Alternative site should be available that are located outside the E4 zone in an LGA as large as this. The Cemetery/memorial park should be closer to existing facilities to cut costs of staff travelling and traffic in general. 	<p>There is no room for traditional burials in the bushland area (Portion 75). Any rubbish/litter will be dealt with by ground staff.</p> <p>The NSW National Parks and Wildlife lands are of high conservation value and cannot be developed due to its biodiversity values.</p> <p>Captains Flat is not considered large enough for the potential demand and is not close to the centres of population for Queanbeyan.</p> <p>The conservation values and archaeological sensitive areas do not prevent large areas of the site being developed as long as they are managed appropriately.</p> <p>It is considered appropriate that a new cemetery/memorial park to be within relatively easy commuting distance for local residents.</p> <p>The cemetery/memorial park is an important infrastructure facility that will benefit the wider community.</p>	<p>Request the Urban Landscapes Branch to regularly clean up any rubbish.</p> <p>No change as result of this submission</p>

**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 3.34 and Schedule 1 (Division 3.4) of the
Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979**

Common Issue Topic	Submission Number	Submission Details	Response	Action
			The costs of staff travel and facilities for staff will be included in the business plan.	
Contamination /flooding/ groundwater	1, 3, 5, 7, 13, 21, 28, 32, 34, 37, 38, 45, 46, 51, 52, 58, 61, 66, 67	<p>19 submissions received raised concerns specifically in respect of contamination, flooding and groundwater as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern that most studies were completed in the dry months/years. The ground is very rocky, and the geological survey even indicates, that most of the land cannot be used for burials. Concerned about the degradation of metal of casks and the impact that these toxins leaching into the soils and water can have on livestock, fauna and the Mt Pleasant and other licensed bores. Potential of flooding in Church Creek – an elevated site would be more appealing. Questions the Hydrological Assessment based on flow event up to the 1% AEP as flooding has occurred close to the site. If the site is watered to make it a green and pleasant place it will severely add to the water issues in the area. Bores ran dry in the last year and properties were under water restrictions in the area. Impact on bore water volume and quality. 	<p>Flora and fauna studies are generally carried out in Spring (October/November) in this region. That is to ensure the relevant threatened species (particularly flora) are observable. Importantly hydrogeology monitoring was spread over at least 18 months including wetter periods.</p> <p>Geotech surveying confirmed there is land with the depth of soil that can be used for burials.</p> <p>It is intended that groundwater will be monitored over the life of the cemetery/memorial park. This will be an operational requirement of any development application is approved.</p> <p>The riparian zone as defined through flood modelling will be avoided due to the potential for flooding and rapidly elevating water tables in the alluvium of the creek bed. As such no graves will be placed there.</p> <p>The hydrology assessment does acknowledge some flooding associated with Church Creek. Most of this flooding is exacerbated by a restricting culvert under Old Cooma Road. Once this culvert is resized any flood water will largely be contained in the creek walls and any over-spill will be able to be mitigated through appropriately designed stormwater infrastructure.</p> <p>There will be no gravesites dug within the Riparian corridor. The quality of the water in the water table</p>	<p>No change as a result of this submission.</p> <p>Should the planning proposal proceed consider resizing the culvert under Old Cooma Road as part of any future development.</p>

**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 3.34 and Schedule 1 (Division 3.4) of the
Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979**

Common Issue Topic	Submission Number	Submission Details	Response	Action
			<p>will be monitored and any potential contaminants will be treated appropriately.</p> <p>Council will be required to obtain a license to extract bore water from the Natural Resources Access Regulator.</p>	
Environmental General	1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 28, 32, 33, 38, 40, 45, 48, 51, 52, 53, 56, 58, 59, 61, 64, 66, 67	<p>22 submissions received covered general environmental issues (including flora and fauna impacts) and are summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fear that an expansion to the memorial park would include a crematorium creating further environmental issues. • The area is known for its environmental importance and as such was supposed to be set to pasture - inconsistent with the objectives for the E4 zone and the impact in the quiet rural setting. • There is not going to be enough land left after a constraints map identifies suitable land – the site will not be viable given costs of infrastructure. • Disregard for rural residents of the QPRC area - again. Many bought properties in the areas around Little Burra and Royalla to try and enjoy a little tranquillity away from city living. Residents have already experienced noise from roadworks and huge increases in traffic as Googong grows, but in addition to that we've suffered all the noise, pollution and inconvenience of the new development in Mount Pleasant - only 	<p>There is no intention to include a crematorium at a later date. Council has specifically resolved to remove this element of the planning proposal.</p> <p>The site is zoned E4 Environmental Living. This zoning provides for rural residential development and ancillary uses including extensive agriculture, dwellings, farm buildings, emergency service facilities and community facilities. E4 land generally has lower biodiversity values compared to land zoned E1 National Parks and Nature Reserves zone or E2 Environmental Conservation (which is the zoning of the land opposite the current Queanbeyan Cemetery).</p> <p>The Geotech investigations undertaken confirm there is a suitable area of land for the cemetery/memorial park (including burials) having regard to the depth of soil and groundwater levels. The monitoring of groundwater levels has been undertaken over an 18 month period and is proposed to continue into the future.</p> <p>It is intended the costs of infrastructure to support the cemetery/memorial park will be covered by its operations in the long-run.</p>	No change as a result of this submission.

**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 3.34 and Schedule 1 (Division 3.4) of the
Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979**

Common Issue Topic	Submission Number	Submission Details	Response	Action
		<p>made worse if a crematorium is built at a later date.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned also by all night lighting that may be added, the loss of environmental amenity, possible impacts on groundwater quality, the potential for more funerals per week than currently stated, increased weed invasion & rubbish blown onto properties opposite and fact that this site is towards the outer fringe of the area it is supposed to serve. There is no way to hide the cemetery/memorial park from view, even if tree planting and screening occurs, from the elevated properties at Mount Campbell. Site is situated on important box gum woodland which could be enhanced to provide and protect an endangered ecological community. Contamination from coffins, dead bodies noise and air pollution. Suitability of the site given the works required. Requirement of NRAR not being able to be met. 	<p>The landscaping may not screen all views, however it is intended to soften the impact of any structures or buildings and contribute to an attractive environment. If the planning proposal proceeds it is proposed that the community will have opportunities to input into the design of the facility to ensure quality and good aesthetics.</p> <p>The flora and fauna study recommends that the existing native vegetation - especially the box gum woodland be retained and additional planting utilise native local species. This is supported.</p> <p>NRAR has advised it supports the planning proposal subject to recommendations which will be implemented by Council (such as ongoing groundwater monitoring).</p>	
Mental Health /Social	3, 18, 30, 33, 39, 56, 58	7 submissions were received raising issues concerning with the potential social and health impacts of a cemetery/memorial park being located amongst the rural setting and close to their homes.	<p>Council acknowledges some residents have a social or cultural concern about the use of land for cemetery/memorial park purposes, particularly burials.</p> <p>Council's studies indicate there are unlikely to be significant noise, odour or other emissions that</p>	No change as a result of this submission.

**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 3.34 and Schedule 1 (Division 3.4) of the
Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979**

Common Issue Topic	Submission Number	Submission Details	Response	Action
			would impact on the amenity or health of nearby residents. Council is not aware of similar problems impacting upon long-term residents currently located near its existing cemetery sites in Queanbeyan, Bungendore or Braidwood.	
Process/Communication	1, 3, 7, 26, 28, 32, 40, 48, 50, 51, 52, 58, 60, 66, 67	<p>15 submissions were also received raising issues in regard to the process or communication undertaken in respect of the cemetery/memorial park summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The community meeting should not be conducted via Zoom. • Landowners purchasing sites within the new subdivision were not advised of the planning proposal. • Notification should be sent to residents of the urban area of Googong. • The questions of the survey conducted in regard to the Cemetery/memorial park were geared towards support. • Concerns about the (secretive as stated by one submitter) process undertaken to select the site. The cemetery/memorial park should be located in an area that does not directly impact on an existing community. • Submitters were not advised of the matter being considered by Council at the meeting of 24 June 2020. • The studies were corrupt and some of their studies were completed by Council staff. 	<p>Due to safety concerns in respect of the COVID-19 virus it was not appropriate for Council to hold a physical public meeting in this instance.</p> <p>Council did advise landowners of the cemetery/memorial park proposal by letter dated 20 April 2017. Council also advised the property developers of the Mt Pleasant Estate.</p> <p>The planning proposal is the first stage of the planning process and the community consultation was undertaken during August/Sept 2030.</p> <p>The questionnaire was formulated to ascertain the community's attitude towards a cemetery/memorial park in the proposed location and were prepared by the consultant engaged by Council.</p> <p>Council conducted a locality search based on certain criteria. Eight specific properties within the selected localities were considered during the search. All but one failed due to environmental/geotechnical assessments or were not available for acquisition.</p>	No change as a result of this submission.

**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 3.34 and Schedule 1 (Division 3.4) of the
Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979**

Common Issue Topic	Submission Number	Submission Details	Response	Action
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The social report by Coffey consultants proposed community drop-in sessions at Fernleigh Park, where these held and where were feedback forms distributed? Expenditure expended so far on investigative work of the site. 	<p>Visual impact on surrounding properties will be mitigated by screening with dense landscaping.</p> <p>The meeting on 24 June sought Council's approval to proceed to the public exhibition and community consultation phase and consultation commenced following Council's resolution.</p> <p>The additional drop-in sessions refer to actions following the approval of the planning proposal. Council is yet make a final decision on whether the planning proposal proceeds or not.</p> <p>The studies have been prepared consistent with the Gateway determination issued by the State Government.</p>	
Property Values	3, 7, 13, 18, 19, 33, 35, 39, 50, 51, 52, 56, 58, 61, 66	<p>15 submissions received raised concerns that the proposed development of a cemetery/memorial park in the locality will have negative impact on the value of their and surrounding properties. A number of submitters stated that they would either not have bought in the area (or paid as much when purchasing).</p> <p>One submitter has suggested that Council should now be retrospectively purchasing their property.</p>	<p>The Social Impact Assessment Report prepared by Council notes fears of reduced property values are a concern to residents in the immediate geographical area.</p> <p>However, the report also notes any reduction in land values are likely be in the short term only and primarily associated with property speculation about the cemetery/memorial park.</p> <p>As noted elsewhere, the planting of native species will help screen the nearest properties. Involving residents in the concept design is also recommended to help allay fears in respect of the</p>	No change as a result of this submission.

**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 3.34 and Schedule 1 (Division 3.4) of the
Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979**

Common Issue Topic	Submission Number	Submission Details	Response	Action
			cemetery/memorial park that potentially impact on property prices.	
Support General	2, 4, 8, 9, 11, 16, 17, 22, 24, 27, 31, 36, 41, 42, 49, 55	<p>16 submissions expressed general support for a new cemetery/memorial park at the proposed location for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supportive of a local option to be able to remain forever in the community where they had chosen to live. Will provide a sense of belonging and for a facility close to family. • Supportive of a cemetery/memorial park and it should include a function centre for wakes and a pedestrian linkage to Anglican Church across the road. • Existing cemetery has limited sites left. • Interested to know if Council would be offering Tender Funerals (not for profit) to have an onsite funeral home to provide affordable and meaningful services. • A cemetery/memorial park could be a wonderful addition to the area. A landscaped parkland of native planting used to encourage a diversity of species could be superb. 	<p>It is noted that 16 submissions have expressed general support for the development of a cemetery/memorial park in this locality.</p> <p>The feasibility of issues of Tender Funerals will be addressed as part of any business plan.</p> <p>The support is noted. The feasibility of a pedestrian linkage can be investigated at the design stage. If the proposal proceeds road upgrade and maintenance issues will be considered by Council's Community Connections Portfolio. Installation of NBN is not carried out by Council</p>	No change as a result of this submission.

**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 3.34 and Schedule 1 (Division 3.4) of the
Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979**

Common Issue Topic	Submission Number	Submission Details	Response	Action
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is good opportunity for Council to restore a degraded environment as well as provide the community with a much-needed facility. • The location is easily accessible for local community. • The QBN and District Anglican Church (QDAC) welcomes the proposal and seeks to be consulted regarding design and layout. The proposed location is close to St. Paul's church on Old Cooma Road. The two sites are within walking distance and the site design of the cemetery/memorial park should incorporate a linkage via a pedestrian path. It is important that the design and layout of the cemetery/memorial park demonstrates that the two sites, whilst independent of each other, have a shared community role in providing support for folk experiencing loss. • Support of the proposal subject to off road pedestrian and cycle connection to Googong; road upgrades to cater for extra traffic; entry to Cemetery/memorial park being off Burra Rd; resurfacing of intersection of Evans Road and Old Cooma Road and Installation of NBN at Googong and Mt Campbell. 		

**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 3.34 and Schedule 1 (Division 3.4) of the
Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979**

Common Issue Topic	Submission Number	Submission Details	Response	Action
Neutral	62	The submission made on behalf of the Burra Community Association reports on a survey they undertook in regard to the proposed cemetery/memorial park.	The survey result report that whilst 46% of people who completed the survey were against the proposal, 32% were in favour and 32% were undecided.	No change as a result of this submission