

# Parkwood Cross Border Agency Forum March 2019

Outcomes Report

---

**Contact:**

Steve Rossiter or Kim Anson  
Steve.Rossiter@elton.com.au  
02 6274 3300

---

**CANBERRA  
02 6274 3300**

Superintendent's House  
25 Lennox Crossing  
Acton ACT 2601

---

www.elton.com.au  
consulting@elton.com.au  
Sydney | Brisbane | Canberra | Darwin | Melbourne | Perth  
ABN 56 003 853 101

---

**Prepared by** Will Pearson and Kim Anson

---

**Reviewed by** Steve Rossiter

---

**Date** 10 May 2019

---

**Version** Final Draft

---

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>SUMMARY</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>OVERVIEW OF PRE-2019 AGENCY CONSULTATION AND REPORTING</b>	<b>4</b>
2.1	2007 – 2016 consultation	4
2.2	2017 Planning Proposal - services and infrastructure	4
<b>3</b>	<b>OVERVIEW OF 2019 FORUM</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>KEY FORUM OUTCOMES</b>	<b>8</b>
4.1	Testing principles guiding Infrastructure and Service Delivery	8
4.2	Testing the approach to infrastructure and service delivery	8
4.2.1	Local services, utilities, transport and land management	8
4.2.2	Human services, health and education	9
4.2.3	Police and emergency services	10
4.3	Updated approach and matters requiring short term action	11
<b>APPENDICES</b>		
A	Attendees at the Cross Border Agency Forum	13
B	Cross Border Agency Forum Agenda	17
C	Updated Principles guiding planning of services and infrastructure	20
D	Updated Services and Infrastructure options	21

# 1 Summary

This report provides an overview of the attendance, discussions and outputs from the NSW/ACT cross border cross agency Forum held on 12 March 2019.

A condition of the Alteration of Gateway Determination dated 28 August 2018 from the NSW Department of Planning and Environment required Yass Valley Council to hold the forum:

*“Council is to undertake an agency forum as part of the consultation process with government agencies under condition 6. The forum will assist these agencies in preparing their submission on the proposal by providing them with an outline of the intent of the revised planning proposal and the proposed servicing framework contained in the Services and Infrastructure Report.”*

46 participants from 23 agencies attended the 2019 Forum, in addition to three Council representatives and the Riverview Projects team.

To place the 2019 Forum in its context, Section 2 of this report briefly summarises the timeline of key consultation with government agencies about the proposed urban development at Parkwood from 2007-2016. It also summarises the approach to services and infrastructure developed in 2017, which was tested and refreshed through individual agency consultation in late 2018/early 2019 and then at the forum on 12 March.

Section 3 provides an overview of the 2019 Forum, with key outcomes reported in Section 4.

The Appendices include detailed information about the agenda, attendees and updates to the Principles and approach which emerged from the Forum.

The intent of the revised Planning Proposal was explained to the forum as were the guiding principles and the 2017 approach to planning and delivering services and infrastructure. As a result of consultation with individual agencies in 2018/19 and the cross- agency Forum, the 2017 approach remains largely unchanged.

- » A small number of additions to the guiding principles were suggested as included in Appendix C.
- » Detailed and constructive discussions about implementation of servicing arrangements raised some further issues for consideration, which have been noted for further immediate action in Section 4 or for follow up closer to construction in Appendix D.
- » The options and the preferred options remain largely unchanged. The base case remains feasible within existing legislation, with the period 2-5 years before construction viewed as crucial for fine tuning and finalising the preferred option, with some to be confirmed earlier. (see Appendix D)
- » In addition, many delivery agencies as well as the NSW Cross Border Commissioner and the ACT Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate would prefer to achieve an approach which is regional rather than state and territory based. This was viewed as more efficient and effective in delivering services and infrastructure in accordance with the principles. In particular, there was a focus on achieving Principles 1 and 2, being achieving the look and feel of a borderless community wherever possible and providing a consumer centric service and complaints model of service delivery.

## 2 Overview of pre-2019 agency consultation and reporting

### 2.1 2007 – 2016 consultation

**2007 -2010:** Riverview Projects consulted with relevant agencies on the proposed urban development, starting with the ACT Land Development Agency from 2007, Yass Valley Council from 2009 and the NSW Department of Planning and Infrastructure in 2010. Discussions included principles and possible approaches to the provision of local infrastructure and services.

**June 2013:** the ACT Government announced an agreement with Riverview Projects (ACT) to facilitate the planning and development of Parkwood. Extensive engagement with key agencies was undertaken prior to this announcement, including the NSW Department of Premier and Cabinet, the NSW Office of Environment and Heritage and the ACT Chief Minister’s Directorate.

**November 2013:** an interactive planning and design forum (PDF) was held over three days to prepare the preliminary draft West Belconnen/Parkwood Master Plan. The PDF combined the skills and experience of technical experts from ACT and NSW agencies, Yass Valley Council, a broad range of consultancies, government decision makers and key community representatives.

**June 2014:** following the PDF and in the lead up to the submission of the Planning Proposal, extensive engagement was undertaken with Yass Valley Council, further refining the principles and approach to local infrastructure and service provision. The ACT government was continually briefed and consulted.

**November 2015:** when the ACT Government approved the rezoning of West Belconnen, a significant amount of engagement continued with ACT Government Directorates including the Environment and Planning Directorate, Territory and Municipal Services and ICON water.

**April -December 2015:** the NSW Department of Planning and Environment issued the Gateway Determination which was the trigger for the next more detailed phase of engagement with agencies, particularly in NSW. Individual agency as well as cross agency discussions were held with senior staff to canvas a range of options for service delivery, identify if there were preferred options, explore possible timing and next steps, and identify funding mechanisms.

**January- March 2016:** the series of meetings with NSW Government agency representatives continued, confirming the outcomes of the post gateway discussions and in some cases highlighting additional options. The options were then tested with senior representatives from across the ACT Government Directorates in the lead up to the Cross Border Agency Forum. The final testing occurred at the March 2016 Forum, with the outputs directly captured in the Outcomes Report and the 2017 Planning Proposal Report on Services and Infrastructure.

### 2.2 2017 Planning Proposal - services and infrastructure

The services and infrastructure report explored in detail 16 local government services and 15 state and territory services. It proposed a “**base case**” for service and infrastructure delivery that is feasible within existing legislation and supported by MOUs between the NSW and ACT governments. It demonstrated that all necessary services and infrastructure could be provided and funded.

Key elements of the base case include:

- » Local service delivery by Yass Valley Council, or via Council contracting with ACT government agencies to deliver services wherever enabled within existing legislation.
- » Icon Water providing bulk water, with Council being the local water supplier.
- » ACTEWAGL providing gas and electricity.

- » A p-12 school and related education services provided by the NSW government.
- » Emergency services provided by the ACT government, building on the approach and arrangements in existing MOUs and tested via desk top exercises prior to construction commencing.
- » Police, child protection and other state and territory services provided by a combination of NSW and ACT government agencies, building on existing arrangements including joint taskforces and special constable arrangements.
- » Land management services in the conservation corridor provided primarily by the Conservation Trust, possibly supported by some government service provision.

The extensive consultation with Council, NSW and ACT service delivery agencies identified service delivery options that were regarded as more efficient and effective than the base case. The long lead time for planning Parkwood in NSW was viewed by agencies as providing flexibility to respond to emerging government policy and legislative directions, as well as changes in government and Council preferences over time. This includes the opportunity for exploration of more innovative and efficient service delivery options which are described in Appendix D. These options achieve the 'borderless community' approach to a greater extent.

Some, but not all, of the borderless community options would require specific financial agreements, legislative change and/or amendments to regulations. For example, legislative change and amendments to regulations would be required to outsource some regulatory services to the ACT government. Some of these changes may occur as a result of ongoing legislative reviews while others may require specific consideration. These matters were all documented in the 2017 report.

A summary table of all options identified in 2017 is included at Appendix D. This is the options table that was tested at the 2018/2019 individual agency consultations, culminating in the cross agency discussions at the Forum. Appendix D also included updates in red suggested at the 2019 Forum or in individual agency consultations leading up to or following the Forum.

## 3 Overview of 2019 Forum

The Cross Border Agency Forum was held on 12 March 2019 with representatives from various NSW and ACT Government departments and agencies, as well as Yass Valley Council. Agencies invited included all those required by the Alteration of Gateway Determination in response to the resubmitted Planning Proposal in 2017. Additional interested agencies were also invited.

A full list of organisations and attendees is included at Appendix B.

The purpose of the forum as described on the agenda was:

- » To update NSW and ACT agencies about the proposed Parkwood development and the planning approval process
- » To provide an overview and gain any further feedback about the proposed approach to infrastructure and service delivery developed in consultation with Yass Valley Council, NSW and ACT government agencies
- » To ensure agencies have sufficient information prior to being formally requested to provide submissions on the Planning Proposal

Forum participants were provided with an overview of the project and the planning process, including the changes in the revised Planning Proposal that had occurred since the original Forum in 2016. The Development Director of the Suburban Land Agency explained the involvement of the ACT Government as a joint venture partner with Riverview Projects.

An overview of the proposed infrastructure and service delivery framework was then provided by project team members. This overview included the service delivery guiding principles, options for service and infrastructure delivery, funding, and timing of review points and resolution of preferred options.

A theme of 'seamless' delivery of services in the cross-border environment was consistent throughout the presentation and supported by participants.

The NSW Cross Border Commissioner and the Deputy-Directory General, Policy and Cabinet from the ACT Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate spoke about cross border planning in general and the best practice elements, including taking a regional approach. Particular focus was given to the increasingly strong working relationship between the ACT and NSW governments and agencies, supported by the existing Memorandum of Understanding on Regional Collaboration as well as other important operational cross-border agreements.

As per the 2016 Forum, a workshop session followed the presentation. Three concurrent sessions were held with attendees participating in the appropriate sector specific workshop. The three sector-based discussions were:

- » Municipal/local services; Utilities; Land Management, Environment; Transport
- » Emergency Services and Police
- » Human Services, Education and Health.

The workshops were designed to re-test the service and infrastructure options as developed and documented in the 2017 Parkwood Planning Proposal – Services and Infrastructure Report.

- » Are there any further suggested refinements to the approach/options?
- » Are the proposed next steps and timing appropriate?
- » Are there matters that require further attention to assist agencies prepare submissions?
- » Are there any further comments on the guiding principles?

The workshops commenced by re-examining the agreed approach for each service or type of infrastructure from the 2017 report. Participants were asked to consider whether any changes had occurred since 2017 that may impact future delivery of services or the provision of infrastructure.

Participants then moved on to reviewing the principles guiding planning of services and infrastructure to determine whether any improvements could be made. The workshop groups reported back to all participants at the end of the individual sessions.

A copy of the Forum agenda is provided at Appendix B. An update to the principles guiding planning of services and infrastructure is included at Appendix C and an update to the options table is at Appendix D.

## 4 Key forum outcomes

### 4.1 Testing principles guiding Infrastructure and Service Delivery

The principles were presented to the whole Forum and then discussed in the three working groups. The principles were broadly endorsed to provide ongoing guidance for the planning of services and infrastructure. There was some discussion and questions, leading to a small number of suggested amendments to the principles. The updated set of principles are included at Appendix D, with updates noted in red.

Key points from the discussions were:

- » The principles have been developed to guide services and infrastructure planning and delivery. A different and overarching set of principles exist in legislation for the Planning Proposal to be tested against in NSW. It is worth clarifying this when naming the services and infrastructure principles. In addition to the NSW legislation, the Planning Proposal should have regard to the overarching principles in ACT legislation.
- » Principle 8 should ensure no detriment for NSW as well as the ACT.
- » Principle 10 deals with needs based planning. A reference to the triggers that would ensure early provision of services and infrastructure was suggested for consideration.
- » Principle 13 recognises the importance of building on existing servicing and financing arrangements. It is also important to recognise emerging arrangements.
- » Principle 18 refers to MOUs as a basis for service delivery. In order to provide flexibility, other possible instruments should also be referenced.

### 4.2 Testing the approach to infrastructure and service delivery

#### 4.2.1 Local services, utilities, transport and land management

18 participants from 10 agencies attended this discussion. The discussion touched on each of the services.

In picturing the future in Parkwood, ACT representatives in particular envisaged the sorts of issues that may arise should Yass Valley Council contract most services to the ACT. Key points that emerged about **local services** were:

- » If regulatory activities are to be outsourced to ACT, a preference was expressed by ACT agencies to achieve harmonised laws and regulation between NSW and the ACT. This was seen as desirable from both from a resident perspective and for ease of management of the service. While it could be feasible for staff to administer different legislation, it isn't desirable in seeking to achieve the feel of a borderless community. Examples discussed included regulation of dogs and cats, illegal dumping, littering and unlawful uses.
- » It was suggested that two- five years before construction commences in NSW is the right timing for more detailed consideration of ACT and NSW legislation and possible harmonisation. One option suggested was that the two governments and Council take an overall approach to this matter rather than dealing with it on an agency by agency basis.
- » There was also a desire expressed for Council to consider whether the decision about contracting out one specific service is linked to another, with the specific example being DA assessment and certification.
- » Harmonisation of infrastructure standards wherever possible was also identified as desirable both for the community and also efficiency of maintenance services.

It was acknowledged that contracting services to the ACT and achieving similar service levels in the ACT and NSW would depend on Yass Valley Council being able to achieve rating income comparable to the ACT. This is a critical issue requiring a streamlined rating process.

With regard to **management of the conservation area**, representatives from NSW Crown Lands outlined the recent discussions and investigations that have led to clarification of the waterway as being Crown Land. Options for management of the waterway include the Ginninderry Environmental Management Trust and Council, either of which can apply to become the reserve trust manager. Ongoing discussions are planned to work through the options, which should now be recognised as involving more than the Trust on its own.

Initially with regard to **transport** and then more broadly, the issue was raised as to the triggers for various services to be commenced eg buses, car share, park and ride. The principle about needs based planning needs to translate at the appropriate time to the determination of triggers for service commencement. The two- five year timeframe in advance of construction was seen to be appropriate for decision making.

With regard to **water management**, given 42 wetlands and 12 catchments, the importance of water sensitive urban design and water harvesting was raised. There is already significant attention given to this issue for the whole cross border development. Two- five years in advance of construction was viewed as the right timing to resolve the details of the approach, with the matter also to be highlighted in the summary table.

The options for **provision of water** were unchanged from 2017.

## 4.2.2 Human services, health and education

11 participants from 6 agencies attended this group discussion. The group covered broad issues regarding the type of community Parkwood would be and the type of service network required to support it, as well as detailed agency-specific discussion.

In terms of the broad discussion, the group referred to the 'First 2000 Days Framework', A Policy Directive of the NSW Government issued by NSW Health in February 2019 ([https://www1.health.nsw.gov.au/pds/ActivePDSDocuments/PD2019\\_008.pdf](https://www1.health.nsw.gov.au/pds/ActivePDSDocuments/PD2019_008.pdf)), as a key input into human services, health and education planning. The discussion focussed on the importance of early intervention, proactive delivery of services, and the long term benefits created through an emphasis on children and families. This approach emphasised the connection and interdependencies among human services, health and education agencies. One area that was consistent with this theme, that the group thought required greater attention, was pre-school education and early childhood development.

In related discussion, the importance of a coordinated network of service provision that involved government, not-government and private sector provision was identified. For optimal service provision to be achieved, an integrated approach to service provision was identified as fundamental. This was seen as both a source of more effective and more efficient service provision.

The funding arrangements under the Commonwealth/State Agreement were identified as the primary source for a number of services including community health, hospitals and community services. The group suggested that the nature of these agreements should be reviewed regularly to ensure they continue to be effective over time. It was noted that current arrangements do not include costs for expanded infrastructure such as hospitals, so alternatives will be required if additional capital infrastructure investment is required.

Beyond these broader issues, there was little change recommended to the 2017 options. The following service areas remained the same:

- » Child protection
- » Community health (with the exception of the addition of an option for joint commissioning of services)
- » Community services
- » Hospitals

» Education.

The planning of schools was a key issue, with both ACT and NSW Education agencies acknowledging the opportunity for a shared approach. NSW Education reported that the 5,000 dwellings in NSW may not be sufficient to support a secondary school in NSW. Options identified included the possibility of a smaller secondary school in NSW, or for a partnership arrangement where NSW secondary students attend an ACT Government secondary school.

The relevant Education agencies also recognised that more joint planning and information sharing was required to address both infrastructure provision and funding. The group agreed that revised school student population projections would be developed and that a meeting between ACT and NSW Education agencies would be organised to progress a joint planning approach.

### 4.2.3 Police and emergency services

13 participants from 5 agencies attended this discussion. The discussion was largely focussed on the logistics surrounding the servicing of the locations within their specified response times.

The working group reflected on the guiding principles and reaffirmed their appropriateness with one suggested addition. With regard to the references to an MOU, the view was the MOU was suitable for confirming intent and defining a level of cooperation. However, it was not necessarily the most appropriate for the delivery of a specified service, which would require a legally binding instrument. The group suggested a reference to an "MOU or other legal instrument" to allow flexibility when exploring options.

No changes were made to the options for service delivery. The group suggested a further refinement to the overall approach might include a restated commitment to the highest possible service standard as a benchmark for future cross-border servicing arrangements.

The working group noted that no additional information is required to complete the next step in the process, with the exception that to assist agencies prepare submissions, ESA, RFS and NSW RFS require a copy of the Trust Management Plan for bushfire management of the river corridor.

The working group noted that the Regional Bushfire Management Plan is due for review in the near future and Parkwood should provide input.

The costing of various policing options was raised, with the view that some costings could be developed to assist with consideration of the options.

The group requested the following points be captured for future consideration;

- » There should be input to the planning, location and design of service infrastructure, as response times will need to be considered and may influence the service agreement
- » Scenario testing should inform infrastructure requirements.
- » Scenario modelling may be required to ensure the matrix of services (cross border and interagency) are considered to assist in pinpointing strategic limitations for further attention.
- » Sharing of information impacting on response parameters will be maintained with a round table agreement to circulate. A Cross border planning standard (shared DCP) is required to determine bushfire strategy for the area.
- » Ongoing monitoring and updates regarding funding arrangements are desired.
- » Emergency management legislation will need to be clear to ensure no mixed messages regarding the "lead". The legislation supporting the Jervis Bay School cross border solution is a good practice example.
- » Technological tools and automated messaging will be required and may require significant lead time to implement.

## 4.3 Updated approach and matters requiring short term action

The updated options table is in Appendix D and includes key steps and timing.

More immediate action items are included in the table below

### Immediate Actions

Item	Comments and timing
Prepare revised school student population projections.	Riverview Projects to prepare in April.
ACT and NSW Education agencies to meet.	Riverview Projects to organise in April.
ESA, RFS, NSWRFSS require a copy of the Trust Management Plan for bushfire management of the river corridor.	Riverview Projects to organise immediately.
Update of Regional Bushfire Management Plan due soon.	Riverview Projects to co-ordinate a meeting to update those working on the plan about the Parkwood Planning Proposal.
Prepare brief for OLG about streamlining the rating process to achieve aligned rates for the NSW and ACT developments.	Riverview Projects to prepare for Yass Valley Council and OLG.

# Appendices

# A Attendees at the Cross Border Agency Forum

## Workshop Groups

**Table 1 Municipal and local government services; Utilities; Land Management, Environment; Transport Participants**

Agency	Agency Representative/s	Position (if recorded)
<b>Access Canberra</b>	Ben Green	Director, Regulatory Solutions and Compliance
<b>Department of Industry – Crown Lands</b>	Cliff Lloyd	
	Steve Watts	
<b>EPSDD</b>	Alison Moore	
<b>NSW Planning and Environment</b>	Graham Judge	
<b>ICON Water</b>	Nicole Vonarx	Principal Liaison, Urban Planning Integration
	Tim Elliott	Senior Technical Liaison
<b>OEH</b>	Allison Treweek	
	Nicola Hargraves	
<b>Roads and Maritime Service</b>	Maurice Morgan	
<b>Suburban Land Agency</b>	Chris Webb	Development Director
<b>TCCS</b>	Geoff Davidson	Director, Transport Planning and Active Travel, City Services
	Darwin Zeta	Manager Capital Works Planning
	Tim Wyatt	Manager Transport Planning and Policy
	Gabriel Joseph	Manager Place Co-ordination
	Stephen Alegria	Executive Branch Manager, City Presentation
	Chandra Chandramoha	
<b>Transport for NSW</b>	Matthew Dudley	

Total number of agencies included = 10

Total number of agency representatives = 18

**Table 2 Emergency Services and Police Participants**

Agency	Agency Representative/s	Position (if recorded)
<b>Emergency Services Agency</b>	Bren Burkevics	Justice - Security and EM
	David Foot	Risk and Planning
	David Horner	Risk and Planning
<b>NSW Police</b>	Chris Schilt	Yass Local Area Comand
	Dave Cowell	A/ Inspector / Office in Charge, Yass Police Station
<b>NSW Police – Emergency Management</b>	Paul Lloyd	Regional Emergency Management Officer
<b>Rural Fire Service</b>	Bradley Bourke	
	Amanda Moylan	Team Leader - Development Assessment and Planning, South
	Nick Turner	Regional Services Manager (Operations) Regional Operations, South
	Richard Maloney	Superintendent
	Greg Potts	
<b>SES</b>	Joanne Humphries	
	Allan Budziarski	

Total number of agencies included = 5

Total number of agency representatives = 13

**Table 3 Human Services and Health Workshop Participants**

Agency	Agency Representative/s	Position (if recorded)
<b>Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate</b>	Leesa Croke - (EA is Alex Slobodian)	Deputy Director General, Policy and Cabinet
	Ryan Thomson	
	David Clapham	Acting Manager, Intergovernmental Relations
<b>Education Directorate</b>	Margaret Stewart	
<b>Family and Community Services</b>	Jill Herbert	
	Hannah Wanless	
<b>NSW Ambulance</b>	Kim Tonkin	
<b>NSW Department of Education</b>	Stacey Miers	
	Stephanie Bashford	
<b>Suburban Land Agency</b>	Gareth Burdon	
	Chris Webb	Development Director

Total number of agencies included = 6

Total number of agency representatives = 11

**Table 4 Unallocated to Workshop**

Agency	Agency Representative/s	Position (if recorded)
<b>NSW Planning and Environment</b>	Luke Musgrave	Director Regions, Southern
<b>Premier and Cabinet</b>	Heidi Stratford	Director, South East
<b>Cross Border Commissioner</b>	James McTavish	Cross Border Commissioner
<b>Chief Minister, Cross Border</b>	David Clapham	Acting Manager, Intergovernmental Relations

Total number of agencies included = 4

Total number of agency representatives = 4

**Table 5 Apologies**

Agency	Agency Representative/s	Position
<b>ACT</b>		
<b>Access Canberra</b>	David Peffer (EA - Julie)	Deputy Director General
<b>ACT Ambulance</b>	Howard Wren	
<b>Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate</b>	Stephen Miners	Deputy Under Treasurer
	Sam Engele	Executive Group Manager, Policy and Cabinet
<b>Community Services Directorate</b>	Rebecca Cross (DG)	
	Bernadette Mitcherson (DDG)	Bernadette's Executive Officer - cc her for info
<b>Emergency Services Agency</b>	Carmel Summers	SBMP Members
<b>Environment, Planning and Sustainable Development Directorate</b>	Daniel Iglesias	Director, ACT Parks and Conservation Service
	Steven Gianakis	
<b>Fire and Rescue</b>	Mark Brown	
<b>Health Directorate</b>	Michael De'Ath	
	Karen Doran	Corporate Services Deputy Director-General
	Leonie McGregor	Health Systems, Policy and Research Deputy Director-General
	Nicole Kefford	
<b>Icon Water</b>	Alison Pratt	
<b>Justice and Community Safety Directorate</b>	David Pryce	Deputy Director General Community Safety
<b>Rural Fire Service</b>	Joe Murphy	
<b>State Emergency Service</b>	Tracey Allen	
	Graham Ible	
<b>Transport Canberra and City Services</b>	Emma Thomas	Director General
	Ben McHugh	Executive Group Manager, City Operations
	Peter Steele	Transport Canberra buses
<b>New South Wales</b>		

<b>Ambulance Service of NW</b>	Mark Gibbs	
<b>Department of Planning and Environment - Energy and Resources</b>	Paul Dale	Director Land and Titles Advice
	Malcolm Drummond	
<b>Fire and Rescue NSW</b>	Steven Hayes	
<b>Local Land Services</b>	Chris Harris	Acting Manager
<b>NSW Department of Family and Community Services</b>	Helen Board	Director Commissioning and Planning
	Kathryn Stonestreet	Manager Commissioning and Planning
<b>NSW Department of Health</b>	Kristi Payten	Health Services Planner, Southern NSW Local Health District
<b>NSW Department of Industry - Water</b>	Jillian Reynolds	
<b>NSW Department of Justice - Office of Emergency Management</b>	Feergus O'Connor	Office of Emergency Management
	Mandy Moore	Office of Emergency Management
<b>NSW Department of Primary Industries - Agriculture</b>	Wendy Goodburn	
<b>NSW Rural Fire Service</b>	Martha Dotter	
<b>NSW State Emergency Service</b>	Cherie Parmenter	
<b>NSW Treasury</b>	San Midha	Deputy Secretary of Treasury, Policy and Budget
<b>Office of Emergency Management</b>	Wendy Graham	
	Nadine Hume	
<b>Office of Environment and Heritage</b>	Michael Saxon	

Total number of agencies apologies = 10

Total number of agency representative apologies = 18

## **B Cross Border Agency Forum Agenda**

<b>Project</b>	Parkwood Planning Proposal	<b>Date</b>	12 March 2019
<b>Venue</b>	33-35 Brindabella Circuit, Brindabella Business Park	<b>Time</b>	10.45am-2.30pm
<b>Purpose</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>» To update NSW and ACT agencies about the proposed Parkwood development and the planning approval process</li> <li>» To provide an overview and gain any further feedback about the proposed approach to infrastructure and service delivery developed in consultation with Council, NSW and ACT government agencies</li> <li>» To ensure agencies have sufficient information prior to being formally requested to provide submissions on the Planning Proposal</li> </ul>		

Time	Item	Lead
10.45am	<b>1. Registration and refreshments</b>	
11.00am	<b>2. Introduction</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>» Acknowledgement of country</li> <li>» Welcome</li> <li>» Purpose of forum</li> </ul>	Chris Berry (Director of Planning, Yass Valley Council) Kim Anson (Workshop Facilitator, Elton Consulting)
11.20am	<b>3. Update on project</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>» Overview from Council</li> <li>» Background - overview of timeline and process including engagement</li> <li>» Overview of intent and detail of revised planning proposal</li> <li>» Alteration of Gateway Determination – NSW DPE requirements</li> <li>» Next steps in planning process</li> <li>» Question and Answer</li> </ul>	Liz Makin (Strategic Planning Manager, Yass Valley Council) David Maxwell (Riverview Projects) Chris Webb (Development Director, Suburban Land Agency) Stephen Gouge (Knight Frank Town Planning)
12.30pm	<b>4. Cross Border Planning</b>	Leesa Croke, Deputy Director General, Policy and Cabinet, ACT Government) James McTavish (NSW Cross Border Commissioner)
12.45pm	<b>5. Light lunch</b>	

Time	Item	Lead
1.15pm	<p><b>6. Testing the approach</b></p> <p>Small group discussions – three groups</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Are there any further suggested refinements to the approach?</li> <li>&gt; Are the proposed next steps and timing appropriate?</li> <li>&gt; Are there any further comments on the guiding principles?</li> <li>&gt; Are there matters requiring further attention to assist agencies prepare their submissions to NSW DPE?</li> </ul> <p>» Report back</p>	<p>Facilitator and project team</p> <p>David Maxwell</p> <p>Stephen Gouge, Amy Ryan</p> <p>Kim Anson, Steve Rossiter, Will Pearson</p> <p>Ross O'Shea</p> <p>Mick Palmer</p> <p>Stephen Harding</p>
2.15 pm	<p><b>7. Next steps</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>» Recap outstanding items</li> <li>» Process and timing for agency submissions</li> <li>» Forum reporting</li> <li>» Final questions and comments</li> </ul>	<p>Kim Anson</p> <p>Stephen Gouge</p>
2.30pm	<p><b>8. Close</b></p>	<p>Yass Valley Council</p>

## C Updated Principles guiding planning of services and infrastructure

### Look and Feel

1. Achieve the look and feel of a borderless community wherever possible.
2. Provide a consumer centric service and complaints model of service delivery.
3. Encourage both government and non-government service providers to be guided by these principles.

### Local Service Provision

4. Establish same or similar service levels for local services in ACT and NSW wherever possible
5. Implement the same or similar infrastructure standards in ACT and NSW wherever possible
6. Set local government rates and charges at an adequate level to cover the costs of local services and infrastructure maintenance and renewal in the long term.
7. Recognise that if provided by ACT service providers, user charges for water, sewer, gas and electricity service provision in Parkwood will seek to recoup costs at levels comparable to ACT charges.
8. Ensure service provision into Parkwood from the ACT has no detrimental impact on service delivery in the ACT and NSW.
9. Use existing legislative opportunities to maximise options for delivery of local services into Parkwood by ACT Government and other providers.

### State and Territory Service Provision

10. Utilise needs based planning to inform service provision and consider triggers for commencement of services.
11. Establish same or similar service levels for state services in ACT and NSW wherever possible.
12. Implement same or similar infrastructure standards in the ACT and NSW wherever possible.
13. Recognise existing and emerging Commonwealth, State and Territory service provision and financing agreements
14. Build on existing cross agency MOUs and operational arrangements which already deliver coordinated NSW and ACT government services across the border for policing, emergency services and human services.
15. Build on and where needed further formalise engagement and dispute resolution procedures between governments related to operational MOUs, guided by the governance approach in the overarching MOU.
16. Use the framework of the overarching MOU between the ACT and NSW Governments to engage further, finalise arrangements and resolve potential and actual disputes to support service access and delivery.

### Timing and process

17. Review service delivery proposals and policy directions in 2020 and then every 2 to 5 years before construction in NSW
18. Use existing legislation and MOUs or other relevant instruments as a foundation for service delivery
19. Continue to explore opportunities created by legislative reform directions and change

## D Updated Services and Infrastructure options

This table was originally produced in Parkwood Planning Proposal, Services and Infrastructure report, 2017. It has been updated following the cross- border forum on 12 March, 2019 with updates in red. The table is organised with local services first in alphabetical order, followed by state and territory services in alphabetical order. The colour coding reflects the three workshop groups at the forum.

Local government, utilities, land management, environment, transport

Human Services and Health

Police and Emergency Services

Key infrastructure and services	Summary of service delivery options (preferred option in bold, if determined)	Recurrent funding source	Key steps	Timing on key step
<b>Local Services</b>				
<b>Abandoned vehicles regulation</b>	1. Yass Valley Council <b>2. Contracted by Yass Valley Council to ACT Government</b>	Rates income and fines	Confirm option and resolve details	2 years in advance
<b>Community strategic planning</b>	Yass Valley Council	Rates income	Resolve details	2 years in advance
<b>Companion animals' management</b>	1. Yass Valley Council <b>2. Contracted by Yass Valley Council to ACT Government</b>	Rates income and user charges	Confirm option and resolve details including *regulatory amendment if ACT delivery * <b>explore harmonisation of NSW and ACT legislation</b>	<b>2 -5 years in advance</b>

Key infrastructure and services	Summary of service delivery options (preferred option in bold, if determined)	Recurrent funding source	Key steps	Timing on key step
<b>DA assessment</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Yass Valley Council</li> <li>2. Contracted by Yass Valley Council to ACT Government</li> </ol>	Rates income and user charges	Confirm option and resolve details including <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>» Explore harmonisation</li> <li>» Consider whether assessment and certification require the same approach</li> </ul>	2-5 years in advance
<b>DA determinations</b>	Yass Valley Council	Rates income and user charges	Confirm option and resolve details	2-5 years in advance
<b>Development certification</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Yass Valley Council</li> <li>2. Contracted by Yass Valley Council to ACT Government or ACT service provider</li> </ol>	Rates income and user charges	Confirm option and resolve details including <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>» Consider whether assessment and certification require the same approach</li> </ul>	2-5 years in advance
<b>Community Home Support Service Program services</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Yass Valley Council</li> <li>2. Community organisations</li> <li>3. Contracted by Yass Valley Council to ACT Government or ACT service provider</li> </ol>	Commonwealth funding-consumer based	Confirm option and resolve details	2-5 years in advance
<b>Food shop regulation</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Yass Valley Council</li> <li>2. <b>Contracted by Yass Valley Council to ACT Government</b></li> </ol>	User charges	Confirm option and resolve details	2 years in advance
<b>Illegal dumping regulation</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Yass Valley Council</li> <li>2. <b>Contracted by Yass Valley Council to ACT Government</b></li> </ol>	Rates income and fines	Confirm option and resolve details, including amendment to regulation if required	2-5 years in advance

Key infrastructure and services	Summary of service delivery options (preferred option in bold, if determined)	Recurrent funding source	Key steps	Timing on key step
<b>Library services</b>	1. Yass Valley Council -mobile service <b>2. Contracted by Yass Valley Council to ACT Government-</b> Kippax library possibly supported by a shop front drop off.	Rates income and fines	Confirm option and resolve details	2-5 years in advance
<b>Parking regulation</b>	1. Yass Valley Council <b>2. Contracted by Yass Valley Council to ACT Government</b>	Fines and user charges	Confirm option and resolve details, including legislative position	2-5 years in advance
<b>Parks and open space maintenance</b>	1. Yass Valley Council <b>2. Contracted by Yass Valley Council to ACT Government</b>	Rates income	Confirm option and resolve details	2 years in advance
<b>Private pool inspections</b>	1. Yass Valley Council <b>2. Contracted by Yass Valley Council to ACT Government or 'authorised authority'</b>	Rates income and user charges	Confirm option and resolve details regarding necessary administrative action	2 years in advance
<b>Public health inspections, including hairdressers</b>	1. Yass Valley Council <b>2. Contracted by Yass Valley Council to ACT Government</b>	Rates income and user charges	Confirm option and resolve details, including legislative position	2-5 years in advance
<b>Rate setting and collection</b>	Yass Valley Council	Rates income	Confirm rating related to servicing costs	2-5 years in advance
<b>Roads, stormwater and footpaths maintenance</b>	1. Yass Valley Council <b>2. Contracted by Yass Valley Council to ACT Government</b>	Rates income	Confirm option and resolve details <b>Explore option of harmonising infrastructure standards</b>	2 years in advance <b>5 years in advance</b>
<b>Waste collection and recycling</b>	1. Yass Valley Council <b>2. Contracted by Yass Valley Council to ACT Government</b>	User charges	Confirm option and resolve detail	2 years in advance



Local government, utilities, land management, environment, transport

Human Services and Health

Police and Emergency Services

Key infrastructure and services	Summary of service delivery options (preferred option in bold, if determined)	Recurrent funding source	Key steps*	Timing on key steps*
<b>State and Territory Services</b>				
<b>Ambulance</b>	Options <b>1. ACT Government from Aranda or Charnwood</b> 2. NSW Government	User charges and possible subsidies	Confirm preferred option and associated subsidies	2-5 years in advance
<b>Child protection</b>	Options 1. Similar to current approach » NSW Government from Yass or Queanbeyan » Joint Investigation Response Team from ACT and NSW <b>(for criminal matters)</b> 2. ACT government	NSW Government NSW and ACT governments as per existing arrangements for joint investigations	Review approach with agencies based on government policy directions	2-5 years in advance
<b>Community bus services</b>	<b>Non-government organisation</b>	Commonwealth funding and user charges	Monitor reform outcomes Confirm approach	2-5 years in advance

Key infrastructure and services	Summary of service delivery options (preferred option in bold, if determined)	Recurrent funding source	Key steps*	Timing on key steps*
Community health	Options 1. ACT Government from: » existing sites, or » a new service site within community hub 2. NSW government from sites as outlined above 3. Explore joint commissioning of services	Funding framework as per Commonwealth/State Government agreement <b>Funding framework to be reviewed and updated every five years</b>	Confirm preferred approach early for planning purposes	<b>5 years in advance</b> <b>Reviewed every 5 years</b>
Community services	<b>A coordinated network of Government, Non-Government and Private sector provision</b>	Community development position funded by Ginninderry Joint Venture. Ongoing community services funded by State and Commonwealth Government	Review situation to understand likely provision- reform directions suggest funding will be linked to consumers	2-5 years in advance
Fire and rescue services	<b>ACT Government, consistent with the current or an enhanced MOU</b>	<b>Negotiated as part of the MOU review</b>	<b>Review of existing MOU</b>	<b>2-5 years in advance</b>
			Desk top exercise - <b>scenario modelling and testing</b>	2-5 years in advance
Gas and electricity services	<b>Owned and supplied by ACTEWAGL</b>	User charges	Resolve details	2 years in advance
Hospitals	<b>Canberra Hospital and Calvary Bruce Hospital (ACT) as per likely consumer choice</b>	Funding as per Commonwealth/State/Territory Government agreement	Monitor ongoing health agreements and associated financial arrangements	2-5 years in advance

Key infrastructure and services	Summary of service delivery options (preferred option in bold, if determined)	Recurrent funding source	Key steps*	Timing on key steps*
<p><b>Natural resources and environment management</b></p>	<p>Management provided by the Ginninderry Environmental Management Trust and others.</p>	<p>Funding proposed to include:</p> <p><b>NSW</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 1% levy on land sales</li> <li>- \$100 rates surcharge per lot</li> <li>- commercial activities operated by Trust</li> </ul> <p><b>ACT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-contribution from ACT government and developer equivalent to 1% levy on land sales</li> <li>-annual contribution from ACT government equivalent to \$100/lot surcharge in NSW</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- work with NSW Crown Lands regarding boundary issue and options for management of waterway</li> <li>- include proposed funding arrangements in rating submission to OLG</li> <li>- review details of implementation of Trust in NSW, noting the first stage of the Management Trust will be in place in ACT by 2020</li> </ul>	<p>2019/20</p> <p>2-5 years in advance of opening of reserve in NSW</p>
<p><b>Policing</b></p>	<p>Options</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. ACT and NSW police via existing Special Member model, with administrative enhancements</li> <li>2. Option 1, plus joint patrols</li> <li>3. Cross border justice scheme model, currently in place in border areas of South Australia, Northern Territory and Western Australia</li> </ol>	<p>A detailed feasibility assessment and new financial arrangements between ACT and NSW governments would be required for buffer zone option.</p> <p>No special financing arrangements anticipated for other options.</p>	<p>ACT and NSW governments to commence discussions about options, including buffer zone, and reach agreement on preferred direction.</p>	<p>2020</p>

Key infrastructure and services	Summary of service delivery options (preferred option in bold, if determined)	Recurrent funding source	Key steps*	Timing on key steps*
	4. Buffer zone option – a new model with ACT laws operating in Parkwood			
<b>Public bus and other transport options</b>	Options 1. private operator in the region 2. <b>ACT Government</b>	User charges	Review any outstanding issues and triggers for early delivery of options eg park and ride; buses; carshare	2-5 years in advance
<b>Rural fire services</b>	Options 1. Provision of service from Wallaroo Road with the unit crossing Ginninderra Creek. Provision of service from Wallaroo Road with the unit crossing Ginninderra Creek. <b>2. Service provided by the ACT.</b> MoU similar to Jervis Bay Territory would be an effective mechanism	Negotiated as part of the MOU review	Review of existing MOU	2-5 years in advance
			Risk planning	From 2016, updated every 5 years
			Resolve option and confirm detail	2-5 years in advance
<b>Schools and education services</b>	Options 1. Access for NSW residents to ACT schools 2. NSW Government to operate a school, potentially from K-Yr 12.	New access arrangements and possibly financing arrangement would be required between ACT and NSW Governments for Option 1. This could be in the form of recurrent funding (potentially via the Grants Commission). MOU to set framework for negotiations	Resolve preferred option. If Option 1, financial arrangements may be required.	10 years in advance
<b>State emergency services</b>	Options 1. Provision of services from NSW (Yass, Goulburn or Queanbeyan)	Negotiated as part of the MOU review	Review of existing MOU	2-5 years in advance

Key infrastructure and services	Summary of service delivery options (preferred option in bold, if determined)	Recurrent funding source	Key steps*	Timing on key steps*
	<b>2. Provision of services from the ACT, consistent with the current or an enhanced MOU</b>		Test option in desk top exercises	2-5 years in advance or earlier if Ginninderra Falls open early
<b>Water and sewerage services</b>	<p>Options</p> <p>1. Bulk water supply by Icon Water, Yass Valley Council is retail supplier</p> <p><b>2. Service owned and supplied by Icon Water</b></p> <p>Appropriate water sensitive urban design and water harvesting are integral to both options.</p>	User charges	<p>Sewerage service</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- commence construction of new hydraulic services</li> <li>- complete construction</li> </ul> <p>Water</p> <p>Review regulatory and pricing framework to maximise streamlining</p> <p>Resolve water harvesting</p>	<p>October 2023</p> <p>2025</p> <p>2025</p> <p>2-5 years in advance</p>