

From: Gerald Lynch [gjlynch@grapevine.net.au]
Sent: Wednesday, 17 June 2015 5:46 PM
To: Terrplan
Subject: Draft Variation 351 (NCP DA85)

Following are my comments on DV351/DA85

Gerald Lynch
54 Erldunda Circuit
Hawker ACT 2614

Start:

Much of the planning study documentation concerns the effect of proposed development on physical, environmental and social aspects, but very little detail is provided on the unique cross-border issues which the development must involve when some 13,000 people are expected to live in some sort of NSW exclave on the ACT border.

Inevitably the population of West Belconnen and any contiguous urban area in NSW will look to the ACT for provision of all services required. The planning proposals should not simply dismiss the cross-border implications as having been covered in Section 9, when this section simply refers to some sort of "understanding" between the ACT and NSW without spelling out how it will be turned into practice.

For example, how is policing of the area to be conducted? ACT law does not necessarily apply in NSW nor presumably would the ACT police service have any effective automatic jurisdiction in the NSW section of the cross-border development. Yet it is almost unthinkable that NSW will be able or willing to police the urban area of the development when road access is only likely to be possible from ACT. Even if road access is available from NSW, unless a police presence is established within the development, NSW police would have to travel from either Queanbeyan or Murrumbateman/Yass to deal with any incidents in the cross-border development.

Somewhat similar considerations apply to fire and ambulance services as well as schooling. None of this is dealt with in the planning documents made available.

NSW residents would, for the most part, still look to the ACT for employment. They would therefore economically be part of the ACT, and they will be constant users of ACT roads and draw exclusively on the ACT for urban services. It is unthinkable that Yass Council will be in a position to deliver anything meaningful in this regard. Yet presumably that council will be the rate-levying and income-receiving authority. It is equally unthinkable that cross-border residents will look to Yass or Queanbeyan for hospital or medical services, be they emergency or otherwise. And the NSW residents will expect to receive the same level of services as are available to ACT residents and ratepayers because their sustenance is derived from the ACT and they are likely to identify as "Canberra" residents. But the cross-border development is not even comparable to Queanbeyan,

where there is an established and capable municipal authority with self-standing arrangements in place to handle waste management, water supply, sewerage, road maintenance, street lighting, public transport and the other municipal services required. Further, any cross-border resident will be able and required to register and insure vehicles under NSW law and at NSW rates while probably using those vehicles predominantly on ACT roads.

By default, ACT residents are likely to be placed in the undesirable situation of receiving no benefit from the cross-border area of development while being required to sustain most of the costs. This is inequitable and should be addressed more comprehensively in the planning process.

Finish