THE CITY OF NEWCASTLE

Ordinary Council Meeting

Councillors,

In accordance with section 367 of the Local Government Act, 1993 notice is hereby given that an Ordinary Council Meeting will be held on:

DATE: Tuesday 28 February 2017
TIME: 5.30pm
VENUE: Council Chambers
2nd Floor
City Hall
290 King Street
Newcastle NSW 2300

F Cordingley
Interim Chief Executive Officer

City Administration Centre
282 King Street
NEWCASTLE NSW 2300

21 February 2017

Please note:

The City of Newcastle Council meetings are webcast. Council accepts no liability for any defamatory, discriminatory or offensive remarks or gestures that are made during the course of the meeting. Opinions expressed or statements made by participants or third parties during the webcast, or included in any presentation, are the opinions or statements of those individuals and do not imply any form of endorsement by the City of Newcastle. Confidential meetings of Council will not be webcast.

The electronic transmission is protected by copyright and owned by the City of Newcastle. No part may be copied or recorded or made available to others without the prior written consent of the City of Newcastle. This transmission is not, and shall not, be taken to be an official record of the City of Newcastle or of any meeting or discussion depicted therein.

Council meetings are recorded for the purposes of verifying the accuracy of minutes taken. Only the official minutes may be relied upon as an official record of the meeting. Council may be required to disclose recordings pursuant to the Government Information (Public Access) Act 2009, or where Council is compelled to do so by court order, warrant or subpoena or by any other legislation.
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REPORT ON NOTICE OF MOTION 28/02/17 - WARD 4 CAPITAL WORKS
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NOTE: ITEMS MAY NOT NECESSARILY BE DEALT WITH IN NUMERICAL ORDER
CONFIRMATION OF PREVIOUS MINUTES

MINUTES - ORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING 20 DECEMBER 2016

The adopted minutes of the Ordinary Council Meeting held on 20 December 2016 are resubmitted to Council for the purpose of seeking Council approval to adopt a corrected version of the procedural motion tabled by the Lord Mayor regarding the Lord Mayoral Minute on the appointment of an Interim Chief Executive Officer.

The draft minutes of the Ordinary Council Meeting held on 20 December 2016 were adopted by Council at the Ordinary Council Meeting held on 24 January 2017 as follows:

That the Lord Mayoral Minute on the appointment of an Interim Chief Executive Officer lay on the table until the next Ordinary Council Meeting, and that the matter be referred to the Office of Local Government for review…..

The tabled procedural motion on 20 December 2016 was as follows:

That the Lord Mayoral Minute on the appointment of an Interim Chief Executive Officer lay on the table until the next Ordinary Council Meeting, and that the matter be referred to an independent Office of Local Government accredited conduct reviewer for review…..

The corrected version of the minutes are now attached for adoption by Council including the five previously omitted words as bolded and underlined above (see page 7 of the Ordinary Council Meeting Agenda 28 February 2017).

RECOMMENDATION

The revised and corrected draft minutes of the Ordinary Council Meeting held on 20 December 2016 as circulated be taken as read and confirmed.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A: 161220 Ordinary Council Meeting Minutes

Note: The attached minutes are a record of the decisions made by Council at the meeting and are draft until adopted by Council. They may be viewed at www.newcastle.nsw.gov.au
MINUTES - ORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING 20 DECEMBER 2016 THAT WAS RECONVENED AFTER THE ADJOURNED ORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON 13 DECEMBER 2016.

The meeting was held in the Council Chambers, 2nd Floor City Hall on Tuesday 20 December 2016 at 6.36pm.

PRESENT
The Lord Mayor (Councillor N Nelmes), Councillors D Clausen, T Doyle, J Dunn, B Luke (retired at 7.30pm), M Osborne, S Posniak and A Rufo.

IN ATTENDANCE
P Chrystal (Interim Chief Executive Officer), G Cousins (Director Corporate Services), F Cordingley (Director Infrastructure), A Baxter (Acting Director Planning and Regulatory), M Blackburn-Smith (Manager Development & Building Services), F Giordano (Manager Governance and Legal), N Baker (Chief of Staff), K Hyland (Manager Communications and Engagement), B Johnson (Media Officer), A Leach (Council Services/Minutes) and A Knowles (Council Services/Webcasting).

Mr Stephen Blackadder, Blackadder Associates.

MESSAGE OF ACKNOWLEDGEMENT
The Lord Mayor read the message of acknowledgement to the Awabakal and Worimi peoples.

PRAYER
The Lord Mayor read a prayer and a period of silence was observed in memory of those who served and died so that Council might meet in peace.

APOLOGIES

PROCEDURAL MOTION
Moved by Cr Clausen, seconded by Cr Posniak
Council recommit apologies for this meeting.

Carried

MOTION
Moved by Cr Osborne, seconded by Cr Posniak
The apologies submitted on behalf of Councillors Tierney and Waterhouse be received.

Carried

Councillor Dunn left the Chamber at 6.38pm and returned at 6.40pm
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PROCEDURAL MOTION
Moved by Cr Nelmes

The Lord Mayoral Minute on the appointment of an Interim Chief Executive Officer lay on the table to the next Ordinary Council Meeting and that the matter be referred to an independent Office of Local Government accredited Conduct Reviewer for review, noting that the independent recruiter Stephen Blackadder who has more than thirty years’ experience in local government, has attended Council on two evenings to outline the process, and has additionally provided a detailed written report addressing Councillor concerns. The Conduct reviewer is to additionally investigate actions by Councillors relating to the reported conversations between ****************************, **************************** and **************************** prior to interviews and the fact that none of these ‘concerns’ were raised by **************************** during the process and the removal of confidential information from Council Chambers to ensure compliance with the requirements of the Local Government Act, Council's Code of Contact and Code of Meeting Practice.

Carried

REPORTS BY COUNCIL OFFICERS

ITEM-105 CCL 13/12/16 - ADOPTION OF AMENDED MEETING SCHEDULE FOR APRIL 2017

MOTION
Moved by Cr Osborne, seconded by Cr Clausen

That Council:

1. Amend its Ordinary Council Meeting schedule for the first and second quarters of 2017 so that:
   a) Council meets on the fourth Tuesday in January;
   b) Council meets on the second and fourth Tuesday in February, March, May and June; and
   c) Council meets on the last Wednesday (26th) of April (to prevent a clash with school holidays and ANZAC Day).

Carried
ITEM-106 CCL 13/12/16 - TABLING OF PECUNIARY INTEREST RETURNS

MOTION
Moved by Cr Clausen, seconded by Cr Osborne

That Council notes the pecuniary interest returns as tabled by the Interim Chief Executive Officer for the period 1 July 2016 and 31 October 2016. Carried

MOTION
Moved by Cr Posniak, seconded by Cr Osborne

That Council receive and note Council's Code of Conduct Statistics Report for the period 1 September 2015 to 31 August 2016 at Attachment A. Carried

ITEM-107 CCL13/12/16 - CODE OF CONDUCT COMPLAINTS STATISTICS REPORT

MOTION
Moved by Cr Posniak, seconded by Cr Osborne

That Council receive and note Council's Code of Conduct Statistics Report for the period 1 September 2015 to 31 August 2016 at Attachment A. Carried

ITEM-108 CCL 13/12/16 - AUDIT REPORT COMMITTEE AND INTERNAL AUDIT ANNUAL REPORT

MOTION
Moved by Cr Posniak, seconded by Cr Doyle

That Council receives the Audit Committee and internal audit annual report for the 2015/2016 financial year. Carried

ITEM-109 CCL 13/12/16 - PROPOSED ROAD CLOSURE AND SALE OF PART OF LAND OFF NEWCOMEN STREET, NEWCASTLE

MOTION
Moved by Cr Osborne, seconded by Cr Clausen

1 (i) Council endorses the closure of the end of the lane off Newcomen Street, Newcastle, adjacent to Lot 1 DP 981842;
(ii) Subject to receiving approval for the road closure from the Crown (NSW Department of Primary Industries - Crown Lands), Council approves the sale of the parcel of land to the adjoining owner for $60,000 (plus GST) as determined by an independent certified valuer. All costs including legal, survey and service relocation will be borne by the applicant;

(iii) Authority be granted to the Interim Chief Executive Officer or his delegate to execute all relevant documentation to effect the transactions; and

(iv) The revenue received by Council from the sale of the land be transferred to the Land and Property Reserve.

Carried

ITEM-110 CCL 13/12/16 - ADOPTION OF HUNTER ESTUARY COASTAL ZONE MANAGEMENT PLAN

MOTION
Moved by Cr Osborne, seconded by Cr Posniak

Council adopts the Hunter Estuary Coastal Zone Management Plan (Attachment A).

Carried

ITEM-111 CCL 13/12/16 - WESTERN CORRIDOR DISTRICT SPORT AND RECREATION COMPLEX

MOTION
Moved by Cr Osborne, Cr Doyle

The item lay on the table until the status of the land is clarified.

Carried

ITEM-112 CCL 13/12/16 - ADOPTION OF THE GENERAL COMMUNITY USE PLAN OF MANAGEMENT

MOTION
Moved by Cr Posniak, seconded by Cr Osborne

The draft GCU PoM (Attachment A) be adopted in accordance with s.40 of the Local Government Act 1993.

Carried
ITEM-113 CCL 13/12/16 - ADOPTION OF THE NEWCASTLE SAFE CITY PLAN 2017 - 2020

MOTION
Moved by Cr Posniak, seconded by Cr Clausen

Council resolves to adopt the Newcastle Safe City Plan 2017 - 2020 (Plan) as provided in Attachment A.

Carried

ITEM-114 CCL 13/12/16 - AMENDMENT TO NEWCASTLE DCP 2012 - NEW SECTION RESIDENTIAL ACCOMMODATION

MOTION
Moved by Cr Clausen, seconded by Cr Doyle

1. Council resolves to place the draft amendments to Newcastle Development Control Plan 2012 (DCP), incorporating a new Section 3.03 Residential Accommodation as provided in Attachment A and consequential amendments to Part 3 Land Use Specific Provisions, Part 6 Locality Specific Provisions and Part 7 Development Provisions of the DCP, as provided in Attachment B, on public exhibition for a minimum of 28 days.

2. That Council receive a workshop on the proposal and feedback at the end of the public exhibition period.

For the Motion: Lord Mayor, Cr Nelmes and Councillors Clausen, Doyle, Dunn, Luke, Osborne, Posniak and Rufo.

Against the Motion: Nil. Carried
ITEM-115 CCL 13/12/16 - RECLASSIFICATION OF LAND AT 21 BRADFORD CLOSE KOTARA

MOTION
Moved by Cr Dunn, seconded by Cr Posniak

1 Council resolves to:

i) Endorse the attached planning proposal (Attachment A), pursuant to section 55 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 (EP&A Act), in order to amend Newcastle Local Environmental Plan 2012 (LEP) for land at 21 Bradford Close, Kotara as follows:

a) Include the subject land within Part 1 – Land classified or reclassified, as operational land – no interests changed, Schedule 4 Classification and reclassification of public land, as follows:

- Column 1 to read “Kotara”
- Column 2 to read “Lot 182, DP 850168”

ii) Forward the planning proposal to the Minister for Planning and Environment (DPE) for Gateway Determination pursuant to section 56 of the EP&A Act.

iii) Advise the Secretary of the Department of Planning and Environment that Council does not seek to exercise delegations for undertaking section 59(1) of the EP&A Act.

iv) Receive a report back on the planning proposal following completion of the required consultation and noting section 29 of the Local Government Act 1993 requires a public hearing to be held in respect of the reclassification of land.

For the Motion: Lord Mayor, Cr Nelmes and Councillors Clausen, Dunn, Luke, Posniak and Rufo.

Against the Motion: Councillors Doyle and Osborne.

Carried
ITEM-116 CCL 13/12/16 - RECLASSIFICATION AND REZONING OF LAND AT 162A NEWCASTLE ROAD WALLSEND

MOTION
Moved by Cr Clausen, seconded by Cr Dunn

1 Council resolves to:

   i) Endorse the attached planning proposal (Attachment A), pursuant to section 55 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 NSW (EP&A Act), to amend Newcastle Local Environmental Plan 2012 (LEP) in order to reclassify land at 162A Newcastle Road, Wallsend, described as Lot 110 DP 9755, from community to operational and to rezone the land from RE1 Public Recreation to R3 Medium Density Residential.

   ii) Forward the planning proposal to the Department of Planning and Environment (DPE) requesting that a draft Local Environmental Plan be prepared and made pursuant to section 59(1) of the EP&A Act.

   iii) Advise the Secretary of the DPE that Council does not seek to exercise delegations for undertaking section 59(1) of the EP&A Act.

For the Motion: Lord Mayor, Cr Nelmes and Councillors Clausen, Doyle, Dunn, Luke, Osborne, Posniak and Rufo.

Against the Motion: Nil.

Carried

ITEM-117 CCL 13/12/16 - Report on Council Attendance at United Nations Conference on Housing and Sustainable Urban Development

MOTION
Moved by Cr Osborne, seconded by Cr Clausen

1 Council resolves to receive the report on the conference.

2 The United Nations (UN) New Urban agenda (NUA) and sustainable development goals be considered in the preparation of the next Newcastle City Council community strategic plan.

Carried
NOTICES OF MOTION

ITEM-18 NOM 13/12/16 - OPEN AND TRANSPARENT GOVERNANCE STRATEGY

MOTION
Moved by Cr Doyle, seconded by Cr Osborne

That Council:

1. A workshop regarding the Strategy will be held during February 2017 with input from the Office of Local Government (OLG), the New South Wales Ombudsman, and the Independent Commission Against Corruption.

2. That a communications plan will be developed regarding the Strategy, following the proposed Councillor workshop that communications plan to include:

   A. include the wording of councils decision on public exhibition as soon as possible, seeking relevant feedback, comment, ideas and suggestions from the community on the matters raised in that resolution, and on any other matters related to an effective "Open and Transparent Governance Strategy".

   B. Council develop an appropriate Newcastle Voice survey seeking similar feedback, comment, ideas and suggestions from the community during this period.

   C. Council conduct community workshops to foster community discussion on Council’s governance and to gain further community input into Council’s Governance Strategy.

3. That a draft Strategy and supporting communications plan be presented to the Ordinary Council Meeting on 28 February 2017.

   Carried unanimously
MOTION
Moved by Cr Doyle, seconded by Cr Osborne

Council resolves to:
1. Develop guidelines designed to complement Council’s Cultural Strategy 2016 – 2019 and clearly define how funds can be distributed to those community arts groups who demonstrate capacity to advance the city’s cultural landscape.

2. Allocate, within its next four-year planning cycle, provision for ongoing budgetary support with a sum of $200,000 per annum to this Community Arts Development Program.

AMENDMENT
Moved by Cr Clausen

That Council resolves to:

1. Develop guidelines designed to complement Council’s Cultural Strategy 2016-2019 and clearly define how funds can be distributed to those community art groups who demonstrate capacity to advance the City’s cultural landscape.

2. A workshop be held preferably in February no later than March to discuss budget within the next four year planning cycle for this Community Arts Development Program, noting the Growing Sustainable Arts and Cultural Organisations in Newcastle policy presently being drafted for presentation to Council in March 2017.

The mover and seconder accepted the amendment provided it included that the workshop be held no later than March. The amendment became the motion before the Chair.

MOTION
Moved by Cr Doyle, seconded by Cr Osborne

That Council resolves to:

1. Develop guidelines designed to complement Council’s Cultural Strategy 2016-2019 and clearly define how funds can be distributed to those community art groups who demonstrate capacity to advance the City’s cultural landscape.

2. A workshop be held preferably in February no later than March to discuss budget within the next four year planning cycle for this Community Arts Development Program, noting the Growing Sustainable Arts and Cultural Organisations in Newcastle policy presently being drafted for presentation to Council no later than March 2017.

Carried
ITEM-20 NOM 13/12/16 - OPEN AND TRANSPARENT GOVERNANCE - LIFTING THE CORPORATE VEIL

MOTION
Moved by Cr Osborne, seconded by Cr Doyle

1. That Council write to the Premier, the Minister for Local Government, and local State MPs, to encourage them to amend the Local Government Act 1993 to require companies that have dealings with councils across NSW to disclose transparency details of their directors and significant stakeholders;

2. Include on the agenda for the workshop with Councillors process as part of the Open and Transparent Governance Strategy during February 2017 to include:

   a) Establishing procedure that ensures the highest level of transparency, accountability and probity in our City's governance by requiring that anyone who has dealings with Council through a Corporate entity (including through tenders, consultancies, development applications, planning agreements etc) provide sufficient company details so that names and addresses of all Directors and Major or significant beneficiary stakeholders are identified,

   b) Options to publish in a Public Register the details of the nature of the dealings with Council, the Corporate entity involved, and the Directors and major or significant beneficiary shareholders.

   Carried
ITEM-21 NOM 13/12/16 - RE-ESTABLISHMENT OF COUNCIL'S CYCLING WORKING PARTY AND CONVERT TO ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MOTION
Moved by Cr Doyle, seconded by Cr Osborne

1. Notes this report;
2. Establish the Cycling Advisory Committee;
3. Approves the Cycling Advisory Committee Charter in the form as attached at Attachment A; and

Carried

Councillor Luke gave notice that he had to retire from the Chamber and took leave of the meeting at 7.30pm.

ITEM-22 NOM 13/12/16 - INCREASING DOG LEASH FREE AREAS INCLUDING ENCLOSED AREAS

MOTION
Moved by Cr Osborne, seconded by Cr Doyle

That Council, as a priority:

1. Review the number of Dog Leash Free Areas across the city, with a focus on enclosed off leash areas and the aim to increase the number of designated areas to meet the growing demand.

2. Review the Sportsland Plan of Management, as part of the proposed new Community Land Plan of Management, to allow specific ovals to be used as time-restricted Dog Leash Free Areas (for example, sunrise to 9am, and 5pm to sunset), including regularising the arrangement that was recently in place at Connelly Park in Carrington.

3. Report back to the April 2017 meeting with a draft Community Land Plan of Management to be placed on public exhibition, to outline the timeframe to roll out the new Dog Leash Free Areas (including enclosed areas) and to include any necessary expenditure in the 2017-18 Council Budget process.
AMENDMENT
Moved by Cr Nelmes,

That Council, as a priority:

1. Review the number of Dog Leash Free Areas across the city, with a focus on enclosed off leash areas and the aim to increase the number of designated areas to meet the growing demand.

2. Report to the April 2017 meeting to place the proposed new Community Land Plan of Management on public exhibition, to outline the timeframe to roll out the new Dog Leash Free Areas (including enclosed areas) and to include any necessary expenditure in the 2017-18 Council Budget process such a draft Community Land Plan of Management to include consideration of specific sportsgrounds/ovals to be used as time-restricted Dog Leash Free Areas including Connelly Park in Carrington, Novocastrian Park in New Lambton and Waratah Park in Waratah.

The mover and seconder accepted the amendment which became the motion before the Chair.

MOTION
Moved by Cr Osborne, seconded by Cr Doyle

That Council, as a priority:

1. Review the number of Dog Leash Free Areas across the city, with a focus on enclosed off leash areas and the aim to increase the number of designated areas to meet the growing demand.

2. Report to the April 2017 meeting with a draft Community Land Plan of Management to be placed on public exhibition, to outline the timeframe to roll out the new Dog Leash Free Areas (including enclosed areas) and to include any necessary expenditure in the 2017-18 Council Budget process such a draft Community Land Plan of Management to include consideration of specific sportsgrounds/ovals to be used as time-restricted Dog Leash Free Areas including Connelly Park in Carrington, Novocastrian Park in New Lambton and Waratah Park in Waratah.

Carried unanimously
CONFIDENTIAL REPORTS

ITEM-37 CON 13/12/16 - CONTRACT FOR FURTHER INVESTIGATION OF FORMER WARATAH GASWORKS SITE - CONTRACT NO. 2017/222T

MOTION
Moved by Cr Clausen, seconded by Cr Osborne

Council move into confidential session at 7.47pm.

Carried

Council reconvened into open session at 8.02pm.

MOTION
Moved by Cr Clausen, seconded by Cr Osborne

1 Council resolves to:
   i) Authorise the Interim Chief Executive Officer (Interim CEO) to award Contract 2017/222T for $307,500 (exc GST) to AECOM Australia Pty Ltd (AECOM) for a further detailed site contamination investigation of the former Waratah Gasworks site.

   ii) Decide in accordance with s.55(3)(i) of the Local Government Act (Act) that by reason of the extenuating circumstances a satisfactory result would not be achieved by inviting tenders for that contract.

   iii) State for the purposes of s.55(3)(i) of the Act the reasons for that decision are as follows:

      a) AECOM are the recognised industry experts in gasworks investigation and rehabilitation and currently hold much of the relevant information with respect to this former gasworks site; and

      b) In order to promptly manage and respond to any risks the investigations need to be carried out expeditiously.

2 This confidential report relating to the matters specified in sections and 10A(2)(d) of the Act be treated as confidential and remain confidential until Council determines otherwise.

Carried

The meeting concluded at 8.05pm
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REPORTS BY COUNCIL OFFICERS

ITEM-5  CCL 28/02/17 - EXECUTIVE MONTHLY REPORT - JANUARY 2017

REPORT BY: CORPORATE SERVICES
CONTACT: DIRECTOR CORPORATE SERVICES / MANAGER FINANCE

PURPOSE

To report on Council’s monthly performance. This includes:

a) Monthly financial position and year to date (YTD) performance against the 2016/17 Operational Plan as at the end of January 2017.

b) Investment of temporary surplus funds under section 625 of the Local Government Act 1993 (Act), submission of report in accordance with the Act and clause 212 of the Local Government (General) Regulation 2005 (Regulation).

RECOMMENDATION

1 The report be received.

KEY ISSUES

2 At the end of January 2017 the consolidated YTD actual operating position is a surplus of $5.8m which represents a positive variance of $2.6m against the budgeted YTD surplus of $3.2m. This budget variance is due to a combination of income and expenditure variances which are detailed in Attachment A. The full year revised budget for 2016/17 is an operating surplus of $4.6m.

3 The January YTD position includes $7.3m of revenue items which are either one-off or cannot be applied to meet operational expenditure ($3.2m Special Rate Variation revenue, $1.6m consolidation of Newcastle Airport result, $1.1m stormwater management service charge, $0.9m local road grants which fund capital works and $0.5m for the one off recovery of insurance claims). When these items are removed Council’s sustainable underlying operating position at the end of January is a deficit of $1.5m.

4 The net funds generated as at the end of January 2017 is a surplus of $11.3m (after capital revenues, expenditure and loan principal repayments). This is a positive variance of $14.7m to the YTD revised budget. This is primarily due to a timing variance in the delivery of Council’s works program with a higher amount of project expenditure (both capital and operational expenditures) expected to be incurred during the final quarter of the financial year.
## Full Year Revised Budget vs YTD Revised Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revised Budget</th>
<th>YTD Revised Budget</th>
<th>YTD Actual Result</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Variance %</th>
<th>Financial Impact</th>
<th>Commitments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>+ve / -ve</td>
<td>$'000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246,273</td>
<td>143,619</td>
<td>146,474</td>
<td>2,855</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241,626</td>
<td>140,419</td>
<td>140,683</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>140,419</strong></td>
<td><strong>140,683</strong></td>
<td><strong>265</strong></td>
<td><strong>0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>-</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,467</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Operating Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operating Expenditure</th>
<th>Revised</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Variance %</th>
<th>Financial Impact</th>
<th>Commitments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>+ve / -ve</td>
<td>$'000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,647</td>
<td>3,201</td>
<td>5,791</td>
<td>2,591</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Capital Raising revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Add Back Non Cash Items</th>
<th>Revised</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Variance %</th>
<th>Financial Impact</th>
<th>Commitments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>+ve / -ve</td>
<td>$'000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42,562</td>
<td>24,563</td>
<td>24,820</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Funding available for capital expenditure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total capital spend</th>
<th>Revised</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Variance %</th>
<th>Financial Impact</th>
<th>Commitments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>+ve / -ve</td>
<td>$'000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64,822</td>
<td>38,164</td>
<td>29,177</td>
<td>(8,987)</td>
<td>-24%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>27,178</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Loan Principal Repayment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Net Funds Generated / (Used)</th>
<th>Revised</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Variance %</th>
<th>Financial Impact</th>
<th>Commitments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>+ve / -ve</td>
<td>$'000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5,525)</td>
<td>(3,349)</td>
<td>11,346</td>
<td>14,695</td>
<td>-439%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>30,645</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Financial Impact

5 The variance between YTD revised budget and YTD actual results at the end of January 2017 is provided in the Executive Monthly Performance Report (Attachment A). Key elements are:

---

Note 1 - Actual and Budget results include an estimate for the Newcastle Airport

Note 2 - Budget revised at September 2016
6 Factors favourably impacting Financial Position

i **User charges & fees – increase of $1.7m**
   The Summerhill Waste Management Centre (SWMC) has generated above budget income ($1.2m) which is partially offset by an increased NSW State Waste Levy expense. In addition Council is also achieving higher than budgeted income through the hire of facilities in our parks ($0.3m), D&B building assessments ($0.2m) and on street parking meters ($0.1m).

ii **Interest on investments – increase of $0.2m**
   Interest Income exceeded budget due to total portfolio holdings being greater than anticipated and interest rate higher than forecast.

iii **Other operating revenues – increase of $0.8m**
   Other revenues exceeded budget due to the one-off receipt of insurance claims and the recovery of legal fees.

iv **Employee costs – decrease of $0.9m**
   Lower than forecast staff costs due to timing of the project program and general vacancies with the largest variance relating to the Facilities and Recreation Business Unit ($0.6m).
iv **Materials & contracts – decrease of $0.9m**

Lower than forecast operational costs due to changes in the scheduling of project work in Strategic Planning ($1.4m) and Cultural Facilities ($0.6m). This is partially offset by above budget operational expenditure generated through the asset renewal program ($1.6m).

7 **Factors adversely impacting Financial Position**

i **Other operating expenses – increase of $1.9m**

Expenditure on the NSW State Waste Levy is higher than anticipated due to soil that has been imported to the SWMC site ($2.2m). This is a timing variance and Council will receive a credit as the soil is expected to be exported again.

ii **Net loss from disposal of assets – increase of $0.3m**

It is forecast that the 2016/17 asset renewal program will generate more asset write off expense than budgeted. The level of asset disposal becomes clearer as detailed planning of projects is undertaken or works commence and the forecasted loss on disposal will become more accurate as the year progresses.

8 At the end of January commitments raised against operating expenses totalled $3.5m. The commitments represent the work currently being undertaken and awaiting invoice as well as the work planned for the future.

9 The month of January returned an operating surplus of $1.3m which is in line with the revised monthly budget. The main variance was above budget income through the SWMC which was offset by additional NSW State Waste Levy.

### Trend in monthly operating position 2016/17

![Trend in monthly operating position chart](chart.png)
10 Council’s total capital revenue at the end of January is above the YTD revised budget by $2.9m with the result driven by proceeds from the sale of assets. The variance is largely related to timing of receipt of settlement proceeds from the sale of Council’s retirement villages, which were originally budgeted to occur during the previous financial year.

11 Council’s total capital spend at the end of January is $29.2m. This result is $9m below the YTD revised budget. The total works spend inclusive of operational and capital expenditure is $38.6m at the end of January compared with a revised budget of $48.1m.

12 At the end of January, commitments raised against capital work totalled $27.2m. The commitments represent both the work currently being undertaken and awaiting invoice as well as the work planned for the future. Major commitments include:

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Year Revised Budget $'000</th>
<th>YTD Revised Budget $'000</th>
<th>YTD Actual Result $'000</th>
<th>Variance $'000</th>
<th>Variance %</th>
<th>Financial Impact %</th>
<th>Commitments $'000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital Revenues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12,188 Grants &amp; contributions - Capital</td>
<td>7,110</td>
<td>6,580</td>
<td>(529)</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,500 Proceeds from the sale of Assets</td>
<td>1,458</td>
<td>4,849</td>
<td>3,391</td>
<td>233%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14,688 Total Capital Raising revenue</td>
<td>8,568</td>
<td>11,429</td>
<td>2,861</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Surplus/(deficit) after capital revenue</td>
<td>11,769</td>
<td>17,220</td>
<td>5,452</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustments for Non Cash Items</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41,444 Add back Depreciation</td>
<td>23,911</td>
<td>23,911</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,646 Add back loss on Disposal</td>
<td>1,544</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1,528) Less land &amp; infrastructure donations</td>
<td>(891)</td>
<td>(891)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding available for capital expenditure</td>
<td>36,332</td>
<td>42,040</td>
<td>5,708</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34,870 Asset renewals</td>
<td>21,196</td>
<td>15,809</td>
<td>(5,387)</td>
<td>-25%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>11,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,173 2012 SRV Priority Projects</td>
<td>2,724</td>
<td>2,265</td>
<td>(459)</td>
<td>-17%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>1,404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13,653 New / upgrade</td>
<td>9,199</td>
<td>7,107</td>
<td>(2,092)</td>
<td>-23%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>9,191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11,126 Non-Infrastructure Projects</td>
<td>5,045</td>
<td>3,996</td>
<td>(1,049)</td>
<td>-21%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>5,431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64,822 Total capital spend</td>
<td>38,164</td>
<td>29,177</td>
<td>(8,987)</td>
<td>-24%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>27,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,600 Loan Principal Repayment</td>
<td>1,517</td>
<td>1,517</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5,525) Net Funds Generated / (Used)</td>
<td>(3,349)</td>
<td>11,346</td>
<td>14,695</td>
<td>-439%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>30,645</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

Note 1 - Actual and Budget results include an estimate for the Newcastle Airport
Note 2 - Budget revised at September 2016
i  **Building renewal – $4.5m**
   Commitments include $2.5m in relation to works on the southern façade of City Hall.

ii  **Environmental asset renewal – $5m**
   Commitments include $1.7m for completion of a sea wall at South Newcastle, $1.9m for the Stockton seawall, and $1.1m of work planned on Council's stormwater management systems.

iii  **Waste Projects – $7.6m**
   Commitments include the contract to design and construct the next waste cell (cell 9) required at SWMC ($6.5m).

Council’s temporary surplus funds are invested consistent with Council’s Investment Policy, Investment Strategy, the Act and Regulations. Details of all Council funds invested under s. 625 of the Act are provided in the Investment Policy and Strategy Compliance Report (section 4 of Attachment A).

**COMMUNITY STRATEGIC PLAN ALIGNMENT**

14 This report aligns to the Community Strategic Plan under the strategic direction of ‘Open and collaborative leadership’ action 7.4b ‘ensure the management of Council’s budget allocations and funding alternatives are compliant with Council policy and relevant legislation to ensure the long term financial sustainability of the organisation.’

**IMPLEMENTATION PLAN/IMPLICATIONS**

15 The distribution of the report and the information contained therein is consistent with:

i) Council’s resolution to receive monthly financial position and performance result on a monthly basis,

ii) Council’s Investment Policy and Strategy, and

iii) clause 212 of the Regulation and s. 625 of the Act.

**RISK ASSESSMENT AND MITIGATION**

16 No additional risk mitigation has been identified this month.

**RELATED PREVIOUS DECISIONS**

17 Council resolved to receive a report containing Council’s financial performance on a monthly basis.

18 At the Ordinary Council Meeting held on 26 April 2016 Council resolved the following:
The report be received with the addition of a compliance report on Council's adopted clauses on ethical and social responsibility set out in Council's Investment Policy to be included under the section “Investment Policy Compliance Report”.

19 The Investment Policy Compliance Report included in the Executive Monthly Performance Report has been amended to include a specific confirmation in regard to compliance with part E of the Investment Policy.

CONSULTATION

20 A monthly workshop is conducted with the Councillors to provide detailed information and a forum to ask questions. In circumstances where a workshop cannot be scheduled the information is distributed under separate cover.

OPTIONS

Option 1

21 The recommendation as at Paragraph 1. This is the recommended option.

Option 2

22 Council resolves to vary the recommendation in respect of the receipt of the report. This is not the recommended option.

BACKGROUND

23 Previous resolutions of Council and the Audit Committee identified the need for careful monitoring of Council’s financial strategy and operational budget result. The presentation of a monthly Executive Performance Report to Council and a workshop addresses this need thereby meeting and exceeding the requirements of the Act.

REFERENCES

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A: Executive Monthly Performance Report - January 2017
Distributed under separate cover
ITEM-6  

CCL 28/02/17 - QUARTERLY BUDGET REVIEW STATEMENT - DECEMBER 2016

REPORT BY: CORPORATE SERVICES
CONTACT: DIRECTOR CORPORATE SERVICES / MANAGER FINANCE

PURPOSE

To provide Council with the Quarterly Budget Review Statement as at 31 December 2016, in accordance with clause 203 of the Local Government (General) Regulation 2005.

RECOMMENDATION

1 Council receives the December Quarterly Budget Review Statement (Attachment A) and adopts the revised budget as detailed therein.

KEY ISSUES

2 The December Quarterly Budget Review Statement includes adjustments required to the budget to reflect trends identified in the actual operating performance for the first half of the 2016/17 financial year. Operational budget variations have been identified, for categories of revenue and expenditure within the December Quarterly Budget Review Statement however there is effectively no net change in the overall operating result. Council’s budgeted annual operating surplus of $4.6m for the year ended 30 June 2017 remains unchanged.

3 The net funds budgeted to be used in the 2016/17 financial year has been decreased by $5.5m. This results in net funds used of $59,000 or effectively a balanced funding position for the financial year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016/17 Adopted Budget $'000</th>
<th>Adopted September 2016 $'000</th>
<th>Recommended December 2016 $'000</th>
<th>Projected year end result $'000</th>
<th>Actual YTD $'000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Operating Revenue</td>
<td>246,494</td>
<td>(221)</td>
<td>1,991</td>
<td>248,264</td>
<td>125,612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Operating Expenses</td>
<td>241,076</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>1,990</td>
<td>243,616</td>
<td>121,157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Operating Revenue Less Operating Expenditure</td>
<td>5,418</td>
<td>(771)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4,648</td>
<td>4,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Capital Raising revenue</td>
<td>14,321</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>9,165</td>
<td>23,853</td>
<td>13,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add back Non Cash Items</td>
<td>41,094</td>
<td>1,468</td>
<td>(3,656)</td>
<td>38,906</td>
<td>21,273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding available for capital expenditure</td>
<td>60,833</td>
<td>1,064</td>
<td>5,510</td>
<td>67,407</td>
<td>39,708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total capital spend</td>
<td>64,352</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>64,866</td>
<td>27,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan Principal Repayment</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>1,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Funds Generated / (Used)</td>
<td>(6,119)</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>5,466</td>
<td>(59)</td>
<td>11,073</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FINANCIAL IMPACT

4 The analysis below will focus exclusively on the financial impact of budget changes recommended in the December Quarterly Budget Review Statement in regard to operational revenue and expenditure. Key elements of the forecast include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operating Revenue</th>
<th>2016/17 Adopted Budget $’000</th>
<th>Adopted September 2016 $’000</th>
<th>Recommended December 2016</th>
<th>Projected year end result $’000</th>
<th>Actual YTD $’000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rates &amp; charges</td>
<td>144,941</td>
<td>(37)</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>66,888</td>
<td>34,464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User charges &amp; fees</td>
<td>66,809</td>
<td>8,340</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>9,170</td>
<td>5,403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>8,340</td>
<td>(769)</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>17,525</td>
<td>8,329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Operating Revenue</td>
<td>246,494</td>
<td>(221)</td>
<td>1,991</td>
<td>248,264</td>
<td>125,612</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operating Expenses</th>
<th>2016/17 Adopted Budget $’000</th>
<th>Adopted September 2016 $’000</th>
<th>Recommended December 2016</th>
<th>Projected year end result $’000</th>
<th>Actual YTD $’000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee costs</td>
<td>95,220</td>
<td>(769)</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>41,137</td>
<td>23,391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowing costs</td>
<td>3,901</td>
<td>58,119</td>
<td>(160)</td>
<td>41,444</td>
<td>20,723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; contracts</td>
<td>40,776</td>
<td>57,768</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>27,056</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation &amp; amortisation</td>
<td>41,214</td>
<td>41,137</td>
<td>41,444</td>
<td>23,391</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Loss from disposal of assets</td>
<td>1,846</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>4,146</td>
<td>1,314</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Operating Expenses</td>
<td>241,076</td>
<td>243,616</td>
<td>121,157</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 Factors favourably impacting Financial Position

i **User charges & fees – increase of $0.1m**

Actual revenue generated in the first half of the financial year indicates that Council will generate $0.2m more income through on-street parking meters than previously budgeted.

ii **Interest on investments – increase of $0.8m**

Interest Income is forecast to exceed budget due to total portfolio holdings being greater than anticipated due to the impact of timing differences in the payments for project work. In addition a higher yield has been achieved than was budgeted.
iii Other operating expenses – increase of $0.5m
In the current year to date Council has received one-off payments for insurance claims and the recovery of legal costs relating to work undertaken in previous financial years. These recoveries were not previously budgeted for this financial year.

iv Grants & contributions – increase of $0.6m
Council has received a $0.5m grant from the NSW Environment Protection Agency (EPA) for Phase 1 of the scientific investigation works at the former Waratah Gasworks site. This additional income is offset by equivalent additional operational costs incurred undertaking the project (refer comments at paragraph 6(i) below). This information was not available at the time of completion of the September Quarterly review.

6 Factors adversely impacting Financial Position
i Materials & Contracts – increase of $0.4m
Additional costs have been incurred for the completion of the Phase 1 investigation works at the former Waratah Gasworks site. This additional cost is offset by equivalent additional revenue as referenced at paragraph 5(iv) above.

ii Net loss from disposal of assets – increase of $1.5m
When renewal projects are completed the residual book value of the elements of the asset that have been renewed (ie replaced) are required by the relevant accounting standards to be written off (disposed). This residual book value is difficult to forecast prior to commencement of the renewal work. Accordingly it is expected that the 2016/17 asset renewal program will generate an additional $1.5m of residual book value to be written off than originally budgeted. The level of asset disposal becomes clearer as detailed planning of projects is undertaken or works commence and the forecasted loss on disposal will become more accurate as the year progresses.
Factors impacting the capital program

i  Grants & contributions – increase of $5.2m
   The budget has been adjusted to reflect additional forecast land under road and infrastructure asset donations. These donations are recorded as a revenue item but do not involve any exchange of cash and so are removed when calculating the funding available for capital expenditure.

ii  Proceeds from the sale of Assets – increase of $4m
   The budget has been increased to reflect the receipt of settlement proceeds from the sale of Council’s retirement villages. The settlement was originally budgeted to occur during the previous financial year.

iii  Total capital expenditure – nil change
   The Works Program (both capital and operational expenditure) has been reviewed to align with revised program scheduling that took place during the quarter. These adjustments have resulted in some changes between program categories but no significant net change to the total value of the Capital Works Program.
8 The total gross value of project budgets included in the revised 2016/17 Works program budget for the December Quarterly Budget Review has been revised to $87.7m. However, the increase has been offset by a revised provision of $5.8m to reflect the budgeted value of work in progress (WIP) as at 30 June 2017. This results in no significant change to the total net value of the Works program at this quarterly review. Accordingly, the revised budget for the Works program remains broadly in-line with the adopted budget for the 2016/17 financial year.

9 Detailed breakdown of the budget adjustments are provided in Attachment A and a summary of key movements in the 2016/17 Works program is provided below.

### Works program summary

*Result for the financial period ending 31 December, 2016*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Works Program</th>
<th>Adopted 2016/17 Works Program Budget $,000</th>
<th>Adopted September QBRS $,000</th>
<th>Recommended December 2016 QBRS $,000</th>
<th>Projected year end result 2016/17 $,000</th>
<th>Actual Dec YTD $,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Represented by</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asset Renewal</td>
<td>40,205</td>
<td>6,537</td>
<td>46,742</td>
<td>19,354</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non - Infrastructure Projects</td>
<td>13,994</td>
<td>(60)</td>
<td>(233)</td>
<td>13,701</td>
<td>4,573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Assets</td>
<td>17,916</td>
<td>(2,728)</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>15,391</td>
<td>8,565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Rate Variation Projects</td>
<td>9,893</td>
<td>(3,761)</td>
<td>(26)</td>
<td>6,106</td>
<td>2,686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Works Program</strong></td>
<td>82,008</td>
<td>81,996</td>
<td>(56)</td>
<td>81,940</td>
<td>35,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Asset Renewal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building and Structures</td>
<td>13,600</td>
<td>(1,597)</td>
<td>909</td>
<td>12,912</td>
<td>7,179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Roads</td>
<td>13,699</td>
<td>2,680</td>
<td>(2,476)</td>
<td>13,903</td>
<td>5,424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>12,906</td>
<td>5,454</td>
<td>1,567</td>
<td>19,927</td>
<td>6,751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Asset Renewal</strong></td>
<td>40,205</td>
<td>6,537</td>
<td>46,742</td>
<td>19,354</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non - Infrastructure Projects</strong></td>
<td>13,994</td>
<td>(60)</td>
<td>(233)</td>
<td>13,701</td>
<td>4,573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleet Replacement</td>
<td>8,798</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,798</td>
<td>2,322</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>2,320</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,320</td>
<td>1,412</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic</td>
<td>1,749</td>
<td>(193)</td>
<td>1,556</td>
<td>347</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Capital</td>
<td>1,127</td>
<td>(60)</td>
<td>(40)</td>
<td>1,027</td>
<td>492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Non - Infrastructure</strong></td>
<td>13,994</td>
<td>(60)</td>
<td>(233)</td>
<td>13,701</td>
<td>4,573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New / Upgrade Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built Infrastructure</td>
<td>3,901</td>
<td>1,652</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>5,806</td>
<td>2,518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste</td>
<td>14,015</td>
<td>(4,380)</td>
<td>(50)</td>
<td>9,585</td>
<td>6,047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total New Assets</strong></td>
<td>17,916</td>
<td>(2,728)</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>15,391</td>
<td>8,565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2012 SRV - Priority Projects</strong></td>
<td>9,893</td>
<td>(3,761)</td>
<td>(26)</td>
<td>6,106</td>
<td>2,686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter St Revitalisation</td>
<td>993</td>
<td>(231)</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>306</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Revitalisation</td>
<td>4,025</td>
<td>(1,273)</td>
<td>(1,000)</td>
<td>1,752</td>
<td>451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycleways</td>
<td>4,375</td>
<td>(2,046)</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>2,803</td>
<td>1,891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackbutt</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>(211)</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total 2012 SRV - Priority Projects</strong></td>
<td>9,893</td>
<td>(3,761)</td>
<td>(26)</td>
<td>6,106</td>
<td>2,686</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The Budget above is inclusive of operational and capital works
10 Project funding requirements
i City roads – decrease of $2.5m
Large planned works including the Wickham transport interchange ($1.5m) have been rescheduled into 2017/18 while Council waits for sewage and traffic design work to be completed by Transport for NSW.

ii Environment – increase of $1.6m
The 2016/17 program has been increased as Council continues to focus on the design and construction of key stormwater drainage assets.

iii Buildings & structures – increase of $0.9m
The 2016/17 program has been increased to include replacing the air conditioning plant on the Fred Ash Building ($0.4m) and Queens Wharf maintenance ($0.2m).

iv Coastal revitalisation – decrease of $1m
The Coastal Revitalisation program was reduced by $1m to reflect changes in the payment schedule relating to work being undertaken on the Bathers Way project.

COMMUNITY STRATEGIC PLAN ALIGNMENT
11 This December Quarterly Budget Review Statement aligns to the Community Strategic Plan under the strategic direction of ‘Open and collaborative leadership’ action 7.4b ‘ensure the management of Council’s budget allocations and funding alternatives are compliant with Council policy and relevant legislation to ensure the long term financial sustainability of the organisation’.

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN/IMPLICATIONS
12 The adoption of the recommendation will enable ongoing implementation of Council’s adopted 2013-17 Delivery Program and 2016/17 Operational Plan in a cost effective and efficient manner. If the recommended budget adjustments are not approved it will significantly impact on the Council's ability to undertake the projects outlined in the 2016/17 Works program (as adjusted in the December Quarterly Review Statement) and will ultimately impact on the organisation's ability to meet the current and future years' Operational Plans. In order to ensure that Council remains financially fit for the future and continues on its path to financial sustainability it is essential that it continues to meet its annual Operational Plans.

RISK ASSESSMENT AND MITIGATION
13 Adoption by 28 February 2017 will meet legislative obligations to submit a Quarterly Budget Review Statement to Council within two months of the end of each quarter.
RELATED PREVIOUS DECISIONS

14 Adoption of the updated 2013-17 Delivery Program and 2016/17 Operational Plan on 28 June 2016.

CONSULTATION

15 A Councillor Workshop was conducted on 21 February 2017 to provide detailed background information to Councillors and to provide a forum for Councillors to ask questions.

OPTIONS

Option 1

16 The recommendation as at Paragraph 1. This is the recommended option.

Option 2

17 Council resolves to vary the recommendation that Council adopts the report. This will impact on the ability of Council to meet the targets outlined in the 2016/17 Operational Plan and may impact on its future financial sustainability. This is not the recommended option.

BACKGROUND

18 The Integrated Planning and Reporting framework requires councils to prepare a Quarterly Budget Review Statement. The Quarterly Budget Review Statement should provide a revised estimate of the income and expenditure of the council for the financial year and recommend any budget amendments required to achieve the revised estimate of the income and expenditure for the year.

19 The Quarterly Budget Review Statement now incorporates a property and land use section. The Local Government Act 1993 requires that all leases with a term of five years or more, approved under delegated authority, are reported to Council on a quarterly basis.

REFERENCES

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A Quarterly Budget Review Statement – December 2016
Distributed under separate cover
ITEM-7  CCL 28/02/17 - BERESFIELD LOCAL CENTRE PUBLIC
DOMAIN PLAN - PROPOSED TRAFFIC PLAN

REPORT BY: INFRASTRUCTURE
CONTACT: DIRECTOR INFRASTRUCTURE / MANAGER
INFRASTRUCTURE PLANNING

PURPOSE

To approve the traffic management plan (traffic plan) developed as part of the public domain plan for Beresfield Local Centre. The traffic plan is anticipated to mitigate motor vehicle crashes and provide improved pedestrian and cyclist accessibility, amenity and safety.

RECOMMENDATION

1 Approve the traffic management plan as set out in Attachment A.

KEY ISSUES

2 As part of the preparation of the Beresfield Local Centre Public Domain Plan (PDP), Council conducted a community consultation workshop on 19 September 2016 at Beresfield Public School Hall on Anderson Drive. The workshop was designed to engage with the community to discuss opportunities and constraints and receive feedback on the potential improvements before developing the draft public domain plan and traffic plan.

3 Council undertook traffic and pedestrian surveys to ascertain the need and justification for various traffic facilities within the draft public domain plan and traffic plan. The survey result map is shown in Attachment B.

4 The following improvements have been proposed within the traffic plan:

   i) Proposed 40km/h (HPAA) on the following street sections:
      - 600m length on Lawson Avenue between Michael Hill Avenue and Kendall Street;
      - 250m length on Addison Street between Lawson Avenue and Landor Street;
      - 100m length on Beresford Avenue between Lawson Avenue and Landor Street;
      - 150m length on Milton Street between Addison Street and Landor Street; and
      - 100m length on Newton Street between Lawson Avenue and Ruskin Street.
   
   ii) Realignment of intersections west of Lawson Avenue.
iii) Upgrading the existing zebra crossing on Addison Street at Lawson Avenue to a 75mm high wombat crossing with kerb extensions.

iv) Relocation of the existing zebra crossing on Lawson Avenue to the realigned Beresford Street intersection and upgrading it to a 75mm high wombat crossing with kerb extensions.

v) New 75mm high wombat crossings on Lawson Avenue at Addison Street and on Newton Street at Lawson Avenue.

vi) 75mm high raised thresholds as gateway treatments at the start and end of the proposed 40km/h HPAA on Lawson Avenue.

vii) Sets of 75mm high speed cushions on Lawson Avenue, Addison Street, Beresford Avenue, Milton Street and Newton Street within the proposed 40km/h HPAA.

viii) Left-in/left-out turning movements on Railway Parade at Lawson Avenue intersection.

ix) Future upgrade of the footpath on the northern side of Addison Street to a shared path connecting to the railway station.

5 The Roads and Maritime Services (RMS) crash database for the last five years (1 July 2010 - 30 June 2015) indicates that there have been eight crashes, out of which four are injury crashes, within the proposed 40km/h HPAA. The proposal is anticipated to mitigate these crashes. The crash collision diagram is shown in Attachment C.

6 The exhibition leaflet consisting of the draft public domain plan and traffic plan, as shown at Attachment D, was tabled to the Newcastle City Traffic Committee (NCTC) on 19 December 2016 (Item 189) to seek comments and in-principle support for the proposed draft traffic plan. The Hunter Valley Buses (HVB) representative commented that it does not support the proposed wombat crossing on approach to the bus stop as it could become a potential fall hazard for passengers. He requested that Council consider other traffic calming measures in such instances as recommended by the RMS. The Committee provided in-principle support for the draft traffic plan and HVB comments were noted.

Council response: Council considers the risk of not having a wombat crossing to be greater than that of the potential fall hazard to bus passengers. Passengers will adapt to the new layout of the street and can remain seated until the bus stops if necessary.
7 Council conducted a public exhibition on the draft public domain plan and traffic plan from 12 December 2016 to 23 January 2017. The public exhibition questionnaire was designed so that the community can provide separate responses (Yes/No) on the key proposals in addition to providing general comments. Council received a total of 18 responses out of which 12 responses were in favour of relocating the existing pedestrian crossing, 13 responses were in favour of the proposed 40km/h HPAA and traffic calming, 11 responses were in favour of the proposed left-in/left-out restriction and 13 responses were in favour of other changes such as trees and kerb extensions. The summary of consultation responses is shown at Attachment E.

8 The following are the key concerns raised by the respondents along with Council's respective responses:

i) Some respondents have requested to provide zebra crossings other locations in the area.

**Council response:** Zebra crossings cannot be installed as traffic and pedestrian volumes do not meet the stipulated RMS warrants.

ii) A respondent raised concerns regarding Tennyson Street.

**Council response:** Tennyson Street is approximately 600m long and has give-way restrictions at the Ogilvie Street intersection which already serves as a mid-point traffic calming measure. Introduction of give-way restrictions is not appropriate at the remaining two intersections of Percy Street and Newton Street.

iii) A respondent has questioned the need to introduce the 40km/h HPAA and traffic calming measures on Lawson Avenue.

**Council response:** Traffic surveys conducted on Lawson Avenue (two locations) and Addison Street indicated that the 85th percentile speed of traffic is in excess of the posted speed limit of 50km/h. The proposed traffic plan is anticipated to mitigate crashes and also provide improved pedestrian and cyclist accessibility, amenity and safety.

iv) Some respondents have also raised concerns regarding the impact of construction on local businesses.

**Council response:** Council will aim to minimise disruption to local businesses during construction as much as possible. Council will communicate with all business owners directly affected prior, during and after construction.

v) A respondent questioned the location of the proposed zebra crossing on Newton Street at Lawson Avenue. The respondent prefers to have the proposed zebra crossing mid-block in Newton Street.

**Council response:** The mid-block location is not preferred as it is constrained by the existing driveways and would result in higher loss of parking.
9 The traffic plan following the public exhibition period was tabled to the Newcastle City Traffic Committee (NCTC) on 20 February 2017. The advice from the NCTC meeting held has been separately provided in a memo to the Councillors.

10 There are no changes proposed to the traffic plan that was put on public exhibition and the proposal is forwarded for Council approval.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

11 The overall public domain plan, including the proposed traffic plan, will be delivered through Council's Operational budget funding over the next few years. Council will seek a grant from the Roads and Maritime Services (RMS) to part-fund the cost of the proposed 40km/h HPAA component of the traffic plan.

COMMUNITY STRATEGIC PLAN ALIGNMENT

12 The project is aligned with the "Liveable and Distinctive Built Environment" strategic direction that has an objective of creating "Mixed-use urban villages supported by integrated transport networks". The project supports the targeted community outcome of providing "walkable neighbourhoods".

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN/IMPLICATIONS

13 Construction of Stage 1 of the project is scheduled to commence in financial year 2017/18, subject to Council approval, and the project will be completed in stages over the next few years subject to funding.

RISK ASSESSMENT AND MITIGATION

14 The traffic plan is anticipated to mitigate crashes and provide improved pedestrian and cyclist accessibility, amenity and safety. The proposed works will be undertaken in accordance with the relevant Austroads and RMS guidelines.

RELATED PREVIOUS DECISIONS

15 Nil.

CONSULTATION

16 A community consultation workshop was conducted on 19 September 2016. The public exhibition was undertaken between 12 December 2016 and 23 January 2017.

OPTIONS

Option 1

17 The recommendation as at Paragraph 1. This is the recommended option.
Option 2

18 The recommendation for the proposed traffic plan is not adopted by Council. No action be taken. This is not the recommended option.

BACKGROUND

19 Background information is presented in the Key Issues sections 2 to 10 of this report.

REFERENCES

Nil

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A: Beresfield Local Centre Public Domain Plan and Traffic Plan
Attachment B: Manual Traffic and Pedestrian Survey Result Map
Attachment C: Crash Collision Diagram
Attachment D: Exhibition Leaflet
Attachment E: Summary of Consultation Responses
To The Business Owner/Property Owner/Resident

Beresfield Local Centre: Draft Public Domain Plan and Traffic Plan

Council is developing a Draft Public Domain Plan and Traffic Plan for Beresfield Local Centre. Proposed improvements include:

- Reduce the speed limit within the local centre zone from 50km/h to 40km/h by implementing a 40km/h High Pedestrian Activity (HPA) area
- Traffic calming devices to improve pedestrian safety and amenity
- Relocation of the existing Lawson Ave pedestrian crossing and upgrade to a raised wombat crossing
- New raised wombat crossings on Niven Street, Addison Street and Lawson Avenue
- Realignment of intersections west of Lawson Avenue
- Retention of parking has been prioritised with a net gain of 1 parking space
- Other streetscape improvements include street trees, kerb extensions, outdoor dining and public art

Your feedback on the questions below is important to assist Council in making a final decision. The plan is on exhibition from Monday 12 December until Monday 23 January 2017. A full coloured copy is available on Council’s website: www.newcastle.nsw.gov.au - under the ‘Community’ tab, go to ‘Get Involved’, then ‘Have Your Say’

Please provide feedback by 5pm Monday 23 January 2017. Comments can be made via Council’s website at www.newcastle.nsw.gov.au - under the ‘Community’ tab, go to ‘Get Involved’, then ‘Have Your Say’, or by forwarding written comments to:

Newcastle City Council
Attention: Traffic and Transport
PO Box 489
NEWCASTLE NSW 2300
Email: mail@ncc.nsw.gov.au

For further information please contact Josieel Caruana, Council Traffic Engineer on telephone 4974 2666, or Sarah Haran, Council Landscape Architect on telephone 4911 2151. If there are no submissions received Council will assume there are no objections to the proposed changes.

Name: ____________________________
Address: ___________________________

Do you agree with moving the existing pedestrian crossing? [ ] Yes [ ] No

Do you agree with the proposed traffic calming and 40km/h zone? [ ] Yes [ ] No

Do you agree with the proposed left in, left out restriction at the Railway Parade junction? [ ] Yes [ ] No

Do you agree with the other proposed changes e.g. trees, kerb extensions & outdoor dining? [ ] Yes [ ] No

Further comments:

---

Design Proposal

- Tasks involving minor landscaping
- Separations between parking and pedestrian zones
- Raised kerb around new planting to provide separation

Legend

- Raised kerb with new planting
- Separation between parking and pedestrian zones
- Pedestrian pathways

Lawson Ave: Section B
## BERESFORD LOCAL CENTRE PUBLIC DOMAIN AND TRAFFIC PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P&amp;R Number</th>
<th>Ped Crossing</th>
<th>Traffic Calming</th>
<th>Railway Pedals</th>
<th>Other Changes</th>
<th>Summarised Comments</th>
<th>Council Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OT2016/05481</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Everything looks fine apart from you may want to consider putting crossings labelled 6 ‘raised pedestrian crossing with kerb extension to improve pedestrian access. Lighting upgrade across Beresford Avenue and across Lander Street at their intersections with Lawson Avenue, the same as the proposed pedestrian crossing across Addison Street at its intersection with Lawson Avenue as these intersections are where large amounts of pedestrians from the rail station and students from Francis Greenway High School cross the roads, as the footpath on Apex Park side of Lawson Avenue is the main pedestrian thoroughfare.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OT2016/05369</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Good start to improving Beresfield - need to do something with the shops and laneway.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OT2016/05414</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Submission from Post Office summarised. Left in and out only at Railway Pde and realignment of Beresford junction will solve traffic issues. 48km not agreed. Agree with more trees and beautification. Outdoor dining should be outside food shops. Apex park should include a skate park. Need enough rubbish bins with any outdoor tables. Need and state devices on new walls etc. Concerned about disruption to business during construction. Needs access to driveway 6am to 6pm Mon to Fri.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P&amp;R Number</th>
<th>Ped Crossing</th>
<th>Traffic Calming</th>
<th>Railway Pedals</th>
<th>Other Changes</th>
<th>Summarised Comments</th>
<th>Council Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OT2016/05336</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Looks fine - may want to consider putting crossings labelled 6 ‘raised pedestrian crossing with kerb extension to improve pedestrian access. Lighting upgrade across Berekford Ave/Lander St at intersections with Lawson Ave same as the proposed ped crossing across Addison St at its intersection with Lawson Ave as these intersections are where large amounts of pedestrians from rail station and students from Francis Greenway High School cross the roads, as the footpath on Apex Park side of Lawson Ave is the main pedestrian thoroughfare.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P&amp;R Number</th>
<th>Ped Crossing</th>
<th>Traffic Calming</th>
<th>Railway Pedals</th>
<th>Other Changes</th>
<th>Summarised Comments</th>
<th>Council Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TR2016/01574</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Soft to eye fencing around parkland for safety - currently used mush as not safe for children with traffic issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OT2016/05271</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>No comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OT2016/05180</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Council is only making changes to the publicly owned land in the street. Council cannot make changes to privately owned land or buildings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Council had conducted traffic and pedestrian survey at the intersection to ascertain feasibility of zebra crossings across all approaches. The survey result indicated that Lawson Avenue (northern side) and Newton Street are the predominant pedestrian desire lines. Zebra crossings cannot be installed on Beresford Avenue and Lawson Avenue (southern side) approaches as traffic and pedestrian volumes do not meet the stipulated RMS warrants. Furthermore, the Beresford Avenue approach is proposed to be realigned and narrowed to improve safety. While Council has not undertaken a traffic and pedestrian survey at Lander Street / Lawson Avenue intersection it is anticipated that traffic and pedestrian volumes will not meet the stipulated RMS warrants as in the case of Beresford Avenue. However, Lander Street approach is proposed to be realigned and the existing pedestrian refuge will be retained to improve safety.
| TR2016/05187 | Y | Y | Y | No comment | No response. |
| TR2016/081838 | Y | Y | Y | No comment | No response. |
| OT2016/05258 | N | Y | Y | No comment | No response. |
| OT2016/08259 | Y | Y | Y | No comment | No response. |

| OT2016/05260 | Y | Y | N | No comment | No response. |

Concern with current limited give way. Tennyson Street will become new speed throughfoor Woodberry. It already has speed cars down daily for the shops (needs more give way like paralel street?).

Tennyson Street is approximately 800m long and has give-way restrictions at Ogilvie Street intersection which already serves as a mid-point traffic calming measure. Introduction of give-way restrictions is not appropriate at the remaining two intersections of Percy Street and Newton Street. Furthermore, it should be noted that through traffic potentiality using Tennyson Street as a short cut is likely to be deterred as drivers would still need to eave the remaining section of the proposed 40km/h HPAA and due to the proposed restricted turning movements at Railway Parade / Lawson Avenue intersection.

| OT2017/00120 | N | N | N | N | Barely qualifies as a plan-no cost benefit analysis, environmental impact statement, costs, time or alternatives. |

| TR2017/00047 | Y | Y | Y | Y | This is great can't wait till it's done | No response. |

| ECM 8863459 | - | - | - | - | "Newton St is a bottleneck because of all the vehicular activity, and an accident waiting to happen. Would like the proposed pedestrian crossing to be located midway along Newton St east of the entry to Woolworth's car park, because it would slow traffic and make it safer to cross. Objects to the proposed location at the junction of Newton St and Lawson Ave because it will disrupt the traffic flow into Newton St from Lawson Ave and Birmingford Ave. |

| OT2016/05251 | Y | Y | Y | Y | Summarised: Upgrade proposal is good. May attract businesses and employment. Some commercial premises have people living in them is this allowed. What is happening with police station? Can Council help businesses upgrade frontages? Ped crossing across Birmingford at Lawson should be considered as this is where majority of people cross. Not enough spaces for cars at new unit block - they park on main street, needs an overflow area. Extra commuter parking at railway station needed. When will work start and how will Council work with businesses? |

Council cannot make changes to privately owned land or buildings - including the railway's car park. Council consulted the police and they wish to retain their allocated on-road spaces. At present Council has no frontage upgrade scheme in place. Overflow parking for the unit block is not proposed, but the 40km/h zone and free parking will assist with sight line issues caused by cars parking on Lawson Ave. Council had conducted traffic and pedestrian survey at the intersection to ascertain feasibility of zebra crossings across all approaches. The survey result indicated that Lawson Avenue (northern side) and Newton Street are the predominant pedestrian desire lines. Zebra crossings cannot be installed on Birmingford Avenue and Lawson Avenue (southern side) approaches as traffic and pedestrian volumes do not meet the stipulated RMS warrants. Furthermore, the Birmingford Avenue approach is proposed to be realigned and narrowed to improve safety.

<p>| OT2017/00226 | Y | Y | Y | Y | Support NCC for looking at our suburbs and hope that the proposed changes are carried out sooner rather than later. The main shopping area needs attention, in particular the pedestrian crossing and hopefully the lower speed limit will make the streets safer. The planting of trees will soften the look of the street. Yes please to all of the above | No response. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TR2017/00060</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summarised: Strongly objects to traffic calming and trees. Thinks reverse parking on Beaufort is unsafe. Police only zone unused. Doesn’t think proposals will reverse the decline of the shopping centre.

Traffic surveys conducted on Lawson Avenue (two locations) and Addison Street indicated that the 85th percentile speed of traffic is in excess of the posted speed limit of 50km/h. The proposed traffic plan is anticipated to mitigate crashes and provide improved pedestrian and cyclist accessibility, amenity and safety. Council’s standard is now for reverse parking as it is safer than reversing out into traffic. Council consulted the police and they wish to retain their allocated on-road spaces. Street trees will improve the aesthetics of the centre and encourage use.
ITEM-8 CCL 28/02/17 - STOCKTON LOCAL CENTRE PUBLIC DOMAIN PLAN - PROPOSED TRAFFIC PLAN

REPORT BY: INFRASTRUCTURE
CONTACT: DIRECTOR INFRASTRUCTURE / MANAGER INFRASTRUCTURE PLANNING

PURPOSE

To approve the traffic management plan (traffic plan) developed as part of the public domain plan for Stockton Local Centre. The traffic plan is anticipated to mitigate motor vehicle crashes and provide improved pedestrian and cyclist accessibility, amenity and safety.

RECOMMENDATION

1 Approve the traffic management plan as set out at Attachment A.

KEY ISSUES

2 As part of the preparation of the Stockton Local Centre Public Domain Plan (PDP), Council conducted a community consultation workshop on 21 September 2016 at the Stockton RSL on Douglas Street. The workshop was designed to engage with the community to discuss opportunities and constraints and receive feedback on the potential improvements before developing the draft public domain plan and traffic plan.

3 Council undertook traffic and pedestrian surveys to ascertain the need and justification for various traffic facilities within the draft public domain plan and traffic plan. The survey result map is shown at Attachment B.

4 The following improvements have been proposed within the traffic plan.

   i) Proposed 400m long 40km/h (HPAA) on Mitchell Street between King and Hunter Streets.

   ii) Removal of the existing mid-block zebra crossing on Mitchell Street between King Street and Crown Street.

   iii) Proposed two at-grade zebra crossings on Mitchell Street at King Street and Crown Street intersections.

   iv) Proposed at-grade zebra crossing on Crown Street at Mitchell Street intersection.

   v) Kerb extensions on the western corners of Mitchell Street at all intersections within the proposed 40km/h HPAA.
vi) Kerb extensions on the eastern corners of Mitchell Street at Crown Street and King Street intersections.

vii) A set of 75mm high speed cushions as a gateway treatment at the start of the proposed 40km/h HPAA on Mitchell Street at King Street.

viii) Two sets of 75mm high speed cushions on Mitchell Street at Crown Street and Queen Street intersections within the proposed 40km/h HPAA.

ix) Continuous footpath treatments across Little William Street and Little Maitland Street at Mitchell Street intersections.

x) Footpath widening on King Street fronting Stockton Public Library.

5 The RMS crash database for the last five years (1 July 2010 - 30 June 2015) indicates that there have been three non-injury crashes within the proposed 40km/h HPAA. The proposal is anticipated to mitigate these crashes. The crash collision diagram is shown in Attachment C.

6 The exhibition leaflet consisting of the draft public domain plan and traffic plan, as shown in Attachment D, was tabled to the Newcastle City Traffic Committee (NCTC) on 19 December 2016 (Item 188) to seek comments and in-principle support for the proposed draft traffic plan. The Hunter Valley Buses (HVB) representative commented that it does not support the proposed raised threshold with pedestrian crossing (wombat crossing) on approach to the bus stop as it could become a potential fall hazard for passengers. He requested that Council consider other traffic calming measures in such instances as recommended by the RMS. The Committee provided in-principle support for the draft traffic plan and HVB comments were noted.

**Council response:** Council is not progressing with the wombat crossing proposal considering the objection raised by HVB. Council will install at-grade zebra crossings at the proposed locations.

7 Council conducted a public exhibition on the draft public domain plan and traffic plan from 12 December 2016 to 23 January 2017. The public exhibition questionnaire was designed so that the community can provide separate responses (Yes/No) on the key proposals in addition to providing general comments. Council received a total of 34 responses out of which 17 responses were in favour of relocating the existing pedestrian crossing, 24 responses were in favour of the proposed 40km/h HPAA and traffic calming and 23 responses were in favour of other changes such as trees and kerb extensions. The summary of consultation responses is shown at Attachment E.

8 The following are the key concerns raised by the respondents along with Council's respective responses:
i) Some respondents have objected to the proposal of relocating the zebra crossing to the south of King Street intersection. They have raised that the proposed location is unsafe as the intersection of Mitchell Street and King Street has witnessed a few crashes in the past. Some respondents have also requested to relocate the crossing mid-block aligned with the mall entry.

Council response: Zebra crossings are typically located at intersections as they offer better visibility and minimise loss of parking. Locating crossings at intersections is also anticipated to enhance safety as traffic speeds are typically lower, compared to mid-block sections of a street, and drivers are more vigilant.

Council has amended the zebra crossing proposal following the public exhibition. The proposed crossings on Mitchell Street at King Street and Crown Street intersections will cater to the desired pedestrian crossing lines from both directions. A zebra crossing is also proposed on Crown Street at the Mitchell Street intersection to further improve pedestrian connectivity with the local centre and school.

ii) Some respondents have requested the installation of additional zebra crossings across Mitchell Street at Crown, Queen and Hunter Streets.

Council response: The revised proposal includes a zebra crossing on Mitchell Street at the Crown Street intersection. The proposal also includes kerb extensions at Queen Street and Hunter Street intersections to reduce crossing distance and enable installation of zebra crossings in future if the RMS warrants are met.

iii) Some respondents have requested implementation of a Shared Zone or Pedestrian Zone on Mitchell Street with no traffic permitted between King and Crown Streets.

Council response: Shared Zones or Pedestrian Zones are installed at locations with high pedestrian volume and low traffic volume. Mitchell Street currently has relatively lower pedestrian volume compared to traffic volume. Implementation of such a zone will divert traffic to adjoining residential streets and reduce residential amenity. Given the above, implementation of such a zone is not anticipated to receive community and stakeholder support.

iv) A respondent has objected to the installation of traffic calming devices citing that they are dangerous. Furthermore, it has been raised that kerb extensions make it difficult to turn at intersections.

Council response: The proposed traffic calming devices are an integral component of the 40km/h HPAA and are anticipated to improve safety. Kerb extensions will be designed to accommodate heavy vehicle turning movements.
v) Some respondents have requested removal or relocation of one set of bus stops on Mitchell Street to accommodate more parking for the local centre.

**Council response:** Council had investigated removal of northbound and southbound bus stops that are currently located between Little William Street and Little Maitland Street. Council had consulted Newcastle Buses and Hunter Valley Buses (HVB) on the proposal. HVB did not support removal of these bus stops as the spacing between the King Street and the Wharf bus stops would be in excess of the maximum 400m interval as recommended by the Transport for New South Wales (TfNSW) guideline.

Council will however investigate relocation of the northbound and southbound bus stops on Mitchell Street between King Street and Crown Street in future to create additional parking spaces. Council will consult with TfNSW, bus operators and affected residents/businesses before progressing with the relocation proposal.

vi) A respondent has objected to the proposal of introducing restricted (timed) parking fronting the library as these spaces are used by older residents to visit local businesses.

**Council response:** The parking spaces fronting the library currently permit unrestricted parking. During the community consultation workshop some residents raised the issue of unavailability of parking while visiting the library. The one hour (1P) parking spaces have been proposed to facilitate library patrons. The impact of the proposal is anticipated to be negligible given that there are ample parking opportunities surrounding the local centre.

vii) A respondent has requested extending the traffic calming measures on Mitchell Street up to the bowling club and oval. The respondent has also highlighted the lack of a pedestrian crossing facility near the club and has requested to provide a pedestrian refuge.

**Council response:** The nominated location is outside of the local centre and therefore the requested proposals cannot be included within the proposed public domain plan and traffic plan. However, Council will investigate the matter separately by tabling any warranted proposals to the NCTC for approval and delivering them through the Local Area Traffic Management/Pedestrian Access Mobility Plan (LATM/PAMP) funding priority listing.

9 The traffic plan following the public exhibition period was tabled to the NCTC on 20 February 2017. The advice from the NCTC meeting held has been separately provided in a memo to Councillors.

10 There has been changes proposed to the traffic plan that was put on public exhibition and the revised proposal is forwarded for Council approval. The key changes to the traffic plan following the public exhibition are as follows:
i) The proposed zebra crossing on Mitchell Street at the King Street intersection will be constructed at-grade instead of the earlier proposal to have a raised zebra (wombat) crossing.

ii) Additional two at-grade zebra crossings will be installed on Mitchell Street and Crown Street to provide improved pedestrian connectivity.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

11 The overall public domain plan, including the proposed traffic plan, will be delivered through Council's Operational budget funding over the next few years. Council will seek a grant from the Roads and Maritime Services (RMS) to part-fund the cost of the proposed 40km/h HPAA component of the traffic plan.

COMMUNITY STRATEGIC PLAN ALIGNMENT

12 The project is aligned with the "Liveable and Distinctive Built Environment" strategic direction that has an objective of creating "Mixed-use urban villages supported by integrated transport networks". The project supports the targeted community outcome of providing "walkable neighbourhoods".

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN/IMPLICATIONS

13 Construction of Stage 1 of the project is scheduled to commence in the 2017/2018 financial year, subject to Council approval, and the project will be completed in stages over the next few years subject to funding.

RISK ASSESSMENT AND MITIGATION

14 The traffic plan is anticipated to mitigate crashes and provide improved pedestrian and cyclist accessibility, amenity and safety. The proposed works will be undertaken in accordance with the relevant Austroads and RMS guidelines.

RELATED PREVIOUS DECISIONS

15 A previous proposal for a 40km/h HPAA on Mitchell Street between King and Crown Streets was approved by Council on 2 February 2010. The proposal was not implemented due to the unavailability of funding. Please note that the current proposal incorporates a lengthier 40km/h HPAA on Mitchell Street between King and Hunter Streets.

CONSULTATION

16 A community consultation workshop was conducted on 21 September 2016. The public exhibition was undertaken between 12 December 2016 and 23 January 2017.
OPTIONS

Option 1

17 The recommendation as at Paragraph 1. This is the recommended option.

Option 2

18 The recommendation for the proposed traffic plan is not adopted by Council. No action be taken. This is not the recommended option.

BACKGROUND

19 Background information is presented in the Key Issues sections 2 to 10 of this report.

REFERENCES

Nil

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A: Stockton Local Centre Public Domain Plan and Traffic Plan
Attachment B: Manual Traffic and Pedestrian Survey Result Map
Attachment C: Crash Collision Diagram
Attachment D: Exhibition Leaflet
Attachment E: Summary of Consultation Responses
DESIGN PROPOSAL

1. Parking access at Ferry Terminal to be addressed as a separate project.
2. Relocate pedestrian crossing to improve access and increase on street parking.
3. North-western and north ramps to reduce crossing distances and new traffic signals.
4. Special location to maintain traffic speeds.

CAR PARKING NUMBERS

ADDITIONAL PARKING SPACES

LOST PARKING SPACES

NET

OVERALL PLAN

New Standard Concrete Footpaths.
Concrete Asphalt Footpath.
Footpath widening outside low-traffic area.
Existing footpath widening and planting.
Footpath continuation across laneways to give pedestrian priority.

POTENTIALS

Potential for footpath improvements by private landowner.
Potential for footpath widening, landscaping and landscape improvements by private landowner.
Potential for occasional street furniture for markets and community events.
Investigate the relocation of bus stops in consultation with Hunter Valley Buses.

NOTE

1. The use of footpaths as a result of pedestrian crossings on some parking spaces. All these areas are shown in the plan.

2. The location of street furniture including second bays and bike bays will be considered at the detailed design stage.

3. This is a concept plan for the consultation of stakeholders. It is a detailed outline design. In some instances the final layout may vary. This design is subject to technical review by the City of Newcastle.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P&amp;R Number</th>
<th>Ped Crossing</th>
<th>Traffic Calming</th>
<th>Other Changes</th>
<th>Summarised Comments</th>
<th>Council Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OT2017/00053</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Doesn't believe that the road requires slowing and the movement of the pedestrian crossing to the end of the street will be dangerous as there are many elderly people who use it and those drivers coming out of the side streets may not see them as easily.</td>
<td>Zebra crossings are typically located at intersections as they offer better visibility and minimise loss of parking. Locating crossings at intersections is also anticipated to enhance safety as traffic speeds are typically lower, compared to mid-block sections of a street, and drivers are more vigilant. The proposed location is also considered safer as the southbound bus stop will be on its departure side unlike on the approach to the existing crossing. Slowing the road speed will also make it safer to cross mid-block.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OT2017/00052</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Does not agree with adding timed parking in front of the library. This is a small community with limited parking already due to congestion at the Ferry Terminal and this restriction will only hinder those older residents who utilise this area to park when visiting the local business district. I think the proposal of additional trees and outdoor dining/furn extensions are fantastic and will allow people to utilise the area for greater lengths of time than currently, due to increased seating etc. I strongly oppose moving the pedestrian crossing, as this moves pedestrians further away from accessing both the pharmacy and the supermarket. This will have a huge impact on older residents who like to walk to the shops and it looks like pedestrians are being moved out to allow for more car spaces. If the parking remains un-reversed then I don't think moving the crossing to create an additional 1 or 2 parks can be justified.</td>
<td>Timed parking at the library was requested by community members to facilitate library patrons. There is ample parking within the centre and the impact on overall parking will be negligible. Zebra crossings are typically located at intersections as they offer better visibility and minimise loss of parking. Locating crossings at intersections is also anticipated to enhance safety as traffic speeds are typically lower, compared to mid-block sections of a street, and drivers are more vigilant. The proposed location is also considered safer as the southbound bus stop will be on its departure side unlike on the approach to the existing crossing. Slowing the road speed will also make it safer to cross mid-block. Council has amended its zebra crossing proposal following the public exhibition. The proposed crossings on Mitchell St and King St and Crown St intersections will cater to pedestrian desire lines from both directions. A zebra crossing is also proposed on Crown St and Mitchell St intersection to further improve pedestrian connectivity with the local centre and the school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OT2016/05491</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Fruitbean machine self promotion - wants local food van to be able to operate at Ferry Wharf</td>
<td>The Ferry Wharf and Griffiths Park are not part of the study area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR2016/01942</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Fruitbean machine self promotion - wants local food van to be able to operate at Griffith Park</td>
<td>The Ferry Wharf and Griffiths Park are not part of the study area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR2016/01337</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No comment</td>
<td>No response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR2016/01927</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>To further enhance the traffic calming measures, the part of the road into the laneway to Lesseis Bowlo Club and Oval desperately needs an (Refuge) Traffic Island for pedestrian safety. This would be an ideal introduction to reducing speed as you approach the shopping precinct. It is a heavily used pedestrian area with the elderly (Bowlo Club) and young (beach &amp; oval) with good traffic volumes added, it is a dangerous mix. The refuge would allow safe transfer to and from both sides and not have people 'doing the run' across and risk injury/death. As stated - would also serve as a precursor to the new measures further up. The nominated location is outside of the local centre and therefore the requested proposals cannot be included within the proposed public domain plan and traffic plan. However, Council will investigate the matter separately by tabling any warranted proposals to the NCTC for approval and delivering them through the LATM / PAMP funding priority listing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OT2016/05371</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Move bus stops outside busy zone to provide more car parks. Council will investigate the proposal separately in future.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OT2016/0538</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2 submissions from same person. Very supportive of beautification of Mitchell St but strongly objects to having outdoor dining outside 52 Mitchell – a residential property. Suggest NCC do a survey of residents parking impact on Mitchell St. Proposed location of ped crossing at King should be reviewed - the location has a history of accidents. Suggests removal of bus stop to make more parking spaces. Tree locations should be reviewed because of savings. Agrees with kerb extensions but drainage must be considered. 52 Mitchell St is a house but has been mistakenly shown on the plan as a food outlet. Number 54 is the food outlet. The outdoor dining note will be moved to outside 54. Zebra crossings are typically located at intersections as they offer better visibility and minimise loss of parking. Locating crossings at intersections is also anticipated to enhance safety as traffic speeds are typically lower, compared to mid-block sections of a street, and drivers are more vigilant. The proposed location is also considered safer as the southbound bus stop will be on its departure side unlike on the approach to the existing crossing. Showing the road speed will also make it safer to cross mid-block. The trees will go in the parking lane where there are savings. Council will investigate relocating bus stop in consultation with Hunter Valley Buses. Council awareness that drainage issues need to be addressed, drainage design will be undertaken at the Civil Design stage.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR2016/01876</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No comment. No response.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR2016/05276</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Likes everything about the plan, particularly the trees, street calming, kerb extensions and outdoor dining potential. It would be good if when Council approves DAs for businesses in the main street that they be required to have an active street frontage. At the moment there are plenty of blank walls/ advertising over many potential active street frontages (eg funeral home, bottle shop, music room, new dental etc). Council is looking into ways to promote active street frontages.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR2016/01835</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Looks like a winner. No response.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR2016/01836</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No comment. No response.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR2017/00023</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Loves proposal - hoping to see it become a reality. No response.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR2017/00040</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Trees Ok, but not near intersections which impede visibility. Road needs realign. Intersection sight lines will be considered at the Civil Design Stage.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ECM 5853447</th>
<th>Suggested pedestrian crossing at end of Hunter St adjacent George Washington Hotel, to accommodate major pedestrian flow from ferry up Mitchell St. Traffic volumes and speeds around the ferry terminal a concern.</th>
<th>The revised proposal includes a zebra crossing on Mitchell St at Crown St intersection. The proposal also includes kerb extensions at Queen St and Hunter St intersections to reduce crossing distance and enable installation of zebra crossings in future if the RMS warrants are met.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TR2017/001506</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECM 5841855</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR2017/000246</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EV2017/000096</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS18011086</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OT2017000164</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OT2017000156</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OT2017000156</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OT2017000159</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OT2017000175</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OT201700194</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OT2017000206</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From a forward-planning perspective, the Core Local Centre should be extended to Hunter Street and consideration be given to providing the same traffic and transport (footpath, seating, parking) improvements along the entire four block strip rather than excluding two full blocks at the “Entrance” to the suburb - which are zoned commercial. It is critical that the “Entrance” to Stockton is included in the Core Local Centre of Stockton. There needs to be a pedestrian crossing erected across Mitchell Street parallel to Hunter Street - at the Hunter Street end (General Washington). This intersection is a busy one particularly with traffic from the ferry wharf. Then there would be a crossing at the entrance to the 40km zone (Hunter Street end) as well as at the end of the zone (King Street). I would also suggest that another pedestrian crossing is erected at Crown Street as many schoolchildren cross the street here to either continue through to St Peters, or to catch the bus from Mitchell Street to go to the Public School. The new concrete ashlar footpath should be extended the additional two blocks to the “Entrance” (Hunter Street) ensuring a continued flow from the Entrance to the suburb along to the shopping centre rather than the current plans for standard footpaths along the two blocks between Hunter Street and Queen Street, before people reach the shopping centre. My husband and I own 7 Mitchell Street and 41 Malbord Street. This year we will be submitting a DA to council for a retail development at 7 Mitchell and we would like to include outdoor dining in the plans.

Zebra crossings are typically located at intersections as they offer better visibility and minimise loss of parking. Locating crossings at intersections is also anticipated to enhance safety as traffic speeds are typically lower, compared to mid-block sections of a street, and drivers are more vigilant. Council has amended its zebra crossing proposal following the public exhibition. The proposed crossings on Mitchell St and King St and Crown St intersections will cater to pedestrian desire lines from both directions. A zebra crossing is also proposed on Crown St and Mitchell St intersection to further improve pedestrian connectivity with the local centre and the school. The proposal also includes kerb extensions at Queen St and Hunter St intersections to reduce crossing distance and enable installation of zebra crossings in future if the RMS warrants are met. Concrete Ashlar pavement will be extended along the western side of Mitchell St which has a more commercial character.

As I live on the corner of the new proposed pedestrian crossing & our bedrooms are at the front of the house, I believe the noise would be increased especially during the summer months when pedestrian traffic is increased. Aligning the crossing with the mall walkway makes more sense I believe.

Zebra crossings are typically located at intersections as they offer better visibility and minimise loss of parking. Locating crossings at intersections is also anticipated to enhance safety as traffic speeds are typically lower, compared to mid-block sections of a street, and drivers are more vigilant. Council has amended its zebra crossing proposal following the public exhibition. The proposed crossings on Mitchell St and King St and Crown St intersections will cater to pedestrian desire lines from both directions. A zebra crossing is also proposed on Crown St and Mitchell St intersection to further improve pedestrian connectivity with the local centre and the school.
| TR2017/00056 | No | Yes | No | There is one pedestrian crossing in Mitchell street. The | Council has amended its zebra crossing proposal following the public exhibition. The proposed crossings on Mitchell St and King St and Crown St intersections will cater to pedestrian desire lines from both directions. A zebra crossing is also proposed on Crown St and Mitchell St intersection to further improve pedestrian connectivity with the local centre and the school. |
|---------------|----|-----|----| problem with moving it further up is moving it away from | |
|               |    |     |    | main shopping area which causes disadvantages for disabled & the elderly. To only gain ONE extra parking | |
|               |    |     |    | space is poor designing. Perhaps a couple of less trees | |
| TR2017/00058 | No | No  | Yes| Suggestions about foreshore area outside the public domain | No response. |
|               |    |     |    | plan scope. | |
| TR2017/00059 | Yes| Yes | Yes| Timed parking on Dunbar Street between King & Crown Streets. Also, timed parking on King and Crown Streets between Mitchell Street and Dunbar Street. | Council will investigate provision of restricted parking on the concerned streets separately in future. |
| TR2017/00084 |    |     |    | Does not want traffic calming devices thinks it will make | The proposed traffic calming devices are an integral component of the 40km/h HPAA and are anticipated to improve safety. Kerb extensions will be designed to accommodate heavy vehicle turning movements. Street trees were a high priority among those who attended the community workshop. Any street trees that die or are vandalised will be replaced by Council. Timed parking at the library was requested by community members who attended the workshop. Council has amended its zebra crossing proposal following the public exhibition. The proposed crossings on Mitchell St and King St and Crown St intersections will cater to pedestrian desire lines from both directions. A zebra crossing is also proposed on Crown St and Mitchell St intersection to further improve pedestrian connectivity with the local centre and the school. Council is no longer raising the proposed pedestrian crossings due to an objection from Hunter Valley Buses. |
|               |    |     |    | roads unsafe. Trees will be dangerous and block sight lines and die. Mass plantings will die or scratch cars. Tables and seating outside the library is a good idea. Timed parking is not a good idea. The library is not a good place for public toilet because it isn’t open everyday. Public toilets better in Senior citizen’s centre. Upgraded lighting would be good. Leave the pedestrian crossing where it is but raise it. Disabled parking near GP a good idea. Custom fencing a bad idea. Plan does not show outdoor dining accurately. |
ITEM-9 CCL 28/02/17 - LLEWELLYN STREET NEIGHBOURHOOD CENTRE, MEREWETHER - PROPOSED TRAFFIC PLAN

REPORT BY: INFRASTRUCTURE
CONTACT: DIRECTOR INFRASTRUCTURE / MANAGER INFRASTRUCTURE PLANNING

PURPOSE

Council is developing a Traffic Plan for Llewellyn Street as part of the Local and Neighborhood Centres Public Domain Plan. The plan proposed a number of pedestrian and traffic calming improvements as shown in Attachment A to improve pedestrian safety and amenity. The matter is forwarded to Council for final consideration and approval.

RECOMMENDATION

1 Approve the Llewellyn Street traffic plan with the following measures:
   - Raised threshold with pedestrian crossings and kerb extensions in Llewellyn Street at the corner of Merewether and Dent Streets and in Dent Street east of Llewellyn Street;
   - Raised threshold and speed cushions in Llewellyn Street fronting No. 65 and 48; and
   - Endorse the 40 km/h hour High Pedestrian Activity Area (HPAA) in Llewellyn Street between Morgan and Merewether Street and forward the matter to Roads and Maritime Services (RMS) for approval and implementation.

KEY ISSUES

2 Council has received concerns regarding the lack of pedestrian facilities in Llewellyn Street near the shopping area between Dent and Merewether Street.

3 Council recently identified Llewellyn Street as part of the Local Neighborhood Public Domain Plan which prioritised this location for a traffic study.

4 Attachment A shows the traffic plan for Llewellyn Street which proposes the following works:
   - Pedestrian crossings and traffic calming devices in Llewellyn Street to improve pedestrian safety and amenity;
   - Reduce speed limit in parts of Llewellyn Street from 50 km/h to 40 km/h;
   - Pedestrian crossing in Dent Street once traffic criteria are met;
   - Change Merewether Street (between Llewellyn Street and Berner Street) to one-way traffic flow on each side of the median; and
   - Streetscape improvements to Llewellyn Street including trees, kerb extensions and footpath widening.
5 Pedestrian and traffic surveys were conducted in Llewellyn and Dent Streets, as shown in Attachment B, to determine the locations where the majority of pedestrians walk. The pedestrian crossings in Llewellyn Street meet the warrant for installation based on both the pedestrian and traffic surveys.

6 Pedestrian and traffic surveys were conducted in Dent Street and these show that the pedestrian volume warrant exceeds the requisite criteria. However, the location does not meet the vehicle volume criteria stipulated by the RMS. Council is unable to avail the benefit of a reduced warrant as this location is not used predominantly by school children or aged/impaired pedestrians. However, due to the size of the development at 25-29 Llewellyn Street and the commercial and day care facilities, it is envisaged that the traffic volume warrant will be met once the development is fully occupied. Therefore, the pedestrian crossing with raised threshold is recommended for future installation in Dent Street once the traffic criteria is met. It would then be constructed with the Llewellyn Street pedestrian crossing fronting the post office.

7 A Development Application was submitted to Council in 2015 for 25A Llewellyn Street to construct units with a ground floor day care facility. The development will generate pedestrian traffic and a pedestrian facility in Llewellyn Street was included in the DA consent for provision of funding and construction by the developer. The raised threshold with pedestrian crossing and kerb extensions will not impact parking on the northern side of the businesses or impact access to the bottle shop. It will assist pedestrians to cross Llewellyn Street and will also slow down traffic. The developer of 25A Llewellyn Street agreed to fund the raised threshold and pedestrian crossing and it will be included in their building works program.

8 Speed surveys conducted in Llewellyn Street recorded an average speed of 42 km/h and 85th percentile speed of 52 km/h. The 85th percentile speed is the speed which 85% of vehicles travel below. These speeds could be lowered by the traffic calming and pedestrian crossings proposed. The 40 km/h HPAA is recommended in Llewellyn Street between Morgan Street and Merewether Street and meets the (RMS) criteria for installation. The 40 km/h HPAA proposal will be forwarded to RMS for approval.

9 The change to one-way traffic flow was recommended by the Newcastle City Traffic Committee (NCTC) to delineate the flow of traffic in Merewether Street which is narrow in this location.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

10 The proposed pedestrian crossing in Llewellyn Street, at the corner of Merewether Street, will be funded by the developer of 25A Llewellyn Street. The other traffic calming devices and pedestrian crossing will be funded as part of the Local Neighborhood project and will be included in the 2017/2018 Operational Budget for approval. The one-way changes in Merewether Street will be implemented following Council approval and will be funded from the Traffic Facilities funding approved in the 2016/2017 Operation Budget.
COMMUNITY STRATEGIC PLAN ALIGNMENT

11 The proposed work is aligned with the Strategic direction of “Connected City” whereby “transport network and services will be well connected and convenient. Walking and cycling will be viable options for the majority of our trips”. The proposal will increase safety for pedestrians in Llewellyn Street and Dent Street due to improved pedestrian facilities.

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN/IMPLICATIONS

12 Approval of the raised thresholds and traffic calming devices are not delegated to council officers and must be referred to Council for final determination. Approval of the raised threshold does not have any implications on existing or future planning policies. The proposal will support Council’s mission to enhance the quality of life by improving the safety of road users.

RISK ASSESSMENT AND MITIGATION

13 The proposed pedestrian facilities are intended to reduce risk and increase safety for pedestrians. The installation of these pedestrian crossings has been proposed to address residents’ concerns of pedestrian safety. The introduction of the 40 km/h HPAA will additionally enhance the traffic safety in this location.

RELATED PREVIOUS DECISIONS

14 Council has recently been advised of the Local Neighborhood Centre project studies and Llewellyn Street is one of the areas being studied. It is a coincidence that a development has been lodged (25A) requiring development contribution to provide a pedestrian facility allowing the project to coordinate with the Llewellyn Public Domain Plan Study and Traffic Plan study.

CONSULTATION

15 Consultation has been conducted in the area. A copy of the leaflet sent to the residents is shown in Attachment A. The proposed plan was exhibited between 4 November and 2 December 2016. Council staff were available in Llewellyn Street on Monday 21 November 2016 to answer questions from residents and businesses.

16 There is majority support to the project consultation. A summary of the residents’ responses is shown in Attachment C.

17 One of the main issues raised by the residents is parking. Residents are concerned that when developments are fully occupied (particularly the land at 37 Llewellyn Street), there will be insufficient parking for residents and businesses. The project may also remove a number of parking spaces due to trees, pedestrian crossings and speed humps.
18 Fire and Rescue NSW supports the pedestrian crossings, tree and one-way street proposal in Merewether Street but does not believe the 40 km/h speed limit is necessary due to the speed hump. It is concerned about the proposed kerb extensions in Llewellyn Street and Dent Street and the impact on access to the fire station. Their concerns will be investigated further and accommodated by council officers in the detailed design stage.

19 The project will not remove a significant number of parking spaces. Trees will be planted on the footpath and kerb extensions to the pedestrian crossings will be installed on the corners of the intersection where there are existing No Stopping restrictions. Three parking spaces will be removed where the pedestrian crossing is to be installed in Llewellyn Street at the corner of Merewether Street as part of the project.

20 Residents queried why a pedestrian crossing was not proposed in the middle of Llewellyn Street, between Dent and Merewether Streets, fronting the IGA Supermarket. This is not recommended as it would remove about eight parking spaces fronting the four businesses on both sides of the road and may impact the sustainability of these businesses.

21 One suggestion to increase on-street parking in the area proposed resumption of the piece of land in the northbound lane on the eastern side of Merewether Street, between Llewellyn and Berner Streets to provide angle parking. This is not part of this project and is not proposed at this time. It was noted during consultation that some residents are already opposed to this suggestion.

22 There was a query about whether access to the fire station at 39 Llewellyn Street will be affected by the proposed pedestrian crossing north of Dent Street. Access will be maintained in and out of the fire station, the proposed pedestrian crossing will be situated south of the fire station driveway.

OPTIONS

Option 1

23 The recommendation as at Paragraph 1. This is the recommended option.

Option 2

24 Council does not approve the proposed Llewellyn Street traffic plan. This is not the recommendation option.

BACKGROUND

25 Background information is shown in the Key Issues Section 2 - 9 of this report.
REFERENCES
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Attachment A: Consultation leaflet
Attachment B: Pedestrian count surveys
Attachment C: Summary of resident responses
Community Consultation

To The Business Owner / Resident
Llewellyn Street (between Morgan Street and Merewether Street)
Proposed Traffic Plan

4 November 2016

Council is developing a Traffic Plan for Llewellyn Street Neighbourhood Centre as part of the Local and Neighbourhood Centres Public Domain Improvement Program. Proposed improvements are shown in the Traffic Plan overleaf and include:

- Pedestrian crossings and traffic calming devices in Llewellyn Street to improve pedestrian safety and amenity.
- Reduce the speed limit of parts of Llewellyn Street from 50 km/h to 40 km/h
- Change Merewether Street (between Llewellyn Street and Berner Street) to one-way traffic flow on each side of the central median
- Retention of parking has been prioritised, however there is a minor loss in Llewellyn St due to regulatory requirements for the pedestrian crossings.
- Other streetscape improvements to Llewellyn Street include trees, kerb extensions and footpath widening.

Your feedback on the questions below is important to assist Council in making a final decision. Council staff will be available outside the IGA supermarket in Llewellyn Street on Monday 21st November 2016 between 3.00pm and 5.30pm to answer any queries you may have. A full coloured copy of the Llewellyn Street Traffic Plan is available on Council’s website: http://www.newcastle.nsw.gov.au/Council/News/Local-and-Neighbourhood-Centres-Program.
The plan is on exhibition from Friday 4 November until Friday 2 December. Please forward written comments by 5pm Friday 2 December 2016 to The Interim Chief Executive Officer, Newcastle City Council, Attention: Traffic and Transport, PO Box 489, NEWCASTLE NSW 2300 or email: mail@ncc.nsw.gov.au. For further information please contact Jocelyn Cardona, Council Traffic Engineer on telephone 4974 2688, or Sarah Horan, Council Landscape Architect on telephone 4974 2151.
If there are no submissions received Council will assume there are no objections to the proposed changes.

Name: ________________________________
Address: ________________________________

Do you agree with the proposed pedestrian crossings in Llewellyn Street Neighbourhood Centre? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Do you agree with the proposed one way traffic changes to Merewether Street? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Do you agree with the other proposed changes to Llewellyn Street Neighbourhood Centre e.g. trees, kerb extensions; outdoor dining area etc? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Further comments: ________________________________
PEDESTRIAN COUNTS LLEWELLYN STREET

MEREWETHER BETWEEN DENT STREET AND MEREWETHER STREET

SURVEY DAY: Tuesday, 26 May 2016
Weather: Fair

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AM Period End</th>
<th>A pedestrians</th>
<th>B pedestrians</th>
<th>C pedestrians</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.30</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.45</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SURVEY DAY: Thursday, 21 May 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PM Period End</th>
<th>A pedestrians</th>
<th>B pedestrians</th>
<th>C pedestrians</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.45</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SURVEY DAY: Monday, 25 May 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AM / PM Period End</th>
<th>A pedestrians</th>
<th>B pedestrians</th>
<th>C pedestrians</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Traffic Volume: Llewellyn St east of Dent Street - average traffic per day = 5,957 vpd
12:00-1:00pm - 577 vehicles per hour
4:30-5:00 - 600 vehicles per hour
PEDESTRIAN COUNTS DENT STREET, MEREWETHER

EAST OF LLEWELLYN STREET

SURVEY DAY: Thursday, 20 October 2016
Weather: Fair

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period Ending</th>
<th>Traffic Volume (two-way)</th>
<th>Pedestrian Volume (two-way)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:15am</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30am</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:45am</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00am</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|          |              |                          |
| 12:45pm  | 19           | 10                        |
| 1:00pm   | 15           | 16                        |
| 1:15pm   | 10           | 8                         |
| 1:30pm   | 21           | 13                        |
| Total    | 65           | 47                        |

<p>| | | |
|          |              |                          |
| 4:15pm   | 22           | 13                        |
| 4:30pm   | 18           | 16                        |
| 4:45pm   | 20           | 24                        |
| 5:00pm   | 15           | 22                        |
| Total    | 75           | 75                        |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ECM No</th>
<th>Do you agree with the pedestrian crossings in Llewellyn Street?</th>
<th>Do you agree with the one way traffic changes in Merewether Street</th>
<th>Do you agree with other changes in Llewellyn Street Neighbourhood Centre?</th>
<th>Comments/Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TR 2016/01554</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>No speed bumps at Merewether/Llewellyn &amp; Morgan / Llewellyn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR 2016/01554</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Does not want to see any speed bumps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR2016/01557</td>
<td>(see letter)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR2016/01565</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Kerb ext, outdoor dining will decrease number of parking spaces. Parking will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>become major issue with development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR2016/01566</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>No infrastructure that will further reduce parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR2016/01568</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Needs car park built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR2016/01578</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Support all proposals as will better manage traffic and increase safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR2016/01579</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Please to see proposals/improvements including traffic calming. More outdoor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dining - needs its 'own identity'. Install pots tees etc with coloured foliage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Road needs resurfacing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR2016/01587</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>One way Merewether St - ensure caution at the pedestrian crossings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR2016/01589</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Concern that tree outside PO &amp; cafe will restrict view of ped crossing - needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to be lit at night</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR2016/01588</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Request asphalt to cover concrete to reduce road noise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR2016/01590</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR2016/01591</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Sounds great!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR2016/01603</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR2016/01605</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Between Dent &amp; Merewether St needs ped island safety as believes people will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>not walk to the ends to cross the road. Due to large volume of traffic ped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>crossing will need protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR2016/01612</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supports use of grassed medium for parking. Need to find more parking in the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR2016/01616</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Concerned with lack of parking - need to use footpath for streetscapes no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>parking spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR2016/01629</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Reduce speed limit in Llewellyn to 40 km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR2016/01635</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Extend 40 km zone length of Llewellyn St. Additional crossing at Morgan Street &amp;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>at bus stop 67 Llewellyn St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR2016/01636</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>With addition of pedestrian crossings fail to see need for reduced speed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR2016/01654</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Daily users and says sensible plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR2016/01655</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR2016/01667</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Speed an issue Needs 3 crossings include Dent St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR2016/01669</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Speed humps to slow traffic Narrow corners reduce visibility and reduce parking. Removed healthy trees now want to plant more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR2016/01669</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Asphalt over concrete road - centreline marking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR2016/01672</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR2016/01674</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Poor decision to reduce parking spaces - businesses dependent on them. No car parks replaced with trees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR2016/01675</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Raised entry threshold poor - Speed limit outside fire station. Drop street trees and raised entry and would then fully support plan. Plant trees in Merewether St medium if there has to be planting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR2016/01686</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Issue is parking - current parking reliant on informal parking in privately owned space. Raised crossings also at Llewellyn/Morgan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR2016/01685</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Will make situation Dent/Llewellyn worse ped crossing at Merewether St pointless. Council should acquire vacant land at 35 Llewellyn to make formal car park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR2016/01676</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>20 additional parking spaces on grass medium as it is unused and there is plenty of green space in the vicinity. There is only 1 bus every hour dedicated to a bus - suggest use the bus space for casual parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR2016/01685</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>The proposal for Dent/Llewellyn corner will make it more hazardous. Ped crossing at Merewether St pointless. Reducing parking spaces is ridiculous. If plan to be implemented Council should purchase vacant land at 35 Llewellyn to make formal car parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR2016/01655</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Issue is parking availability - the total plan is reliant on informal parking on land which is privately owned. More raised crossings near Llewellyn Morgan St roundabout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR2016/01687</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>There are not enough raised ped crossings Morgan/Llewellyn St roundabout - safe crossings to bus links may reduce car congestion. The informal parking area is a liability to the plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR2016/01707</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td>Issue re lack of parking near PO. Would like to meet with Council representatives re proposal. Comments; meet Post Office employee on site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR2016/01711</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Traffic and parking an issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR2016/01712</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR2016/01713</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| TR2016/01714 | No response | No response | N | Extend the 40km/h to Hall or Mitchell St - there is a lot of heavy delivery vehicles now using Llewellyn st.

TR2016/01716 | Y | Y | Y | More parking spaces and less loading zones up to Hall St. Parking has become very difficult.

TR2016/01720 | Y | Y | Y | Being built by large blocks of units - usually not enough parking space for unit owners. Parking is worse when events like football and cricket on at Townson Oval

TR2016/01720 | Y | Y | Y | Use Merewether St medium to create parking spaces. Could provide 50 spaces

TR2016/01730 | Y | Y | Y | These changes need to be done. Very pleased for this to happen

TR2016/01731 | Y | Y | N | Sad lack of parking spaces Suggest a carpark on strip in Merewether St coupled with a child's play area

TR2016/01732 | Thinks so | Y | Think so | Has a vested interest in 35 Llewellyn - has questions about the tree and raised threshold in from of her property 65 Llewellyn. Constructions need to provide adequate parking for residents. Likes the 40km/h zone

TR2016/01733 | Y | Y | Y | 40 km/h should be from roundabouts at Morgan and Mitchell Street

TR2016/01734 | Y | Y | Y | With two large developments in Llewellyn St parking needs to be a priority. No raised pod crossings or speed humps. They damage vehicles and are too noisy. No trees on the kerbside. Llewellyn St being turned into a main road.

TR2016/01735 | N | Y | N | Very Good

TR2016/01736 | Y | Y | Y | Fire Brigade

TR2016/01737 | Y | Y | N | Do not remove their driveway as have future plans. Therefor leave curb at 31 Llewellyn. Issue re proposed tree at this address. Please contact Kate McDonald 0414904311

TR2016/01740 | Y | Y | Y | Fire Brigade

TR2016/01740 | Y | Y | Y | Letter raising concern to the idea of cutting the median island in Merewether Street for additional parking.

TR2016/0487 | Y | Y | Y | Further parking in Merewether St using part of the median strip. Support pedestrian crossing at Fire Station??

| Total Yes | 41 | 46 | 31 |
| Total No | 5 | - | 15 |
| Total responses received: Including no response to questions | 54 |
ITEM-10  CCL 28/02/17 - MINMI EAST PRECINCT (STAGE 1B) DEVELOPMENT - PROPOSED UPGRADE WORKS TO MINMI ROAD

REPORT BY: INFRASTRUCTURE
CONTACT: DIRECTOR INFRASTRUCTURE / MANAGER INFRASTRUCTURE PLANNING

PURPOSE

To approve various upgrade works in the Minmi Road reserve to cater for the anticipated future development traffic.

RECOMMENDATION

1 Approve the upgrade works, as in Attachment A, proposed by the applicant in the Minmi Road reserve with the following three amendments recommended by the Newcastle City Traffic Committee (NCTC):
   i) Installation of a traffic signal instead of the proposed central roundabout adjoining the proposed mixed-use land uses and bus stops.
   ii) Installation of a second set of bus stops near the eastern boundary of the development.
   iii) Upgrade of the Blue Gum Hills Regional Park intersection to a Channelised Right-Turn (CHR) intersection instead of the proposed carriageway widening on the northern side of the intersection.

KEY ISSUES

2 Council has received a development application (DA2015/10393) regarding the Minmi East Precinct (Stage 1B) development situated on Minmi Road, Minmi, from Monteath and Powys Pty Ltd on behalf of Winten (No.21) Pty Ltd.

3 The development currently comprises a 317 lot subdivision and is situated on both sides of Minmi Road, Minmi, from approximately 250m west of Brookfield Avenue (The Outlook) up to the entrance to Minmi Cemetery.

4 The applicant proposes construction of new roads within the site as well as various upgrade works in the Minmi Road Reserve to cater for the anticipated future traffic.

5 The key works proposed in the Minmi Road Reserve are as follows:
   i) Minmi Road to remain two lane two-way carriageway i.e. one traffic lane in each direction;
   ii) Carriageway widening along the full frontage of the site to accommodate various facilities such as footpaths, shared paths, parallel parking lanes and on-road cycle lanes;
iii) Two roundabouts with pedestrian refuges on all approaches;

iv) Raised median along the northern section to allow only left-in/left-out movements at the two proposed T-intersections;

v) Pedestrian refuge within the raised median at the second proposed T-intersection from the north;

vi) A set of two bus stops in proximity of the proposed central roundabout and mixed-use land uses;

vii) Carriageway widening on the northern side of Minmi Road at Blue Gum Hills Regional Park intersection;

viii) Construction of the proposed Duckenfield Shared Path section along the western boundary of the site;

ix) Shared path connection of the development to the proposed Duckenfield Shared Path across Back Creek on Minmi Road;

x) Shared path connection across Minmi Road to the existing path on the southern side near the cemetery.

6 It should be noted that the proposal includes a 2.5m wide shared path on the northern side as well as 1.8m wide on-road cycle lanes on both sides of the road fronting the site. The proposed shared path will connect to the shared path fronting The Outlook (Stage 9) in order to maintain continuity for pedestrians and cyclists. Similarly, the proposed on-road cycle lanes on both sides of the road will connect to the east and is anticipated to cater for experienced riders such as commuters who prefer to travel at higher speed on road.

7 The proposal was tabled to the NCTC on 21 November 2016 (Item 176). The following key aspects of the proposal were raised by council officers for the Committee’s consideration and comment.

i) Council officers recommend installation of a traffic signal instead of the proposed central roundabout adjoining the proposed mixed-use land uses and bus stops. Traffic signals are considered more appropriate at this location to enhance pedestrian and cyclist safety.

ii) Council officers, in consultation with Hunter Valley Buses (HVB), recommend a second set of bus stops near the eastern boundary of the development. The distance between the currently proposed bus stops (near the central roundabout) and the recommended second set would be around 450m which would be ideal. If the latter is not installed then the distance between the currently proposed bus stops and the existing bus stops near Highland Highway would be around 1.2km. Transport for New South Wales (TfNSW) also supports this recommendation.
iii) Council officers recommend that the Blue Gum Hills Regional Park intersection is upgraded to a Channelised Right-Turn (CHR) intersection to improve safety. The applicant has currently proposed to widen the carriageway on the northern side of the intersection.

8 The NCTC, in its meeting on 21 November 2016, supported installation of traffic signals (instead of the central roundabout), second set of bus stops and upgrade of the Blue Gum Hills Regional Park intersection into a CHR intersection.

9 A community consultation was conducted from 31 October 2016 to 5 December 2016 in accordance with Part 8 Division 2 of the Roads Act 1993. The consultation leaflets were distributed/posted to more than 500 residents and non-resident owners of The Outlook and Minmi village. Various stakeholders such as public utilities and bus operators were also sent consultation leaflets. The consultation leaflet is shown in Attachment B.

10 Council received 25 responses from residents and businesses out of which 13 are in favour and 9 against the proposal. The summary of consultation responses is shown in Attachment C.

11 The proposal, along with the summary of consultation responses, was re-tabled to the NCTC on 19 December 2016 (Item 187). The Committee endorsed the proposal and recommended forwarding the following comments to the elected Council for final determination.

i) It was noted that the majority of objections from the consultation were related to retaining Minmi Road as a two lane two-way carriageway fronting the site.

Council Response: Council had conducted a radar-based mid-block two-way traffic survey on Minmi Road, west of Brookfield Avenue, from 31 May 2016 to 8 June 2016 to ascertain traffic characteristics. The survey result indicated an average daily traffic volume (two-way) of 6,958 vehicles, with 737 vehicles and 704 vehicles in an average weekday AM and PM peak hour respectively.

The typical mid-block capacity of an urban two lane two-way road with interrupted flow is 1,800 vehicles per hour in accordance with Austroads guideline. Considering the additional development traffic and typical annual growth rate, the mid-block traffic volumes on Minmi Road are anticipated to remain below 1,800 vehicles per hour capacity. The NCTC therefore recommended that the current proposal to retain two lane two-way carriageway configuration of Minmi Road fronting the site is supported.

ii) The Committee reiterated its support for the previous recommendations from the 21 November 2016 meeting regarding the installation of traffic signals (instead of the central roundabout), second set of bus stops and upgrading the Blue Gum Hills Regional Park intersection to a CHR intersection.
FINANCIAL IMPACT

12 The proposal will be implemented by the applicant at no cost to Council.

COMMUNITY STRATEGIC PLAN ALIGNMENT

13 The development is aligned with the "Liveable and Distinctive Built Environment" strategic direction that has an objective of creating "Mixed-use urban villages supported by integrated transport networks". The project supports the targeted community outcomes of providing walkable neighbourhoods, reduced car dependency and appropriate transport systems.

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN/IMPLICATIONS

14 The NCTC recommendation and subsequent Council resolution (this resolution) for the purpose of Part 8 Division 2 (Roads Act, 1993) will be incorporated into the Development and Building section's advices and discussions with the applicant. It will also be part of the report and recommendation to the Joint Regional Planning Panel (JRPP) who will ultimately be determining the development application (DA2015/10393).

RISK ASSESSMENT AND MITIGATION

15 The proposed upgrade works will be undertaken in accordance with the relevant Austroads and RMS guidelines.

RELATED PREVIOUS DECISIONS

16 Nil

CONSULTATION

17 A community consultation was conducted from 31 October 2016 to 5 December 2016.

OPTIONS

Option 1

18 The recommendation as at Paragraph 1. This is the recommended option.

Option 2

19 Council approves the upgrade works proposed by the development without the three amendments supported by the NCTC. This is not the recommended option.
BACKGROUND

20 Background information is presented in the Key Issues sections 2 to 10 of this report.

REFERENCES

Nil

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A: Concept Proposal
Attachment B: Consultation Leaflet
Attachment C: Summary of Consultation Responses
Community Consultation

To The Owner / Occupier

MINMI EAST PRECINCT (STAGE 1B) DEVELOPMENT
Proposed Upgrade Works to Minmi Road

31 October 2016

A development application (DA2015/10393) has been submitted to Council regarding the Minmi East Precinct (Stage 1B) development. The development is situated on both sides of Minmi Road from approximately 250m west of Brookfield Avenue up to the entrance to Minmi Cemetery.

The development proposes construction of new roads within the site as well as various upgrade works within the Minmi Road reserve to cater for the anticipated future traffic. The key elements proposed within the Minmi Road reserve are as follows:

- Minmi Road to remain two lane two-way carriageway i.e. one traffic lane in each direction;
- Carriageway widening along the full frontage of the site to accommodate various facilities such as footpaths, shared paths, parallel parking lanes and on-road cycle lanes;
- Two roundabouts with pedestrian refuges on all approaches;
- Raised median along the northern section to allow only left-in/left-out movements at two T-intersections;
- Pedestrian refuge within the raised median at the second T-intersection from the north;
- Two bus stops in proximity of the proposed commercial centre;
- Carriageway widening to allow uninterrupted northbound through traffic movement at the right turn into Blue Gum Hills Road;
- Construction of the proposed Duckenfield Shared Path section along the western boundary of the site;
- Shared path connection of the development to the proposed Duckenfield Shared Path across Back Creek on Minmi Road;
- Shared path connection across Minmi Road to the existing path on the southern side near the cemetery.

A plan of the proposal is attached for reference. The proposed plan and consultation responses will be tabled to the next available Newcastle City Traffic Committee for consideration. Council welcomes your comments on this proposal and feedback will shape the final decision made by Council. Council will assume that any resident/business choosing not to reply to this letter has no objection to the proposal.

Are you in favour of the proposal (please tick)?

YES ☐ NO ☐

Please forward written comments by 5 December 2016 to The Interim Chief Executive Officer, Newcastle City Council, Attention: Transport & Traffic, PO Box 489, NEWCASTLE NSW 2300 or email: mail@ncc.nsw.gov.au. Phone: 4974 2000, Fax: 4974 2222. For further information on the proposal please contact Dinen Nathwani, Traffic Engineer, on 4974 2663. This notification is in accordance with Part 8 Division 2 of the Roads Act 1993.

Name (Optional): 
Address (Mandatory): 

Comments (attach additional page, if necessary):

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________
## SUMMARY OF THE CONSULTATION

**MINMI EAST PRECINCT (STAGE 1B) DEVELOPMENT - PROPOSED UPGRADE WORKS TO MINMI ROAD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address of Respondent</th>
<th>Request No</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Summary of Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northview Street, Fletcher</td>
<td>TR2016/01511</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The respondent would like Minmi Road to be converted into a dual carriageway since all the new development will lead to an increase in traffic. He would also like the bus stop to be placed off Minmi Road so that school bus can drop children near houses instead of the main road with more traffic. If this is not feasible, then a pedestrian crossing with traffic lights or speed humps should be installed to safe guard young children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bimbimie Street, Fletcher</td>
<td>TR2016/01512</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Minmi Road must be widened into two lanes each way. The road is already very busy and will be chaotic with the extra vehicles from the new estate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northview Street, Fletcher</td>
<td>TR2016/01513</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The respondent would be in favour of this proposal if there was going to be some consideration to managing the high volume of traffic that already use this two-lane carriageway. Adding more traffic at peak times would be unacceptable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McInnes Street, Minmi</td>
<td>TR2016/01522</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Minmi Road needs to be dual carriageway both ways. Traffic has grown considerably and will grow more with more development. It will be cheaper for the Council to extend the dual carriageway now than 10 years later. Future planning needs to be done rather than looking at current situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brookfield Avenue, Fletcher</td>
<td>TR2016/01532</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodford Street, Minmi</td>
<td>TR2016/01536</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>This will be good for the Minmi area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McInnes Street, Minmi</td>
<td>TR2016/01545</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Traffic congestion will increase, especially with the proposed roundabouts. One only needs to observe for one day to appreciate how much traffic already travels on Minmi Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nullarbor Avenue, Canberra (Brookfield Avenue, Fletcher)</td>
<td>TR2016/01555</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodford Street, Minmi</td>
<td>TR2016/01567</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>I believe this would increase through traffic to the motorway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell Street, Minmi</td>
<td>TR2016/01592</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The respondent does not support the proposal due to lack of infrastructure i.e. retaining Minmi Road as two lane two-way road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arbour Avenue, Fletcher</td>
<td>TR2016/01611</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>The resident does not agree with the proposal to retain Minmi Road as two lane two-way road (one traffic lane in each direction). This road is bumper to bumper in the mornings and evenings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brookfield Avenue</td>
<td>TR2016/01619</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Minmi Road is already congested, especially in the mornings, from Coles onward to Wallsend. It is often bumper to bumper traffic. Two lane two-way road is required now as the development would make traffic much worse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>TR Number</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McInnes Street, Minmi</td>
<td>TR2016/01637</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodford Street, Minmi</td>
<td>TR2016/01646</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The respondent is concerned with the proposed road works. The respondent would like to know how it is going to proceed and its duration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boroke Way, Fletcher</td>
<td>TR2016/01647</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>The respondent has grave concerns about some of the proposals. In particular, the fact that the road will not be widened but will remain a two-way carriageway. The respondent is concerned that it is already quite a busy road now and this proposal, as well as the further stages of the development, will put many more cars onto this road (potentially thousands more a day once the entire development is complete). As well as the additional cars travelling on the road, the traffic will be slowed significantly by two roundabouts (on a stretch of road that is only about a kilometre long) and cars parking on the road and entering/exiting the commercial area. The respondent can also foresee the road speed being reduced because of this proposed situation – which will slow things down even more, leading to congestion. The respondent believes that this will be very dangerous for potential accidents, as well as slow the flow of traffic significantly and cause many problems for both the current residents and the new residents once the development is finished e.g. it is already difficult exiting Brookfield Avenue to the right during peak hours, once there are hundreds of more cars on this road it will be nearly impossible. At the very least this road should be changed to a three lane road but preferably it should become a four lane road to allow for the increased traffic flow. While footpaths are important, it is more important to have enough lanes for the traffic – the cars and buses that will be using this road with the increased housing and development. While some of the other features will be good (e.g. the connection to the Duckenfield Path, more footpaths, a safe bus stop) it will mean little if there is too much traffic flow for the road to handle, making it too busy and dangerous for all who use the road – both automobiles and pedestrians. Additionally, two roundabouts on a stretch of road approximately a kilometre long, seems like a lot of roundabouts for such a short distance of road. The respondent urges Council to increase the width of this road and include more lanes to cope with the increased traffic that will be using the road because of the new development, making it safer for all who will use this road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minmi Road, Minmi</td>
<td>TR2016/01671</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arbour Avenue, Fletcher</td>
<td>TR2016/01684</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Complimentary subdivision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellfrog Street, Fletcher</td>
<td>TR2016/01704</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>A bus stop needs to be created going west on Minmi Road near Brookfield Avenue entrance to The Outlook estate. There is currently no stop between Minmi and Britannia.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Stakeholder Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Approval</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transport for NSW (TfNSW)</strong></td>
<td>TR2016/01514</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport for NSW (TfNSW) has no objection to the proposed location of the bus stops. However, TfNSW recommends that additional bus stops should be considered as part of the proposed road upgrade, as ideally residents should be within 400m of bus stop along Minmi Road. If this is considered by the Traffic Committee, Hunter Valley Buses (HVB) should be involved to ensure that they meet service requirements. The design of the roundabout must ensure bus movement can traverse straight through...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
movements. To ensure this, the central island should:
- Be constructed to a height no greater than 50mm
- Be clear of obstructions such as traffic signage or plantings
- Standards, design, and safety adhere to Austroads Guide to Road Design Part 4B: Roundabouts

If the proposed road upgrade works are approved by Council, any road works performed on Minmi Road should be discussed with HVB to ensure appropriate mitigation is accommodated for existing bus services that operate via Minmi Road.

Hunter Valley Buses TR2016/01519 - HVB would be in full support of traffic signals instead of the currently proposed central roundabout. Our experience would suggest once the housing is complete, children will be crossing here and a refuge is a very basic means to aid in this movement. Children have a habit of exiting a bus and running in front of our vehicles and into the travel lanes without looking. Signals would give the students an area to congregate and cross safely.

It is anticipated this would be compounded by the proposed mixed-use land uses in the vicinity. Signals would also help enforce traffic calming along this section of road aiding buses and our passengers alighting in this area. We have indicated most buses will remain on Minmi Rd to minimise the infrastructure which would be required if we were to enter and service the development. Crossing of Minmi Rd will be necessary for aged, disabled and young passengers alike. Signals would certainly be a step towards reducing any potential incidents at this location, future proofing the area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of owners/occupier consulted</th>
<th>500 (approx.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of owners/occupier responded</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response to the Consultation (%)</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owners/occupier in favour of the proposal</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owners/occupier against the proposal</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ITEM-11  CCL 28/02/17 - SMART CITIES INTERNATIONAL COLLABORATION

REPORT BY:  PLANNING AND REGULATORY
CONTACT:  ACTING DIRECTOR PLANNING AND REGULATORY / MANAGER STRATEGIC PLANNING

PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to seek Council endorsement of the Lord Mayor's signing of a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Global Smart Cities and Communities Coalition (GSC3) (Attachment A).

RECOMMENDATION

1 That Council resolves to endorse the Lord Mayor to sign the MOU with the GSC3.

KEY ISSUES

2 GSC3 is a global network of leading smart cities. The purpose of GSC3 is to accelerate smart city thinking and practice by providing platforms for sharing knowledge, experience and solutions, and thereby avoiding duplication and increasing the uptake of innovation. Many current members are international reference cities instrumental in developing the current smart city approach in Newcastle, including Amsterdam, Netherlands, Chicago, USA and Austin, USA. These cities face smart city implementation challenges similar to those in Newcastle and have addressed them through models of approach considered relevant to emulate.

3 GSC3 also links cities to key smart city partners at a global scale, including financing organisations, research centres and universities, advisory service providers and global thought leaders such as Brookings Institute, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, European Network of Living Labs, Metro Labs and many more.

4 Our smart city approach has a key aim to establish an international profile, and to connect to relevant global networks of peer cities in the same way that we have joined and continue to leverage membership of the Australian Smart Communities Association (ASCA) at the national level.

5 It is strategically beneficial to become a member city of GSC3. Joining GSC3 bears no cost and has the following key strategic benefits:

   i) connection to peer cities for infoshare and collaborative projects

   ii) connection to key international resources and capabilities
iii) embracing the adopted model of collaborative partnering

iv) enhanced international profile and reputation.

6 GSC3 will be visiting Newcastle on 15 March 2017 to progress Newcastle’s membership via signing an MOU (Attachment A). The GSC3 seeks engagement with the elected leadership of member cities hence it is expected by GSC3 that the Lord Mayor sign the MOU on behalf of Newcastle City Council.

7 Our commitment with GSC3 can be met with existing operational resources in terms of staff time and project funds.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

8 There is no specific financial impact of the endorsement of the Lord Mayor as signatory to the MOU with GSC3. There is no financial commitment, and the MOU is a not a legally binding document. Membership is nil ongoing cost and joining GSC3 will confer benefits as identified at paragraph 5. Any future projects flowing from the collaboration may require Council funding co-contributions but these would only be entered into under our lead or with our input into project design. Such projects would proceed only via regular operational approval pathways.

COMMUNITY STRATEGIC PLAN ALIGNMENT

9 As part of the Newcastle Smart City Initiative, becoming a member city of GSC3 aligns directly with the ‘Smart and Innovative City’ theme of Newcastle 2030, and specifically the following objectives:

6.2: A culture that supports and encourages innovation and creativity at all levels

6.3: A thriving city that attracts people to live, work, invest and visit.

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN/IMPLICATIONS

10 Responsibilities for Council of membership of GSC3 include:

i) Allocation of a staff resource as formal point of contact with GSC3, intended to be the Smart City Coordinator.

ii) Regular communications between Council and GSC3 lead points of contact.

iii) Supply and regular updating of project information for showcasing on GSC3 websites and international promotional channels.

iv) Workshop activities (virtual) to identify opportunities to leverage the experience of the GSC3 cities in identifying challenges and solutions or projects that will lead to strategic solutions.
The opportunities and responsibilities will be met by the existing Smart City Team.

RISK ASSESSMENT AND MITIGATION

11 There are no risks identified in endorsing the Lord Mayor as signatory to the GSC3 MOU.

RELATED PREVIOUS DECISIONS

12 There are no related previous decisions.

CONSULTATION

13 Endorsing the Lord Mayor as signatory to the GSC3 MOU has not been the subject of community consultation.

OPTIONS

Option 1

14 The recommendation as at Paragraph 1. This is the recommended option.

Option 2

15 Council may elect not to endorse the Lord Mayor to sign the MOU. This course of action would require negotiation with GSC3 to have the Interim Chief Executive Officer as signatory on behalf of Newcastle City Council, with potential delays to membership. This is not the recommended option.

REFERENCES

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A: Memorandum of Understanding between GSC3 and Newcastle City Council
Memorandum of Understanding
Between the Global Smart City and Community Coalition – GSC3

and

The city of Newcastle, NSW, Australia

This Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) sets forth the terms and understandings between the named parties to pursue their mutual interest to research, develop, deploy and evaluate technology and analytically based solutions to the problems facing the systems and infrastructure that serve the quality of life and economy of the city of Newcastle and the cities and communities of the Global Smart City and Community Coalition (GSC3).

Background

As cities are increasingly asked to address global problems on a local level, the Global Smart City and Community Coalition is positioned to be the new platform that will leverage the collective knowledge and solutions. GSC3 is a nonprofit member-serving organization financed and operated by cities, supported by governments, universities and businesses.

The City’s Executive Office of Innovation has clearly emphasized the willingness to be a testbed and demonstration site for innovation to achieve more effective and efficient government and to improve the lives of residents.

Both parties wish to showcase the City as a vibrant, innovative and sustainable community while developing technologies, methods and models for use across the country and the world.

Purpose

The primary purpose of this MoU is to ensure the communication and coordination necessary for shared learning and fast identification and implementation of replicable solutions agreed upon by the parties.

This MoU does not represent a commitment on behalf of either party to pursue specific projects or partnerships. Future projects may require subsequent agreements between the parties and may be subject to Council approval.

This MOU, while representing the desire of parties to collaborate together, is not a legally binding document.
Process

This purpose will be accomplished through the following process:

1. The City’s Innovation Officer and the Chairman of GSC3 shall both designate a lead person on behalf of the organization.
2. The City’s Innovation Officer and its lead will identify the City’s challenges that the GSC3 might address.
3. The GSC3 and its lead will identify innovation projects that might help address City problems.
4. The City’s Innovation Officer and GSC3’s lead will meet on a regular basis to discuss the potential new projects identified by the City’s Executive Office of Innovation and/or the GSC3 and, when applicable:
   a. use the GSC3’s assistance and expertise to reach an agreement on which projects to pursue;
   b. use the experiences of GSC3 cities and partners to develop a plan for implementation;
   c. keep GSC3 up to date on progress of projects.

A secondary purpose is to mutually pursue partnerships with other parties to extend our knowledge and pursue research, development and deployment projects with multiple communities around the world.

Funding

This MoU is not a commitment of funds to either party on behalf of the other party. When funding is needed by either party to pursue an agreed upon project, then the expectation is that the funding may be pursued by one party with the endorsement and support of the other.

Duration

This MoU is at-will and may be modified by mutual consent of authorized officials from GSC3 or the Mayor’s Office. This MoU shall become effective upon signature by the Chief Technology Officer of the city of Newcastle and the Chairman of GSC3.

----------- Date:

----------- Date:

---

1 City's Innovation Officer is the City's Chief Technology Officer, Chief Innovation Officer, Smart City program manager or an alternative city official in charge of smart city innovation in the city.
ITEM-12  CCL 28/02/17 - TEMPORARY SUSPENSION OF ALCOHOL FREE ZONES FOR UPCOMING EVENTS

REPORT BY:  PLANNING AND REGULATORY
CONTACT:  ACTING DIRECTOR PLANNING AND REGULATORY / MANAGER STRATEGIC PLANNING

PURPOSE

To seek Council's approval to temporarily suspend the associated Alcohol Free Zones (AFZ) for the following events:

i) Beaumont Street Carnivale for Beaumont, Cleary, James Lindsay and Denison Streets, Hamilton, on Sunday 12 March 2017 from 6am to 8pm.

ii) Newcastle Fringe Festival for Birdwood Park, Newcastle West from 18 to 30 March 2017 from 10am to 10pm.

iii) Velvet, a Spiegeltent event, for Civic Park, Newcastle from 17 May 2017 to 4 June 2017 from 8pm to midnight.

iv) Newcastle Diggers Club Anzac Day activities in Keightley Lane, Newcastle on Tuesday 25 April 2017 from 6am to 6pm.

RECOMMENDATION

1   i) Council approve the temporary suspension of the AFZ for Beaumont, Cleary, James, Lindsay and Denison Streets, Hamilton, on Sunday 12 March 2017 from 6am to 8pm for the purpose of holding the Beaumont Street Carnivale. This suspension is subject to the event organiser, Hamilton Chamber of Commerce, meeting all requirements of the NSW Police - Newcastle Local Area Command (NSW Police) and Council.

ii) Council approve the temporary suspension of the AFZ for Birdwood Park, Newcastle West, from 18 to 30 March 10am to 10pm for the purpose of holding the Newcastle Fringe Festival - Circus Avalon performances. This suspension is subject to the event organiser, Circus Avalon, meeting all requirements of the NSW Police and Council.

iii) Council approve the temporary suspension of the AFZ in Civic Park, Newcastle, from 17 May 2017 to 4 June 2017 from 8pm to midnight for the purpose of holding Velvet, a Spiegeltent event presented by Newcastle Civic Theatre. This suspension is subject to the event promotor and Newcastle Civic Theatre, meeting all the requirements of the NSW Police and Council.
iv) Council approve the temporary suspension of the AFZ in Keightley Lane, Newcastle on Tuesday 25 April 2017 from 6am to 6pm for the purpose of allowing ANZAC Day activities. This suspension is subject to the event organiser, Newcastle Diggers Club, meeting all the requirements of the NSW Police and Council.

KEY ISSUES

2 A new Council policy adopted on 24 November 2015, re-established AFZs in locations across the City and required Council approval be sought for the lifting of AFZs when an approved festival or function is held.

3 Any lifting of an AFZ must be under the direction of the NSW Police. In this instance the proposal for the Beaumont Street Carnivale, Newcastle Fringe Festival, Velvet and 2017 ANZAC Day activities have been considered by the LAC and Council officers. The NSW Police supports the lifting of the AFZs subject to the event organiser meeting the conditions placed on the event.

4 Section 645 of the Local Government Act 1993 (Act) provides for Council, by resolution, to allow the temporary suspension of AFZs. The Act and Ministerial Guidelines on Alcohol Free Zones (February 2009) provides a specific procedure which must be followed in relation to suspending AFZs, and this includes a requirement to seek Council's endorsement. Following the adoption of these suspensions, Council must publish a notice in the local newspaper informing of the suspension that will be in place in:

i) Beaumont, Cleary, James, Lindsay and Denison Streets, Hamilton, on Sunday 12 March 2017 from 6am to 8pm for the purpose of Beaumont Street Carnivale.

ii) Birdwood Park, Newcastle West from 18 to 30 March 2017 from 10.00am to 10.00pm for the purpose of Newcastle Fringe Festival - Circus Avalon performances.

iii) Civic Park, Newcastle from 17 May 2017 to 4 June 2017 from 8pm to midnight for the purpose of Velvet, a Spiegeltent event.

iv) Keightley Lane, Newcastle on Tuesday 25 April 2017 from 6am to 6pm for the purpose of Anzac Day activities.

5 Street signs must be covered immediately on commencement of the timeframe and the covers removed immediately following the suspended time. This is the responsibility of the organiser of the event but will be overseen by Council staff. Liaison with the NSW Police both before and after the Council resolution is an essential requirement. This consultation with the NSW Police has been undertaken by Council officers and will continue in the lead up to the events.

6 The NSW Police are satisfied with the management strategies that have been put in place by the event organisers and supports the suspension of the AFZs on these occasions.
FINANCIAL IMPACT

7 The costs associated with advertising of the suspension of AFZs are at full cost recovery from the event organisers.

COMMUNITY STRATEGIC PLAN ALIGNMENT

8 Lifting the AFZ for an approved event aligns with the strategic direction *Vibrant and Activated Public Places* and more specifically the objective of *Safe and Activated Places that are used by people day and night*.

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN/IMPLICATIONS

9 The responsibility of implementing the suspension of the AFZ lies with the event organiser. Assistance will be provided by Council officers including notification of the suspension in a local newspaper and overseeing covering and uncovering the AFZ signs before and after the event.

RISK ASSESSMENT AND MITIGATION

10 Council officers and the NSW Police will work closely with event organisers to ensure harm minimisation and risk mitigation strategies are in place to manage the serving and consumption of alcohol at events. The Event Authorisation issued by Council to the event organiser for the use of the related road / park reserve sets out relevant conditions and consents for each event.

RELATED PREVIOUS DECISIONS

11 Council has previously agreed to suspend the AFZ for the purpose of Beaumont Street community events, festivals, and in Keightley Lane for the annual ANZAC Day activities.

CONSULTATION

12 Formal consultation is not deemed necessary due to the nature of the planned events. It is also worth noting that no negative feedback has been received as a result of the temporary suspension of the AFZs for events held in previous years.

OPTIONS

Option 1

13 The recommendation as at Paragraph 1. This is the recommended option.

Option 2

14 Council resolves not to support the suspension of the AFZs on these occasions. This is not the recommended option.
BACKGROUND

15 Hamilton Chamber of Commerce has successful managed festivals and other community events for their suburb over a number of years where Council has approved the temporary suspension of the AFZ.

16 Similar events to the Spiegeltent and the Newcastle Fringe Festival have been held in the City where there has been no issues.

17 Newcastle Diggers Club successfully manages ANZAC Day activities annually.

REFERENCES

ATTACHMENTS

Nil
ITEM-13  CCL 28/02/17 - DA2016/01457 - 73 DARLING STREET HAMILTON SOUTH - DEMOLITION OF STRUCTURES, ERECTION OF GRANDSTAND / CLUBHOUSE, ASSOCIATED CAR PARK AND SITE WORKS

REPORT BY:  MANAGER DEVELOPMENT AND BUILDING
CONTACT:  ACTING DIRECTOR PLANNING AND REGULATORY / MANAGER DEVELOPMENT AND BUILDING

PURPOSE

The Development Application is reported to Council for determination as the site is classified as community land and Section 47E of the Local Government Act 1993 (the Act) restricts Council's power to delegate the granting of consent for the type of development proposed on community land. Council's Development Applications Committee (DAC) cannot determine the application as the DAC operates under a delegation from Council.

RECOMMENDATION

1 That the application for the demolition of structures, erection of grandstand / clubhouse, associated car park and site works be approved and consent granted, subject to compliance with the conditions set out in the Draft Schedule of Conditions (refer to Attachment B of the development assessment report, which is Attachment A to this report).

2 That those persons who made submissions be advised of Council's determination.

KEY ISSUES

3 An assessment of the Development Application is included within the development assessment report (refer to Attachment A).

FINANCIAL IMPACT

4 The determination of the Development Application will have minimal financial impact.

COMMUNITY STRATEGIC PLAN ALIGNMENT

5 The determination of the Development Application is consistent with Council's Community Strategic Plan in that it supports the liveable and distinctive built environment strategic direction.
IMPLEMENTATION PLAN/IMPLICATIONS

6 It is considered that determination of the Development Application will not have any implementation plan implications.

RISK ASSESSMENT AND MITIGATION

7 It is considered that determination of the Development Application will not generate any significant risks for Council.

RELATED PREVIOUS DECISIONS

8 There are no other related previous decisions.

CONSULTATION

9 The application was publicly notified for a period of 14 days in accordance with Council's Public Notification Policy. One public submission was received, objecting to the proposal. The concerns raised were in regards to parking / safety, impact on private land, tree removal, public works and noise as described in the development assessment report (refer to Attachment A)

OPTIONS

Option 1

10 The recommendation as a Paragraph 1 and 2. This is the recommended option.

Option 2

11 That the application for the demolition of structures, erection of grandstand clubhouse, associated car park and site works be refused. It is considered that this option would be contrary to the public interest and is not the recommended option.

BACKGROUND

12 The Development Application was submitted to Council on 21 December 2016.

13 Council’s Development Applications Committee cannot determine the application as the Development Applications Committee operates under a delegation from Council. Section 47E of the Act restricts Council’s power to delegate the granting of consent for such a development on community land.
REFERENCES

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A: Development Assessment Report - DA 2016/01457 - 73 Darling St, Hamilton South

Distributed under separate cover
NOTICES OF MOTION

ITEM-1 NOM 28/02/17 - LIGHTING COWPER STREET BRIDGE CARRINGTON

COUNCILLORS: S POSNIAK, D CLAUSEN, N NELMES AND J DUNN

PURPOSE

The following Notice of Motion was received on 9 February 2017 from the abovenamed Councillors:

MOTION

1. That Council remove, or cease installing LCD lighting along the Cowper Street bridge and replace same with light fittings in line with the aesthetic created by the much admired “ball fittings”.

2. Council adopt an integrated lighting solution around Throsby Creek area with specific emphasis on improving lighting on the Carrington side of the creek.

3. Before any such plan is adopted Council consult with the Throsby Creek community as to their lighting needs.

BACKGROUND

An email received from Frank Cordingley, Director Infrastructure dated 20/1/17 explains that the old lights along the Cowper Street Bridge were about 25 years old and beyond repair. He indicates components were no longer available and in the interests of public safety these fittings needed to be replaced.

Accepting that replacement of these lights was necessary, this memo does not explain why the public was not consulted, before removal and replacement of the iconic lights occurred.

I have been inundated with emails from concerned residents and Community groups expressing dismay at the loss of the iconic view created by the ball lights previously in place on this bridge.

LCD lights may be functional and practical but they do not reflect the aesthetic previously established by the ball lights.

No investigation seems to have been made by Council officers, to identify and use modern light fixtures with the same aesthetic.

The archway of lights created a unique gateway for entry into Carrington. This aesthetic has been destroyed by the installation of modern lights.

The Carrington Community Group met on 30/1/17.
50 residents attended the meeting. Many of the attendees expressed concern that the lights were replaced without consultation. Many residents expressed concern that the new lights were industrial in nature and this had a dramatic impact on the view, especially for Cruise ship passengers as this was now the entry to the cruise ship terminal. It was noted that in addition to a lack of beauty the residents felt that the new fittings did not provide the same amount of light as the previous “ball lights.

In addition to the issue of the Cowper Street Bridge, generally the lighting in Throsby Creek, is considered to be insufficient.

Throsby Creek is a popular recreation destination, especially for activities such as walking and cycling.

There is a lack of lighting beyond the Carrington Bridge.

This creates risks for the safety of members of the community accessing this area for recreation.

An integrated lighting plan needs to be developed and implemented to overcome this potential risk.

**ATTACHMENTS**

Nil
REPORT ON NOTICE OF MOTION 28/02/17 - LIGHTING COWPER STREET BRIDGE CARRINGTON

REPORT BY: INFRASTRUCTURE

CONTACT: ACTING DIRECTOR INFRASTRUCTURE

ACTING DIRECTOR COMMENT

Recently Council completed the installation of lighting on the Cowper Street Bridge at Carrington. In doing so, Council improved public safety by conforming to modern lighting standards, while at the same time consolidated 48 lights down to 16, introducing technology with greater service life, increased reliability, and lower power usage.

In regard to the old lights, the "ball fittings" had numerous performance concerns including regular individual light outages, vandalism, and had become translucent due to UV exposure. The previous configuration consisted of some 48 lights, all of which shone upwards and did not meet modern performance criteria in terms of pedestrian safety. Replacement parts had become redundant and were unable to be sourced in the market place. The poles the lights were mounted on were badly damaged by rust.

Council had received numerous complaints regarding the ball lights including poor lighting, or lights not working at all and overall safety concerns as a result. Following installation of the new lights Council has received positive feedback regarding safety improvements to the area.

Council officers will investigate provision of an integrated lighting solution (a plan) around Throsby Creek area with specific emphasis on improving lighting on the Carrington side of the creek.

Before any such plan is actioned it will be placed on public exhibition.
RECOMMENDATION

1. That Council retains the recently installed lighting for the benefit of:
   a. Compliance of the new lighting to requisite standards,
   b. Improvement achievable with LED technology with life to 50000 hours,
   c. Decrease in maintenance and service calls,
   d. Reduction in power cost and carbon footprint, and
   e. Change of poles for steel to stainless steel to eliminate corrosion.

2. Council Officers create a scoping project and investigate options for improved lighting around the Throsby Creek area, specifically on the Carrington side of the creek.

3. That any such plan be placed on public exhibition for consultation with the Throsby Creek Community.
ITEM-2 NOM 28/02/17 - WARD 4 CAPITAL WORKS
COUNCILLORS: J DUNN, D CLAUSEN, S POSNIAK AND N NELMES

PURPOSE

The following Notice of Motion was received on 9 February 2017 from the abovenamed Councillors:

MOTION

That Council:

1 Identify and treat the following works as a priority:
   (i) Wallsend bridge replacement/upgrade;
   (ii) Minmi Road footpath and road widening between Cowper Street and Macquarie Street, Wallsend;
   (iii) Water main replacement and road re-sealing Anderson Drive, Tarro; and
   (iv) Wallsend and Beresfield town centre public domain plan.

2 Provide Councillors with a detailed timetable for completion of the above works by way of Officers report at the next ordinary Council meeting.

3 Provide a monthly update on the progress of the above works with reference to the relevant timetable and provide an explanation for any delay, by way of Officers report at each ordinary Council meeting until the completion of the works.

BACKGROUND

Council has previously resolved to undertake the above works which are currently in various stages of completion.

In light of the significant risk to life and property posed by major flood events in the Wallsend town centre, the flood mitigation works which include the replacement and upgrade of bridges at Tyrrell, Nelson and Boscawen Streets, should be prioritized and completed as a matter of urgency. It is also important that the Wallsend town centre public domain plan be completed concurrently with the flood mitigation works to ensure the best planning outcome for residents of Wallsend.

Mimi Road, Wallsend and Anderson Drive, Tarro upgrades are a source of significant and continued complaints from local residents, with good cause. With a growing population in the western corridor Minmi Road is a critical transport link for this population and users of the Summer Hill waste facility, and Anderson Drive being the main access to Tarro and Beresfield is in desperate need of repair.
It is important that these works be afforded the priority they deserve, and the public is entitled to be kept up to date on their progress and the reason for any delay.

ATTACHMENTS

Nil
In response to Notice of Motion received on 9 February 2017 the following information is provided:

1. **Identify and treat the following works as a priority:**
   
   (i) **Wallsend bridge replacement/upgrade;**
   (ii) **Minmi Road footpath and road widening between Cowper Street and Macquarie Street, Wallsend;**
   (iii) **Water main replacement and road re-sealing Anderson Drive, Tarro;**
   and
   (iv) **Wallsend and Beresfield Town Centre Public Domain Plan (PDP)**

   These projects are already high priority and are part of the current project portfolio that is being actioned. They are scheduled to fit efficiently in the broader program when considering availability of resources, lead up work, design work and approvals that are required for the projects. As delivery of the capital works program is one of Council's core operational requirements, internal mechanisms to manage projects and their progress are in place. This ensures an integrated effort across all business units with status reporting and management actions should escalation of issues be required. Section 2 below highlights the status of each of these projects.

2. **Provide Councillors with a detailed timetable for completion of the above works by way of Officers report at the next ordinary Council meeting.**

The status of the projects are summarised below:

(i) **Wallsend bridge replacement/upgrade:**

   Work is already underway for the replacement of the Tyrell Street bridge as detailed in memo to Councillors dated 7 February and 13 February 2017. Consultants were engaged on 21 September 2016 to prepare concept plans, with completion expected this month (February 2017). Detailed design is expected to commence in March 2017. The cost benefit analysis is currently underway evaluating costs versus the benefits of raising the bridge height to different levels. Previous analysis recommended removal of the bridge.

(ii) **Minmi Road footpath and road widening between Cowper Street and Macquarie Street, Wallsend:**
Commencement of work has been pushed back to mid-March on this project. This has been done to align the work with another project to potentially achieve a $600,000 cost saving across both projects where soil that would otherwise have to be disposed of can be used as fill for this project. At this stage, completion is expected by August 2017. The temporary footpath will be replaced as part of this work now that a lighting solution for the area has been approved by Ausgrid.

(iii) Water main replacement and road re-sealing Anderson Drive, Tarro:

Hunter Water Corporation has now agreed to the replacement of this watermain. The contract for design of the watermain has been let and is expected to be completed by July 2017. A tender will then be called for the construction with road resurfacing to be done by Council staff when the watermain has been replaced.

(iv) Wallsend and Beresfield Town Centre Public Domain Plan (PDP)

Wallsend Local Centre PDP is under preparation. Consultants Group GSA has been engaged and a draft PDP is expected by April this year which will go on public exhibition. Stage 1 construction works is subject to funding.

Beresfield Local Centre PDP has been prepared and placed on public exhibition in December/January 2017. The Traffic report in relation to the PDP is to be reported to Council on 28 February 2017. Stage 1 of the works in Beresfield Local Centre is subject to funding and likely to commence in the next financial year.

3 Provide a monthly update on the progress of the above works with reference to the relevant timetable and provide an explanation for any delay, by way of Officers report at each ordinary Council meeting until the completion of the works.

It is considered that monthly reporting is not productive as all projects are carried out as efficiently as resourcing allows and monthly progress is incremental. Each of the projects have complexities and stages that change as design development progresses.

Council does not have the resources to report to Councillors by Ward on a monthly basis as our focus is required to deliver the whole capital works program. If this reporting was a priority, other projects are likely to be delayed.

RECOMMENDATION

Council notes the information provided regarding Ward 4 projects status and reporting capabilities.
ITEM-3 NOM 28/02/17 - SAFETY ALONG THROSBY CREEK

COUNCILLORS: M OSBORNE AND T DOYLE

PURPOSE

The following Notice of Motion was received on 16 February 2017 from the abovenamed Councillors:

MOTION

Noting that

a) Newcastle City Council has adopted the Safe City Plan 2017-2020 which supports Council’s Newcastle 2030 Community Strategic Plan for Safe and Vibrant Public Spaces and a Caring and Inclusive Community, and

b) Council staff have previously investigated the installation of lighting along the shared pathway along Throsby Creek from Industrial Drive to Lewis Street and determined that the only option available to Council is to install above ground solar lighting similar to that installed at Honeysuckle,

Council:

1 Allocates funding in the 2017/18 Budget to design and install above ground solar lighting along the shared pathway along Throsby Creek from Industrial Drive to Lewis Street, and

2 Investigates popular shared pathways across the city that would benefit from the installation of lighting and includes an appropriate budgetary provision in the 2017/18 Budget.

BACKGROUND

Newcastle City Council is committed to developing a safe, connected cycleway network across the city.

More and more people are active at dawn and dusk and after dark, cycling and walking on shared pathways across the city.

The Throsby Creek shared pathway was built in the late 1990’s and has become a busy link in the cycleway network, with cyclists, runners and people walking their dogs and much use at dawn and dusk and after dark.

The Throsby Creek shared pathway is unsafe with poor visibility at dawn and dusk and after dark – public safety will be enhanced with appropriate lighting along the path from Industrial Drive to Lewis Street.
ATTACHMENTS

Nil.
REPORT ON NOTICE OF MOTION 28/02/17 - SAFETY ALONG THROSBY CREEK

REPORT BY: INFRASTRUCTURE
CONTACT: ACTING DIRECTOR INFRASTRUCTURE

DIRECTOR COMMENT

Officers have undertaken investigations in response to previous requests for lighting of the Throsby Creek shared pedestrian and cycle path. For the section from Lewis Street to Hannell Street, preliminary investigations indicated that above-ground solar lighting would be the only option, due to the lack of public utilities in the area.

A further site inspection was undertaken on 8 February 2017 to review the scope of works and determine possible locations for solar panel lighting along the shared path. Dense vegetation and close proximity to residents extremely limit possible locations to install solar operated lights.

A lighting assessment has been undertaken for the section of pathway from Lewis Street to Hubbard Street. Lighting upgrade of this section will use existing supply, however 27 poles will require replacement due to existing condition and type of fitting, in addition to 13 new poles. The estimated cost for completion of this work, which is programmed for 2017/18, is $345,000.

Costs for lighting of the section from Lewis Street to Hannell Street are expected to be significantly more than the section from Hubbard Street to Lewis Street. Further investigation of options, such as path replacement (rebuild or overlay with incorporation of lighting) and associated issues, is required to determine the appropriate course of action. Considerations include:

- Extent of tree root systems;
- Site foundation (existing path has likely been constructed on blast furnace slag, which will complicate excavation);
- Extent of tree canopy;
- Approval processes for removal of trees (which may be on public or private land);
- Tree condition (Note: Trees from Lewis Street to Hannell Street appear to be in sound condition. There are no apparent arboreal grounds for their removal); and
- In path lighting options.

Perceptions of safety certainly influence a person's willingness to ride. Design of new bicycle facilities should address the principles of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED). Where is it anticipated that a route will attract use during periods of poor light, lighting of the path may be considered and in the design process, factors such as energy use, visual and other impacts of light equipment and effects of light pollution taken into account.
RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that Council:

1 Allocate funds in the 2017/18 budget to undertake further investigation and develop a concept design for the path from the vicinity of Lewis Street to Hannell Street, which addresses CPTED principles.

2 Commence the Lewis Street to Hubbard Street lighting replacement and upgrade project (estimated cost of $345,000) in 2017/18).

3 Undertake investigation of key shared paths throughout Newcastle and develop a position on the appropriateness of lighting provision.
ITEM-4 NOM 28/02/17 - PILOT STUDY TO ESTABLISH LOCAL CHARACTER

COUNCILLORS: M OSBORNE AND T DOYLE

PURPOSE

The following Notice of Motion was received on 16 February 2017 from the abovenamed Councillors:

MOTION

Noting that

a) The Newcastle Development Control Plan 2012 does not include any common understanding of the existing or desired future local character of Tighes Hill and provisions that would ensure that elements of historical interest that contribute to the character of Tighes Hill are protected,

Council:

1 Allocates funding in the 2017/18 Budget to undertake a Pilot Study of the local character of Tighes Hill, and engage with the local community with the following objectives:

   a) To describe a common understanding about the key significant features of the neighbourhood character of the area,

   b) To come to an understanding of the desired future character of the area,

   c) To write Development Control Plan provisions that specify design solutions and controls to ensure that future development is compatible with the existing and desired character of the area and that elements of historical interest that contribute to the character of Tighes Hill are protected, and

   d) To provide a project framework to roll out this work to all suburbs of Newcastle.

2 Establish a specific Working Party comprising Councillors, local residents/representatives from the Tighes Hill Community Group and the Throsby Villages Alliance, representatives from heritage organisations, planning professionals from the community and council staff to guide the project.
BACKGROUND

At a recent Public Voice presentation, Tighes Hill residents highlighted that Council's DCP does not contain any description of a common understanding of the existing or desired future local character of Tighes Hill or any provisions that would allow development proposals to be assessed against to ensure they respect an area’s existing local character.

ATTACHMENTS

Nil
DIRECTOR COMMENT

Newcastle City Council's Local Planning Strategy (LPS), adopted by Council in July 2015, incorporates a vision and objectives for 33 neighbourhoods in Newcastle. Tighes Hill falls into two catchments - the catchments are based on Australian Bureau of Statistics collector districts. A copy is attached (Attachment A).

Councillors will note the objectives include to protect the elements of historical interest that contribute to the character of Tighes Hill and encourage quality urban design that respects local character while establishing the commercial centre as the southern gateway to the renewal corridor.

The LPS was developed over a three year period and incorporated extensive community engagement. The strategy was built on a series of working papers that were each released for comment during their development. The resulting strategy was adopted after a formal 12 week consultation period which at the time, Councillors commented was exemplary. It included ten location based workshops held with stakeholders across Newcastle.

Councillors should also note that the planning legislation reforms currently out for comment, propose introducing a new standard format for development control plans (DCPs). Until this is resolved and the form, content and timeframes for a potential new format DCP are understood, Council officers would not support creating new elements for our existing DCP.

In addition, the amendments to the planning legislation are including changes to strategic planning to strengthen the link between strategic planning and planning controls by requiring clear statements on how strategic objectives will be implemented by LEPs and DCPs.

A DCP’s primary purpose is to provide guidelines for planning and design to support the statutory planning controls in the LEP. The LEP implements the planning strategy so the appropriate place for character statements are in the strategy.

The adopted LPS contains 51 actions, prioritised as short, medium and long term, along with a range of ongoing actions. Council resources should be directed to completing the identified and adopted actions, ahead of new initiatives. At the current time, with current resources, 33% of the actions are completed or underway.
Again, the proposed planning legislation reforms will likely require the LPS to be reviewed. Council's approach to local neighbourhood provisions should be examined at that time, in the full context of all land use and planning actions required.

**RECOMMENDATION**

A pilot study is not supported at this time.

**ATTACHMENTS**

**Attachment A:** Australian Bureau Of Statistics Collector Districts
Islington and Tighes Hill

Islington

Description

Islington is a well connected suburb with frequent bus services and in close proximity to the Hamilton Train Station. Islington has been identified as a place of renewal where higher residential densities, mixed use development and greater commercial floor space are encouraged.

Significant Features

Islington Park, Throsby Creek and Newcastle TAFE campus at Tighes Hill.

Forecasts


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Islington &amp; Tighes Hill</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2031</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>3,630</td>
<td>3,875</td>
<td>3,662</td>
<td>3,745</td>
<td>3,838</td>
<td>+208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households</td>
<td>1,661</td>
<td>1,714</td>
<td>1,743</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>1,878</td>
<td>+217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Size (persons)</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwellings</td>
<td>1,693</td>
<td>1,752</td>
<td>1,762</td>
<td>1,850</td>
<td>1,920</td>
<td>+227</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Neighbourhood lifecycle for Islington and Tighes Hill

An additional 227 dwellings are required to accommodate another 208 people (217 households) in Islington and Tighes Hill by 2031.

There is proportionally less single dwellings and more high density housing compared to the City of Newcastle.

In 2011, the dominant household type in Islington - Tighes Hill was lone person households, which accounted for 32.0% of all households.

The main changes in household type between 2011 and 2026 are forecast to be:

- The largest increase is forecast to be in lone person households, which will increase by 97 households, comprising 34.8% of all households, compared to 32.0% in 2011.
- In contrast group households are forecast to decrease by 12 households, to comprise 7.8% of all households in 2021, compared to 9.3% in 2011.
### Vision and Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vision</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Islington will build on the characteristics of the Islington village centre and existing built form along Maitland Road, while providing opportunities to intensify residential density and stimulate commercial activity, to utilise the streetscape along Maitland Road.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Reinforce the existing character and sense of place for Islington through appropriate built form and streetscape improvements.
- Provide site responsive and sustainable development that maximises environmental benefits afforded by the northerly aspect.
- Enhance Islington and Wickham Park by:
  - Improving the views/surveillance to Islington Park and Wickham Park through appropriate building orientation.
  - Improve facilities such as toilets and seating.
  - Where possible enhance Throsby Creek to a natural waterway.
- Provide improved connectivity from the Maitland Road to adjoining areas and open space linkages.
- Improve pedestrian amenity and safety through street activation and passive surveillance from adjoining uses.
- Strengthen the commercial core of Islington through appropriate redevelopment of sites that reinforce the centre.
- Encourage mixed use buildings along Maitland Road that consist of active frontages at ground level.
- Improve safety and amenity through uses that activate the street edge.
- Provide for mixed use development that is sympathetic to the character of Islington.
- Encourage consolidation of allotments to allow developments to be planned and designed in a holistic manner.
- Introduce local area traffic management.

---

3 The vision and objectives have been sourced from Section 6.4 Islington Renewal Corridor, The Newcastle Development Control Plan 2012.
**Tighes Hill**

**Description**

Tighes Hill features a mix of employment generating activities (industrial) and residential land. Tighes Hill is well served by buses and has good access to employment and commercial activities on Maitland Road, Mayfield.

**Significant Features**

- Gross Street Reserve, Throsby Creek and Newcastle TAFE campus.

**Vision and Objectives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vision</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The identity of Tighes Hill will be reinforced and its potential as a mixed use urban centre promoted. | - Protect the elements of historical interest that contribute to the character of Tighes Hill.  
- Improve the accessibility and viability of the commercial centre.  
- Encourage quality urban design that respects local character while establishing the commercial centre as the southern gateway to the renewal corridor.  
- Improved pedestrian and cycling throughout the suburb. |
ITEM-5 NOM 28/02/17 - CLIMATE CHANGE POLICY

COUNCILLORS: T DOYLE AND M OSBORNE

PURPOSE

The following Notice of Motion was received on 16 February 2017 from the abovenamed Councillors:

MOTION

Noting that

1. The NSW Government released its NSW Climate Change Policy Framework in December 2016 setting a target of net-zero emissions by 2050;

2. Council’s current Strategic Climate Policy (2010, revised 2012) states Council’s intention to:
   a) Regularly review its plans, strategies, policies and benchmarks, where their content may be affected by climate change, to ensure they remain current as the science of climate change develops.
   b) Ensure that Council’s actions, decisions and policy response to climate change remains current and reflects Council’s operational capacity, community expectations and changes in climate change scenarios.

   and,

3. The 2008 statistics regarding share of carbon emissions from business (83%), residential (15.4%), education (1.3%) and Council (0.4%) quoted in Council’s NEWCASTLE 2020 Carbon and Water Management Action Plan, indicate that most of the necessary focus in combating climate change in the Newcastle LGA is through working with business and residents.

Council resolves:

A. To prepare a draft policy and associated management plan to address the urgent need for action on climate change and to complement the NSW State Government’s Climate Change Policy Framework.

The policy and management plan will revise and augment Council’s current Strategic Climate Policy Carbon and Water Management policy (2015) and NEWCASTLE 2020 Carbon and Water Management Action Plan.

The draft policy and associated management plan will include:

i. A target of 100% renewable energy use by 2030 for council operations
ii A target of zero net emissions by at least 2040 for council operations
iii Measures to promote and support local renewable energy suppliers
iv Measures that council can adopt for its own operations that reduce emissions
v Schemes that will help small businesses to be water and energy efficient
vi Regulatory measures that will ensure energy efficiency and maximise use of renewable energy sources within the LGA
vii Relevant planning controls and compliance measures
viii Advocacy measures to reduce the large carbon footprint associated with Newcastle’s industry, especially those associated with port operations
ix Raising community awareness through educational, promotional and communications projects and materials

B To receive a report back from officers on how council can fast track achieving 100% renewables and zero net emissions, and the associated budgetary implications so that we can include these measures in the budget and management plan.

C To call on the state and federal governments to work together to come with a transition plan to ensure a just transition for workers and communities including increased funding for TAFE and programs especially in areas of energy efficiency and renewable energy.

BACKGROUND

The unprecedented global temperatures over the last three years and the recent heat-wave covering most of the Australian continent area prompt a call to action on climate change across all levels of government.

The NSW Government’s Climate Change Policy Framework (December 2016) has set a target of net-zero emissions by 2050 and recognises that;

Most effective climate change adaptation occurs at a local level through the actions of individuals, businesses and communities in response to locally specific climate change impacts.

The Policy Framework further commits that:

The NSW Government will help NSW adjust to a changing climate by supporting local adaptation actions, managing climate change risks to its own assets and services and removing market, regulatory and governance barriers to the private sector and local government adapting effectively

Newcastle Council has a history of actively addressing climate change through its policies, management and action plans. These include:

Newcastle 2030 Community Strategic Plan
Climate Change Policy
Newcastle 2020 Carbon & Water Management Action Plan
While Newcastle Council’s operations account for a low proportion of carbon emissions when compared to other sectors of the Newcastle community, there remains measures that can be taken to improve our carbon footprint and water usage. It is clear from any examination of the state of carbon emissions that council needs to work actively with the local community to act urgently to reduce carbon emissions and adopt other necessary measures to arrest the alarming rate of climate change.

ATTACHMENTS

Nil
Acting Director Comment

Council currently has Strategic Climate Change Policy (revised 2012) and a Carbon and Water Management Action Plan for 2020. This Plan sets out Council's 'Operational Aspirational Goals' by 2020 such as 30% reduction in Council's electricity; 20% reduction in Council's fossil based liquid fuel usage; 30% low carbon renewal energy target; and 80% of Newcastle street lights using best practice energy technology.

In relation to fast tracking achieving 100% renewables and zero net emissions, it is noted that to achieve 100% renewal energy for Council would require 14GWh of electricity annually. In addition, zero net emissions would require offsetting 50,000tCo2-e (carbon emissions).

Council has not estimated the cost of achieving these outcomes, whether it has the resourcing or financial capacity to pursue these targets, and what other services or infrastructure improvements would need to be foregone to enable this result.

Recommendation

The Councillor Notice of Motion (NOM) recommendation be amended for part A.

A. Council continue to pursue the existing goals within Newcastle 2020 Carbon and Water Management Action Plan which complements the NSW Climate Change Policy Framework.
ITEM-6 NOM 28/02/17 - PERFORMING ANIMALS IN CIRCUSES

COUNCILLORS: T DOYLE AND M OSBORNE

PURPOSE

The following Notice of Motion was received on 16 February 2017 from the abovenamed Councillors:

MOTION

That Council:

A Reaffirms its prohibition of the use of performing exotic animals in circuses on council owned land.

B Respects widespread community concern that the welfare of animals is given recognition through appropriate regulation and legislation at a local state and national level.

C Calls on all state government agencies that are responsible for the leasing of land within the Newcastle Local Government Area for circus use to implement a policy of prohibition on the use of performing exotic animals in circuses.

In order to enact this resolution Council's interim Chief Executive Officer will write to relevant state government agencies expressing council’s objection to the use of performing animals in circuses anywhere in the Newcastle Local Government Area.

BACKGROUND

Australia’s largest animal circus, Stardust Circus recently held performances at McDonald Jones Stadium at Broadmeadow. Despite Newcastle Council’s 1997 ban on circuses with exotic animals, Stardust were able to set up at McDonald Jones stadium (the Newcastle Knights Stadium) because it is not council owned land. It is however State Government owned land, so to achieve an LGA-wide cruelty-free circus policy, Council needs to put pressure on the State Government and its agencies that own and control the leasing of their land to implement Council’s ban.

A wild animal belongs in the wild, not performing tricks in a circus. Much of their life is spent sitting around in cages either travelling to and from each town they will show at, or waiting until the show start time. Animals are sentient beings that should be allowed the right to be free of cruel treatment. Council’s 1997 resolution affording exotic animals the right to be free of the restriction associated with circus performance needs to be carried through to ALL circus performances in the Newcastle LGA.
ATTACHMENTS

Nil