

BCA Comments on Draft QPRC S7.12 Rural Contributions Plan

The Braidwood Community Association (BCA) appreciates the opportunity to comment on the draft QPRC S7.12 Rural Development Contributions Plan.

The BCA understands and accepts the rationale for creating this new Rural Contributions Plan, replacing a number of outdated development contributions plans. The inclusion of a Works Schedule to determine the use of the funds collected under this Plan introduces a degree of transparency which is also appreciated.

The BCA's comments are mainly concerned with the details of the Works Schedule.

Predicted timing and staging of projects in the Works Schedule

The BCA notes that the Draft Plan states that :

*“Contributions received under this Plan will be allocated to the infrastructure projects listed in the works schedule in **Appendix A**. The priorities for expenditure and delivery follow the timing and staging identified in that works schedule.” (p14).*

The Works Schedule covers a time period of 15 years. The report to Council estimates an income of approximately \$12m will be collected over that period under this Plan, and the Works Schedule includes projects with a predicted cost of \$12,309,900.

However there are variables that may impact on this prediction. Over this period, some of the projects in the Works Schedule may receive other funding eg from grants.

There is also an option for developers to propose other ways to meet their development contribution obligations. The BCA notes this statement in the draft Plan:

“If a developer wants to deliver infrastructure listed in this Plan on Council’s behalf, they can offer to enter into a Planning Agreement under section 7.4 of the Act. Through this agreement, they may build works, pay money, dedicate land, or provide another type of material public benefit.

The contributions offered under a Planning Agreement can be in addition to, or instead of, the contributions required by this Plan and the Act.” (p18).

If Planning Agreements are made which bypass the expectation of a direct monetary contribution to this fund, the predicted income for the Works Schedule will be reduced.

Other variables include the inevitable increase in costs for many of these projects over time. While contingencies are included in the estimated costs, the final costs over the allocated time period of up to 15 years are unknown.

The BCA understands that the Plan will be reviewed every 5 years, allowing for updates to the Works Schedule. We suggest that more frequent updates may be required, due to the number of variables at play.

Unpredictable Income from Contributions.

The BCA notes the staff replies to Cr Willis' questions on this Plan. (Item 14.1, Councillor questions on Agenda Items for 8 July 2026 meeting).

In reply to one of Cr Willis' questions, staff commented that *"the collection of funds under this plan will be slow and sporadic due to the nature of the development in the rural area"*.

In reality, this means that the time frames for project completion in the Works Schedule must be regarded as indicative and almost certainly subject to delay. Given that these projects are important to their communities and have been identified in other QPRC documents as needing funding, this only adds to the uncertainty around their delivery. It is not clear whether these projects can access funding through other channels, once included in this Works Schedule.

Our rural communities need information and clarification about other options for funding of these essential projects, rather than relying on the "slow and sporadic" collection of funds through this Plan. There are proposed footpaths in Braidwood that have been listed in the PAMPS Plan for years, that are now included in this Works Schedule with a 5-10 year time frame. See comments below re errors in the published Works Schedule.

Prioritising of projects

There are three 5 year time frames in the Works Schedule, with a number of projects included in each time frame. Some of these are relatively simple projects such as refuge islands or footpaths in Braidwood, while others have cost estimates in the millions. There is no indication of how each project will be prioritised as funds become available. Will the most expensive ones take priority, or will they have to wait while the necessary funds are accumulated?

Cr Willis raised this in her questions (Q 4a) but no answer was provided. The reply referred only to the Rural Fire Suppression Asset Item and noted an error in the time frame for the Nerriga Toilet Water Supply. This is one of several errors in the Works Schedule.

Errors in the Works Schedule

It is noted that there are several errors in the Works Schedule, including the time frames for items R3, R4 and R9, as revealed in answers to Cr Willis' questions at the Council meeting on 8 July 2026. Instead of being scheduled for delivery in 0-5 years, as the Works Schedule states, three Shared Path projects in Braidwood are in fact scheduled for delivery in 5-10 years.

These projects are:

R3 Shared path link across the Braidwood Recreation Ground	\$ 714,000
R4 Shared path along Duncan St between Wallace st and Monkittee St	\$ 667,100
R9. Shared path between Duncan and Wallace – along Ryrie	\$1,000,600
TOTAL:	\$2,381,700

Another error is noted re Item R9 above. There is no connection between Duncan and Wallace Streets along Ryrie Street, so it is not clear where this shared path is located. In answer to Cr Willis' question, the reply was that "this is the shared path known as Ryrie Street and McKellar Street between Duncan Street and Kings Highway in the PAMP document". This makes even less sense. Ryrie St and Wallace St (Kings Hwy) are parallel, while Duncan St runs E-W between them. We assume this refers to a shared path along Ryrie St, which has no footpaths despite being a major route to and from Braidwood Central School.

The cost of this shared path has increased from \$378,00 in the PAMPS document, to \$1,000,600 in the Works Schedule. The BCA suggests that this project could be conducted in stages, rather than being listed as one very expensive project not scheduled to begin for at least 5 years, and possibly up to 10 years.

After removing these 3 projects from the 0-5 year group of projects, this leaves the following small-scale Braidwood projects scheduled for between 0-5 years:

R1 Footpath along Kings highway between McKellar St and the Braidwood Colonial	\$ 190,600
R2 Footpath along Wallace St between Park Lane and Wilson St	\$ 76,300
R5 Shared Path along Monkittie St between Wilson St and Duncan St	\$ 349,400
R6 Refuge Island on McKellar St west of Wallace St	\$ 110,000
R7 Refuge Island on Wallace St north of Duncan St	\$ 110,000
R8 Refuge Island on Wallace St north of Lascelles St	\$ 110,000
C7 88 Wallace Street – Building Works	\$ 150,000
TOTAL:	\$1,096,300

Braidwood Saleyards Upgrade

The inclusion of the Braidwood Saleyards Upgrade (\$1,955,300) increases the total proposed spending on Braidwood projects scheduled for between 0-5 years to **\$3,051,600**.

While the BCA supports the need for upgrades to the Braidwood Saleyards, we question whether this is an appropriate project for this Plan. We note the following statement in the Report to Council, 8 July 2026, Item 9.7:

“Councils in NSW can collect contributions from development to help fund new local infrastructure within their Local Government Area, such as parks, community facilities, local road upgrades, footpaths, stormwater drainage and traffic management. These contributions help ensure that new developments don't place an undue burden on existing ratepayers.” (p24).

The Braidwood Saleyards are essential to the local agricultural community, and this is one of our major local industries. The 2024 Braidwood Saleyards Assessment commissioned by QPRC highlighted the need for major work to improve the efficiency of the saleyards, at an estimated cost of over \$2m. The BCA would hope that QPRC could access the required funds via a grant to undertake this work, rather than using developer contributions which are intended to provide shared infrastructure and facilities for the whole community. Another option could be part-funding from fees for the use of the saleyards, as this is a business facility, rather than a community facility.

Need for further consultation with the local communities

The BCA believes that the updated PAMPS document does not accurately reflect local priorities. Appendix B (Survey Results-Braidwood) in the **Review of the Works Implementation Plan- Pedestrian and Cyclist Priority List, Dec 2025** shows that there were fewer than 30 responses to this survey from Braidwood. We understand the difficulties of obtaining responses to surveys of this type. The low response level in this case means that many voices have not been heard. As representatives of the community, with local knowledge unavailable to QPRC staff in Queanbeyan, the BCA would be more than willing to work with the staff to review the list of Braidwood projects in the proposed Works Schedule, before this Plan is endorsed by Council.

The BCA notes that Item T2 on the Works Schedule refers to a bus shelter in Majors Creek. It has been reliably reported that Majors Creek already has 2 bus shelters and does not need another one. They may prefer to have a footpath, if they were consulted about this.

In conclusion, the BCA recommends to Council that before adopting the draft Rural Contributions Plan, it agrees to put the corrected Works Schedule out for public consultation again and requests Council staff to also hold public meetings in the various areas covered to discuss the Works Schedule.

Thanks you for the opportunity to comment.

Submitted by Sue Murray
BCA President,
On behalf of the Braidwood Community Association.

12 August 2026