

LATE ITEMS ORDINARY MEETING

AGENDA

13 OCTOBER 2020

Your attendance is required at an Ordinary meeting of Council to be held in the Council Chambers, 232 Bolsover Street, Rockhampton on 13 October 2020 commencing at 9:00am for transaction of the enclosed business.

In line with section 277E of the Local Government Regulation 2012, it has been determined that it is not practicable for the public to attend Council meetings in person at the current time. Until further notice, Council meetings will instead take place via videoconference and will be livestreamed online.

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

12 October 2020

Next Meeting Date: 27.10.20

Please note:

In accordance with the *Local Government Regulation 2012*, please be advised that all discussion held during the meeting is recorded for the purpose of verifying the minutes. This will include any discussion involving a Councillor, staff member or a member of the public.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ITEM		SUBJECT	PAGE NO
11	OFFIC	CERS' REPORTS	1
	11.8	PROMOTION OF 2020 STATE GENERAL ELECTION PRIORIT GRACEMERE HIGH SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION	
	11.9	REDIRECTION OF EXISTING FUNDING	

11 OFFICERS' REPORTS

11.8 PROMOTION OF 2020 STATE GENERAL ELECTION PRIORITY - GRACEMERE HIGH SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

File No: 11092

Attachments: 1. Signage 1 (set of 3)

2. Signage 2 (set of 3)

Authorising Officer: Evan Pardon - Chief Executive Officer

Author: Damon Morrison - Manager Office of the Mayor

SUMMARY

This report seeks Council's endorsement to continue its support and advocacy efforts on behalf of the local community for the construction of a High School at Gracemere by 2024 and for direction from Council on its preferred methods of advocacy during the upcoming 2020 State General Election in furtherance of this priority project.

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

THAT Council:

- 1. resolves to continue to support and advocate on behalf of the local community for the construction of a high school at Gracemere by 2024 as a priority project; and
- 2. endorse option (xx) as outlined in the body of the report.

COMMENTARY

The State of Queensland (represented by Department of Education, Skills and Employment) is the registered owner of land described as Lot 146 on plan CP866179, Title Reference 50417412 situated at 146 Lucas Street, Gracemere (the Lucas Street site) which has been earmarked for the future construction of a high school for the local community.

Following a comprehensive community engagement exercise undertaken in November 2014, Council has supported and advocated on behalf of the Gracemere and broader community for the construction of a high school at the Lucas Street site.

Council's support and advocacy has included formal representations at State Government Community Cabinet deputations (2015 and 2016), meetings with and correspondence to current and former Members of Parliament and relevant Ministers of the Queensland Government (since 2015) and during previous and current state general election campaigns as a Council priority (2017 and 2020).

Direction is sought from Council on the following options to advocate for a commitment by candidates during the current 2020 state general election campaign for the construction of a high school at Gracemere:

- 1. That Council installs a series of signs at the Lucas Street site as per attachment 1 and 2 until 28 October 2020 and continues to engage with individual candidates and the community via media releases/social media to promote and seek a commitment towards the project.
- 2. That Council does not install any signage at the Lucas Street site and continues to engage with individual candidates and the community via media releases/social media to promote and seek a commitment towards the project.

BACKGROUND

According to the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) Census data the population of Gracemere from the period 2011 to 2016 has been

- 2011 8,452 persons;
- 2016 11,315 persons.

Population estimates for Gracemere as at 30 June 2019 was 12,758 persons with the Queensland Government Statistician's Office (QGSO) projecting population growth for Gracemere from 2021 to 2041 as follows:

Year	2021	2026	2031	2036	2041
Population	13,278	15,157	17,306	19,969	22,796

The latest QGSO projections for secondary school aged students from Gracemere are as follows:

SA2 Name	2021	2026	2031	2036	2041
Gracemere	1,237	1,421	1,496	1,655	1,862

The Queensland Schools Planning Commission review of demand in 2015 found that growth should be monitored and if a new school was not warranted in the current decade (to 2021) it assumed it would be in the next (2021 to 2031).

Council understands that a more recent review has confirmed that demand may exist for the construction of one to two secondary schools for the Gracemere community within the next 10 years.

PREVIOUS DECISIONS

No relevant previous decisions have been made by Council.

BUDGET IMPLICATIONS

All budget implications relevant to the matter under consideration will be met within the 2020/2021 operational budget for the Office of CEO.

LEGISLATIVE CONTEXT

Nil

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

Section 181 of the Electoral Act 1992:

- (1) A person must not, during the election period for an election—
 - (a) print, publish, distribute or broadcast; or
 - (b) permit or authorise another person to print, publish, distribute or broadcast;

any advertisement, handbill, pamphlet or notice containing election matter unless there appears, or is stated, at its end the particulars required by subsection (2).

Maximum penalty—

- (a) in the case of an individual—20 penalty units; or
- (b) in the case of a corporation—85 penalty units.
- (2) The particulars are the name and address (other than a post office box) of the person who authorised the advertisement, handbill, pamphlet or notice

STAFFING IMPLICATIONS

There are no staffing implications relevant to the matter under consideration.

RISK ASSESSMENT

Community support for the construction of a high school at Gracemere has consistently been conveyed to Council since at least 2014 in a range of forums. Council has an important role in supporting and advocating for regional priorities which reflect the needs of local communities to other levels of Government and stakeholders.

Any support and advocacy for regional priorities reflecting the needs of local communities to other levels of Government and stakeholders should be undertaken by Council in consideration of the broader strategic objectives of Council.

CORPORATE/OPERATIONAL PLAN

Corporate Plan – sections 2.1, 4.4 and 5.1

Operational Plan – section 5.1.2

CONCLUSION

A need has been identified for the construction of one (if not two) high schools to service the increasing population base of the Gracemere and surrounding communities during the period 2021-2031. The Council has supported and advocated on behalf of the Gracemere and broader community for the construction of a high school at Gracemere since at least 2015 and direction is now sought from Council on its preferred method of advocating for this key community project during the course of the 2020 State General Election campaign.

PROMOTION OF 2020 STATE GENERAL ELECTION PRIORITY GRACEMERE HIGH SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

Signage 1 (set of 3)

Meeting Date: 13 October 2020

Attachment No: 1

GRACEMERE WANTS A HIGH SCHOOL

THE QLD GOVERNMENT OWNS LAND HERE FOR A HIGH SCHOOL

SO WHERE IS OUR HIGH SCHOOL?

PROMOTION OF 2020 STATE GENERAL ELECTION PRIORITY GRACEMERE HIGH SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

Signage 2 (set of 3)

Meeting Date: 13 October 2020

Attachment No: 2

THE QLD GOVERNMENT BOUGHT LAND HERE TO BUILD A HIGH SCHOOL

SO WHY ARE YOU STILL STILL STUCK IN TRAFFIC?

GRACEMERE DESERVES AFAIR GO

11.9 REDIRECTION OF EXISTING FUNDING

File No: 12534 Attachments: Nil

Authorising Officer: Evan Pardon - Chief Executive Officer

Author: Ross Cheesman - Deputy Chief Executive Officer

SUMMARY

This report is to provide an update to Councillors on the progress of the resolution of Council at its Special Council meeting held on 30 September 2020 and seeks further direction from Council.

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

THAT

- 1. Council formally notifies the Australian and Queensland Governments that it fully supports and recognises the South Rockhampton Flood Levee Project as a priority infrastructure project of significant/paramount importance for the region.
- 2. In the absence of receiving confirmation from the Australian or Queensland Governments of immediate funding availability and/or a commitment to (jointly or severally) fund the balance construction costs of the South Rockhampton Flood Levee Project, Council seeks and obtains a written commitment from both levels of Government to redirect all approved funding grants and financial commitments currently allocated and announced to the South Rockhampton Flood Levee Project to alternative projects to be approved by Council under a separate report.
- Council seeks confirmation from the Australian and Queensland Governments that the South Rockhampton Flood Levee Project remains a viable priority project to be considered in future funding opportunities.

COMMENTARY

Following the special meeting of Council on 30 September further discussions with stakeholders have been undertaken. Informal discussion with the QRA have indicated that they are having high level discussions with Treasury. At an officer level, at the time of writing, recent attempts to contact officers of the DITRDC have been unsuccessful. Despite this it would be fair to say that Council has received positive support from the Federal Member for Capricornia and the Deputy Prime Ministers Office. Ms Landry has been seeking a formal position from Council with the view to redirecting the approved Federal Government funds whilst still maintaining the SRFL as a viable project.

With regards to the State Government, previous advice has indicated that the SRFL plays an important role in the construction of the Rockhampton Ring Road. In addition, the Member for Rockhampton has also been supportive of the SRFL however overall no formal position has been indicated.

Despite this it appears highly likely that additional funding for SRFL will not be forthcoming in the immediate future. The Federal Government budget does not contain any additional funds nor is there any indication of other Federal sources. The State Government also have not been forthcoming with any additional funds. The recent cabinet meeting and State Covid Economic Update which did announce several projects, did not specifically include the SRFL.

In this regard and based on the communication with relevant stakeholders it is recommended that Council formally adopt its position and seek the re-allocation of the approved SRFL funding to other critical projects in the Rockhampton region. It is important that in doing this both other levels of government recognise the importance of the SRFL and that it remains a viable project that they consider for funding in the medium term.

It is recommended that the possible critical projects be considered under a separate report.

BACKGROUND

As has been reported and resolved by Council, an additional \$105m is being sought from both levels of government in addition to the already approved \$50m (\$25m from each level). To date nothing has been forthcoming in securing these additional funds. Officers have been in continual contact with the Queensland Reconstruction Authority (QRA) and the Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Communication (DITRDC) as well as local members of Parliament, who have been supportive, in an attempt to secure this additional funding.

PREVIOUS DECISIONS

The most recent decision in this regard was made at the 30 September Special Meeting where it was resolved that Council endorse Option (3) as outlined in the body of the report, pending further discussions with relevant stakeholders.

BUDGET IMPLICATIONS

If approved this alteration will be made to the 20-21 budget. There will also be changes to the Long Term Financial Plan required.

LEGISLATIVE CONTEXT

Nil

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

Nil

STAFFING IMPLICATIONS

Nil direct

RISK ASSESSMENT

The first risk is that without redirecting these funds, due to the additional funds not forthcoming the region may miss out on any potential investment opportunity.

Council is seen as the level of government that withdrew its support from the SRFL. This report and adopted resolution should mitigate this risk.

CORPORATE/OPERATIONAL PLAN

Operational Plan Actions 1.1.16/2.1.5/2.2.3/2.3.1 and 2.4.3 are relevant to this decision.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion it is not ideal that Council has been put in a position whereby it has to decide to redirect approved funding for what would be a priority infrastructure project for the region. The SRFL has many benefits that Council are well aware of which include the Ring Road. It is recommended that Council's position be that these funds are redirected purely on the basis that no further funding has been or appears to be allocated by the other levels of government to the SRFL and the region needs these already approved funds to be applied to other critical projects to be determined by Council.