

## Councillor's Office – Division 8

Tourism, Sport & Major Events Portfolio

Telephone (07) 5475 9858

Email: [jason.opray@sunshinecoast.qld.gov.au](mailto:jason.opray@sunshinecoast.qld.gov.au)

<https://www.facebook.com/jason.opray>



7 June 2016

Mudjimba Resident's Association

Mr John Low, President

[admin@mudjimbaresidentsassoc.org.au](mailto:admin@mudjimbaresidentsassoc.org.au)

Dear John,

I refer to the email received yesterday morning inviting me to the Mudjimba Resident's Association meeting tonight. I have a prior existing commitment with the Chief Executive of Tourism Events Queensland, so I am unable to attend your meeting – please accept my apologies.

I provide the following information in response to the questions provided by your association. For ease of reading, I have provided my responses in blue under your questions.

### **SOLAR FARM PROJECT**

1. Could you find out and let us know where the money for the solar farm came from? The information we have at hand is that the SC Council has been knocked back twice for funding by higher levels of government.

[\\$39 million in debt and the balance of \\$10 million from Council cash.](#)

2. Can you please explain the thinking behind the sufficiency of this Project? It has been estimated by Council that it will cost \$49 million and it will save ratepayers \$22 million over a 30 year period. It would seem that this investment will never pay for itself.

[The project will deliver \\$71 million worth of benefits, less the cost of \\$49 million leaving savings of \\$22 million. The financial benefits that have been estimated are quite conservative particularly the large scale generation certificates \(\\$22.6 million\) which could be more than 50% higher.](#)

## FLOOD MANAGEMENT

1. It appears that the flood management levels/data is different across the Council's three major projects e.g. Solar farm, Suncentral, and Airport, even though they are all on the same river/ flood plain? Could you please provide more information?

Levels can be different because they come from:

- a) Different locations in the catchment;
- b) Different flood models, developed at different times, but using the latest information available at time of development;
- c) Have different detail in a specific area that is especially relevant to a particular investigation;
- d) Apply different modelling assumptions based on best practise, which may change from time to time.

Council's Principal Engineer of Flooding and Stormwater Management has advised as follows:

*"Council has a regional flood model that informs flood levels in the Maroochy Catchment. This is used to inform flood searches, say if someone is looking to build a house. When a development application is made, the planning scheme requires that a flood hazard assessment be completed to assess impact, if the application is triggered by the Flood Overlay Code. This is why there are different flood studies as the basis for these projects.*

*That said, two of the above projects are not assessed by Council, but the State has similar requirements. It is appropriate that these smaller models take information from the regional model to inform boundary conditions, when they can't be assessed in isolation. The SunCentral study for instance, primarily needs to consider flooding from Cornmeal Creek, but also has an awareness of backwater flooding from the Maroochy River and Stormtide.*

*The airport study started in 2011/2012, it made use of the available Council MikeFlood model but then improved the detail around the airport site to include better definition and structure details.*

*The SunCentral flood study developed a new model for the Cornmeal Creek catchment and used the data from the 2012 flash flood in that area to calibrate the model.*

*In 2013, Council embarked on a new flood study for the Maroochy River, using latest technology flood modelling. A version of this model was adopted for the Solar Farm, but used data from the SunCentral study in Cornmeal Creek to improve the model around the CBD."*

2. Why is the flood management/data different for the airport to across the David low way and the turtle sands project?

To accurately answer this question, the flood information for both projects would need to be reviewed. It is not possible for this to be done prior to tonight's meeting so a response to this question is unable to be provided.

3. Why did the council raise the RL on the north shore quietly last year without community consultation?

I suspect that this question relates to the Flood Overlay that got applied when the new Sunshine Coast planning scheme came in back in 2014. The new planning scheme (including overlay maps) went through significant public consultation. Flood mapping changes affected a number of areas on the Coast, not just the north shore.

## **HELICOPTER NOISE**

1. Why did airport/councillors not warn and keep the public informed about the increased movements.

The only comment at the Airport Committee Forum from Pallot was “helicopter movements have increased however we have only had 3 complaints so all is fine”.

There was discussion at the December Aviation Forum and again at the most recent forum regarding helicopter activity. The SCA Coordinator Operations and Assets provided an update and an overview of Becker Helicopter training activities. The update included confirmation that the activity had started to ramp up in recent weeks as was predicted at the December 2015 meeting and the observation made that there had only been 3 complaints at that time. A brief overview of the different stages of training was given and comment made that the increase in activity was likely to continue as some groups were now approaching IFR and night time training activities.

2. Why does the Helicopter School not adhere to the Fly Neighbourly Policy? Are you aware of it and what can you do to change it.

Helicopter activities are subject to the fly neighbourly policy and any reported breaches will be investigated.

3. Will the construction of the new runway mean the helicopter school will need to be relocated?

Council has made a number of commitments in relation to helicopter activity as part of the Sunshine Coast Airport Expansion Project EIS. Commitments include:

- The relocation of the existing two helicopter training pads currently located in the north western sector of the aerodrome to the north west of the aerodrome; and
- Working with helicopter operators to relocate helicopter operations to the western general aviation area.

4. No reply from P Pallot on minutes email re Airport Aviation Forum, Jason copied?

I understand that Peter intends to address the minutes of the previous meeting at the next meeting.

## **SHELL EXPRESS SERVICE STATION**

Shell express service station approval? Traffic, impact on locals.

On 29 January 2016, Council approved a service station at 693 & 695 David Low Way. The entire application can be viewed on Council's website – application number MCU15/0093.

Please find attached:

1. Council officer's assessment report - [Attachment 1](#)
2. Council's decision notice (including conditions of approval) - [Attachment 2](#)
3. Approved plans - [Attachment 3](#)

## **PRATT SURFING WORLD**

Pratt Surfing World, David Low Way project, update please.

Current application for a service station and two drive-thru restaurants at 797-809, 811-821 & 823-833 David Low Way Mudjimba (Surfing World Sunshine Coast Pty Ltd).

The application went through public notification and was open for submissions/comments from 16 November – 7 December 2015. The application is still being assessed by Council officers and will be coming before Council shortly.

The entire application can be viewed on Council's website – application number MCU15/0069.

The plans submitted by the applicant are attached. Please refer to [Attachment 4](#).

## **AIRPORT**

1. How will the airport respect the Fly Neighbourly Policy when the new runway opens?

As part of the EIS, Council has committed to revise the fly neighbourly policy to reflect the proposed east west runway.

2. We need an explanation of how the conditions as imposed by the Co-ordinator General on noise aggravation will be addressed by the airport given it will maintain its no curfew status.

The Coordinator General has made no conditions in relation to aircraft noise. Council has made a number of commitments in relation to airport noise listed below;

6. Work cooperatively with Airservices Australia when a Runway Operating Plan for all new runway operations is developed and implemented.
7. Expand the Community Aviation Forum to include representatives from newly noise affected areas.
8. Continue consultation with residents, schools and other essential community infrastructure that can be affected by future aircraft noise.
9. Continue to manage helicopter noise at the airport in accordance with current policies and procedures.

10. Publish an updated ANEF on a regular basis at intervals of between 5-10 years.
11. Make online aircraft noise tool publically available.
12. Helicopter training operations will be relocated to the two new helicopter training pads that are to be created in the north-west area of the airport site.
13. The proponent will not renew or extend leases for helicopter operations within the southern general aviation area beyond 2027
14. The proponent will work with helicopter operators and lessees of helicopter operations sites within the southern general aviation area to relocate helicopter operations to the western general aviation area earlier than 2027 where possible.
15. Revise the fly neighbourly policy to reflect the proposed east-west runway.
16. Work with Air Services Australia to develop noise abatement procedures and preferred runway arrangements to help improve aircraft noise outcomes for nearby residents.
17. Work in cooperation with ASA and CASA when they undertake the design of the RNP for the new runway approaches. RNP is a means of increasing efficiency of operations and improving aircraft noise outcomes.

3. Could you confirm whether or not the Royal Bank of Canada has advised Council that there are no investors interested in the airport until the construction risk has been eliminated and they have an operational runway.

This is not correct – Royal Bank of Canada have advised that different types of investors would take different approaches before and after the construction is complete but there are a investors who have expressed a strong interest in the airport as at today.

If so, is it correct that SC Council is planning on borrowing the funds for construction (\$347m to \$420m) and then attract a partner to take over some of the debt.

Council borrowing for a period of time is one of the options that Council is looking at.

4. As a community we would like to see the business case for the development of the airport. Jason can you please provide the financial business case so that as ratepayers we can be confident that our rates will not be adversely impacted upon?

Council will be considering the funding for the airport at a Special Meeting on 13 June 2016.

5. As a ratepayer of the SC we are concerned with the amount of money that Council is spending promoting the airport even after the Coordinator General decision has been provided.

The airport is a business unit of Council. Council will continue to grow the business, irrespective of the Coordinator General's decision.

Can you advise the amount of money Council has spent on advertising the benefits of the airport and explain why Council is persisting with advertising after the decision has been given?

Please advise what advertising the association believes is occurring. As far as I am aware, no paid advertising on the benefits of the airport expansion has been undertaken.

I trust that this information provides some clarity to your members. Again, please accept my apologies for tonight's meeting. I look forward to attending the next meeting on 2 August.

Kind regards,



CR JASON OPRAV  
Councillor - Division 8  
(Tourism, Sport and Major Events Portfolio)