ATTACHMENTS DISTRIBUTED UNDER SEPARATE COVER

REPORTS BY COUNCIL OFFICERS

ITEM-39  CCL 22/05/18 - EXECUTIVE MONTHLY PERFORMANCE REPORT
Attachment A

ITEM-40  CCL 22/05/18 - QUARTERLY BUDGET REVIEW STATEMENT
Attachment A

ITEM-42  CCL 22/05/18 - PUBLIC EXHIBITION OF DRAFT DOGS IN OPEN SPACES STRATEGY
Attachment A

ITEM-43  CCL 22/05/18 - ADOPTION OF WALLSEND PUBLIC DOMAIN AND TRAFFIC PLANS
Attachments A to I

ITEM-45  CCL 22/05/18 - PUBLIC EXHIBITION OF DRAFT OUTDOOR EXERCISE FACILITY STRATEGY
Attachment A

ITEM-48  CCL 22/05/18 - ADOPTION OF NEWCASTLE AFFORDABLE LIVING PLAN
Attachments A and B

DISTRIBUTED UNDER SEPARATE COVER
CCL 22/05/18
EXECUTIVE MONTHLY PERFORMANCE REPORT - APRIL 2018

Attachment A: Executive Monthly Performance Report - April 2018
Monthly Performance Report
April 2018
Financial Summary

Operating progress at a glance
Operating Analysis
Overall budget funding summary
Overall performance graphs

Financial Detail

Overall financial position by group
Executive Management overall financial position
Planning & Regulatory overall financial position
Corporate overall financial position
Infrastructure overall financial position
Rates Income Analysis
Debtors Report

Capital

Project Program Summary
Ward 4 Capital Works Update

Investments

Introduction
Investment Policy Compliance Report
Schedule of Investment movements for period ended 30 April, 2018
Key Performance Indicator Compliance
Credit Risk Compliance
Credit Risk Compliance (continued)
Maturity Risk Compliance
Budget to Actual Interest Performance
Schedule of Investment movements for period ended 31 March, 2018
Schedule of Investment movements for period ended 28 February, 2018

Customer Services, Communications, Consultation Services & Records

Customer Service
Communications
## Operating progress at a Glance as at 30 April, 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department / Service Unit</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Variance ($,000)</th>
<th>Variance %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CEO's Office</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>Expenditure on the IT project program is below the YTD budget</td>
<td>1,208</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication and Engagement</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning &amp; Regulatory Director</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>Termination costs</td>
<td>(219)</td>
<td>-76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development &amp; Building</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Planning</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>Expenditure on strategic projects is below the YTD budget</td>
<td>1,899</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Services</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>Overall higher revenue in fines than expected</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Facilities</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>Termination costs</td>
<td>(170)</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td>326</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Services Director</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>Termination costs</td>
<td>(126)</td>
<td>-34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>Finance holds a salary saving budget which is achieved by all of Council's business units</td>
<td>(534)</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Services</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td>(77)</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Service</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td>102</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal and Governance</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Director</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td>(34)</td>
<td>-10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Planning</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>Expenditure on the works project program is below the YTD budget</td>
<td>3,390</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Works</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>Termination costs</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects and Contracts</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td>(106)</td>
<td>-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities &amp; Recreation</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td>169</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Management</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td>285</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Operating Analysis as at 30 April, 2018

### Department / Service Unit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Var ($'000)</th>
<th>Var(%)</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Over budget by more than 5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over budget by 5% or less</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result within budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Operating Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Var ($'000)</th>
<th>Var(%)</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rates and charges</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User charges &amp; fees</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>Cultural facilities - $0.4m</td>
<td>Higher than budgeted revenue has been generated through Council's cultural venues such as the Museum and Civic Theatre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other operating revenues</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Fine revenue - $0.4m</td>
<td>Increase in fines in relation to parking compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants &amp; contributions - Operating</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Operating Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Var ($'000)</th>
<th>Var(%)</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee costs</td>
<td>(1,265)</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>Staff costs</td>
<td>Lower than forecast staff costs due to timing of the project program and general vacancies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowing costs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; Contracts</td>
<td>(5,508)</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>Opex from projects - $6m</td>
<td>Expenditure generated by the 2017/18 works program is below the YTD budget at the end of April.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation &amp; Amortisation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other operating expenses</td>
<td>888</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>State waste levy - $0.8m</td>
<td>Expenditure on the NSW State Waste Levy is above budget due to higher than forecast tonnages. The higher levy is offset by above budget income ($0.5m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Loss from Disposal of Assets</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Overall Budget Funding Summary

**Result for the financial period ending 30 April, 2018**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Full Year</th>
<th>Revised Budget</th>
<th>Revised Result</th>
<th>YTD Actual</th>
<th>YTD Result</th>
<th>Variance $'000</th>
<th>Variance %</th>
<th>Financial Impact</th>
<th>+ve / -ve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating Revenue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rates &amp; charges</td>
<td>156,106</td>
<td>129,823</td>
<td>129,823</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User charges &amp; fees</td>
<td>81,934</td>
<td>68,918</td>
<td>69,634</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>9,242</td>
<td>7,502</td>
<td>7,629</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other operating revenues</td>
<td>10,417</td>
<td>9,343</td>
<td>9,803</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants &amp; contributions - Operating</td>
<td>16,090</td>
<td>8,952</td>
<td>8,941</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating Revenue</strong></td>
<td>273,789</td>
<td>224,538</td>
<td>225,830</td>
<td>1,292</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating Expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee costs</td>
<td>96,893</td>
<td>80,703</td>
<td>79,438</td>
<td>(1,265)</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowing costs</td>
<td>3,742</td>
<td>3,084</td>
<td>3,085</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; contracts</td>
<td>75,951</td>
<td>65,251</td>
<td>59,743</td>
<td>(5,508)</td>
<td>-8%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation &amp; amortisation</td>
<td>41,422</td>
<td>34,287</td>
<td>34,292</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other operating expenses</td>
<td>49,741</td>
<td>44,061</td>
<td>44,949</td>
<td>888</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net loss from disposal of assets</td>
<td>6,029</td>
<td>5,024</td>
<td>5,024</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating Expenses</strong></td>
<td>273,778</td>
<td>232,410</td>
<td>226,531</td>
<td>(5,879)</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating Revenue Less Operating Expenditure</strong></td>
<td>(7,872)</td>
<td>(701)</td>
<td>7,171</td>
<td>-91%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital Revenues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants &amp; contributions - Capital</td>
<td>18,838</td>
<td>15,698</td>
<td>15,844</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proceeds from the sale of Assets</td>
<td>2,548</td>
<td>2,123</td>
<td>2,295</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Capital Raising revenue</strong></td>
<td>21,386</td>
<td>17,822</td>
<td>18,139</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Surplus/(deficit) after capital revenue</strong></td>
<td>21,397</td>
<td>9,950</td>
<td>17,438</td>
<td>7,489</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adjustments for Non Cash Items</strong></td>
<td>64,248</td>
<td>45,427</td>
<td>52,921</td>
<td>7,494</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add back Depreciation</td>
<td>41,422</td>
<td>34,287</td>
<td>34,292</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add back loss on Disposal</td>
<td>6,029</td>
<td>5,024</td>
<td>5,024</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less land &amp; infrastructure donations</td>
<td>(4,600)</td>
<td>(3,833)</td>
<td>(3,833)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding available for capital expenditure</strong></td>
<td>54,945</td>
<td>48,487</td>
<td>47,646</td>
<td>(841)</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asset renewals</td>
<td>22,641</td>
<td>22,172</td>
<td>23,934</td>
<td>1,762</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 SRV Priority Projects</td>
<td>14,134</td>
<td>12,101</td>
<td>13,259</td>
<td>1,158</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New / upgrade</td>
<td>7,493</td>
<td>8,217</td>
<td>4,243</td>
<td>(3,974)</td>
<td>-48%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Infrastructure Projects</td>
<td>10,677</td>
<td>5,997</td>
<td>6,210</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total capital spend</strong></td>
<td>54,945</td>
<td>48,487</td>
<td>47,646</td>
<td>(841)</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan Principal Repayment</td>
<td>2,882</td>
<td>2,402</td>
<td>2,402</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Funds Generated / (Used)</strong></td>
<td>6,421</td>
<td>(5,461)</td>
<td>2,873</td>
<td>8,335</td>
<td>-153%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note 1 - Actual and Budget results include an estimate for the Newcastle Airport
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>YTD Budget '000</th>
<th>YTD Actual '000</th>
<th>Var ($)</th>
<th>Var(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating Revenue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Rates &amp; charges</td>
<td>1,003</td>
<td>1,003</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 User charges &amp; fees</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>383</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Interest</td>
<td>2,887</td>
<td>2,888</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Other operating revenues</td>
<td>4,676</td>
<td>5,029</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Grants &amp; contributions - Operating</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>217</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating Revenue</strong></td>
<td>601</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>20,732</td>
<td>21,837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating Expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Employee costs</td>
<td>11,170</td>
<td>10,871</td>
<td>2,279</td>
<td>2,279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Borrowing costs</td>
<td>2,887</td>
<td>2,888</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Materials &amp; contracts</td>
<td>4,676</td>
<td>5,029</td>
<td>1,477</td>
<td>1,477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Depreciation &amp; amortisation</td>
<td>4,676</td>
<td>5,029</td>
<td>1,477</td>
<td>1,477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Other operating expenses</td>
<td>2,887</td>
<td>2,888</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Net Loss from disposal of assets</td>
<td>2,887</td>
<td>2,888</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating Expenses</strong></td>
<td>17,237</td>
<td>15,831</td>
<td>21,192</td>
<td>21,837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating Revenue Less Operating Expenditure</strong></td>
<td>(16,636)</td>
<td>(15,231)</td>
<td>(18,282)</td>
<td>(15,753)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## YTD Budget vs Actual

### Operating Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>YTD Budget</th>
<th>YTD Actual</th>
<th>Var ($)</th>
<th>Var(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rates &amp; charges</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User charges &amp; fees</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other operating revenues</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Operating Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>YTD Budget</th>
<th>YTD Actual</th>
<th>Var ($)</th>
<th>Var(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee costs</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>732</td>
<td>2,287</td>
<td>1,287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowing costs</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; contracts</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>3,165</td>
<td>369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation &amp; amortisation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other operating expenses</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Loss from disposal of assets</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Operating Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YTD Budget</th>
<th>YTD Actual</th>
<th>Var ($)</th>
<th>Var(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Operating Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YTD Budget</th>
<th>YTD Actual</th>
<th>Var ($)</th>
<th>Var(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,220</td>
<td>1,144</td>
<td>7,348</td>
<td>7,293</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Operating Revenue Less Operating Expenditure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YTD Budget</th>
<th>YTD Actual</th>
<th>Var ($)</th>
<th>Var(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1,220)</td>
<td>(1,144)</td>
<td>(7,140)</td>
<td>(7,076)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Development &amp; Build.</td>
<td>Strategic Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Revenue</td>
<td>YTD Budget $'000</td>
<td>YTD Actual $'000</td>
<td>YTD Budget $'000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Rates &amp; charges</td>
<td>1,003</td>
<td>1,003</td>
<td>1,003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 User charges &amp; fees</td>
<td>3,410</td>
<td>3,378</td>
<td>6,548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Interest</td>
<td>1,025</td>
<td>1,008</td>
<td>2,421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Other operating revenues - Operating</td>
<td>3,410</td>
<td>3,378</td>
<td>6,548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Grants &amp; contributions - Operating</td>
<td>1,003</td>
<td>1,003</td>
<td>1,003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Operating Revenue</td>
<td>3,410</td>
<td>3,378</td>
<td>6,548</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Operating Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Director</th>
<th>Development &amp; Build.</th>
<th>Strategic Planning</th>
<th>Regulatory Services</th>
<th>Cultural Facilities</th>
<th>Libraries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 Employee costs</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>3,750</td>
<td>3,700</td>
<td>3,471</td>
<td>3,369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Borrowing costs</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4,177</td>
<td>4,020</td>
<td>4,572</td>
<td>4,662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Materials &amp; contracts</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5,488</td>
<td>3,714</td>
<td>1,373</td>
<td>1,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Depreciation &amp; amortisation</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>1,373</td>
<td>1,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Other operating expenses</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1,552</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Net Loss from disposal of assets</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1,552</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Operating Expenses</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>4,248</td>
<td>4,199</td>
<td>11,356</td>
<td>9,463</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Operating Revenue - Less Operating Expenditure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Director</th>
<th>Development &amp; Build.</th>
<th>Strategic Planning</th>
<th>Regulatory Services</th>
<th>Cultural Facilities</th>
<th>Libraries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(290)</td>
<td>(509)</td>
<td>(838)</td>
<td>(836)</td>
<td>(11,356)</td>
<td>(9,463)</td>
<td>(1,373)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the month ending 30 April, 2018

Planning & Regulatory

Director Strategic Planning Development & Build. Cultural Facilities Libraries Planning & Regulatory

For: Regulatory Services Director Strategic Planning Development & Build. Cultural Facilities Libraries Planning & Regulatory

30 April, 2018
### Corporate Services

**For the month ending 30 April, 2018**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Director</th>
<th>Finance</th>
<th>Property Services</th>
<th>Customer Service</th>
<th>Legal &amp; Governance</th>
<th>Corporate Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YTD Budget $'000</td>
<td>YTD Actual $'000</td>
<td>YTD Budget $'000</td>
<td>YTD Actual $'000</td>
<td>YTD Budget $'000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rates &amp; charges</td>
<td>111,703</td>
<td>111,703</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>111,712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User charges &amp; fees</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>2,638</td>
<td>2,620</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>7,246</td>
<td>7,373</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7,246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other operating revenues</td>
<td>1,402</td>
<td>1,441</td>
<td>2,701</td>
<td>2,701</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants &amp; contributions - Operating</td>
<td>5,415</td>
<td>5,420</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating Revenue</strong></td>
<td>126,111</td>
<td>126,326</td>
<td>5,348</td>
<td>5,330</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee costs</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>701</td>
<td>726</td>
<td>2,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowing costs</td>
<td>2,839</td>
<td>2,839</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>4887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; contracts</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>1,737</td>
<td>1,771</td>
<td>951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation &amp; amortisation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other operating expenses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3,056</td>
<td>2,978</td>
<td>382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Loss from disposal of assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating Expenses</strong></td>
<td>376</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>9,824</td>
<td>10,573</td>
<td>3,254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating Revenue Less Operating Expenditure</strong></td>
<td>(376)</td>
<td>(502)</td>
<td>116,287</td>
<td>115,753</td>
<td>2,094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Infrastructure Planning</td>
<td>Civil Works</td>
<td>Projects &amp; Contracts</td>
<td>Facilities &amp; Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YTD Budget</td>
<td>YTD Actual</td>
<td>YTD Budget</td>
<td>YTD Actual</td>
<td>YTD Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Rates &amp; charges</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>17,036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 User charges &amp; fees</td>
<td>687</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>4,230</td>
<td>3,744</td>
<td>33,374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Interest</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Other operating revenues</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>781</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Grants &amp; contributions - Operating</td>
<td>768</td>
<td>731</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Operating Revenue</td>
<td>1,462</td>
<td>1,514</td>
<td>5,100</td>
<td>4,610</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Employee costs</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>6,497</td>
<td>5,189</td>
<td>991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Borrowing costs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Materials &amp; contracts</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22,915</td>
<td>20,931</td>
<td>3,058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Depreciation &amp; amortisation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17,083</td>
<td>17,084</td>
<td>3,727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Other operating expenses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3,362</td>
<td>3,315</td>
<td>761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Net Loss from disposal of assets</td>
<td>5,024</td>
<td>5,024</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Operating Expenses</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>54,881</td>
<td>51,543</td>
<td>20,548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Operating Revenue</td>
<td>(348)</td>
<td>(382)</td>
<td>(53,419)</td>
<td>(50,029)</td>
<td>(15,448)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Operating Expenditure</td>
<td>(348)</td>
<td>(382)</td>
<td>(53,419)</td>
<td>(50,029)</td>
<td>(15,448)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Rates Income as at 30 April, 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YTD Budget (000's)</th>
<th>YTD Actual (000's)</th>
<th>Variance (000's)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rates and Charges</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Rates</td>
<td>109,964</td>
<td>109,964</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Waste</td>
<td>16,999</td>
<td>16,999</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater</td>
<td>1,642</td>
<td>1,642</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levies</td>
<td>1,218</td>
<td>1,218</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Rates</strong></td>
<td>129,823</td>
<td>129,823</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Debtors Report as at 30 April, 2018

### Outstanding Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Debt Recovery Action</th>
<th>No. of Properties</th>
<th>$ Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legal Action</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>$853,127.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Arrangements</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>$449,133.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferral against estate</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>$694,825.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>700</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,997,087</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Aged Debtors Report (Major Debtors Report)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Apr-18</th>
<th>Mar-18</th>
<th>Apr-17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current</strong></td>
<td>3,639,760</td>
<td>3,419,244</td>
<td>1,133,809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>30 Days</strong></td>
<td>759,506</td>
<td>497,554</td>
<td>104,748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>60 Days</strong></td>
<td>69,590</td>
<td>9,964</td>
<td>36,379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>90 Days</strong></td>
<td>724,740</td>
<td>1,325,255</td>
<td>746,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>5,193,596</td>
<td>5,252,017</td>
<td>2,021,531</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Breakdown of Material Debtors

greater than $100,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Debtor</th>
<th>Business Unit</th>
<th>Total $</th>
<th>Current $</th>
<th>30 Days $</th>
<th>60 Days $</th>
<th>90 Days $</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BP Australia Pty Ltd</td>
<td>Infrastructure Planning</td>
<td>$586,023</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>586,023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleanaway</td>
<td>Waste Management</td>
<td>439,523</td>
<td>439,523</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veolia Environmental</td>
<td>Waste Management</td>
<td>$424,739</td>
<td>424,739</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enviropacific Services</td>
<td>Waste Management</td>
<td>$729,727</td>
<td>226,611</td>
<td>489,054</td>
<td>14,063</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMCC</td>
<td>Waste Management</td>
<td>$331,505</td>
<td>331,505</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transpacific Cleanawa</td>
<td>Waste Management</td>
<td>$102,463</td>
<td>102,463</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gleeson Civil Engineering</td>
<td>Waste Management</td>
<td>$170,750</td>
<td>73,748</td>
<td>88,204</td>
<td>8,797</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Worx Civil</td>
<td>Waste Management</td>
<td>$102,920</td>
<td>102,920</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Commentary on Material Debtors greater than 90 days

BP Australia Pty Ltd - Greater than 90 Days
Legal action is currently underway with BP regarding a segment of Council's pipework being broken. This is an on-going issue and the cost represents the pumping out of localised flooding and repair of pipework during negotiations. It is expected that this money will be recouped from BP
# Works Program Summary
For the month ending 30 April, 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Year Revised Budget $,000</th>
<th>Portfolio/Program</th>
<th>YTD Revised Budget $,000</th>
<th>YTD Actual Result $,000</th>
<th>Variance to YTD budget (%)</th>
<th>% of FY Budget Spent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29,688</td>
<td>Buildings, Structures and Places</td>
<td>24,948</td>
<td>25,178</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>557</td>
<td>Aquatic Centres</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>-20%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,262</td>
<td>Blackbutt Reserve</td>
<td>1,756</td>
<td>1,106</td>
<td>-37%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,803</td>
<td>Buildings - Council Support Services</td>
<td>2,240</td>
<td>1,978</td>
<td>-12%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>Caravan Parks and Commercial Properties</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>-65%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,587</td>
<td>City Centre Revitalisation</td>
<td>1,114</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>-43%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11,387</td>
<td>Coastal Revitalisation</td>
<td>9,860</td>
<td>13,208</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>116%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>876</td>
<td>Community Buildings</td>
<td>862</td>
<td>874</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,023</td>
<td>Cultural Facilities</td>
<td>3,235</td>
<td>2,444</td>
<td>-24%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,330</td>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>1,244</td>
<td>1,375</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>103%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,928</td>
<td>Recreation Parks and Sporting Facilities</td>
<td>2,261</td>
<td>2,196</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>339</td>
<td>Public Toilets</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,460</td>
<td>Retaining Walls</td>
<td>1,440</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>-56%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27,227</td>
<td>Roads</td>
<td>25,906</td>
<td>25,815</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,870</td>
<td>Bridges</td>
<td>1,548</td>
<td>1,103</td>
<td>-29%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,569</td>
<td>Footpaths</td>
<td>1,466</td>
<td>1,436</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>795</td>
<td>Road Furniture</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>-41%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11,791</td>
<td>Road Rehabilitation</td>
<td>10,623</td>
<td>9,720</td>
<td>-9%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11,202</td>
<td>Road Resurfacing</td>
<td>11,586</td>
<td>13,153</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>117%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,624</td>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>4,406</td>
<td>3,358</td>
<td>-24%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,236</td>
<td>Cycleways</td>
<td>1,894</td>
<td>1,261</td>
<td>-33%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>Local Area Traffic Management</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>-66%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Parking Infrastructure</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-67%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,008</td>
<td>Pedestrian Access and Mobility Plan</td>
<td>2,238</td>
<td>2,005</td>
<td>-10%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,948</td>
<td>Stormwater</td>
<td>6,160</td>
<td>4,485</td>
<td>-27%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>638</td>
<td>Flood Planning</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,310</td>
<td>Stormwater System</td>
<td>5,704</td>
<td>3,916</td>
<td>-31%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8,117</td>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>6,743</td>
<td>4,299</td>
<td>-36%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,043</td>
<td>Bushland and Watercourses</td>
<td>842</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>-26%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,406</td>
<td>Coast, Estuary and Wetlands</td>
<td>1,156</td>
<td>1,125</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,159</td>
<td>Street and Park Trees</td>
<td>935</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>-12%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,509</td>
<td>Waste Management</td>
<td>3,810</td>
<td>1,727</td>
<td>-55%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,724</td>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>3,705</td>
<td>2,719</td>
<td>-27%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,373</td>
<td>Strategic</td>
<td>5,635</td>
<td>4,895</td>
<td>-13%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,951</td>
<td>Smart City</td>
<td>5,264</td>
<td>4,553</td>
<td>-14%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350</td>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Strategic Plans</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>-23%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,847</td>
<td>Fleet Replacement</td>
<td>2,881</td>
<td>2,079</td>
<td>-28%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,847</td>
<td>Fleet Replacement</td>
<td>2,881</td>
<td>2,079</td>
<td>-28%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,302</td>
<td>Minor Capital</td>
<td>971</td>
<td>954</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Art Gallery Works of Art</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>250%</td>
<td>118%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800</td>
<td>Library Resources</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>-9%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Parking Meter Replacement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>325</td>
<td>Small Purchases</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>-8%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95,850</td>
<td>Total Works Program</td>
<td>81,355</td>
<td>73,782</td>
<td>-9%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The Budget above is inclusive of operational and capital works
## Ward 4 Capital Works at 30 April, 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
<th>Actual Date</th>
<th>Reason for delay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i) Wallsend bridge replacement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyrell St bridge concept design</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Jul-17</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyrell St detail design under contract</td>
<td>Oct-17</td>
<td>Oct-17</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipated construction 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Grant Application lodged with OEH. Services and property interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Minmi Road footpath and road widening between Cowper Street and Macquarie Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street lighting relocations and upgrade construction</td>
<td>Feb-17</td>
<td>Mar-17</td>
<td>Contractor availability and approval for power outage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Design drawings</td>
<td>Mar-17</td>
<td>Mar-17</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil construction commencement</td>
<td>Apr-17</td>
<td>Mar-17</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil construction completion</td>
<td>Aug-17</td>
<td>Sep-17</td>
<td>Need to remove existing power poles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) Water main replacement and road re-sealing Anderson Drive Tarro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start project</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Sep-16</td>
<td>Funding commitment from HWC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award tender for water main feasibility and design</td>
<td>Dec-16</td>
<td>Dec-16</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water main design submitted to Hunter Water Corporation</td>
<td>Jun-17</td>
<td>Jun-17</td>
<td>Scoping greater than expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water main Tender</td>
<td>Jul-17</td>
<td>Sep-17</td>
<td>Additional investigations required due to design issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water main commence construction</td>
<td>Nov-17</td>
<td>Nov-17</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water main complete construction</td>
<td>Feb-18</td>
<td>Jan-18</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil construction commencement</td>
<td>Mar-18</td>
<td>Feb-18</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil construction completion</td>
<td>Jul-18</td>
<td>Oct-18</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv) Wallsend and Beresfield Public Domain Plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallsend Public Domain Plan Draft Concept Plan</td>
<td>Late March 2017</td>
<td>Late March 2017</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Committee</td>
<td>10-Apr-17</td>
<td>10-Apr-17</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibition of Draft PDP</td>
<td>May-17</td>
<td>May-17</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report to Council for adoption of PDP</td>
<td>Jul-17</td>
<td>Report to Council on 22 May 2018</td>
<td>Various investigations following public exhibition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Executive summary:

1. Council’s temporary surplus funds are invested consistent with Council’s Investment Policy and The Local Government Act and Regulations.

2. Application of the investment function has remained consistent with requirements outlined within Part E of Council’s Investment Policy, "Environmentally and Socially Responsible Investments (SRI)".

3. Council’s overall investment portfolio holdings are $300,898,398 comprising $294,833,907 of invested funds, and $6,064,491 Cash At Call. Further disclosure of investment portfolio composition and details of investment placements performed during the reporting period are detailed later in this report.

4. Council achieved a Net Yield on the investment portfolio for the 12 months to 30 April of 2.94%, against the benchmark of 1.75% 90d Bloomberg AusBond Bank Bill Index.

Councils Investment Policy mandates a KPI Active Return (Net Return less benchmark) of 0.50%. The Active Return for the 12 months to April declined in comparison to the prior month to 1.19%.

5. **Interest Income Budget:** The 2017/18 adopted budget from Councils cash and investments was $8.47 million (excluding Newcastle Airport and non-investment portfolio sources of interest). This was revised upward at the September 2017 budget review to $8.51 million. The revised position represents a slight decline in nominal income relative to Financial Year 2016/17. The decline in budgeted revenue is forecast due to Council running a net deficit budget from a funding perspective for 2017/18, as well as a declining total yield.

6. **Interest Income Actual:** Cumulative 2017/18 interest income from Councils cash and investments is $7.18 million (excluding Newcastle Airport and non-investment portfolio sources of interest). Year to date performance exceeds the revised budget by $108,000 or 1.5%. The revised budget position remains achievable should the forecast variables continue to perform as forecast with an increase in full year budget at March quarterly review likely.

The budget to actual interest report as at 30 April 2018 is submitted to Council later in this report.

7. Council’s new and rolled investments are subject to current and future economic financial market prices. The below graphs display the average of interest rate forecasts (which are unchanged from the prior month) sourced from the 4 major Australian Banks.

8. In accordance with Council’s resolution of 30 May 1995, the schedules of investments from the two previous meetings of Council are provided in detail at the conclusion of this report.
Investment Policy compliance report
30 April 2018

Investment policy objectives:

9.1 To provide a framework for the investing of Council's funds at the most favourable rate of interest available to it at the time whilst having due consideration of risk and security for that investment type and ensuring that its liquidity requirements are being met.

9.2 While exercising the power to invest, consideration is to be given to the preservation of capital, liquidity, and the return of investment.

9.3 Preservation of capital is the principal objective of the investment portfolio. Investments are to be placed in a manner that seeks to ensure security and safeguarding the investment portfolio. This includes managing credit and interest rate risk within identified thresholds and parameters.

9.4 Investments should be allocated to ensure there is sufficient liquidity to meet all reasonably anticipated cash flow requirements, as and when they fall due, without incurring the risk of significant costs due to the unanticipated sale of an investment.

9.5 Investments are expected to achieve a market average rate of return in line with the Council's risk tolerance.

9.6 Delegated Officers are to manage the investment portfolio as a hold to maturity investor. Deviation from this method of operation (ie sale of an investment prior to maturity) is permissible for either risk management purposes, to meet unforeseen liquidity requirements, or if deemed advantageous to do so.

9.7 All investments are to comply with the following:

9.7.1 Local Government Act 1993 (NSW) - Section 625
9.7.2 Local Government (General) Regulation 2005 (NSW)
9.7.3 Prevailing Ministerial Investment Order
9.7.4 Local Government Code of Accounting Practice and Financial Reporting
9.7.5 Division of Local Government Investment Circulars; and
9.7.6 Australian Accounting Standards

9.8 Council's preference is to enter into environmentally and Socially Responsible Investments (SRI) where:

9.8.1 The investment is compliant with legislation and Investment Policy objectives (listed above) and parameters; and

9.8.2 The rate of return is favourable relative to comparable investments on offer to Council at the time of investment.
Portfolio Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asset Class allocation</th>
<th>Current month Apr '18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash At Call</td>
<td>6,064,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term Deposit: Fixed rate</td>
<td>83,278,847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term Deposit: Floating rate</td>
<td>36,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floating Rate Note</td>
<td>156,536,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Rate Bond</td>
<td>19,018,252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>300,898,398</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commentary:
Throughout the 12 months to April 2018 Asset Allocations have remained largely consistent.

The single largest Asset Class allocation is to Floating Rate Notes at 52%. This level of exposure has been maintained so that, in conjunction with Investment Policy measures, interest rate risk and credit risk exposure are minimised whilst concurrently Council can continue to maintain an excellent rate of return both on an absolute basis (relative to risk) and relative to Local Government peers.

For April 2018 Councils total value of cash and investments moved broadly in alignment April 2017.
Investment Policy compliance report
30 April 2018

New and matured Investments:

Matured Investments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date matured</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Asset Class</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Rate of Return</th>
<th>Original Term</th>
<th>Original date invested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 Apr 2018</td>
<td>Greater Bank</td>
<td>Term Deposit: Fixed rate</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>3.30%</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>15 Apr 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Apr 2018</td>
<td>ANZ</td>
<td>Floating Rate Note</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
<td>50d bbsw + 0.85%</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>17 Apr 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Apr 2018</td>
<td>ANZ</td>
<td>Floating Rate Note</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>50d bbsw + 0.94%</td>
<td>4.8 years</td>
<td>28 Jun 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Apr 2018</td>
<td>ME Bank</td>
<td>Floating Rate Note</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>50d bbsw + 1.30%</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>17 Apr 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Apr 2018</td>
<td>ME Bank</td>
<td>Floating Rate Note</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>50d bbsw + 0.95%</td>
<td>3.5 years</td>
<td>02 Sep 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Apr 2018</td>
<td>Westpac</td>
<td>Term Deposit: Fixed rate</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>50d bbsw + 1.19%</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>22 Apr 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New Investments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract date</th>
<th>Settlement date</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Asset Class</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Rate of Return</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Maturity date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 Apr 2018</td>
<td>17 Apr 2018</td>
<td>ME Bank</td>
<td>Floating Rate Note</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>90d bbsw + 1.27%</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>16 Apr 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Apr 2018</td>
<td>23 Apr 2018</td>
<td>CBA</td>
<td>Floating Rate Note</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>90d bbsw + 0.85%</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>25 Apr 2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Apr 2018</td>
<td>30 Apr 2018</td>
<td>NAB</td>
<td>Term Deposit: Fixed Rate</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
<td>2.70%</td>
<td>144 days</td>
<td>21 Sep 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I certify that the new investments detailed above have been made in accordance with the Local Government Act 1993, the Local Government (General) Regulation 2005, and Council's adopted Investment Policy.

[Signature]
Martin Swan
Responsible Accounting Officer
Performance measurement:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current month Apr '18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12m: Council return</td>
<td>2.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12m: Benchmark + KPI</td>
<td>2.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12m: KPI outperformance</td>
<td>0.69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commentary:
The Key Performance Indicator (KPI) for income on investments is benchmarked at 0.50% above the 1 year return on the 90 day Bloomberg AusBond Bank Bill Index.

Council is generating a running yield of 1.19% over the Bloomberg Ausbond Index rate, equating to KPI outperformance of 0.69%. This is deemed as excellent both on an absolute basis (relative to risk) and relative to Local Government peers.

In the months since February 2018 short term BBSW rates have increased in excess of 0.25%, whilst the RBA cash rate has remained unchanged. The rise in these short term BBSW rates is due to funding pressures driven by events occurring in the US. Market commentators are unsure as to whether the full impact of this event should be considered as a short term phenomenon or not. This rise will have a concurrent a positive impact upon Councils investment returns as floating rate Asset Classes reprice on a quarterly basis linked to BBSW rates rather than the RBA cash rate.

Portfolio yield remains comfortably above inflation (underlying CPI for the Quarter to December 2017 was 1.90%). Council's portfolio retains a theoretical natural hedge against inflationary impacts via its weighting toward investment in floating rate products. Whilst ever the Reserve Bank of Australia retains inflation targeting monetary policy stance the yield generated on these investments should continue to outperform inflation.
Credit Risk compliance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment credit rating</th>
<th>Current month Apr '18</th>
<th>Exposure limits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA band (inc. major banks)</td>
<td>168,232,384</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A+ and below</td>
<td>132,666,014</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BBB+ and below</td>
<td>93,655,189</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Rated (BBB- and below)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commentary:

Allocations remain conservative from a credit risk perspective and remain well within Council Policy limits.

Trend allocations clearly demonstrate the point at which Standard and Poors downgraded 18 regional ADIs in May 2017 and the resultant increase in BBB+ (and below) investments held by Council, as all holdings with Bendigo Bank and Bank of Queensland were re-rated from the A banding to BBB.

The spike in February 2018 toward AA band investments was the result of favourable pricing offered from Institutions rated within this band.

Additional Policy measures are in place to limit credit risk exposure via individual ADI exposure limits and term to maturity limits.
Credit risk compliance cont:

Commentary:
Exposure remains diversified across a range of counterparties and is well within the limits set in place by Council Policy.
Maturity risk compliance:

Commentary:
Council’s Investment Policy mandates that it hold a minimum of 30% of cash and investments with a maximum term to maturity of less than 12 months. This limit is established to ensure Council retains a comfortable liquidity buffer at all times whilst also ensuring sufficient additional capacity to maintain a long term maturity profile to enable improved yields.

New investment placements during the month of April were split across both short and longer durations. Significant cash inflows will be received in May 2018 with the majority invested to cover future short term liquidity requirements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term to Maturity</th>
<th>Actual performance</th>
<th>Policy Framework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>April</td>
<td>Minimum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 1 Year</td>
<td>103,356,506</td>
<td>34.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 1 Year</td>
<td>197,541,892</td>
<td>65.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 3 Years</td>
<td>75,473,575</td>
<td>25.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 5 Years</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interest Income Variance analysis:

Commentary:
The adopted budget for 2017/18 investment income is $8.5m which is $0.68m (or 7%) below the actual result achieved in the 2016/17 financial year. Reasons for this forecast decline are twofold:

1. Councils Operational Plan is forecast to deliver a cash deficit for the 2017/18 period resulting in a reduced balance of funds invested; and
2. A continued decline in portfolio yield as a result of an ongoing maturity of investments made when yields were higher (which have protected Councils returns from declining sooner).

This full year budget has subsequently been revised upward at the September 2017 budget review to $8.5m.

Total interest income generated in the month to April ’18 was $0.65m, resulting in cumulative interest income tracking in excess of the revised budget year to date.

The budget position remains realistic, however actual to budget variances may arise throughout the remainder of the year in the event of market conditions altering, month to month portfolio value fluctuations, and variances between accounting month end and calendar month end.
**Investment Policy compliance report**  
31 March 2018

**New and matured investments:**

**Matured Investments:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date matured</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Asset Class</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Rate of Return</th>
<th>Original Term</th>
<th>Original date invested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9 Mar 2018</td>
<td>BankWest</td>
<td>Term Deposit: Fixed rate</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>2.45%</td>
<td>129 days</td>
<td>31 Oct 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Mar 2018</td>
<td>NAB</td>
<td>Term Deposit: Fixed rate</td>
<td>$639,423</td>
<td>2.45%</td>
<td>91 days</td>
<td>11 Dec 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Mar 2018</td>
<td>NAB</td>
<td>Term Deposit: Fixed rate</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
<td>2.55%</td>
<td>195 days</td>
<td>30 Aug 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Mar 2018</td>
<td>NAB</td>
<td>Term Deposit: Fixed rate</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>2.56%</td>
<td>204 days</td>
<td>31 Aug 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Mar 2018</td>
<td>NAB</td>
<td>Term Deposit: Fixed rate</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>126 days</td>
<td>17 Nov 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**New Investments:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract date</th>
<th>Settlement date</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Asset Class</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Rate of Return</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Maturity date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27 Feb 2018</td>
<td>8 Mar 2018</td>
<td>UBS Australia</td>
<td>Floating Rate Note</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>90d bbsw + 0.90%</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>8 Mar 2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Mar 2018</td>
<td>9 Mar 2018</td>
<td>NAB</td>
<td>Term Deposit: Fixed Rate</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
<td>2.57%</td>
<td>140 days</td>
<td>27 Jul 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Mar 2018</td>
<td>12 Mar 2018</td>
<td>NAB</td>
<td>Term Deposit: Fixed Rate</td>
<td>$639,424</td>
<td>2.56%</td>
<td>182 days</td>
<td>10 Sept 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I certify that the new investments detailed above have been made in accordance with the Local Government Act 1993, the Local Government (General) Regulation 2005, and Council’s adopted Investment Policy.

Martin Swan  
Responsible Accounting Officer
**Investment Policy compliance report**  
28 February 2018

New and matured Investments:

### Matured Investments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date matured</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Asset Class</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Rate of Return</th>
<th>Original Term</th>
<th>Original date invested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 Feb 2018</td>
<td>BOQ</td>
<td>Term Deposit: Fixed rate</td>
<td>$639,423</td>
<td>2.65%</td>
<td>215 days</td>
<td>6 Jul 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Feb 2018</td>
<td>Newcastle Perm</td>
<td>Floating rate note</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>90d bbsw + 1.10%</td>
<td>3 yrs</td>
<td>27 Feb 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Feb 2018</td>
<td>Newcastle Perm</td>
<td>Floating rate note</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>90d bbsw + 1.10%</td>
<td>2.5 yrs</td>
<td>31 Aug 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Feb 2018</td>
<td>Newcastle Perm</td>
<td>Floating rate note</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>90d bbsw + 1.10%</td>
<td>2.5 yrs</td>
<td>9 Sept 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### New Investments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract date</th>
<th>Settlement date</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Asset Class</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Rate of Return</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Maturity date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 Feb 2018</td>
<td>6 Feb 2018</td>
<td>BOQ</td>
<td>Term Deposit: Fixed Rate</td>
<td>$639,423</td>
<td>2.55%</td>
<td>182 days</td>
<td>7 Aug 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Feb 2018</td>
<td>14 Feb 2018</td>
<td>Bankwest</td>
<td>Term Deposit: Fixed Rate</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>149 days</td>
<td>13 Jul 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Feb 2018</td>
<td>20 Feb 2018</td>
<td>NAB</td>
<td>Term Deposit: Fixed Rate</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>150 days</td>
<td>20 Jul 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Feb 2018</td>
<td>28 Feb 2018</td>
<td>NAB</td>
<td>Term Deposit: Fixed Rate</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
<td>2.49%</td>
<td>86 days</td>
<td>25 May 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Feb 2018</td>
<td>28 Feb 2018</td>
<td>NAB</td>
<td>Term Deposit: Fixed Rate</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>120 days</td>
<td>28 Jun 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Feb 2018</td>
<td>28 Feb 2018</td>
<td>Bankwest</td>
<td>Term Deposit: Fixed Rate</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>135 days</td>
<td>13 Jul 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Feb 2018</td>
<td>28 Feb 2018</td>
<td>Bankwest</td>
<td>Term Deposit: Fixed Rate</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>150 days</td>
<td>3 Aug 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I certify that the new investments detailed above have been made in accordance with the Local Government Act 1993, the Local Government (General) Regulation 2005, and Council's adopted Investment Policy.

[Signature]

Martin Swan  
Responsible Accounting Officer
Communications & Engagement supported the city’s Anzac Day commemorations with broad traditional media promotion that reached an audience of 662,000 and achieved an equivalent advertising space rate value of $212,624. Coverage included an eight-page lift out in the Newcastle Herald populated by six press releases on the line up of events. Two photographers covered the Anzac day dawn service at Nobbys, with a Facebook post of the crowd reaching 10,500 people thanks to 510 likes and 50 shares and similar numbers when ABC Newcastle used the shot for its Facebook page.

C&E also supported the announcement of the organisation redesign, with external and internal communications, including video, social, web and intranet updates, and organised a media event to promote a record $560,000 grants and sponsorship program for 2018.

The C&E team organised and executed an activation at the 2018 Supercars Community Fun Day at Civic Park, driving Council’s Facebook following and promoting the “Dream Big” campaign and broader positive messaging.
COMMUNICATIONS & ENGAGEMENT

We provided marketing and communications to promote:

- **Beresfield and Carrington local centre renewal**: Communication and engagement support during construction phase.
- **Patrick Street, Merewether, road and drainage renewal**: Communications support to inform residents of the planned construction work.
- **Frederick Street, Merewether, road and drainage renewal**: Continued communications to keep residents impacted by the project informed.
- **Cycleways education and promotions** (part of the Cycleways priority project): Ongoing communications support.
- **Household Chemical Cleanout**: Promotion of event on 14 April which enables residents to drop off waste such as paint cans.
- **Wet weather sportsground info**: Communications support to promote the launch of the wet weather page on Council’s website. This includes information and a guide for Council staff and sportsground licensees who use a new app as part of this initiative.
- **Natural Connections program**: Communications planning for environmental education activities scheduled for June.
- **Organisation redesign**: Communications planning for announcement of new structure including appointment of directors for Art Gallery and Museum.
- **Event promotions**: Announcement of winners of Smorgasboard photo competition.
- **2018 Grants & Sponsorship Program**: Communications support throughout April to launch and promote.
- **Supercars Community Fun Day**: Promotion and marquee at event.
- **Blackbutt Reserve snake naming contest**: Announcement of winners.
- **Wat St works**: Doorknocking and collateral delivered along Watt Street regarding the installation of pavers to improve visual amenity.

Our community were involved and provided feedback on:

- **East End Street Scape Stage one public exhibition**: 81 contributions via geomapping tool.
- **Newcastle After Dark public exhibition**: 19 contributions via geomapping tool.
- **Beresfield library users survey**: Online survey to determine preferences for various aspects of service provision at Beresfield library.

We updated our community on these infrastructure projects:

- **Newcastle City Hall restoration project**
- **Kotara Park upgrades to amenities**
- **Stockton laneways drainage renewal**
- **Changes to the Development Control Plan and associated technical manual for private tree removal applications**
- **Memorial tree program at Wallsend Cemetery**
- **Stewart Park (Croudace Rd) stormwater improvement project**
- **Corlette Street, The Junction, drainage improvement project**

Key design projects:

- **Seniors Directory**: Successful launch of 52 page document to promote facilities and activities for seniors in Newcastle.
- **Community Strategic Plan**: Creation of infographics, flyers and at a glance document to highlight the key findings of the community engagement undertaken to develop the plan.
COMMUNICATIONS & ENGAGEMENT

449 media items relating to Newcastle City Council during April 2018

MEDIA HOT TOPICS

ANZAC DAY 2018
Program of events, park and ride, and young buglers

NEW COUNCIL DESIGN
Announcement of new Council organisational design

RECORD GRANTS AND SPONSORSHIPS
on offer in 2018

SOCIAL MEDIA IN APRIL

TOTAL FOLLOWERS ACROSS ALL CHANNELS
24,262 INCREASED BY 451

TOTAL LIKES ACROSS ALL CHANNELS
5,246

TOTAL COMMENTS ACROSS ALL CHANNELS
744

SENTIMENT

57% NEUTRAL
25% POSITIVE
18% NEGATIVE
ORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING
22 MAY 2018
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QUARTERLY BUDGET REVIEW STATEMENT - MARCH 2018
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## Income and Expenses Budget Review Statement

**Result for the financial quarter ending 31 March 2018**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B Revised September 2017</th>
<th>C Revised December 2017</th>
<th>D Recommended March 2018</th>
<th>E Projected year end result 2017/18</th>
<th>F Actual YTD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full Year Adopted Budget</strong></td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income from Continuing Operations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rates &amp; charges</td>
<td>155,366</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>156,106</td>
<td>116,489</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User charges &amp; fees</td>
<td>71,297</td>
<td>2,901</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>82,433</td>
<td>62,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>8,973</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>(99)</td>
<td>9,143</td>
<td>6,930</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other operating revenues</td>
<td>8,638</td>
<td>(44)</td>
<td>1,823</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>10,915</td>
<td>8,839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants &amp; contributions - Operating</td>
<td>15,936</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>(71)</td>
<td>(185)</td>
<td>15,905</td>
<td>8,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants &amp; contributions - Capital</td>
<td>11,855</td>
<td>4,224</td>
<td>2,759</td>
<td>4,555</td>
<td>23,393</td>
<td>14,861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Income from Continuing Operations</strong></td>
<td>272,065</td>
<td>12,210</td>
<td>8,352</td>
<td>5,268</td>
<td>297,895</td>
<td>218,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenses from Continuing Operations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee costs</td>
<td>99,802</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>(4,770)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>96,892</td>
<td>71,535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowing costs</td>
<td>3,764</td>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>3,742</td>
<td>2,779</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; contracts</td>
<td>57,769</td>
<td>14,922</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>76,162</td>
<td>56,491</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation &amp; amortisation</td>
<td>41,435</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>41,431</td>
<td>30,363</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other operating expenses</td>
<td>48,334</td>
<td>4,042</td>
<td>(2,635)</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>49,814</td>
<td>38,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Loss from disposal of assets</td>
<td>4,301</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1,663</td>
<td>6,029</td>
<td>4,522</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenses from Continuing Operations</strong></td>
<td>255,405</td>
<td>7,893</td>
<td>10,480</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>274,070</td>
<td>204,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating result from continuing operations</strong></td>
<td>16,660</td>
<td>4,317</td>
<td>(2,128)</td>
<td>4,976</td>
<td>23,825</td>
<td>13,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net operating result before capital items</strong></td>
<td>4,805</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>(4,887)</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>(1,021)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating Performance</strong></td>
<td>9,106</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>(3,224)</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>6,461</td>
<td>3,501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating Performance Ratio</strong></td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>-58%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes to the Income and Expenses Budget Review Statement

A - Adopted Budget - These figures are from the 2017/18 Operational Plan. This representation is in accordance with Local Government Code of Accounting Practice and Financial Reporting guidelines.

B & C - Revised September and December Quarterly Reviews - These figures represent variations approved by Council in prior reviews.

D - Recommended Changes for Council Resolution - This is the result of the organisational review of actual and the re-forecast of budgets.

E - Projected Year End Result - This figure has been derived by adding column A, B, C and D together. This figure reflects the current forecast result as at 30 June 2018.

F - Actual Year to Date Result - Actual operational income and expenditure as at 31 March 2018.
## Income Statement Variations

**Result for the financial quarter ending 31 March 2018**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Var ($’000)</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rates and charges</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User charges &amp; fees</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>Parking - $0.4m; It is forecast that the Council will generate higher than budgeted revenue through On-Street parking meters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>(99)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other operating revenues</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>Fine revenue - $0.7m; Higher than budgeted revenue through parking compliance fines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants &amp; contributions - Operating</td>
<td>(185)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Income from Continuing Operations</strong></td>
<td>713</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee costs</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowing costs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; contracts</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>General Materials; Minor increase in materials required to deliver services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation &amp; Amortisation</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other operating expenses</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Loss from disposal of assets</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenses from Continuing Operations</strong></td>
<td>292</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2017/18 Budget - Newcastle City Council

#### For the quarter ending 31 March 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Operating Revenue</th>
<th>Operating Expenses</th>
<th>Total Operating Revenue Less Operating Expenditure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>December</td>
<td>March</td>
<td>December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating Revenue</strong></td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Rates &amp; charges</td>
<td>1,209</td>
<td>1,209</td>
<td>134,103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. User charges &amp; fees</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>8,071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Other operating revenues</td>
<td>5,614</td>
<td>5,614</td>
<td>4,344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Grants &amp; contributions - Operating</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>102,068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating Revenue</strong></td>
<td>226,616</td>
<td>226,616</td>
<td>226,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating Expenses</strong></td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Employee costs</td>
<td>13,790</td>
<td>13,260</td>
<td>24,298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Borrowing costs</td>
<td>3,507</td>
<td>3,507</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Materials &amp; contracts</td>
<td>5,245</td>
<td>5,086</td>
<td>13,187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Depreciation &amp; amortisation</td>
<td>1,090</td>
<td>1,090</td>
<td>5,046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Other operating expenses</td>
<td>1,423</td>
<td>1,423</td>
<td>4,316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Internal charges</td>
<td>(17,473)</td>
<td>(17,447)</td>
<td>15,172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating Expenses</strong></td>
<td>3,055</td>
<td>3,055</td>
<td>12,268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating Revenue Less Operating Expenses</strong></td>
<td>203,561</td>
<td>203,561</td>
<td>203,561</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Var ($) Var(%)**

**Var (%)**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Executive</th>
<th>CEO Office</th>
<th>Information Tech.</th>
<th>Human Resources</th>
<th>Communications</th>
<th>Executive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revised</td>
<td>Revised</td>
<td>Revised</td>
<td>Revised</td>
<td>Revised</td>
<td>Revised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>March</td>
<td>December</td>
<td>March</td>
<td>December</td>
<td>March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Var ($)</th>
<th>Var(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Var ($) | Var(%) |

### Operating Revenue
1. Rates & charges
2. User charges & fees
3. Interest
4. Other operating revenues
5. Grants & contributions - Operating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Var ($)</th>
<th>Var(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Operating Revenue</th>
<th>479</th>
<th>485</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Operating Expenses
6. Employee costs
7. Borrowing costs
8. Materials & contracts
9. Depreciation & amortisation
10. Other operating expenses
11. Net loss from disposal of
12. Internal Charges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Var ($)</th>
<th>Var(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Operating Expenses</th>
<th>187</th>
<th>504</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Operating Revenue Less Operating Expenditure</th>
<th>(187)</th>
<th>(504)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

For the quarter ending 31 March 2018

CEO Office Information Tech. Human Resources Communications Executive
### Planning & Regulatory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Director Recommended</th>
<th>Development &amp; Build Recommended</th>
<th>Strategic Planning Recommended</th>
<th>Regulatory Services Recommended</th>
<th>Cultural Facilities Recommended</th>
<th>Libraries Recommended</th>
<th>For the quarter ending 31 March 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>December</td>
<td>March</td>
<td>December</td>
<td>March</td>
<td>December</td>
<td>March</td>
<td>December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Rates &amp; charges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 User charges &amp; fees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Interest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Other operating revenues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Grants &amp; contributions - Operating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Operating Revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Employee costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Borrowing costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Materials &amp; contracts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Depreciation &amp; amortisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Other operating expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Net loss from disposal of assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Charges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Operating Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Operating Revenue Less Operating Expenditure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Var ($)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Var(%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>December</td>
<td>March</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Revenue</td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Rates &amp; charges</td>
<td>134,093</td>
<td>134,093</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 User charges &amp; fees</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>450</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Interest</td>
<td>8,922</td>
<td>8,823</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Other operating revenues</td>
<td>1,462</td>
<td>1,401</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Grants &amp; contributions</td>
<td>11,250</td>
<td>11,251</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operating</td>
<td>Operating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>156,131</td>
<td>156,018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5,788</td>
<td>5,971</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>363</td>
<td>286</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>77</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>162,359</td>
<td>162,355</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Employee costs</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>391</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Borrowing costs</td>
<td>3,448</td>
<td>3,448</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Materials &amp; contracts</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Depreciation &amp; amortisation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Other operating expenses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Net loss from disposal of</td>
<td>(551)</td>
<td>(551)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Internal Charges</td>
<td>(5,884)</td>
<td>(5,912)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,507</td>
<td>1,509</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4,197)</td>
<td>(4,101)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5,738)</td>
<td>(5,738)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(14,863)</td>
<td>(14,788)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(405)</td>
<td>(405)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(138)</td>
<td>(127)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6,834</td>
<td>6,877</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5,181</td>
<td>5,440</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>413</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(172)</td>
<td>(387)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11,785</td>
<td>12,216</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>431</td>
<td>481</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Operating Revenue Less</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenditure</td>
<td>140,297</td>
<td>149,141</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>607</td>
<td>531</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>283</td>
<td>(127)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>249</td>
<td>467</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>150,574</td>
<td>150,139</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(435)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td>Infrastructure Planning</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td>Civil Works</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>December</td>
<td>March</td>
<td>December</td>
<td>March</td>
<td>December</td>
<td>March</td>
<td>December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Rates &amp; charges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 User charges &amp; fees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Interest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Other operating revenues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Grants &amp; contributions -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Operating Revenue</td>
<td>2,936</td>
<td>2,912</td>
<td>6,671</td>
<td>6,798</td>
<td>2,182</td>
<td>2,187</td>
<td>59,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Employee costs</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>8,091</td>
<td>7,583</td>
<td>1,266</td>
<td>1,228</td>
<td>14,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Borrowing costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Materials &amp; contracts</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>28,612</td>
<td>22,409</td>
<td>2,794</td>
<td>4,066</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Depreciation &amp; amortisation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20,657</td>
<td>20,659</td>
<td>4,471</td>
<td>4,478</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Other operating expenses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,005</td>
<td>6,179</td>
<td>956</td>
<td>1,076</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Net loss from disposal of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Internal Charges</td>
<td>(475)</td>
<td>(475)</td>
<td>4,971</td>
<td>4,285</td>
<td>8,723</td>
<td>8,781</td>
<td>795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Operating Expenses</td>
<td>(76)</td>
<td>(49)</td>
<td>73,443</td>
<td>68,627</td>
<td>30,737</td>
<td>32,778</td>
<td>3,109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Operating Revenue Less</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>(70,507)</td>
<td>(65,715)</td>
<td>(24,066)</td>
<td>(25,980)</td>
<td>(3,091)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenditure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Capital Budget Review Statement

Result for the financial quarter ending 31 March 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Year</td>
<td>Revised</td>
<td>Revised</td>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td>Projected year</td>
<td>Actual YTD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopted Budget $’000</td>
<td>September 2017 $’000</td>
<td>December 2017 $’000</td>
<td>March 2018 $’000</td>
<td>end result 2017/18 $’000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,805</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>(4,887)</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>(1,021)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Capital Revenues

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11,855</td>
<td>Grants &amp; contributions - Capital</td>
<td>4,224</td>
<td>2,759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,548</td>
<td>Proceeds from the sale of Assets</td>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>2,526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>14,403</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total Capital Income</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,224</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,737</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Adjustments for Non Cash Items

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41,435</td>
<td>Add back Depreciation</td>
<td>(13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,301</td>
<td>Add back loss on Disposal</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4,600)</td>
<td>Less land &amp; infrastructure donations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>60,344</strong></td>
<td><strong>Funding available for capital expenditure</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,369</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Capital Expenses

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38,199</td>
<td>Asset renewals</td>
<td>(2,654)</td>
<td>(12,903)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,375</td>
<td>2012 SRV Priority Projects</td>
<td>1,033</td>
<td>5,726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13,835</td>
<td>New / upgrade</td>
<td>(4,521)</td>
<td>(1,821)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9,262</td>
<td>Non-Infrastructure Projects</td>
<td>3,615</td>
<td>(2,200)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>68,671</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total Capital Spend</strong></td>
<td><strong>(2,527)</strong></td>
<td><strong>(11,198)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Notes to the Capital Budget Review Statement

See Income and Expense Statement (Page 2)
## Works Program Summary

For the financial quarter ending 31 March 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adopted Budget $'000</th>
<th>Portfolio/Program</th>
<th>Revised September 2017 $'000</th>
<th>Revised December 2017 $'000</th>
<th>Recommended March 2018 $'000</th>
<th>Projected year end result 2017/18 $'000</th>
<th>Actual YTD $'000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27,279</td>
<td>Buildings, Structures and Places</td>
<td>(2,434)</td>
<td>4,843</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>30,120</td>
<td>23,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aquatic Centres</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>(25)</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blackbutt Reserve</td>
<td>(126)</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>(83)</td>
<td>2,179</td>
<td>912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Buildings - Council Support Services</td>
<td>(680)</td>
<td>1,795</td>
<td>(333)</td>
<td>2,470</td>
<td>1,934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caravans and Commercial Properties</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>(35)</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City Centre Revitalisation</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(309)</td>
<td>1,278</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coastal Revitalisation</td>
<td>(2,651)</td>
<td>6,573</td>
<td>1,867</td>
<td>13,254</td>
<td>11,129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Buildings</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>(504)</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1,026</td>
<td>824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural Facilities</td>
<td>(328)</td>
<td>1,471</td>
<td>(287)</td>
<td>3,736</td>
<td>2,249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1,375</td>
<td>1,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coastal Revitalisation</td>
<td>(2,651)</td>
<td>6,573</td>
<td>1,867</td>
<td>13,254</td>
<td>11,129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Buildings</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>(504)</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1,026</td>
<td>824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural Facilities</td>
<td>(328)</td>
<td>1,471</td>
<td>(287)</td>
<td>3,736</td>
<td>2,249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1,375</td>
<td>1,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Toilets</td>
<td>(500)</td>
<td>(574)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retaining Walls</td>
<td>(156)</td>
<td>(1,189)</td>
<td>(752)</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>1,666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roads</td>
<td>3,254</td>
<td>3,991</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>28,103</td>
<td>25,317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bridges</td>
<td>(300)</td>
<td>(55)</td>
<td>(190)</td>
<td>1,680</td>
<td>1,076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Footpaths</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>(1,189)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,574</td>
<td>1,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Road Furniture</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>(506)</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Road Rehabilitation</td>
<td>2,922</td>
<td>(2,757)</td>
<td>(647)</td>
<td>11,144</td>
<td>9,359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Road Resurfacing</td>
<td>(346)</td>
<td>8,498</td>
<td>1,588</td>
<td>12,790</td>
<td>13,126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>(261)</td>
<td>(1,216)</td>
<td>(205)</td>
<td>5,419</td>
<td>3,007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cycleways</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>(808)</td>
<td>(240)</td>
<td>1,906</td>
<td>1,183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local Area Traffic Management</td>
<td>(27)</td>
<td>(460)</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parking Infrastructure</td>
<td>1,711</td>
<td>(2,631)</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pedestrian Access and Mobility Plan</td>
<td>(2,332)</td>
<td>2,683</td>
<td>(45)</td>
<td>2,963</td>
<td>1,784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stormwater System</td>
<td>(1,694)</td>
<td>(1,701)</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>7,399</td>
<td>3,355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>(1,034)</td>
<td>(5,464)</td>
<td>(97)</td>
<td>8,020</td>
<td>3,877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bushland and Watercourses</td>
<td>1,559</td>
<td>(1,706)</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>1,028</td>
<td>576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coast, Estuary and Wetlands</td>
<td>(182)</td>
<td>(212)</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>1,739</td>
<td>1,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Street and Park Trees</td>
<td>(221)</td>
<td>(261)</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1,224</td>
<td>719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waste Management</td>
<td>(2,411)</td>
<td>(3,325)</td>
<td>(480)</td>
<td>4,029</td>
<td>1,538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>(69)</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>(195)</td>
<td>4,529</td>
<td>2,261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implementation and Upgrade of Applications</td>
<td>(1,310)</td>
<td>931</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>2,285</td>
<td>1,282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Infrastructure Improvements</td>
<td>806</td>
<td>(642)</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>1,512</td>
<td>515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic and Systems Analysis</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>(247)</td>
<td>732</td>
<td>464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic</td>
<td>1,486</td>
<td>4,887</td>
<td>(379)</td>
<td>6,994</td>
<td>2,731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Smart City</td>
<td>1,416</td>
<td>4,885</td>
<td>(352)</td>
<td>6,599</td>
<td>2,434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic Plans</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fleet Replacement</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(800)</td>
<td>3,047</td>
<td>1,988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fleet Replacement</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(800)</td>
<td>3,047</td>
<td>1,988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minor Capital</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(243)</td>
<td>(81)</td>
<td>1,221</td>
<td>895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Art Gallery Works of Art</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Library Resources</td>
<td>800</td>
<td></td>
<td>800</td>
<td></td>
<td>546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parking Meter Replacement</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small Purchases</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(243)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Works Program</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>5,249</td>
<td>(358)</td>
<td>95,492</td>
<td>66,702</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The Budget above is inclusive of operational and capital works
### Cash and Investments Budget Review Statement

**Result for the financial quarter ending 31 March 2018**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unrestricted (Available Cash)</th>
<th>34,677</th>
<th>(928)</th>
<th>(3,196)</th>
<th>30,553</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### External Restrictions

**Included in Liabilities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2017/18 (000's)</th>
<th>2018/19 (000's)</th>
<th>2019/20 (000's)</th>
<th>2020/21 (000's)</th>
<th>2021/22 (000's)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bequests, bonds and rententions</td>
<td>1,298</td>
<td>1,298</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Insurance Claims</td>
<td>4,420</td>
<td>4,420</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer Contributions - s94</td>
<td>24,626</td>
<td>4,502</td>
<td>(356)</td>
<td>1,998</td>
<td>30,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific purpose unexpended grants</td>
<td>6,470</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Management</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,970</td>
<td>(1,970)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic waste management</td>
<td>10,577</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10,577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Gallery - bequests and donations</td>
<td>1,693</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business improvement associations</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>(1,100)</td>
<td>610</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coast and estuary crown land</td>
<td>559</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>559</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rawson crown land</td>
<td>1,716</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,716</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special rate variation - priority projects</td>
<td>6,591</td>
<td>5,524</td>
<td>(12,115)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building better cities</td>
<td>3,116</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,116</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions to specific works programs</td>
<td>915</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>915</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superannuation - defined benefits</td>
<td>3,645</td>
<td></td>
<td>(1,800)</td>
<td>1,845</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Externally restricted</strong></td>
<td>66,236</td>
<td>13,096</td>
<td>(17,341)</td>
<td>1,998</td>
<td>63,989</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Internal Restrictions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2017/18 (000's)</th>
<th>2018/19 (000's)</th>
<th>2019/20 (000's)</th>
<th>2020/21 (000's)</th>
<th>2021/22 (000's)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Replacement of plant and equipment</td>
<td>15,120</td>
<td>6,655</td>
<td>(5,149)</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>17,426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee leave entitlement</td>
<td>17,180</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land and Property</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition/Enhancement</td>
<td>83,273</td>
<td>2,548</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>85,821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asset preservation</td>
<td>95,997</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>109,892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to specific works programs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle Airport Limited</td>
<td>13,845</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13,845</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quadrennial council elections</td>
<td>800</td>
<td></td>
<td>(800)</td>
<td></td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 355 committees</td>
<td>799</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>799</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works carried forward</td>
<td>5,778</td>
<td></td>
<td>(5,778)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Internally restricted</strong></td>
<td>232,792</td>
<td>23,298</td>
<td>(11,727)</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>245,163</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Total Restricted

**Total Restricted**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opening Balance in Note 6c 1/07/2017 (000's)</th>
<th>Transfers to 2017/18 (000's)</th>
<th>Transfers from 2017/18 (000's)</th>
<th>Recommended Changes for Council Resolution (000's)</th>
<th>Closing Balance in Note 6c 30/06/2018 (000's)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>232,792</td>
<td>23,298</td>
<td>(11,727)</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>245,163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299,028</td>
<td>36,394</td>
<td>(29,068)</td>
<td>2,798</td>
<td>309,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>333,705</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>339,705</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Contracts
(quarter ended 31 March 2018)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contractor</th>
<th>Contract Detail</th>
<th>Contract Value</th>
<th>Commencement Date</th>
<th>Estimated Completion</th>
<th>Budgeted (Y/N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EMC Lendlease Joint Venture</td>
<td>Summerhill Solar Farm - Design &amp; Construct Contract</td>
<td>$7,915,415</td>
<td>7/02/2018</td>
<td>Nov-18</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITS Pipe tech Pty Ltd</td>
<td>Citywide Trenchless Technology Rehabilitation Works 2018</td>
<td>$446,699</td>
<td>30/03/2018</td>
<td>May-18</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eire Constructions Pty Ltd</td>
<td>Watermain Reconstruction - Frederick Street, Merewether</td>
<td>$324,392</td>
<td>28/03/2018</td>
<td>Jun-18</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Narrowband Network Communications Pty Ltd</td>
<td>Low Power Wide Area Network (LPWAN) - Supply and Install</td>
<td>$244,000</td>
<td>8/02/2018</td>
<td>Feb-21</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHD Pty Ltd</td>
<td>Liner Design Stage 2 - SWMC Cell 9</td>
<td>$144,503</td>
<td>17/01/2018</td>
<td>Jun-18</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warner Company</td>
<td>City Road Merewether Slope Stabilisation</td>
<td>$78,750</td>
<td>19/03/2018</td>
<td>Jun-18</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calder Consultants Pty Ltd</td>
<td>Workplace Design Strategy</td>
<td>$78,513</td>
<td>8/03/2018</td>
<td>Jul-18</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northrop Consulting Engineers</td>
<td>Engineering Design - Stockton Local Centre</td>
<td>$60,504</td>
<td>26/02/2018</td>
<td>Jul-18</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
1. Minimum reporting level is 1% of estimated income from continuing operations or $50,000 whichever is the lesser.
2. Contracts to be listed are those entered into during the quarter and have yet to be fully performed, excluding contractors that are on Council’s preferred suppliers list.
3. Contracts for employment are not required to be included.
4. Where a contract for services etc was not included in the budget, an explanation is to be given (or reference made to an explanation in another Budget Review Statement).
## Consultancy & Legal Expenses
### (quarter ended 31 March 2018)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expense</th>
<th>Expenditure YTD $</th>
<th>Budgeted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consultancies</td>
<td>$4,599,155</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Fees</td>
<td>$320,805</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes:
1. A consultant is a person or organisation engaged under contract on a temporary basis to provide recommendations or high level specialist or professional advice to assist decision-making by management. Generally it is the advisory nature of the work that differentiates a consultant from other contractors.

2. Where any expenses for consultancy or legal fees (including Code of Conduct expenses) have not been budgeted for, an explanation is to be given. Report on external expenses only (not internal expenses).
CITY OF NEWCASTLE

Report by Responsible Accounting Officer for the quarter ending 31 March 2018

The following statement is made in accordance with Clause 203(2) of the Local Government (General) Regulations 2005.

It is my opinion that the Quarterly Budget Review Statement for Newcastle City Council for the quarter ended 31 March 2018 indicated that Council’s projected financial position at 30 June 2018 will be satisfactory at year end, having regard to the projected estimates of income and expenditure and the original budgeted income and expenditure.

Signed: ___________________________ Date: 7/5/18

Name

Responsible Accounting Officer, City of Newcastle
CCL 22/05/18
PUBLIC EXHIBITION OF DRAFT DOGS IN OPEN SPACES STRATEGY

Attachment A: Draft Newcastle City Council Dogs in Open Spaces Strategy
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Dogs are a priority for Newcastle with 44,309 registered dogs across 31,904 households (as at 2016). This has been confirmed by the community interest in the Dogs in Open Spaces Strategy with 1,076 survey respondents and over 300 interviews and written submissions. People are very passionate about their dogs, with many people considering dogs to be part of their family or valued companions, and they wish to have places for their dogs to run free.

The Dogs in Open Spaces Strategy will guide the provision, improvement and management of dog off leash areas over the next 10 years. This includes the development of some strategically located fenced dog parks.

The Strategy is based on 5 Themes including:
- Dog Off Leash Provision
- Fenced Dog Park Opportunities
- Enhancing Existing Off Leash Areas
- Managing Dogs in Public Places
- Community Education and Information

Strategies are provided for each Theme and specific directions are included for each existing and potential dog off leash area. Overriding principles relating to ‘Provision and Location’ and ‘Design and Management’ are also provided.

The recommended directions are mapped on the following page and detailed in the report. The priority actions identified in the Strategy are:
1. Establish additional dog off leash areas where provision is lacking.
2. Provide some fenced dog parks at key locations.
3. Enhance existing off leash areas.
4. Provide community education and information on responsibilities for dogs in public places.

The main items addressed in the Strategy are summarised below.

Provision
Whilst Newcastle currently has 17 dog off leash areas, there is a gap in provision in the central, southern and far western areas. Opportunities for additional off leash areas are considered.

Fenced Dog Parks
Currently there are no fenced dog parks in Newcastle and the community has highlighted a strong demand for some facilities. Suggestions for potential fenced dog parks are provided, including at Lambton Park, Carrington Foreshore (Honeysuckle Reserve), Maryland Drive Reserve (including to also cater for small dogs and puppies), O’Connell Reserve and potentially in the longer term Acacia Avenue Reserve. In addition, part fencing of Islington Park is suggested to improve the safety of dogs.

Design and Function
There is a need to improve the appeal and function of a number of the existing dog off leash areas. This includes better defining off leash areas, reviewing the space allocated at some sites and improving infrastructure and landscapes (shade, seating, shelter, drinking water for dogs, bins).

Sportsground Use
The Strategy recommends that dogs should remain on leash at sportsgrounds. Dogs have the potential to impact on the quality of field surfaces, there are safety issues associated with dogs around children and adults playing sport and some people do not pick up after their dogs which raises health concerns. This has been highlighted through community engagement as well as industry information.

Nature and Beaches
The natural environment requires protection and this raises questions about the appropriate use of some existing off leash sites. Whilst the community is keen to have access to additional beaches, the opportunities are limited. However, timed use of Stockton Beach could be an option.

Community Awareness and Education
The community and dog interest groups have identified the need for increased management of dogs through community education and awareness. Some people do not pick up after their dog and there are issues with dog behaviour management. An awareness and education program that includes information, signage, training opportunities in partnership with interest groups and the promotion of key messages would benefit the community and Council.
Recommended Dog Off Leash Site Directions

LEGEND

- Council Boundary
- Ward Boundary
- Open Space

Recommended Site Directions

- Existing Dog Off Leash with No Change
- Retain as Off Leash with Modifications
- Existing Off Leash with Potential to Fence
- Potential New Fenced Dog Park
- Retain Beach Off Leash Area
- Potential New Beach Off Leash Area
- Potential New Off Leash Not Fenced
- Review Off Leash Function
1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Why have dog off leash areas?

National surveys have found that an increasing number of people consider their dogs to be ‘part of the family’ and ‘walking the dog’ is a key recreation activity. Dogs provide companionship, a reason to exercise and for some people a reason to live.

In 2016, Newcastle had 31,904 households with 44,309 registered dogs (based on the NSW Companion Animals Register and sourced by Council). This represents 51.2% of households and 28.5 dogs per 100 people compared to 38% and 19 dogs per 100 people for NSW as a whole.

Young people and families with children are more likely to own a dog and this is a likely reason for dog ownership being high in Newcastle. Dog ownership is even greater in Lake Macquarie and Cessnock where there are even larger numbers of families.

Dogs are also important companions for older people and people living alone as they give people a reason to walk and socialise with other people, which contributes to the health and well-being of these groups in the community.

Formalised dog off leash areas enable people to take their dogs to a place where dogs can legally run free, exert energy and socialise with other dogs. Dog off leash areas also provide people with a meeting place and an opportunity to connect with others in the community.

Dog off leash areas are justified in Newcastle due to the large number of dogs, the importance of dogs to people and the benefits of dog off leash areas. The NSW Companion Animals Act 1998 states that “....there must at all times be at least one public place in the area of a local authority that is an off leash area”.

1.2 The value of the Strategy

The Dogs in Open Spaces Strategy will guide the future provision, development and management of dog off leash areas in Newcastle over the next 10 years. It will ensure there is an appropriate provision of off leash areas, whilst minimising impacts on public open space and surrounding residents.

The Strategy considers the needs of communities across the City and aims to address gaps in provision and improve the quality and function of existing dog off leash areas. The Strategy also provides a direction on the future provision of some fenced off leash dog parks and identifies specific site opportunities.

The Dogs in Open Spaces Strategy will contribute to achieving broader Council directions included in the Newcastle Community Strategic Plan: Newcastle 2030 and the City of Newcastle Parkland and Recreation Strategy, as well as other plans.

The City of Newcastle Parkland and Recreation Strategy specifically recommends the need to “Review existing and investigate the establishment of additional dog leash free areas” (Action 1.18).

The Strategy will benefit people who do not own a dog as much as dog owners as it will increase the clarity regarding off leash areas, define areas that should not be off leash and encourage responsible behaviour by dog owners.

Consultations undertaken as part of the Dogs in Open Spaces Strategy have highlighted community concerns regarding dog behaviour and a lack of responsible dog management in public places by some people. The Strategy aims to address this issue and other community concerns in addition to the provision of off leash areas.

The Strategy will contribute to recognising and achieving the sections of the NSW Companion Animals Act 1998 that relate to open space and public places.
1.3 What the Strategy has involved

A consultative approach has been adopted in developing the Dogs in Open Spaces Strategy. This includes:

- An on-line survey to Council's community reference panel, Newcastle Voice and members of the wider community, with 1,076 respondents. 34% of these respondents did not own a dog.
- On-site interviews of 143 people across four sites including Islington Park, Dixon Park, Upper Reserve and Ballast Ground at Stockton.
- Targeted planning sessions with community interest groups including dog trainers and other service providers, parks committee representatives and sporting groups.
- Council staff attendance and an additional 122 community interviews as part of 'Pups in the Park' at Lambton Park.
- Submissions received from 42 interested residents expressing concerns and suggestions.
- Planning sessions with an across Council working group representing parks management, community services, strategic planning, the natural environment and communications.
- Community engagement with interest groups and community members as part of the public exhibition period of the Draft Strategy.

In addition, the study involved:

- A review of mapping, aerials, data and information (use of Council and Nearmap mapping, desk top research).
- Consideration of other planning and industry approaches (Appendix A).
- Site visits to all existing dog off leash areas and potential off leash sites. A map of the existing sites is provided on the following page.
- A strategic analysis of the sites and options (Appendix B).
- A strategic analysis of the needs and findings.
- Development of the Draft and Final Strategy reports.

The findings of the consultations, the site analysis and other relevant information is provided as supporting information in Section 6, as well as in the Appendices. A consultation report developed by Council is included in Appendix C.
Existing Dog Off Leash Areas
2 DOG OFF LEASH PRINCIPLES

2.1 Provision and location

Key principles to guide the provision and location of dog off leash areas are below.

1. Dog off leash areas will be provided across Newcastle, using 1 dog off leash area per 20,000 people as a guide for Wards and suburbs.

2. Some fenced off leash dog parks will be provided in Newcastle, with potentially one fenced dog park in each Council Ward.

3. Dog off leash areas will be located on publicly accessible open space, including Council owned and Crown land.

4. Dog off leash areas will not be located adjacent to high traffic roadways to ensure the safety of dogs and people.

5. Sportsgrounds and playing fields will be designated as on leash due to the potential impacts on playing surfaces and conflicts of use.

6. Sites with high natural value, including sites with endangered ecological communities, will be designated as on leash or dogs prohibited.

7. The site suitability criteria on the following page will be used to determine the location of new off leash areas and review sites that could be less suitable.

8. The requirements of the NSW Companion Animal Act regarding ‘dogs prohibited in some public places’ must be adhered to including relating to:

9. Playgrounds and play spaces (within 10 metres)
   - Food preparation areas for humans (within 10 metres)
   - Recreation and sport areas defined as prohibited by the local authority
   - Places used for bathing (including beaches) defined as prohibited by the local authority
   - Places set aside by the local authority for the protection of wildlife

2.2 Design and management

Key dog off leash design and management principles are below.

1. Dog off leash areas in Newcastle will be at least 0.3ha in size and fenced dog parks should be at least 0.5ha.

2. Dog off leash areas will be well defined, clearly mapped and sign posted to avoid any confusion of the off leash area within a public place.

3. Dog off leash areas will be of a quality that will sustain use by dogs, including sound and functional surface, infrastructure and landscaping.

4. The design of dog off leash areas will reflect the Newcastle City Council Disability Inclusion Action Plan and universal design principles to support a range of age groups and abilities.

5. There will be an adequate provision of basic infrastructure at all dog off leash areas including bins, drinking water for dogs and natural shade. The NSW Companion Animal Act requires an adequate provision of bins suitable for the disposal of faeces at all dog off leash areas.

6. Fenced dog parks will incorporate features that contribute to a safe and appealing environment for dogs and owners, such as bins, drinking water for dogs, natural shade, double gates, shelter, seating and mounds and landscape features that support dogs to investigate spaces. Picnic settings (eating areas) and children’s play will not be provided.

7. Perimeter fencing around a fenced dog park should be safe for dogs and consistent with current industry approaches and CPTED principles (permeability, passive surveillance). The design and height of a fence should be determined in consultation with potential users and complement the site character.

8. Where dogs are prohibited or required to be on leash in a reserve, beach or high profile public place, this will be clearly sign posted and promoted.

9. Community awareness and education will be undertaken to encourage positive dog behaviour and increase dog owners’ sense of responsibility.
### Dog Off Leash Site Suitability Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Profile and Access</td>
<td>The site should be central to the population, accessible to vehicles and pedestrians and be easily seen and known by the community. However, dogs off leash may not be appropriate at high profile sites (due to potential impacts on the site character or other users).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Size</td>
<td>The area available for dogs off leash must be at least 0.3ha in size and the whole site should be at least double this size to allow for other uses, support infrastructure and landscaping.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Character Suitability</td>
<td>The site must be public open space with an open reserve or park character. The site must not be a sportsground or a natural area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impacts on People</td>
<td>Potential impacts on residents and other reserve users must be minimal, including no risk to children and adults playing sport, walking and cycling, using a play space or pursuing other recreation activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impacts on Site Character</td>
<td>The visual appeal, landscape or function of the reserve must not be impacted on by the dedication of an off leash area or the inclusion of a fenced dog park. This includes ensuring any potential future enhancements to a reserve for recreation, sport or linear connections are not affected by a dog off leash area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impacts on Natural Environment</td>
<td>Sensitive natural environments should not be impacted on. This includes sites with high biodiversity and environmentally sensitive natural watercourses, wetlands and coastal vegetation, endangered ecological communities and threatened species habitat.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3 THE STRATEGIES

Strategies have been developed for 5 Themes that collectively respond to community needs and the findings of the Dogs in Open Spaces Strategy. The Themes include:

1. Dog Off Leash Provision
2. Fenced Dog Park Opportunities
3. Enhancing Existing Off Leash Areas
4. Managing Dogs in Public Places
5. Community Education and Information

This section outlines strategies for each Theme to address specific needs and issues. A rationale is provided for each strategy.

An Action Plan that lists potential capital works and related priorities is provided in section 5.
## 3.1 Dog off leash provision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy Focus</th>
<th>Strategy Details</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.1 New Off Leash in Gap Areas | Establish some new dog off leash areas in those areas that are lacking provision and particularly in the central and southern parts of Newcastle. Potential options for additional off leash areas include:  
- Lambton Park, Lambton  
- O’Connell Reserve, Adamstown  
- Mayo Street Reserve, Jesmond  
- Brickworks Park, Elermore Vale  
- Warabrook Wetlands, Warabrook  
- Bull and Tourle Streets Reserve, Mayfield  
- Other reserves linked to new development areas (e.g. the western corridor as development occurs) | The areas of Lambton, New Lambton, Adamstown Mayfield and Warabrook are particularly lacking in opportunities for dogs off leash.  
Residents around Lambton have expressed demand for a dog park and Adamstown residents are dissatisfied with the existing provision at West End Park. |
| 1.2 Infrastructure Provision | Establish good support infrastructure in existing and new dog off leash areas including:  
- Trees for shade and landscaping in all off leash areas  
- Pathway connections to all off leash areas  
- Bins and drinking water for dogs in all off leash areas  
- Shelter and seats in key off leash areas (includes fenced)  
- Pathways within key off leash areas (includes fenced)  
- Dog bag dispensers in fenced dog parks | There is a lack of support infrastructure in existing dog off leash areas.  
The consultations undertaken through the Dogs in Open Spaces Strategy and other research highlight that communities are seeking basic infrastructure and shade in off leash areas. |
| 1.3 Review of Existing Off Leash | Consider removing existing dog off leash areas that do not meet the Site Suitability Criteria in Section 2. This involves reviewing the provision of the following sites in consultation with the community:  
- Braye Park, North Lambton  
- King Edward Park, Cooks Hill (following an assessment of the potential impact of the activity on the ecological community by Council) | A large part of Braye Park is a natural area with potential impacts on fauna and Acacia Park is located nearby.  
The existing dog off leash area at King Edward Park is located around Themeda grassland on a coastal headland, which is determined as an endangered ecological community in accordance with the Threatened Species Conservation Act 1995. Council will need to determine if the activity ‘dogs off leash’ is likely to significantly affect the threatened species, population or ecological community’. |
| 1.4 Beaches Off Leash | Consider allowing timed off leash use of Stockton Beach at all times of the year to broaden the opportunities for people to take dogs off leash at a beach in Newcastle. | There is high community demand for additional beach areas for off leash, but limited opportunities.  
Ideally the northern part of Stockton Beach would be designated as off leash at all times. However, erosion and environmental issues limit this opportunity. Timed access to the whole beach is an alternative option. |
## 3.2 Fenced dog park opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy Focus</th>
<th>Strategy Details</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2.1 Fencing of Existing Off Leash | Consider creating fenced dog parks at the following existing off leash areas, as part of providing an initial four fenced dog parks across Newcastle:  
- Carrington Foreshore (Honeysuckle Reserve), Carrington  
- Maryland Drive Reserve, Maryland  
- Acacia Avenue Reserve, North Lambton  
(potentially as a later fenced dog park and not part of the initial four) | The identified sites are spread across Newcastle and would service different Council Wards. The sites are large, have a good profile and should have minimal impact on other reserve users or residents.  
Lambton Park (a suggested new fenced dog park), is located in the same Ward as Acacia Avenue Reserve and has greater site suitability and demand. This makes Acacia Avenue Reserve a lower priority if only four fenced dog parks can be provided. |
| 2.2 Part Fencing Needs       | Undertake part fencing where there is a need to reduce the risk of dogs running onto a road or car park but the site is not suitable for full fencing. This includes:  
- Islington Park, Islington (fence the northern end along the car park edge through to the existing canal fencing and backyard fencing to protect dogs from the road) | Islington Park does not require full fencing as most of the park is away from traffic and fencing would impact on the open and natural character of the site. However, the northern end near the car park is close to Pacific Highway and dogs can cross the canal to the Highway near the car park. |
| 2.3 New Fenced Dog Parks     | Consider establishing new fenced dog parks at the following reserves in consultation with surrounding residents and potential users:  
- Lambton Park, Lambton  
- O’Connell Reserve, Adamstown | The residents around Lambton have expressed demand for a fenced dog park.  
Ward 2 is lacking opportunities for a new fenced dog park and O’Connell Reserve could be the best option. The existing West End Park is too small and poorly located and land at the higher profile Gregson Park is limited and the park already receives high use. |
| 2.4 Puppies and Small Dogs Focus | Create at least one fenced dog park in Newcastle that provides a separate space for puppies and small dogs (separate from the larger dogs). Maryland Drive Reserve could be the best site for this due to the land area available. Acacia Avenue Reserve could also be a possibility due to the land size and central location of this site. | A desire for the separation of large and small dogs has been raised by the community as part of the study consultations.  
There are some good practice examples of separated areas for small and larger dogs around Australia that seem to work well. |
Potential Fenced Dog Parks
3.3 Enhancing existing dog off leash areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy Focus</th>
<th>Strategy Details</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Improved Site Definition</td>
<td>Better define the existing dog off leash areas through accurate site maps, pathways, landscaping and signage. This will involve replacing signs and creating paths and landscaping at some sites.</td>
<td>It is difficult to determine where many of the existing dog off leash areas are located within reserves and the boundaries need to be better defined. The site maps and GIS maps differ for a number of sites.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3.2 Re-Design Requirements | Redesign dog off leash areas that would ideally be increased or reduced in size and have a potential impact on other users or facilities. This includes:  
  - Dixon Park, Merewether (increase the off leash area to create a larger space and move dogs away from the road and at least 10m from the play and food preparation areas and define the off leash area with pathways and landscape)  
  - West End Park, Adamstown (increase the off leash area to create a larger space for dogs to run)  
  - Rawson Reserve, Stockton (reduce the off leash area to draw dogs away from the swimming pool and skate area)  
  - Ballast Ground, Stockton (reduce the off leash area if and when the playing fields are required for sport) | Boundary realignments are suggested for a number of sites for the following reasons:  
  - The dog off leash area in Dixon Park is too small and people already use a larger area. However, an expansion should not impact on other activities in the park and a 10 metre distance from the play and food preparation areas is required  
  - West End Park is too small and there is land to the north east that would enable an expansion of the off leash area  
  - The off leash area in Rawson Reserve is too close to the swimming pool and skate facility  
  - The area allowed for Ballast Ground is very large and there may be a need for additional sports fields in Newcastle |
| 3.3 Relocated Sites | Relocate the Upper Reserve, Wallsend dog off leash area to the south eastern side of Ironbark Creek (Toohrnbing) to move dogs away from the heavy traffic on Lake Road and reflect existing usage patterns. | The existing site is not used due to the traffic volume and high level of risk to dogs. Access to the site is difficult and the site is therefore only local level. As such, shifting the dog off leash area to the other side of Ironbark Creek (Toohrnbing) where most locals already take their dogs is suggested. |
### 3.4 Managing dogs in public places

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy Focus</th>
<th>Strategy Details</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **4.1 Managing Risks**          | Reduce the risks associated with dogs off leash through design, signage and information, such as:  
- Creating a barrier to the play space at Dixon Park to protect children and landscape near the road edge to deter dogs from running onto the road  
- Signage at high use areas such as Islington Park highlighting the potential behaviour patterns of fearful and aggressive dogs, and warning people to beware of taking small children to the park | Risks associated with dogs should be managed and avoided where possible. Children playing with dogs are at risk of dog bites.                                                                                      |
| **4.2 Dogs on Sports Fields**   | Establish signage at all sportgrounds and sports fields to advise the community that dogs must be on leash and to require people to pick up after their dogs. A program of community awareness, education and enforcement will be required. | There is evidence that dogs off leash have the potential to impact on the quality of a sports field including deteriorating surface quality through dogs running and digging and faeces being left on fields (which becomes a health and safety issue). Sports groups have raised concerns about the existing impact of dogs off leash on some sports fields, and particularly those that are fenced. If fields were made available for off leash, the number of dogs using the fields would increase and the impacts would be greater still. |
| **4.3 Timed Dog Off Leash Areas** | Review the appropriateness of existing timed dog off leash areas as follows:  
- Retain, implement and enforce timed use where a site has high use (e.g. Dixon Park)  
- Consider removing timed use at smaller and lower key sites where the potential impact on other users is limited (e.g. West End Park, Ellemore Vale Park and Purdue Park) | Timed use will reduce the risk of conflicts of use and should therefore be retained at Dixon Park. Where a reserve has less use, timed use may not be required. Removing timed use at smaller and quieter reserves should benefit local residents and activate these reserves. |
| **4.4 Dogs in Natural Environments** | Manage dogs to protect natural environments where required, including through the allocation of reserves as:  
- On leash where flora and fauna requires protection and any threatened species will not be impacted on if dogs are controlled on leash  
- Dogs prohibited where flora and fauna and particularly a threatened species is at risk of being impacted on if dogs are off leash or on leash | Where natural areas are significant and dogs off leash can impact on fauna and flora and site biodiversity, dogs should be on leash. Some natural sites will justify dogs being prohibited including to protect threatened species where required in accordance with the Threatened Species Conservation Act 1995. |
### 3.4 Managing dogs in public places (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy Focus</th>
<th>Strategy Details</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.5 Dog Prohibited Areas</td>
<td>Identify and define dog prohibited areas, including:</td>
<td>Existing dog prohibited areas that protect natural resources should be retained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Beaches and Conservation Areas, e.g. Blackbutt Reserve</td>
<td>If dogs could significantly affect a threatened species, population or ecological community, dogs should be prohibited. An ecological analysis of sites has not been undertaken as part of this study and specific sites will need to be determined by Council as a ‘next step’ to this Strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Sites defined as having an Endangered Ecological Communities such as <em>Themeda</em> grassland on seacliffs and coastal headlands in the NSW North Coast and where dogs could have significant impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Other natural areas that are ecologically sensitive or have high biodiversity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Playgrounds and food preparation areas in reserves</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Anzac Memorial Walk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6 Council’s Enforcement Approach</td>
<td>Continue to adopt an ‘inform and educate’ approach to the enforcement of dogs off and on leash. However, where the safety and health of other park users is at risk such as dogs near play and on sports fields, stronger enforcement may be required.</td>
<td>An ‘inform and educate’ approach is consistent with available Council resources and more likely to receive support from the community than an aggressive enforcement approach.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 3.5 Community awareness and education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy Focus</th>
<th>Strategy Details</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5.1 Community Awareness and Education Program | Develop and promote a community education and awareness program in Newcastle that provides the community with key messages and information relating to:  
- Appropriate dog behaviour and owner responsibilities to manage dogs in public places  
- Dog owner and walker health and safety responsibilities including the need to ‘pick up after dogs’  
- The promotion of on leash and dog prohibited areas  
- Dog and puppy training opportunities | Dog owners, people without dogs, dog trainers and service providers have all highlighted the need for increased community education. This is on the basis that some people in the community do not appropriately manage their dogs or pick up after their dogs.  
Increased community education has the potential to raise awareness and encourage increased ‘self-policing’ by other dog owners and residents. |
| 5.2 Signage and Regulations         | Establish and improve signage to better define off leash areas, on leash sites and dog prohibited areas. The signage should be appropriately positioned in reserves and readable (clear, bold, simple and visual). | Clear, bold and simple signage is more likely to be seen by reserve users, which should reduce the risk of conflicts and inappropriate behaviours. Visual presentation can be more effective than words. |
| 5.3 Partnerships                    | Consider partnerships for educating the community and promoting appropriate dog and owner behaviour. This could include:  
- Input to the design and development of the Community Education Program and signage by dog interest groups  
- Promotion of the Community Education Program through dog interest groups and government bodies  
- Shared development and adoption of the Community Education Program and signage by adjoining local councils  
- Free and organised programs run in parks by dog trainers that are supported by Council and other government bodies | Partnerships with dog interest groups, Local Councils and other levels of government will increase the potential outcomes aimed at addressing issues associated with dogs.  
Council is unlikely to have the resources to provide all programs and services relating to dogs. |
4 RECOMMENDED SITE DIRECTIONS

The recommended directions for existing and potential dog off leash areas are provided on the following pages. The directions relate to:

- Potential fenced dog parks
- Other dog off leash areas (not fenced)

The directions are based on site visits, aerial analysis and the findings of community engagement undertaken through the Dogs in Open Spaces Strategy.

A detailed analysis of each site is provided in Appendix B.

A map of the recommended site directions is provided on page 18.
4.1 Potential fenced dog park directions

Fence Existing Dog Off Leash Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Precinct</th>
<th>Reserve Size (ha)</th>
<th>Potential Dog Park Area</th>
<th>Recommended Site Direction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acacia Avenue Reserve</td>
<td>Waratah, North Lambton</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.0ha</td>
<td>Consider Acacia Avenue Reserve for a fenced dog park in the future due to site character and central location. Provide additional natural shade, shelter, seating and drinking water for dogs and consider a defined car park area within the reserve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrington Foreshore (Honeysuckle Reserve)</td>
<td>Wickham, Tighes Hill, Carrington</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.7ha</td>
<td>Develop as a fenced dog park but design the fencing along the waterway to be a lower but safe height to minimise impacts on the waterfront appeal of the site (the dog park could be promoted for smaller dogs and dogs that won’t jump). Keep the pathway outside the fenced dog park and maintain a linear open space for general community use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland Drive Reserve</td>
<td>Maryland, Fletcher, Minmi</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.2ha</td>
<td>Establish a fenced dog park that is designed to allow for the Maryland Creek realignment. The site is large enough for two off leash areas (one for larger dogs and one for puppies and small dogs). Undertake site enhancements including increased trees, seating, shelter and a circulation pathway.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Potential New Fenced Dog Parks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Precinct</th>
<th>Reserve Size (ha)</th>
<th>Potential Dog Park Area</th>
<th>Site Direction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lambton Park</td>
<td>Lambton, New Lambton</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>0.6ha</td>
<td>Create a fenced dog park on the south western part of Lambton Park (for which there is demand). The dog park should include additional trees for shade, shelter, seating and a circulation pathway as well as bins and drinking water for dogs. A grassed area for sports training or community use could be retained to the north of the dog park (on the western side of the pathway connection). The existing pathway should remain out of the dog park for broader community use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O’Connell Reserve</td>
<td>Adamstown, Kotara</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.5ha</td>
<td>Consider establishing a fenced dog park along the Merewether Golf Club boundary (away from the housing). Include a pathway, seating, shelter, drinking water for dogs and bins. Firstly consult with local residents, surrounding dog owners and dog interest groups to ensure the facility is appropriate and will be used.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4.2 Other dog off leash area directions

#### Existing Dog Off Leash Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Precinct</th>
<th>Reserve Size (ha)</th>
<th>Recommended Site Direction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ballast Ground</td>
<td>Stockton, Fullerton</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>If the southern fields are required for sport, reduce the Ballast Ground to the northern end or allow timed use of the southern end, when not being used for sport. Undertake improvements to the car park and toilets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braye Park</td>
<td>Waratah, North Lambton</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>Consider removing the site as a dog off leash area due to the bushland character of the site and the proximity to Acacia Avenue Reserve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixon Park Reserve</td>
<td>Merewether, The Junction</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Retain Dixon Park as a timed dog off leash area to enable other recreation activities at other times. However, better define and increase the off leash area (defined through signage, paths, landscape), provide some additional seating and a shelter within the off leash area and improve the surface quality where possible. The safety of children at the playspace should also be considered as part of any redesign.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elermore Vale Park</td>
<td>Wallsend, Elermore Vale</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>Maintain the site as a local dog off leash area (not fenced) and remove the timed use restriction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horseshoe Beach</td>
<td>Newcastle, Cooks Hill</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>Encourage the Roads and Maritime Services to maintain Horseshoe Beach as an off leash area. Council taking responsibility for the management of the site is not recommended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islington Park (east of Throsby Creek)</td>
<td>Wickham, Tighes Hill, Carrington</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Create a quality dog park that is partly fenced along the car park end of the park through to the canal fencing and includes a double gate entrance to reduce the risks of dogs running onto Pacific Highway and into the car park. Also improve the grass surface, plant additional trees for shade, provide infrastructure (seating, shelter, dog drinking water) and consider the frequency of bin collection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Edward Park</td>
<td>Newcastle, Cooks Hill</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Review the appropriateness of dogs off leash at this site given the potential impact on the Themeda grasslands. This will involve Council determining if the activity ‘dogs off leash’ is likely to significantly affect the threatened species, population or ecological community’ in accordance with the requirements of the Threatened Species Conservation Act 1995.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael/ Pilkington Street Reserve</td>
<td>Waratah, North Lambton</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Maintain the site as a local dog off leash area (not fenced) and remove the timed use restriction. Improve the site amenity with tree planting and seating.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nesca Park</td>
<td>Newcastle, Cooks Hill</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Retain as a dog off leash area but better define the boundaries and improve seating, shelter and shade.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdue Park</td>
<td>Mayfield, Warabrook</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>Continue to provide for off leash but do not fence the entrance or suggest this is a higher level dog park due to the residential setting and limited open space in the area for the local community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rawson Reserve</td>
<td>Stockton, Fullerton</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>Consider reducing the grassed area allocated for dogs off leash and shift the edge away from the skate park and swimming pool. Retain access to the beach as part of the off leash opportunity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarro Recreation Area</td>
<td>Beresfield, Hexham</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>Maintain as an off leash area within a natural space with informal paths and a treed setting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Reserve</td>
<td>Wallsend, Elermore Vale</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>Relocate the off leash area to south eastern end of Ironbark Creek within Upper Reserve. Use signage to discourage dogs on the sports fields.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West End Park</td>
<td>Adamstown, Kotara</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>Expand the site to the north to increase the space and usability of the dog off leash area and increase the appeal of the site through trees for shade, path and seating. Allow dog off leash use at all times (rather than timed use) but do not fence or invest significantly in the site as its local isolated location is not ideal.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Potential Additional Dog Off Leash Areas (not fenced)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Precinct</th>
<th>Reserve Size (ha)</th>
<th>Site Direction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brickworks Park</td>
<td>WallSEND, Elermore Vale</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>Consider creating a dog off leash area in the south west part of the reserve (the swale area). Limited improvements would be required, but ideally the play space would be relocated to the picnic area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bull and Tourle Streets</td>
<td>Mayfield, Warabrook</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Consider creating a dog off leash area on the east side of the reserve. This may require creating a landscape barrier to the play space, although the off leash area could be located away from the play and may only receive local use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claremont Park</td>
<td>Adamstown, Kotara</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>Consider allowing dogs off leash on the western side of the park (away from the play space) to meet local community demand. The space could be local as preferred by the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayo Street Reserve</td>
<td>Shortland - Jesmond</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>Create a dog off leash area on Mayo Street Reserve (ideally the whole reserve area to provide a good sized space), with trees for shade, seating, drinking water for dogs, a bin and shelter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warabrook Wetlands</td>
<td>Mayfield, Warabrook</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>Consider creating a dog off leash area in a less developed section of the reserve between the Eucalyptus Circuit entry car park and the recreation areas (away from play and picnics but allowing water access if appropriate). Include trees for shade, seating, drinking water for dogs and bins nearby.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommended Dog Off Leash Site Directions

LEGEND
- Council Boundary
- Ward Boundary
- Open Space

Recommended Site Directions
- Existing Dog Off Leash with No Change
- Retain as Off Leash with Modifications
- Existing Off Leash with Potential to Fence
- Potential New Fenced Dog Park
- Retain Beach Off Leash Area
- Potential New Beach Off Leash Area
- Potential New Off Leash Not Fenced
- Review Off Leash Function
5 IMPLEMENTATION

5.1 Works action plan

A 10 year Action Plan for items in the strategies that are works related (and could require an allocation of capital funds) is provided on the following page. The priorities in the Action Plan are based on the following timeframes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Indicative Timing (Commence by)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Within 3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>3-6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>After 6 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Improvements and new facilities will need to occur as resources become available and in accordance with other Council priorities. It is important to note that the strategies and priorities in the Dogs in Open Spaces Strategy are only a guide and do not commit Council or any other organisation to allocate resources or achieve any action.

The costing of the actions should occur as part of detailed design and Works program identification undertaken by Council.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Action*</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 New Off Leash in Gap Areas</td>
<td>Establish Lambton Park as an off leash area (refer 2.3).</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Facilities and Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Establish O’Connell Reserve as an off leash area (refer 2.3).</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Facilities and Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Establish Mayo Street Reserve as an off leash area (not fenced, all of reserve).</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Facilities and Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Establish part of Brickworks Park as an off leash area (not fenced, south west swale area).</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Facilities and Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Establish part of Warabrook Wetlands as an off leash area (not fenced, south west linked to water body).</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Facilities and Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Establish part of Bull and Tourle Streets Reserve as an off leash area (not fenced, eastern end).</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Facilities and Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Infrastructure Provision</td>
<td>Establish good support infrastructure in existing dog off leash areas.</td>
<td>High to Lower</td>
<td>Facilities and Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Fencing of Existing Off Leash</td>
<td>Create a fenced dog park at Carrington Foreshore (Honeysuckle Reserve, around 0.7ha).</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Facilities and Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Create a fenced dog park at Maryland Drive Reserve (around 1.2ha, 2 areas including 1 area for small dogs and puppies).</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Facilities and Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Create a fenced dog park at Acacia Avenue Reserve (upper level, around 1ha).</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Facilities and Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Part Fencing Needs</td>
<td>Part fencing of Islington Park (car park edge to canal fence).</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Facilities and Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 New Fenced Dog Parks</td>
<td>Establish Lambton Park as a fenced dog park (around 0.6ha).</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Facilities and Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Establish O’Connell Reserve as a fenced dog park (around 0.5ha).</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Facilities and Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Improved Site Definition</td>
<td>Better define the existing dog off leash areas.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Facilities and Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Re-Design Requirements</td>
<td>Redesign Dixon Park off leash area to increase the space and move dogs away from the road, play and food preparation.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Facilities and Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase West End Park off leash area to create a larger space.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Facilities and Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Relocated Sites</td>
<td>Relocate Upper Reserve dog off leash area to the south eastern side of Ironbark Creek (Toohrmbing).</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Facilities and Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Dogs on Sports Fields</td>
<td>Establish ‘on leash’ signage at all sportsgrounds and sports fields.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Facilities and Recreation, Regulatory Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Signage and Regulations</td>
<td>Establish and improve signage to better define off leash areas, on leash sites and dog prohibited areas.</td>
<td>High to Medium</td>
<td>Facilities and Recreation, Regulatory Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Further details are included in the strategy, section 3.
5.2 Other high priorities

Other high priorities that may not be included in Council’s Works programs but could require people or resource commitments are as follows:

4.4 Dogs in Natural Environments
Manage dogs to protect natural environments where required, including through the allocation of reserves as ‘on leash’ or ‘dogs prohibited’.

4.6 Council’s Enforcement Approach
Continue to adopt an ‘inform and educate’ approach to the enforcement of dogs off and on leash. However, where the safety and health of other park users is at risk such as dogs near play and on sports fields, stronger enforcement may be required.

5.1 Community Awareness and Education Program
Develop and promote a community education and awareness program in Newcastle.

5.3 Partnerships
Consider partnerships for educating the community and promoting appropriate dog and owner behaviour.
5.3 Managing new and improved provision

Providing additional dog off leash areas, enhancing existing dog off leash areas and establishing some fenced dog parks will require a commitment of resources through Council funding and grant funding opportunities.

A staged approach will be required over a 10 year period, with an initial focus on the recommended strategy and site priorities. Items that add greatest value and have a lower cost such as enhancing existing dog off leash areas through tree planting and bins could also be considered in the earlier years.

Council is considering the allocation of funds to enable the development of four fenced dog parks over a period of 4 years, and as such these will be an early priority. The dog parks could be staged with fencing and basic infrastructure being established first and other features such as tree planting, shelters, seating and pathways being later stages. This will be appropriate providing there is a commitment to finish the dog parks to a good standard through later features.

Establishing fenced dog parks and additional off leash areas will have an ongoing maintenance implication for Council, including the likely need for additional funds and staff resources. The recommended community education program and partnerships could also have a resource implication.

However, the improved and new dog off leash areas and the community awareness and education program will add value to a large proportion of people in the community and the allocation of resources to service these people and their dogs is considered to be worthwhile.

5.4 Partnership opportunities

The community engagement undertaken as part of the Dogs in Open Spaces Strategy highlighted there is potential for Council to establish partnerships with dog interest groups such as the RSPCA, other dog welfare groups, trainers and dog care organisations, as well as broader members of the community. There is a strong interest within the community to achieve quality dog off leash areas and to encourage appropriate behaviour by dogs and their owners.

In particular, there is potential to involve community groups in promoting the Dogs in Open Spaces Strategy and achieving specific strategies such as community awareness and education and improvements to existing dog off leash areas. Partnerships could be established and maintained through a Community Dogs Off Leash Implementation Group as well as targeted partner activities such as dog training and information sessions in off leash areas sponsored by Council.

5.5 Review and monitoring

The Dogs in Open Spaces Strategy should be reviewed on an ongoing basis, including a review of the Action Plan each year and a review of the strategic directions at least every 5 years. Needs, priorities and resource availability could change over time.

The success and suitability of dog off leash areas and the impacts on residents and natural environments should be monitored and modifications made to directions if required.

In addition, the use and value of each new fenced dog park and off leash area should be reviewed in consultation with users to guide the development of other future dog off leash areas.
6 SUPPORTING BACKGROUND INFORMATION

6.1 Relevance to other planning

The Newcastle City Council Dogs in Open Spaces Strategy with contribute to achieving Council’s strategic plans and is consistent with other Council planning.

Newcastle 2030
The Newcastle Community Strategic Plan (2013) Newcastle 2030 is Council’s overriding strategic document that determines commitments and priorities. The vision is for Newcastle is to be a Smart, Liveable and Sustainable city. The strategic direction and objectives that are most relevant to the Dogs in Open Spaces Strategy are below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Directions</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vibrant and Activated Public Places</td>
<td>Public places that provide for diverse activity and strengthen our social connections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A city of great public places and neighbourhoods promoting people’s health, happiness and wellbeing</td>
<td>Culture, heritage and place are valued, shared and celebrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Safe and activated places that are used by people day and night</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Particularly relevant strategies are as follows:

Vibrant and Activated Public Places
- 3.1d Create welcoming and accessible community facilities that support opportunities for people to meet and connect with one another.
- 3.1b Increase opportunities for active and passive recreational use of the city’s parks, inland pools and Blackbutt Reserve through the provision of attractive, safe and accessible spaces and amenities.
- 3.3d Provide welcoming facilities and open space that provide for a range of ages and combination of uses and can be easily adapted to suit the changing need of community over time.

Parkland and Recreation Strategy
The City of Newcastle Parkland and Recreation Strategy (2014) provides a framework for open space and recreation and is therefore a key relevant document.

The Vision is “The City of Newcastle will provide, promote and support a range of facilities, events and programs aimed at:
- Meeting the diverse parkland and recreational needs and interests of residents, visitors, students and workers;
- Creating vibrant, activated and sustainable public places; and
- Promoting health, happiness, community connections and wellbeing.”

The most relevant strategic objective is:
Equitable Provision and Development of Facilities Quality parkland and recreation facilities that are diverse, accessible and responsive to changing needs and will provide positive experiences for current and future residents and visitors. A clear decision making framework is essential to guide development and sustainable provision.

The Strategy includes a specific action relating to dogs off leash as follows:
- 1.18 Review existing and investigate the establishment of additional dog leash free areas.

Other Plans and Objectives


In addition, the 2036 Draft Greater Newcastle Metropolitan Plan and the Hunter Regional Plan 2036 provide overriding directions for Newcastle.

The Dogs in Open Spaces Strategy aims to be consistent with other Council and regional planning and objectives.
6.2 NSW Companion Animals Act 1998

Particularly relevant sections and items in the NSW Companion Animals Act 1998 are summarised below:

Section 13 Responsibilities while dog in public place
(6) A local authority can declare a public place to be an off-leash area. This can be limited to apply during a particular period or periods of the day or to different periods of different days. However, there must at all times be at least one public place in the area of a local authority that is an off-leash area.

Section 14 Dogs prohibited in some public places
(1) Dogs are prohibited in the following places (whether or not they are leashed or otherwise controlled):
(a) within 10 metres of any playing apparatus provided for the use of children
(b) within 10 metres of any apparatus for the preparation of food for human consumption or for the consumption of food by humans
(c) a public place used for public recreation or the playing of organised games and in which the local authority has ordered that dogs are prohibited
(d) a public place used for or in conjunction with public bathing or public recreation (including a beach), in which the local authority has ordered that dogs are prohibited
(h) a public place set apart by the local authority for the protection of wildlife and in which the local authority has ordered that dogs are prohibited for the purposes of the protection of wildlife

Section 20 Dogs defecating in public place
(1) If a dog defecates in a public place:
(a) the owner of the dog, or (b) another person who is of or above the age of 16 years is in charge of the dog at that time must immediately remove the dog’s faeces and properly dispose of them.
(2) Proper disposal includes disposal in a rubbish receptacle designated for the purpose by the local authority. It is the duty of a local authority for a place that is commonly used for exercising dogs (including an off-leash area) to provide sufficient rubbish receptacles for the proper disposal of the faeces of dogs that defecate in the place.

Full details of these and other NSW Companion Animals Act 1998 sections are included in the Act. Note the Companion Animal Regulation 2008 is currently under review and any new requirements will need to be considered as appropriate in future reviews of this Strategy.
6.3 Community needs and concerns

The Dogs in Open Spaces Strategy has involved considerable community engagement including:

- An on-line survey to Council’s community reference panel, Newcastle Voice and members of the wider community, with 1,076 respondents.
- On site interviews of 143 people across four sites including Islington Park, Dixon Park, Upper Reserve and Ballast Ground at Stockton.
- A further 122 interviews by Council staff at a ‘Pups in the Park’ event at Lambton Park.
- Targeted planning sessions with community interest groups, parks committee representatives and sporting groups.
- Submissions received from 42 interested residents expressing concerns and suggestions.

The main community needs, concerns and desired directions highlighted by the community engagement are summarised below. Additional summaries including session notes, interview summaries and Council’s Community Survey Report are included in Appendix C.

1. Having designated spaces for dogs off leash is important to the community, including people without dogs and sports groups. Off leash areas enables dogs to run free and socialise, and also reduces the likelihood of people allowing their dogs to run free in areas that are less suitable such as on sports fields. Particularly popular existing dog off leash areas include Islington Park, Carrington Foreshore, King Edward Park and Dixon Park. Large dog off leash areas are desired to enable large and working dogs to run free.

2. The community has expressed a need for some additional dog off leash areas, particularly in areas that are lacking provision. Lambton Park is a key site that has been identified for an off leash area by the community. In addition Council received a community petition regarding the use of Claremont Park for off leash (although there was also some community resistance to this).

3. Some existing dog off leash areas are considered to be too small, are poorly located near main roads or lack definition (people do not know which area can be used).

4. There is a desire for some fenced dog parks to provide areas for dogs that could run onto roads and where people feel more comfortable with their dogs being in a contained area. Particular sites suggested by the community include Lambton Park, Carrington Foreshore (Honeysuckle Reserve), Acacia Avenue Reserve and Maryland Drive Reserve. The need for some fenced dog parks that separate small dogs and large dogs has been raised, mainly by people with small dogs.

5. Improvements to existing dog off leash areas are needed including:
   - Improved amenity such as shade, seating and shelter
   - Improved services such as bins, poo bags and drinking water for dogs

6. There is a desire for access to additional beaches for dogs off leash. Horseshoe Beach is valuable but is too small and there are conflicts between dogs at the beach.

7. Whilst a number of dog owners are keen to have access to sports fields for dogs off leash and some already use sports fields, concerns have been raised by the community about dogs being allowed on sports fields and the health and safety risks for children and adults using the fields. Sports groups are particularly concerned about potential existing and potential impacts of sports fields and users.

8. People not picking up after their dogs has been raised as a key issue including by dog owners and users of existing off leash areas. In addition, there are concerns about aggressive dogs in off leash areas and people not appropriately managing their dogs, and increased awareness of dog owner responsibilities is desired.

A summary of the findings with the community engagement ‘source’ is provided on the following page.
Consideration of the character of Newcastle is also appropriate to determine potential community needs. Dog ownership tends to be greater in areas that have larger proportions of young people or families with children, and higher density areas could have greater demand due to a lack of backyard space for dogs.

However, a large majority of suburbs in Newcastle have high proportions of young people or a family focus and this suggests that dogs off leash is likely to be important across the City. Higher density areas are currently around the Newcastle central area (towards the CBD) and along the eastern coastline, and demand for dog off leash areas could be greater in these suburbs as a result.

---

### Main Community Engagement Findings Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Findings (what people are consistently saying)</th>
<th>Community Interviews</th>
<th>Community Survey</th>
<th>Interest Groups</th>
<th>Submissions and Sports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Importance of dogs and off leash provision</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large areas for dogs to run</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need additional off leash</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better define existing off leash</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location and main road issues</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need fenced dog parks</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to cater for small dogs and puppies</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance existing (shade, seating, surface)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved services (bins, poo bags, water)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase access to beaches (on and off leash)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sportground clash (use vs issues)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog behaviour plus owner attitude concerns</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need education and information</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.4 Key site analysis findings

Newcastle currently has 17 dog off leash areas, which represents one off leash area per 9,142 people as at 2016 (based on a population of 155,416). By 2041, the population is projected to be around 200,000 and if no additional off leash areas are provided the provision will be 1: 11,764 in 2041.

However, despite this good provision some areas are lacking access to dog off leash areas, particularly in the central area around Adamstown and the far west growth area around Maryland. In addition, none of the existing dog off leash areas are fenced and the need for some fenced dog parks has been raised by the community.

Also, some of the existing dog off leash areas have issues associated with location, quality and function. An analysis of each existing dog off leash area based on site visits is provided in Appendix B and the main findings are summarised on the following pages.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Information</th>
<th>Key Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Acacia Avenue Reserve (3.9ha), Waratah, North Lambton Precinct | - Good location central to the population  
- Large size that could include fenced off leash (upper area most suitable) |
| Ballast Ground, Stockton (10.3ha), Fullerton Precinct | - Large open area along water not suitable for fencing  
- Hunter River crossing constraint creates smaller local catchment  
- Uncertainty regarding off leash area (conflicting information)  
- Sports and trail potential conflicts |
| Braye Park (11.8ha), Waratah, North Lambton Precinct | - High profile site linked to main roads  
- Poor park quality and design  
- Large area allocated for off leash  
- Potential impacts on nature and other activities |
| Carrington Foreshore (Honeysuckle Reserve, 1.1ha), Wickham, Tighes Hill, Carrington Precinct | - Large site behind industrial  
- Connected to Throsby Creek, key recreation area, pathway network and wetlands  
- Potential conflicts with path users  
- Potential for fenced off leash due to size and location |
| Dixon Park Reserve (0.5ha), Merewether, The Junction Precinct | - Beach site on ocean that is high profile and well used  
- Timed use (early mornings and evenings) for dogs off leash  
- Off leash area is poorly defined  
- Lack of amenities to support off leash  
- Potential conflict with play and picnics  
- Off leash should not be fenced due to other uses and visual impacts |
| Elermore Vale Park (0.8ha), Wallsend, Elermore Vale Precinct | - A local space for dogs off leash due to the local and low profile location  
- Current timed use may not be necessary (could be used any time) |
| Horseshoe Beach (0.7ha), Newcastle. Cooks Hill Precinct | - Small beach area managed by Roads and Maritime Services  
- High use by dogs off leash |
| Islington Park (east of Throsby Creek, 2.1ha), Wickham, Tighes Hill, Carrington Precinct | - Good profile site off Pacific Highway  
- Large open popular off leash area with link to canal (water)  
- Parking area and northern end of reserve is close to traffic (risk for dogs)  
- Lacking amenities (shade, seating, shelter) |
| King Edward Park (2.2ha), Newcastle, Cooks Hill Precinct | - Significant park near the ocean  
- Off leash area includes Themeda Grasslands (which must be protected)  
- Need to review environmental impacts and appropriateness of off leash |
| Maryland Drive Reserve, Maryland (1.3ha), Fletcher, Minni Precinct | - Large open site along Maryland Creek and Maryland Drive  
- Site is undeveloped and unappealing, with traffic risks for off leash  
- Potential to create fenced off leash (including space for small dogs and puppies) |
| Michael/ Pilkington Street Reserve (1.3ha), Waratah, North Lambton Precinct | - Local setting with grass quarry area suitable for dogs off leash  
- Timed off leash could be reviewed (to enable greater use) |
| Nesca Park (2.1ha), Newcastle, Cooks Hill Precinct | - Lower profile site accessed through local streets  
- Steep topography around off leash area  
- Off leash area could be better defined  
- Lack of amenities in the off leash area (shade, seating, shelter) |
| Purdue Park (0.6ha), Mayfield, Warabrook Precinct | - Local park behind housing with only one access point  
- Not suitable as dedicated dogs only (fenced) due to lack of other open space in the area |
### Main Site Analysis Findings (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Information</th>
<th>Key Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rawson Reserve (5.0ha), Stockton, Fullerton Precinct</strong></td>
<td>- Large open area along water not suitable for fencing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Hunter River crossing creates smaller local catchment in Stockton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Beach area included in off leash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Potential conflict with swimming pool and skate (off leash is too close)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tarlo Recreation Area (10ha), Beresfield Hexham Precinct</strong></td>
<td>- Part of significant sport and recreation reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Large open area not suitable for fencing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Suitable as is with minimal development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Upper Reserve (2.7ha), Wallsend, Elermore Vale Precinct</strong></td>
<td>- Adjoins busy Lake Road with traffic risks to dogs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Difficult access to the site and therefore local use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Could review location of off leash within the reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>West End Park (0.7ha), Adamstown, Kotara Precinct</strong></td>
<td>- Relatively isolated and low profile site along railway line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Unappealing site with a lack of shade, seating and shelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The off leash area would ideally be larger in size</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.5 The main gaps and issues

The main gaps and issues identified through the Dogs in Open Spaces Strategy are outlined below.

- Whilst there are currently 17 dog off leash areas across Newcastle, there is a gap in provision around the central, southern and far western parts of the City (Lambton, Adamstown, Adamstown Heights, Kotara, Maryland, Fletcher).
- Some of the existing dog off leash sites are not ideal for the following reasons:
  - King Edward Park incorporates Themed grassland, which is an endangered ecological community that requires protection in accordance with the Threatened Species Conservation Act 1995. In addition, the site has a steep slope which could limit use. However, the community survey suggests this off leash area is popular.
  - The Dixon Park dog off leash area is too small and adjoins a main road and busy car park. The off leash area is poorly defined and generally people do not contain their dogs within the allocated space. The park is high profile and well used for other recreation activities including play. As such, there is a potential conflict in use, although this is partly managed through timed off leash use (early mornings and evenings).
  - Braye Park is a large reserve that includes a large bushland component, a large gassed area, recreation spaces and a central roadway. It has a hilly topography and issues with site quality and use. The dog off leash area covers a considerable part of the reserve and there could be potential impacts on nature and other users.
  - The West End Park dog off leash area is very small and unappealing. It is relatively isolated with poor passive surveillance, being located alongside a railway line and adjoining backyard. However, there is a lack of potential for other off leash areas in the surrounding suburbs.
- There is potential to improve the quality and function of a number of the existing dog off leash areas, with the consistent issues being:
  - Ground surface quality issues (due to a lack of irrigation and impacts by dogs, e.g. digging and worn areas)
  - A lack of bins or the need to service bins more regularly
  - A lack of seating and shelter for dog owners and walkers
  - The need for drinking water for dogs
- At most parks it is difficult to determine the specific areas that are off leash with little definition of the areas such as through landscapes or paths. In some instances the off leash maps at parks do not match Council’s web site.
- Some dog off leash areas are too close to busy roads such as at Upper Reserve, Dixon Park, Islington Park, Carrington (Honeysuckle) Reserve and Maryland Drive Reserve. Opportunities for addressing dog safety need to be considered.
- There is a desire by the community to have access to other beaches besides Horseshoe Beach and the beach connected to Rawson Park. Both beaches are very small and there is potential for dog conflicts due to the tightness of the sites. However, other beach opportunities are limited due to the high use of beaches by the wider community or natural values (e.g. National Park links). Stockton Beach could be a possibility, although impacts on the wider community would need to be considered. The northern part of Stockton Beach, which is further from other users, has erosion and environmental issues.
- Sportsgrounds are at risk of being impacted on by dogs off leash with people not picking up after their dogs and surface quality issues. Whilst no sportsground is defined as off leash, they are used by some people particularly where fields are fenced. This has an impact on the quality and safety of fields. Sports and community members have suggested that fields should not be available for dogs off leash.
- Some people do not manage their dogs in public places or pick up after their dogs, and a program of community awareness and education is required to address these issues. This has been raised by organisations with an interest in dogs and the community, and observed during the study.
6.6 Industry considerations

Councils across Australia are supporting dogs off leash through the provision of dedicated off leash areas and fenced dog parks. This is in accordance with various State legislations and in recognition that dogs and having places to walk dogs is becoming increasingly important to communities.

The success and use of a dog off leash area will be influenced by various factors, including:

1. The importance of location, with the need for dog off leash areas to be accessible and visual to passing traffic whilst also being safe for dogs.
2. The need for a good size area for dogs off leash as it is not realistic to expect dogs to run within a small open space and there are potential conflicts between dogs if small spaces are fenced.
3. The need for dog off leash areas to be good quality spaces with trees for shade, seating and other amenities. Both fenced and unfenced off leash areas need to be an appealing place for people and dogs.
4. The importance of defining dog off leash areas through signs, paths, landscapes, clear information and where appropriate fencing.

Fenced dog parks are usually designed to cater for regional or district catchments and are located in higher profile sites. The number of fenced dog parks is generally fewer than unfenced due to the cost of provision and the need to isolate part of open space to achieve a fenced dog park.

Fenced dog parks are more developed, with fencing and double gates, paths, landscapes, drinking water for dogs, seating, shelter and features for dogs to play or investigate.

The appropriateness of dogs off leash at sportsgrounds is an issue across Australia and many Councils have determined that dogs should either be on leash or are prohibited. The main reasons for such a response are to protect the quality of sportsgrounds and also to minimise the risks associated with dogs being near children and adults playing sport. There are a number of examples of where dogs have been allowed on a sportsground through a shared use approach, but sports have had to leave the ground due to the impacts on the playing surface, people not picking up after their dogs and potential conflicts. Islington Park is one such example.

A document that draws together the approaches and principles relating to dog off leash areas and would be a useful further resource for Newcastle City Council is Unleashed A Guide to successful dog parks, SA Dog & Cat Management Board. The document includes a guide for dog park planning, design, and management and operations. Key findings are summarised in Appendix A and have been reflected in the directions in the Dogs in Open Spaces Strategy.

In addition to providing well located and good quality dog off leash areas and some fenced dog parks, it is important to promote dog off leash areas and create a positive and respectful environment for dogs and people through community awareness and education. This includes advising people of where dogs need to be on leash or where dogs are prohibited in accordance with the NSW Companion Animals Act 1998.
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Summary of Key Information and Directions

BENEFITS OF DOG PARKS

Benefits for dogs
- Physical and mental exercise for dogs.
- Socialisation for dogs.
- Safe environment for dogs to play.
- Outlet for dog owners to socialise.
- Seniors and disabled owners have an accessible place to exercise their dogs.
- Social well being and mental health.

Benefits for the community
- Responsible dog ownership.
- Affordable recreation option.
- Resting place for travelling community.

PLANNING DIRECTIONS

Location
A good location for a dog off leash area should:
- Be easily accessible by road
- Have adequate space for off-street parking
- Have connections to existing pedestrian paths and trails
- Be within walking distance of residential areas
- Have good surveillance from public areas

Other considerations include:
- Proximity to compatible uses/activities or other community facilities
- Some natural vegetation and topography
- Good drainage

Parking and Accessibility
- Off-street parking should be considered, particularly where visitors are likely to be from outside the area and beyond walking distance from the park and particularly if there is limited availability for on-street parking and the park is likely to receive high visitation.
- Transition from the car park to the designated entrance of the dog park needs to be direct and safe.
- Locating off-street parking as close as possible to the dog park entrance is important in order to discourage owners letting their dog off-leash to and from the park and to reduce any potential conflict with nearby facilities/activities.

Connections to Existing Paths and Trails
- Locating the dog park near existing path and trail networks should be a priority.

Other Facilities
Consider locating a dog park near other community facilities as this can deliver other benefits including:
- Improved casual surveillance
- Shared infrastructure and associated costs
- Opportunities for families to enjoy a range of activities at a single location
Size
There is no simple formula for an ideal park size, and in many circumstances the size of the park is influenced by the amount of land available or the type of open space (i.e. local, district or region) proposed for the park. A major consideration in determining an appropriate size is the expected number of users although this may be difficult to ascertain and may be influenced by the number of other off-leash parks in surrounding areas. ‘The area should be big enough for dogs to run around and space themselves out. If there’s not enough square footage available, a park can easily get crowded. Crowding can lead to tension among dogs.

Advantages of larger sized parks include:
- Less wear and tear of ground surfaces
- Reduced overcrowding of dogs
- Less stressful for dogs
- Cater for more park users
- Provides a destination park, particularly if co-located with compatible activities
- Provides opportunities to create different activity zones within the dog park.

Advantages of smaller sized parks include:
- Provide a local community focus
- Provide off-leash opportunities in inner city locations
- Cost less to construct
- Address specific needs e.g. a dog park for the travelling community.

Shape
The shape of a dog park is usually determined by the site availability, topography, vegetation, site boundaries and adjacent land uses and activities. The shape can have a significant influence on the layout and circulation patterns within the park.
Linear and non-rectangular shapes should be considered as they offer more opportunities to encourage park users to move and be more active through the park. Linear shapes encourage people to move through a space and promote exercise by walking rather than standing in one spot. Irregular (odd) shapes work better than rectangles as they provide more opportunities to create spaces for dogs to ‘get out of the main flow of traffic and ways to take a break from or avoid higher energy dogs.

DESIGN DIRECTIONS

Park Layout
Park layout is one of the most important elements in the design of a dog park as this can influence the interactions within the dog park. The design of a dog park does not have to be complicated but it does need to be well considered.

Activity Zones
A variety of spaces or activity zones should be created within the dog park.

Circulation Paths
Walking paths and/or trails within the park encourage dog owners to walk with their dogs rather than standing in one place. This helps reduce congestion and the concentration of dogs in one particular location and the potential for dogs to form into loose groups.

Fencing
Secure perimeter fencing should be provided to discourage dogs escaping under, over or through the fence.
- The fence should be around 1.7-1.8m in height to discourage dogs jumping over it.
- Constructing the fence with a concrete plinth will also assist with maintenance and prevent smaller dogs escaping under the fence.
- Moveable fencing may also be considered to close off areas of the park for events, or to allow for maintenance and/or turf regeneration.
- It is desirable to select a fencing material that provides good visibility so that park users can see activity inside and around the park.
Entry/Exit Points
Providing multiple entry/exit points serves to minimise dog and human congestion at these locations and reduces wear and tear on surface materials.
- Entry/exit points should be clear of physical structures and amenities such as shelters, benches or drinking fountains to discourage dogs and people congregating.
- A separate entry for maintenance/service vehicles (i.e. council and emergency vehicles) should be provided away from the main entry/exit gates.

Gates
Double-gates should be provided to prevent dogs escaping from the park. The double gates provide a ‘safety airlock’ where park users transition from the external, on-leash environment to the internal, off-leash environment of the dog park.
- The safety airlock is a high traffic area and surface materials need to be durable to withstand high usage and be dog friendly
- Gates should be fitted with self-closing child-proof locks to prevent dogs escaping and unsupervised children entering the park.
- Screening the entry gates from other dogs within the park can help avoid the potential for dog conflict when entering.

Surface Materials
Surface material choice can have an impact on the appearance and experience at the dog park.
- A combination of surface materials should be used to match the activity zones and corresponding intensity.
- All surface materials must be ‘dog friendly’.
- Surfaces should be selected to deter dogs from moving too fast and getting up too much speed in the park.
- Well drained, durable, all weather materials are required for high traffic areas such as the safety airlock.

Essential Amenities

Drinking Water
- Drinking water for both dogs and humans is required inside the dog park
- Adequate drainage around the water bowl to reduce water logging and mud
- Location of the water bowl away from the main entry gates to discourage dogs congregating in high traffic areas
- Suitable water bowls that are large enough for all dogs to use and easy to clean and maintain.

Shade
- Shade should be provided so dogs can rest, cool themselves, and protect themselves against the weather.
- Trees as a natural source of shade are preferable.

Seating
- Seating location and materials are an important consideration in the design stage.
- Seating should be located away from entry/exit gates to avoid congestion
- Keep seating to a minimum, as people tend to sit down, socialize, and do less interacting with their dog. It is better to encourage dog owners to keep moving through the park, interacting and staying connected with their dog.
- Seating should be positioned to provide unobstructed views of the dog play areas
- Benches that surround trees are a good choice because they help protect the trees from dog urinating.

Waste Disposal
- Bag dispensers and waste bins should be considered at appropriate locations in and around the park for cleaning up after dogs.
- Consider bag dispensers with a locking device to prevent bags being pulled continuously and scattered in the park.
- Provide waste bins of a sufficient size and number to accommodate the expected demand.
City of Whittlesea
Dog Off Leash Area Policy and Management Plan, 2016

BENEFITS

Benefits for dogs
- Physical and mental exercise for dogs - provide opportunities where dogs can get physical and mental exercise.
- Socialisation for dogs - provide opportunities for dogs to have frequent interaction with other dogs and people.
- Safe environment for dogs to play - provide a secure environment where dog owners can exercise their dogs off-lead and not encounter cars, bikes and other obstacles.

Benefits for people
- Outlet for dog owners to socialise - provide a public space where dog owners can interact with each other and form community bonds.
- Seniors and disabled owners have an accessible place to exercise their dogs - provide people with limited access, such as the elderly and disabled, with opportunities to exercise their dog and provide ongoing social contact.
- Places for people to connect - provide a space where dog owners can feel connected with other community members improving their mental and emotional health.

Benefits for the community
- Responsible dog ownership - reduce the likelihood of conflict with other users of open space through dog owners letting their dogs off-lead in other recreational areas, and provide opportunities to educate dog owners about animal health and welfare.
- Affordable recreation option - A trip to the Off-Leash Area is a free, outdoor activity where the family can take both their children and their pet.
- Resting place for travelling community - provide a safe resting spot for those owners travelling with their pets, pet friendly holidays.

PROVISION

Number of Off-Leash Areas
The total number of Off-Leash Areas to be provided by the City of Whittlesea for the life of this document is guided by the following.
- Confined Unstructured Off-Leash Areas will generally be limited to 1 per suburb. However, the following items may result in more than 1 of these Off-Leash Area types per suburb:
  - Multiple dog population hot spots within a single suburb leading to possible overcrowding & overuse
  - Connectivity/access issues, such as path networks and road/waterway barriers.

Confined Structured Off-Leash Areas will be provided on a regional basis and would ideally be incorporated into a precinct plan or, at a minimum, a site master plan. The number of Confined Structured Off-Leash Areas within the Municipality would be capped at four.
OFF-LEASH AREA LAND ALLOCATION AND PLANNING

Equitable Access
The extent of Whittlesea’s Off-Leash Areas under this Plan will result in a network of sites that provide equitable access across the existing residential areas. The objective of equitable access is to allow the majority of dog owners to walk to an Off-Leash Area within 20 minutes. This is achieved by:

- Siting Off-Leash Areas as close as possible to areas of high dog population density.
- Allocating each Off-Leash Area with a 2 kilometre catchment to ensure adequate coverage of existing residential areas.
- Considering access barriers such as major roads and waterways.

Identification of Off-Leash Area Network
Using Council’s six existing Off-Leash Areas as a starting point, service gaps within the extent of the Municipality’s existing residential areas were identified. Sites meeting the attribute requirements, and in close proximity (within 2 kilometres) of the highest points of density within the gap area were identified as future Off-Leash Areas. Individual site characteristics were used to determine the type of Off-Leash Area.

Site Attributes
- The minimum size for an Off-Leash Area is 0.3 hectares.
- In general Off-Leash Areas will be excluded from:
  - Defined sports fields and hardstand sports areas (fenced or unfenced).
  - Designated Conservation Reserves.
  - Areas of significant environmental value.
- Off-Leash Areas will not be located within:
  - 20 metres of a playground or barbeque area.
  - 50 metres of any main or collector road (Open Unstructured only).

Considering the exclusions above, preference should be given to sites that have limited potential for other uses given their size, shape, or natural features.

Site Assets
Existing assets can reduce the total cost of implementation and influence patronage of an Off-Leash Area, and they have been taken into account when determining a suitable site. Assets that have influenced the location of an Off-Leash Area include:
- Path network.
- Supply of drinking water and related fixtures.
- Natural and constructed shade areas.
- Seating.
- Tables.
- Landscape features that facilitate play/agility.
- Car parking.
City of Dandenong
Dog Off Leash Strategy 2011

Vision and Strategy Objectives

Vision
Together, Council’s Domestic Animal Management Plan (2007) and Open Space Strategy (2009) outline Council’s commitment to:

- Create an environment where people and pets can peacefully co-exist within the community;
- Inform and educate the community about the needs of companion animals and promote responsible pet ownership;
- Ensure that the needs of the wider community are reflected through Council’s domestic animal management policies and procedures;
- Provide a range of public parks and reserves within walking distance from most residents that are attractive, interesting, safe, readily accessible and comfortable places to be; and
- Provide a comprehensive open space network that delivers environmental, social, health and wellbeing, and economic benefits to the community.

These vision statements have underpinned the development of this Strategy. To achieve this overarching vision, a series of strategic objectives were developed to guide the preparation of this Strategy:

- To balance the needs and wishes of dog owners with the needs of the community for accessible and safe parks.
- To expand the number of dog off-leash areas and ensure a more equitable distribution across the City.
- To encourage greater compliance with relevant local laws and Orders.
- To increase the capacity of Residential Amenity to advocate for responsible pet ownership and enforce relevant local laws and Orders.
- To review the existing dog off-leash areas and supporting infrastructure requirements.
- To clearly delineate dog off-leash areas within each park.
- To minimise potential conflicts between off-leash areas and other park activities (such as playgrounds, sporting activities and conservation zones).
- To increase the use of under utilised parks / sections of parks.
- To improve accessibility to dog off-leash areas.
- To incorporate community views and preferences regarding the management and control of dogs in public open space.
- To publicise the new dog off-leash sites and promote responsible dog ownership through an intensive community awareness campaign.

Findings and Directions

Ancillary Infrastructure
Providing ancillary infrastructure to support off-leash activity is likely to encourage higher levels of compliance in on-leash parks as dog owners are more likely to prefer frequenting off-leash areas than on-lease parks which lack these facilities. Infrastructure (such a signage and fencing) can be used to clearly define the boundaries of an off-lease area, which is likely to address many community concerns regarding the management and control of dogs in public open space.

Signage
Effective signage in parks is the most direct way of advising park users, dog owners and “visiting dog owners” of the location, boundaries and rules of offleash areas. Well located, easy to read effective signage can:

- Encourage greater compliance with local leash laws and assist Council officers to promote responsible pet ownership; and
- Be instrumental in delineating between on-and off-leash areas, which may counter the need for extensive fencing and assist to reduce confusion over the boundaries of a dog off-lease area and minimise conflict with other park uses and activities.
Policy Approach – Signage:
With consideration to community feedback, Council should redesign its “dog signage” and rebrand the City’s off-leash areas to ensure that the locations and boundaries of the City’s dog offleash areas, the responsibilities of dog owners and the off-leash rules are more easily understood by residents.

Fencing
The use of fencing to separate off-leash areas from other park activities is commonly cited as means to address the safety concerns of other park users. However, completely enclosing an off-leash area is not always necessary. In some cases, all that is required is providing visual definition of an off-leash area, or installing fencing along one or two boundaries. Visual definition can be achieved via signage, bollards, an internal park road or by taking advantage of the existing form, layout or natural features of the park (such as marked changes in topography, existing tree lines, hedges, wide planting strips etc).

Policy Approach – Fencing:
Council’s approach to fencing should reflect community feedback:
- When selecting future off-leash sites, Council should take advantage of the existing form or layout of the park to clearly define the off-leash area, thus minimising the need for fencing.
- Where necessary, Council should install structures to signal the perimeter of the off-leash area. In the first instance, an assessment of whether simply providing visual cues to define the boundary is sufficient (such as effective signage or bollards). When required, fencing should be installed to ensure an appropriate barrier to a sensitive adjacent uses or activity (such as children’s playgrounds, bike tracks, picnic or BBQ areas, sports grounds and areas of significant environmental value, revegetation or wildlife habitat).

Dog Waste
Council’s local laws stipulate that dog owners are responsible for the removal and appropriate disposal of litter and dog waste. The survey responses indicate strong support for Council to continue this existing waste policy with 80% of dog owners noting that this policy should be maintained. While an owner can be fined for non-compliance, this is a difficult law to enforce and, consequently, is often ignored by irresponsible dog owners.

Councils have adopted various approaches for dealing with dog waste ranging from placing the onus on dog owners to pick up and dispose of dog waste, to introducing bins, doggy bags or in-park composting facilities and other infrastructure in parks. Each method has various pros and cons in terms of relative success in reducing litter, the ability to enforce regulations and the establishment and ongoing maintenance costs.

While all of these initiatives were generally well supported by survey respondents, the provision of bins in parks was, overwhelming, the preferred method. 95% of survey respondents indicated support for this initiative because bins can be used by all park users and thus can help keep the City’s parks waste and litter free.

Policy Approach: Waste Management
- Council’s local laws currently require dog owners to carry appropriate means and to pick up and dispose of their dog’s faeces. This policy should be continued.
- Council should supply a bin at every off-leash area to assist dog owners to comply with the Council’s local laws. As Council’s waste policy approach should be consistent at all parks, the bag dispenser at Frederick Wachter Reserve should be removed.
- Council should explore the feasibility of supplying a “doggy-do” attachment bag to all registered dog owners.
- All promotional materials for the dog off-leash areas (including signage, Council’s webpage and informational brochures etc.) should promote responsible dog ownership and compliance with Council’s local laws and orders, including that dog owners are responsible for picking up after their dog.
Other Park Infrastructure
Residents and park users indicated overwhelming support for dog off-leash areas being enhanced by signage, fencing, bins and doggy bags, as demonstrated in Figure 6. They also supported the provision of a range of other infrastructure to improve amenity and comfort of the City’s off-leash areas (including walking paths, drinking fountains, dog drinking bowls and seating), all of which further supports the use of these areas for off-leash activity as well as general exercise / physical activity.

However, there are significant capital and ongoing maintenance costs associated with providing such infrastructure, which must be balanced against other priorities in Council’s City Improvement Program.

The designation of off-leash areas does not necessarily preclude other park users from using these areas. If Council provides additional infrastructure (such as walking paths, drinking fountains etc), their provision should be planned and designed to enable multiple user groups to use these facilities, thus providing the most efficient and equitable distribution of resources. Accordingly, those matters should be addressed through Council’s broader Open Space Strategy.
**NSW COMPANION ANIMALS ACT 1998**

**KEY SECTIONS**

**6A General duties of councils**

(1) A council is required:
   (a) to promote awareness within its area of the requirements of this Act with respect to the ownership of companion animals, and
   (b) to take such steps as are appropriate to ensure that it is notified or otherwise made aware of the existence of all dangerous, menacing and restricted dogs (including dogs that might reasonably be considered to be the subject of a declaration under Division 1 or 6 of Part 5) that are ordinarily kept within its area.

(2) Subsection (1) does not limit the other functions that may be conferred or imposed on a council by or under this Act.

**13 Responsibilities while dog in public place**

(1) A dog that is in a public place must be under the effective control of some competent person by means of an adequate chain, cord or leash that is attached to the dog and that is being held by (or secured to) the person.

(2) If this section is contravened:
   (a) the owner of the dog, or
   (b) if the owner is not present at the time of the offence and another person who is of or above the age of 16 years is in charge of the dog at that time—that other person,
   is guilty of an offence.

Maximum penalty:
   (a) 10 penalty units except in the case of a dangerous, menacing or restricted dog, or
   (b) 100 penalty units in the case of a dangerous, menacing or restricted dog.

(3) Any person (including an authorised officer) can seize a dog that is in a public place in contravention of this section. If the owner of the dog is present, the dog cannot be seized except by an authorised officer and only then if the contravention continues after the owner has been told of the contravention. A reference in this subsection to the owner of the dog includes a reference to the person who is for the time being in charge of the dog.

Note: Putting the dog on a leash prevents the dog being seized but it does not excuse the contravention and does not stop action being taken for the contravention.

(4) A dog is not considered to be under the effective control of a person if the person has more than 4 dogs under his or her control.

(5) This section does not apply to:
   (a) a dog accompanied by some competent person in an area declared to be an off-leash area by a declaration under this section (but only if the total number of dogs that the person is accompanied by or has control of does not exceed 4), or
   (b) a dog engaged in the droving, tending or working of stock, or
   (c) a dog being exhibited for show purposes, or
   (d) a dog participating in an obedience class, trial or exhibition, or
   (e) a police dog, or
   (e1) a corrective services dog, or
   (f) a dog secured in a cage or vehicle or tethered to a fixed object or structure.

Note: Just because a dog is not on a lead in an off-leash area, or is secured in a cage or vehicle or is tethered to a fixed object or structure, does not mean that an offence under section 16 is not committed if the dog rushes at, attacks, bites, harasses or chases any person or animal, whether or not any injury is caused.

(6) A local authority can by order declare a public place to be an off-leash area. Such a declaration can be limited so as to apply during a particular period or periods of the day or to different periods of different days. However, there must at all times be at least one public place in the area of a local authority that is an off-leash area.
14 Dogs prohibited in some public places

(1) Dogs are prohibited in the following places (whether or not they are leashed or otherwise controlled):
(a) (meaning any public place, or part of a public place, that is within 10 metres of any playing apparatus provided in that public place or part for the use of children).
(b) (meaning any public place, or part of a public place, that is within 10 metres of any apparatus provided in that public place or part for the preparation of food for human consumption or for the consumption of food by humans).
(c) (meaning any public place, or part of a public place, provided or set apart by a local authority for public recreation or the playing of organised games and in which the local authority has ordered that dogs are prohibited and in which, or near the boundaries of which, there are conspicuously exhibited by the local authority at reasonable intervals notices to the effect that dogs are prohibited in or on that public place or part).
(d) (meaning any public place or any part of a public place that is used for or in conjunction with public bathing or public recreation (including a beach), in which the local authority has ordered that dogs are prohibited and in which, or near the boundaries of which, there are conspicuously exhibited by the local authority at reasonable intervals notices to the effect that dogs are prohibited in or on that public place).
(e) (meaning any property occupied or used for a purpose connected with the conduct of a government school or non-government school under the Education Act 1990, other than any property used for a residence or the curtilage of a residence).
(f) (meaning any property occupied or used for a purpose connected with the conduct of an approved education and care service within the meaning of the Children (Education and Care Services) National Law (NSW) or the Children (Education and Care Services) Supplementary Provisions Act 2011, other than any property used for a residence or the curtilage of a residence).
(g) (meaning a shopping arcade or shopping complex, including any part of it that is used by the public for parking or access to shops, in which or part of which the local authority has ordered that dogs are prohibited and in which, or near the boundaries of which, there are conspicuously exhibited by the local authority at reasonable intervals notices to the effect that dogs are prohibited there). This paragraph does not apply to any shop or part of a shop.
(h) (meaning any public place or any part of a public place set apart by the local authority for the protection of wildlife and in which the local authority has ordered that dogs are prohibited for the purposes of the protection of wildlife and in which, or near the boundaries of which, there are conspicuously exhibited by the local authority at reasonable intervals notices to the effect that dogs are prohibited in or on that public place).

(2) If a dog is in a place in which dogs are prohibited under this section:
(a) the owner of the dog, or
(b) if the owner is not present at the time of the offence and another person who is of or above the age of 16 years is in charge of the dog at that time—that other person, is guilty of an offence.
Maximum penalty:
(a) 10 penalty units except in the case of a dangerous, menacing or restricted dog, or
(b) 100 penalty units in the case of a dangerous, menacing or restricted dog.

(3) Any person (including an authorised officer) can seize a dog that is in a place in which dogs are prohibited under this section. If the owner of the dog is present, the dog cannot be seized except by an authorised officer and only then if the owner fails to remove the dog from the place when the officer directs the owner to do so. A reference in this subsection to the owner of the dog includes a reference to the person who is for the time being in charge of the dog.

Note: Removing the dog prevents the dog being impounded but it does not excuse the contravention and does not stop action being taken for the contravention.

(4) A dog is not prohibited under this section in a place that is a food preparation/consumption area if the place is a public thoroughfare (such as a road, footpath or pathway).

(5) A dog is not prohibited under this section in a school ground or child care centre if it is there with the permission of the person controlling the school ground or child care centre.
(6) A dog is not prohibited under this section in a place within a shopping area if it is there:
   (a) in a vehicle that is secured in such a way as to prevent the dog from escaping from it, or
   (b) with the permission of the person controlling the place, or
   (c) for the purpose of being taken to or from a pet shop, the premises of a veterinary practitioner or a similar establishment.

(7) A local authority is authorised to make the orders contemplated by this section.

(8) This section does not apply to the following dogs:
   (a) a police dog,
   (b) a dog that is an assistance animal being used bona fide by a person with a disability to assist the person,
   (c) a corrective services dog.

20 Dogs defecating in public place

(1) If a dog defecates in a public place:
   (a) the owner of the dog, or
   (b) if the owner is not present at the relevant time and another person who is of or above the age of 16 years is in charge of the dog at that time—that other person, must immediately remove the dog's faeces and properly dispose of them. Maximum penalty: 8 penalty units.

(2) Proper disposal includes disposal in a rubbish receptacle designated for the purpose by the local authority. It is the duty of a local authority for a place that is commonly used for exercising dogs (including an off-leash area) to provide sufficient rubbish receptacles for the proper disposal of the faeces of dogs that defecate in the place.

(3) This section does not apply when the dog is an assistance animal being used bona fide by a person with a disability to assist the person and the person's disability makes compliance by the person with this section not reasonably practicable.

34 Authorised officer may declare dog to be dangerous dog or menacing dog

(1) An authorised officer of a council may declare a dog to be a dangerous dog if the authorised officer is satisfied that:
   (a) the dog is dangerous, or
   (b) the dog has been declared a dangerous dog under a law of another State or a Territory that corresponds with this Act.

(1A) An authorised officer of a council may declare a dog to be a menacing dog if the authorised officer is satisfied that:
   (a) the dog is menacing, or
   (b) the dog is of a menacing breed or kind of dog (or a cross-breed of a menacing breed or kind of dog), or
   (c) the dog has been declared a menacing dog under a law of another State or a Territory that corresponds with this Act.

(1B) A declaration may be made under this section even if the dog is ordinarily kept in another council's area.

(1C) The regulations may prescribe procedures that must be followed or matters that must be considered (or both) before an authorised officer makes a declaration under subsection (1A) (b).

(2) A declaration can be made on the officer's own initiative or on the written application of a police officer or any other person.

(3) A declaration has effect throughout the State. It is not limited in its operation to the area of the council whose authorised officer made the declaration.

Note: This Part also gives the Local Court the power to declare a dog to be dangerous in certain circumstances.
58C Authorised officer may declare dog to be restricted dog

(1) Declaration by council if a notice of intention to declare a dog to be a restricted dog is given under section 58A to the owner of the dog, the authorised officer who gave the notice (or any other authorised officer of the council) may, after the period of 28 days following the giving of the notice, declare the dog to be a restricted dog. It does not matter if the dog is ordinarily kept in another council's area.

(2) Certification in relation to dog’s breed or temperament may be provided An authorised officer of a council is not to declare the dog to be a restricted dog if, within the period of 28 days following the giving of the notice under section 58A, the owner of the dog:
   (a) provides the authorised officer with a written statement by an approved breed assessor to the effect that the dog:
      (i) is not of a breed or kind of dog referred to in section 55 (1) (a)-(d1), and
      (ii) is not a cross-breed of any such breed or kind of dog, or
   (b) provides the authorised officer with:
      (i) a written statement by an approved breed assessor to the effect that the dog is not of a breed or kind of dog referred to in section 55 (1) (a)-(d1) but is a cross-breed of any such breed or kind of dog, and
      (ii) a written statement by an approved temperament assessor to the effect that the dog is not a danger to the public and is not likely, without provocation, to attack or bite any person or animal.

(3) Without limiting the form in which a written statement by an approved breed assessor may be in for the purposes of subsection (2), any such written statement may be in the form of, or comprise, a certificate that is of a kind or description prescribed by the regulations.

(4) The owner of a dog that is the subject of a proposed declaration under this section:
   (a) cannot, despite any other provision of this Act, rely on or produce, any evidence with respect to the dog’s breed or temperament (including any information entered on the Register as to the dog’s breed) apart from a written statement as referred to in this section, and
   (b) is liable to pay for any costs associated with obtaining a written statement from an approved breed assessor or approved temperament assessor for the purposes of this section.

(5) An authorised officer of a council may, in any particular case, extend the 28-day period referred to in subsection (2) for a further period because of extenuating circumstances.

(6) Any written statement provided by an approved breed assessor or approved temperament assessor for the purposes of this section may not be challenged, reviewed, quashed or called into question on any grounds before any court or tribunal in any legal proceedings.
Appendix B: Site analysis findings
### Existing Dog Off Leash Areas Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Information</th>
<th>Site Location (profile, connection to the population, accessibility)</th>
<th>Potential Impact on People (residents, existing or future users, noise, traffic)</th>
<th>Site Characteristics and the Need for Improvements (surface, infrastructure etc)</th>
<th>Site Impacts and Suitability (site character, function, environment)</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acacia Avenue Reserve</td>
<td>Waratah, North Lambton</td>
<td>Local residential streets but Acacia Road is a distributor road&lt;br&gt;Good location central to the population&lt;br&gt;On-site parking would ideally be provided&lt;br&gt;Close to Waratah (Braye Reserve) and Lambton (Michael/ Pilkington Street Reserve) dog off leash areas&lt;br&gt;Morpeh Road Reserve is nearby to cater for other recreation use</td>
<td>Grassed area may be used for sport although there is no amenity and this could instead be used for a defined dog off leash location&lt;br&gt;Defining a dog area could reduce potential conflicts between dogs and other park users</td>
<td>The site includes two areas (one within a quarry with rock edges and one on a grassed upper area overlooking the quarry)&lt;br&gt;The quarry creates a well contained area away from roads that could be used for off leash without fencing (fencing could impact on the site’s less developed character)&lt;br&gt;The upper area is close to roads and could benefit from fencing to create a better used space&lt;br&gt;The reserve has good trees but it lacks seating and shelter&lt;br&gt;There is space for on-site car parking</td>
<td>The upper grassed area could be suitable for a defined fenced dog area&lt;br&gt;The dog area could be designed to protect the treed sections of the reserve&lt;br&gt;Existing trees would provide shade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballast Ground</td>
<td>Stockton, Fullerton</td>
<td>Eastern edge of Newcastle which means many people may need to drive to the site&lt;br&gt;Hunter River crossings could deter people from travelling to the site&lt;br&gt;Small immediate population catchment&lt;br&gt;Behind housing but good profile due to river setting&lt;br&gt;Link to Griffiths Reserve</td>
<td>The southern part of the reserve seems to be a sportsground and should therefore remain open and flexible with use&lt;br&gt;The reserve would be used for walking along the river edge and connects to boating activities to the north</td>
<td>There is confusion as to which parts of the reserve are off leash (conflicting signs with internet)&lt;br&gt;The reserve is large and open with minimal trees, seating or shelter. However, should not impact on views&lt;br&gt;A road entrance and small car park is located between two reserve sections (these could be improved in quality)&lt;br&gt;A poor standard toilet is linked to the sports area</td>
<td>Waterfront open space should not be fenced as this would impact on the views and recreation value of the reserve&lt;br&gt;Potential conflicts with walkers and bikes using the pathway&lt;br&gt;If the southern section of Ballast Ground (below the road and car park) is required for sport, it should not be allowed for off leash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>Site Characteristics</td>
<td>Site Impacts and Suitability</td>
<td>Need for improvements</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>High profile site with major road access</td>
<td>Close to population centre, central to public transport, walking and cycling network</td>
<td>A large proportion of the site is bushland with trails</td>
<td>Provide the site with better access and facilities</td>
<td>Consider the site as a potential dog park for the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>Relatively low profile site but connected to Throsby Creek, key recreation area</td>
<td>Relatively good access from Hargrave Street through to Elizabeth Street and Hargrave Street</td>
<td>The site is large and open, with open and linear paths</td>
<td>Improve the site with better facilities and facilities</td>
<td>The site could be developed as a dog park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrington</td>
<td>Foremost (Honey Suckle Reserve)</td>
<td>Car parking is provided along Hargrave Street and Hindmarsh Street</td>
<td>The site is at the northern end of the reserve which is less ideal for recreation</td>
<td>The site could be improved with better facilities and facilities</td>
<td>The site could be developed as a dog park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisham</td>
<td>Tuggeranong</td>
<td>The site is along the eastern side of the Creek and is a network of linear open space</td>
<td>The site is large and open, with open and linear paths</td>
<td>Improve the site with better facilities and facilities</td>
<td>The site could be developed as a dog park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waratah</td>
<td>North Lambton</td>
<td>Close to population centre, central to public transport, walking and cycling network</td>
<td>The site is large and open, with open and linear paths</td>
<td>Improve the site with better facilities and facilities</td>
<td>The site could be developed as a dog park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Information</td>
<td>Site Location (profile, connection to the population, accessibility)</td>
<td>Potential Impact on People (residents, existing or future users, noise, traffic)</td>
<td>Site Characteristics and the Need for Improvements (surface, infrastructure etc)</td>
<td>Site Impacts and Suitability (site character, function, environment)</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Dixon Park Reserve | Merewether, The Junction | 0.5 | - Beach site on ocean that is high profile  
- Good off road parking but well used for beach activities  
- The dog off leash area is likely to service coastal communities and attract others from beyond the area (due to the high profile of the site) | - If the dog area was available 24 hours a day or an area was fenced, this would impact on the recreation use of the park  
- The playground is in the centre of the park and dogs run through the area. As such children could be at risk  
- Dogs run near the picnic shelters and can impact on other park users  
- Question the suitability for off leash at all (potential to be a key recreation space) | - The site receives a high level of dog off leash use in the mornings and evenings (there is timed use of the site)  
- The off leash area is too small and poorly defined. It is located along the north and eastern edges but people and dogs congregate towards the centre of the reserve (on the eastern side)  
- The ground surface is poor due to the sandy soil and the lack of irrigation  
- Seating and shelter is lacking in the off leash area | - Excluding an area for dogs would not be appropriate due to the recreation importance of the reserve  
- The site has the potential to be further enhanced for recreation  
- Fencing for exclusive dog use is not appropriate for a prime site along the ocean | - Retain use to enable other recreation activities at other times  
- Better define and increase the off leash area (potentially define through signage and consider the eastern section up to the path to give a larger space)  
- Provide some additional seating and a shelter within the off leash area  
- Consider fencing the playground to reduce the risk for children  
- Fencing the dog off leash area is not recommended due to location and recreation value of site  
- Prepare site Master Plan to define use, manage competing interests and guide development. |
| Elermore Vale Park | Wallsend, Elermore Vale | 0.8 | - A local space for dogs off leash due to the local and low profile location  
- Near main roads but very suburban around the park  
- Car parking is in the local cul de sac street | - People with dogs could be a main existing user of the site and the impact could be limited  
- There is a good provision of other open space in the area that people could use | - Open grassed park area surrounded by trees linked to creekline  
- The site is timed off leash and not sure of the reasons for this  
- The cul de sac setting creates a safe space for dogs off leash (with little traffic) | - The site is mainly a grassed area with trees around the edge which is ideal for dogs off leash  
- Fencing the reserve would impact on the appeal and usability of the site and dog owners could prefer the existing openness of the site | - Maintain the site as a local open dog off leash area (not fenced)  
- Do not fence the park for dogs due to the local and natural character of the site and low traffic risks.  
- Remove timed restriction |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Information</th>
<th>Site Location (profile, connection to the population, accessibility)</th>
<th>Potential Impact on People (residents, existing or future users, noise, traffic)</th>
<th>Site Characteristics and the Need for Improvements (surface, infrastructure etc)</th>
<th>Site Impacts and Suitability (site character, function, environment)</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Horseshoe Beach</td>
<td>Newcastle, Cooks Hill</td>
<td>The site has high recreation value beyond people with dogs</td>
<td>Small beach around 230m long</td>
<td>The availability of the beach for dog off leash cannot be determined by Council</td>
<td>Encourage Roads and Maritime Services to maintain Horseshoe Beach as an off leash area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- The foreshore park behind the beach receives high recreation use and should not be allocated for dogs off leash</td>
<td>- Near Nobby’s Beach (which is not leash free)</td>
<td>- The beach receives high use by people with dogs and the loss of this space would impact on the community</td>
<td>- Not suitable to fence the beach or surrounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Walk through paths within coastal vegetated area to access the site</td>
<td>- The recreation and natural character of the beach and surrounding open space would not be suitable for fencing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Paths and vegetation could be better defined and managed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isle of Purbeck</td>
<td>Devonport</td>
<td>The site is high profile</td>
<td>The grass surface is worn and there are holes due to high use and dogs digging</td>
<td>- The site is a large size and is likely to function well as a dog park</td>
<td>Should be a higher level dog park due to its size and high profile location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Good profile site off Pacific Highway</td>
<td>- The concrete canal linked to the dog park is accessed by the dogs although the sides are steep and dogs getting out of the water could be an issue</td>
<td>- Fencing the whole reserve would impact on the large open character of the park (which is what dog owners seem to like)</td>
<td>- Consider fencing along the car park (using the existing bollard line) and creating a double gate entrance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Small amount of off street car parking</td>
<td>- Trees are located around the edges of the dog off lease area and the central area is open with no shade or seating</td>
<td>- The site appears to be well contained for dogs off leash although fencing near the car park and to the canal fence would increase the safety of dogs</td>
<td>- Improve the grass surface through regular maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Relatively good position in the City with surrounding population but also industrial and commercial</td>
<td>- Agility equipment is located at southern end</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Consider some additional trees for shade through the central area as well as infrastructure (seating, shelter, dog bubbler, additional bins)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Link to Isle of Purbeck sports complex</td>
<td>- The bin collection has been raised as an issue by site users</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Review the toilet location, design and management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Appealing site along Purbeck</td>
<td>- The toilet is ageing and may require upgrade</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Increase frequency of bin collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Information</th>
<th>Site Location (profile, connection to the population, accessibility)</th>
<th>Potential Impact on People (residents, existing or future users, noise, traffic)</th>
<th>Site Characteristics and the Need for Improvements (surface, infrastructure etc)</th>
<th>Site Impacts and Suitability (site character, function, environment)</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| King Edward Park | Newcastle, Cooks Hill | 2.2 | - The park is a significant large site near the ocean that is high profile and well used  
- Steep topography at dog off leash area and the whole site  
- Roadside parking and car parking on edge of the park but in busy times it could be difficult to park  
- On eastern edge of Newcastle which means most people would need to drive to the site  
- Whilst other recreation areas (not off leash) are provided in the park the off leash area takes up a large section of the park  
- Due to the high profile of King Edward Park, there could be demand to use the site for viewing and picnics (although the slope could be a deterrent)  
- A fenced area would impact on broader community use  
- The site incorporates Themeda Grasslands, although the grasslands are fenced off to minimise park user impacts  
- The dog off leash area slope is steep, although this also makes the site steep for broader recreation use  
- The area for dogs off leash is not well defined and signage is poor  
- Lack of seating and viewing areas  
- Cliff edge on the ocean edge of the dog off leash area raises safety issues  | - Potential impacts on the Themeda Grasslands  
- Question the suitability of dogs off leash given the site location and high use of the rest of the park  
- Some people use the slope for dog and personal fitness and taking away the site would impact on these people  
- Fencing would be inconsistent with the site character and surrounds including the ocean setting and the natural area  | - Review the appropriateness of dogs off leash at this prime site  
- Not recommended for fencing due to the ocean frontage and natural character of the site  |
| Maryland Drive Reserve | Maryland, Fletcher, Minmi | 1.3 | - The site has the potential to support people in the south west area  
- High profile site near main roads (Maryland Drive and Minmi Road) with good access for surrounding residents  
- Car parking provided in the central part of the reserve  
- The existing dog area is against backyards and there could be impacts on these local residents if a fenced dog park were to incorporate the backyards  
- The site is likely to have limited recreation appeal but could be upgraded in time  
- A linear trail and recreation nodes could be provided as well as a defined dog park (particularly if the dog park is fenced)  
- The reserve is large and has a linear park character  
- The reserve runs along Maryland Creek  
- Council is proposing to widen the creekline in the future to address flooding issues and naturalise the site. However, a dog park could be designed to allow for this  
- The reserve is very baron with a lack of trees and infrastructure  
- The reserve was used for sport but flooding issues resulted in a relocation  | - The potential to impact on the site is limited due to its poor quality  
- The site could be considered as a key recreation reserve. However, the potential recreation use could be limited by the linear character of the reserve  
- A fenced dog park could be designed to separate dogs from walkers and cyclists on the linear trail and enable a recreation as well as a dogs focus  | - A fenced dog area could be considered that allows for the creekline redesign and expansion  
- The site would be large enough for two off leash areas for which there is demand (one for larger dogs and one for puppies and small dogs)  
- Increase the trees, seating and shelter as part of a fenced dog park and through the creekline works  |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Information</th>
<th>Site Location (profile, connection to the population, accessibility)</th>
<th>Potential Impact on People (residents, existing or future users, noise, traffic)</th>
<th>Site Characteristics and the Need for Improvements (surface, infrastructure etc)</th>
<th>Site Impacts and Suitability (site character, function, environment)</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Michael/Pilkington Street Reserve | Waratah, North Lambton | 1.3 - Surrounded by residential streets but good access from main roads  
- Relatively central to suburban areas and potential wide residential catchment  
- On street car parking but wide streets  
- Acacia Reserve is relatively close by | - The reserve has previously been used as a sportsground (over 20 years ago) but it is not well suited to sport and there is no amenity. The Reserve is now primarily used for informal recreation including dogs off leash  
- The reserve is large enough for only part of the reserve to be available for dogs off leash and it could still have a recreation focus  
- Due to the residential surrounds there could be community resistance to a fenced dog park with potential increased traffic, noise and dog incidents | - The site is timed off leash and not sure of the reasons (unless it is to avoid risks with other recreation)  
- The site is dominated by a pit/ quarry area with steep edges  
- A fenced playground is located on the upper level overlooking the quarry | - Given the reserve is neighbourhood level and the main recreation activities are on the upper level, there should be limited impact on other users  
- Dogs off lease could be in the ‘pit area’ and recreation could be catered for on the upper levels (southern end and reserve edges)  
- Council has advised there could be flooding issues with the site | - Dogs off lease could be allowed at any time versus timed providing there are no impacts on recreation users  
- Do not fence as Acacia Park nearby is more suitable for this  
- Improve amenity with tree planting and seating |
| Nesca Park | Newcastle, Cooks Hill | 2.1 - Lower profile site accessed through local streets  
- Steep topography at eastern end (existing off leash area)  
- Near coastline including King Edward Park  
- Off leash area is away from roads | - Local area could be impacted on by attracting more dogs to the reserve (increased traffic and noise)  
- Would abut backyards and there could be local community resistance for a fenced dog park  
- Dogs would need to remain at the eastern end (the current off leash area) as the western end has a good recreation space | - Appealing recreation park with unique playground in the western and central parts of the park  
- The border of the dog off leash area is difficult to determine on-site  
- Off leash area backs onto native vegetation  
- Potential to provide additional seating and information  
- Toilet provided in the park but could be improved in quality  
- Lack of seating, shade and shelter in the dog off leash space | - Fencing would divide the reserve unless an access route at the southern end of the existing off leash area is created  
- Dog users could be satisfied with the existing open nature of the off leash area | - Retain as a dog off leash area but better define the boundaries and improve seating, shelter and shade  
- Not recommended for fencing due to the local setting of the reserve and the adequacy of the current location of the dog off leash area |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Information</th>
<th>Site Location (profile, connection to the population, accessibility)</th>
<th>Potential Impact on People (residents, existing or future users, noise, traffic)</th>
<th>Site Characteristics and the Need for Improvements (surface, infrastructure etc)</th>
<th>Site Impacts and Suitability (site character, function, environment)</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Purdue Park      | Mayfield, Warabrook 0.6                                               | - Local park behind housing  
- Access into the reserve is only from Scholey Street (one entry and exit point)  
- Street car parking only  
- Dog off leash area is away from the road  
- Good population catchment but railway line is a barrier | - Potential local use and off leash dogs could be the main activity due to the relatively hidden site  
- However, the immediate area does not have much open space and dedicating for dogs only would result in a lack of provision in the area  
- Greater use by dogs could impact on surrounding houses and broader park users | - Pleasant good sized site with large shady fig trees and good condition grass  
- Appealing park for informal recreation (cricket pitch) | - Could fence the entrance (most of the reserve is already fenced with backyard and drainage fences) but this could give the perception the site is for dogs only  
- The site is too local and connected to housing to be more than it is  
- Cricket pitch use would be affected | - Continue to support as off leash but do not fence the entrance or suggest this is a higher level dog park  
- Dedicating to dogs off leash through a fenced entrance is not recommended due to the local setting and limited open space in the area for the local community |
| Rawson Reserve   | Stockton, Fullerton 5.0                                               | - On eastern edge of Newcastle which means many people may need to drive to the site  
- Hunter River crossings could deter people from travelling to the site  
- Small immediate population catchment  
- Near caravan park  
- Link to Pitt Street Reserve and Griffiths Reserve | - Key waterfront site with 50m swimming pool facility and existing skate park  
- The reserve is used for walking along the river edge with good connections to other open space  
- Potential impact on recreation users although the dog off leash area is separated from the key recreation parks | - Large grassed area with some trees near the edges and a path network  
- Off leash area includes access to a small beach  
- Off leash area adjoins the skate park and pool  
- Lack of bins and could have more trees for shade | - Question the need for this dog off leash area as well as Ballast. However, caravan visitors could use the space for dogs and access to the beach for dogs is likely to be important to locals  
- A fenced dog area would not complement the site character  
- Potential for site to be key recreation and boating area (particularly given link to tourism and pool)  
- The waterfront open space has high recreation and natural value and therefore should not be fenced | - Could reduce the grassed area allocated for dogs off leash and shift the edge away from the skate park and swimming pool  
- Consider providing a wide linear connection to the beach (the beach area could be of greatest value)  
- Not recommended for fencing due to the waterfront and linear park character of the reserve as well as the existing and potential recreation focus and activities |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Information</th>
<th>Site Location (profile, connection to the population, accessibility)</th>
<th>Potential Impact on People (residents, existing or future users, noise, traffic)</th>
<th>Site Characteristics and the Need for Improvements (surface, infrastructure etc)</th>
<th>Site Impacts and Suitability (site character, function, environment)</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tarro Recreation Area</strong></td>
<td>Beresfield Hexham</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>- Main roads are nearby but local road access - Small population catchment out of the main part of Newcastle - Car park within the reserve but a little far from the off leash area</td>
<td>- Fencing part of the reserve for dogs would impact on the recreation use and natural value of the reserve</td>
<td>- The site is within a wetland setting around a water body with some newly planted trees - Open and natural character</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Upper Reserve</strong></td>
<td>Wallsend, Elermore Vale</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>- Could support people in the south west area but the site is not ideal and there is limited use - Adjoins main roads including Lake Road and Newcastle Link Road of which both have high traffic levels - Access is through a local road (which is not ideal) - Car parking could be provided within the site</td>
<td>- The site is relatively undeveloped and would have limited other recreation value - The site is next to a sportsground but divided by a creekline - The northern part of the site is away from housing but close to traffic</td>
<td>- The site itself is a good size and the setting is appealing. However, the main road location is a deterrent due to the very high traffic volumes and safety concerns for dogs - Local users have advised that people do not use the space due to the traffic risks and they would still be concerned if the space was fenced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>West End Park</strong></td>
<td>Adamstown, Kotara</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>- Relatively isolated and low profile site - Access by local roads - Next to railway line and less appealing site - Railway line is a key barrier to catchment</td>
<td>- Local resident area could be affected by additional traffic and noise - Housing backs onto the reserve and immediate residents could resist increased use - Activities and car parking flow onto the reserve (linked to adjoining buildings) - The site lacks appeal and usage besides for dogs off leash could be limited (as such impacts on existing use would be limited)</td>
<td>- The area for dogs off leash is small, being a strip of land along the railway line - Seating, shade, shelter and a pathway connection are lacking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Potential Additional Dog Off Leash Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Information</th>
<th>Site Location (profile, connection to the population, accessibility)</th>
<th>Potential Impact on People (residents, existing or future users, noise, traffic)</th>
<th>Site Characteristics and the Need for Improvements (surface, infrastructure etc)</th>
<th>Site Impacts and Suitability (site character, function, environment)</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brickworks Park</td>
<td>Wallsend, Elermore Vale</td>
<td>A higher profile recreation park with heritage components</td>
<td>The reserve has a stormwater management role and includes a waterbody and undeveloped sections</td>
<td>It would not be appropriate to provide a fenced area for dogs as this would impact on the natural and open character of the reserve A large swale located in the south west part of the reserve could be suitable for dogs off leash (providing dogs are far enough from the playground)</td>
<td>Consider allowing dogs off leash in the south west part of the reserve (the swale area)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bull and Tourle Streets Reserve</td>
<td>Mayfield, Warabrook</td>
<td>Would service the area between Industrial Drive and Pacific Highway. Whilst this is not an overly large catchment, people in the area are potentially isolated from other dog parks by the major roads</td>
<td>The reserve is quite large and relatively open with trees along Bull Street and a playground in the centre</td>
<td>The size of the reserve would allow space for dogs off leash (up to 0.7ha could be allocated) The playground is located in the centre of the reserve and ideally this would be relocated towards the west side of the reserve at the end of its life to allow for off leash on the east side</td>
<td>Consider creating a dog off leash area on the east side of the reserve. This could require fencing along Bull Road to protect dogs. The playground could be shifted to the west and possibly fenced to separate dogs and children Consider whether a fully fenced dog park at this reserve is appropriate if it is not appropriate to provide a fenced dog park in Stevenson Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Information</td>
<td>Site Location (profile, connection to the population, accessibility)</td>
<td>Potential Impact on People (residents, existing or future users, noise, traffic)</td>
<td>Site Characteristics and the Need for Improvements (surface, infrastructure etc)</td>
<td>Site Impacts and Suitability (site character, function, environment)</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claremont Park</td>
<td>Adamstown, Kotara</td>
<td>- The reserve is surrounded by local residential streets</td>
<td>- Large grassed area surrounded</td>
<td>- Not an existing dog park and used for recreation</td>
<td>- Could be defined as an off-leash dog area but not suitable for fencing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Car parking would need to be in the local street</td>
<td>- by bushland</td>
<td>- Most of the reserve is treed (natural) and could</td>
<td>- Consider allowing off-leash space it should be local and the site should not be heavily promoted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Suburban catchment</td>
<td>- Playground located on eastern side of the reserve</td>
<td>not be fenced</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Bush tracks connect to the reserve</td>
<td>- Potential impact on recreation use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambton Park</td>
<td>Lambton, New Lambton</td>
<td>- Good distributor road connections</td>
<td>- Spaces could be used for sport or recreation and their loss could impact on user groups and residents</td>
<td>- The site is not an existing off-leash dog park</td>
<td>- The south western part of Lambton Park could be considered for a defined fenced dog park (for which there is demand)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Good location central to the population</td>
<td>- If land is taken for a dog park there will be limited open spaces for informal recreation</td>
<td>- A dog area near the tennis courts would impact on the potential recreation use of this space</td>
<td>- The walking desire line (on the western side) should be retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Car parking could be established along the southern edge of the reserve (to also cater for the aquatic centre)</td>
<td>- A walking ‘desire line’ goes through the west side of the reserve from the bowls club area</td>
<td>- A dog area between the lawn bowls and swimming pool is too small and would limit improvements</td>
<td>- A grassed area for training could be retained to the north of a dog park (on the western side)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- The south western part of the reserve could have the greatest potential for a dog park, being a good size and less likely to be required for other activities</td>
<td>- There is a risk that the reserve will become over developed</td>
<td>- Lighting could be considered to enable night use of the dog park given the sportsground will be used at night</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- The south western part of the reserve could have the greatest potential for a dog park, being a good size and less likely to be required for other activities</td>
<td>- The south western part of the reserve would be developed</td>
<td>- The walking desire line (on the western side) should be retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- There is a risk that the reserve will become over developed</td>
<td>- A dog area between the lawn bowls and swimming pool is too small and would limit improvements</td>
<td>- Lighting could be considered to enable night use of the dog park given the sportsground will be used at night</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Information</td>
<td>Site Location (profile, connection to the population, accessibility)</td>
<td>Potential Impact on People (residents, existing or future users, noise, traffic)</td>
<td>Site Characteristics and the Need for Improvements (surface, infrastructure etc)</td>
<td>Site Impacts and Suitability (site character, function, environment)</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayo Street Reserve</td>
<td>Shortland - Jesmond 2.7 - Local lower profile site - The reserve has good passive surveillance - Street car parking potential is good (wide low traffic street)</td>
<td>- The reserve is large enough for dogs off leash to have limited impact on residents</td>
<td>- The reserve is large and open (undeveloped) - The reserve lacks trees, shelter and paths - Would need to improve the quality and appeal of the reserve (which ideally would do anyway)</td>
<td>- The large open site is ideal for dogs to run around - Need to add trees, seating and potentially a shelter and drinking water for dogs - There is no need for fencing as the local road would have little traffic</td>
<td>- Allow dogs off leash at the reserve (ideally the whole reserve area to provide a good sized space) - Increase trees for shade and provide seating - Ideally also provide drinking water for dogs, a bin and shelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Connell Reserve</td>
<td>Adamstown, Kotara 2.1 - The reserve is located on the northern edge of the Merewether Golf Club - Lower profile site accessed through a local street off Glebe Road - Housing catchment is limited by golf course and main roads</td>
<td>- Nearby local residents could be concerned about an off leash area, particularly if it is fenced and there is additional traffic and noise</td>
<td>- Good size treed reserve with playground on south eastern side - The reserve includes an energy sub-station that will be used by Council as a depot location in the future. Vehicles entering the site could be a risk to dogs - Street parking exists and parking to be linked to the energy sub-station road</td>
<td>- If the dog park is fenced, this would minimise potential conflicts and risks associated with the depot site</td>
<td>- Consider a good sized fenced dog park as the area is lacking dog off leash areas - Locate the dog park away from housing fronting onto the eastern side of the reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warabrook Wetlands</td>
<td>Mayfield, Warabrook 25 - A large reserve and wetland area but not easily accessible (access through local roads) - Reserve can be accessed from Decora Crescent and Eucalyptus Circuit (access from Eucalyptus Circuit is least difficult) - Whilst housing is around the wetlands, there is limited housing to the north and surrounding development includes golf course and Newcastle University</td>
<td>- The reserve is large enough to allow dogs off leash in part of the reserve without impacting on other uses - Residents are some distance from the recreation areas within the reserve</td>
<td>- The reserve covers a large area and includes grassed and treed areas, play settings and picnic settings - The quality of the reserve could be further improved - Car parking is provided near the Eucalyptus Circuit entrance</td>
<td>- It would be possible to allow dogs off leash in an area away from the play and picnic settings, towards the Eucalyptus Circuit entrance - It may be possible to allow water access for dogs to swim (subject to safety and water quality)</td>
<td>- Consider allowing dogs off leash in a section between the Eucalyptus Circuit entry car park and the recreation areas (away from play and picnics but allowing water access if appropriate)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Potential Fenced Dog Parks and Rationale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Precinct</th>
<th>Suggested Provision</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acacia Avenue Reserve</td>
<td>Waratah, North Lambton</td>
<td>- Create a fenced dog park that is around 0.9ha on the upper part of the reserve (closest to the corner of Acacia Avenue and Alnwick Road). &lt;br&gt; - Include some additional trees for shade, seating, a shelter and drinking water for dogs. &lt;br&gt; - Incorporate a pathway for disability access and to encourage dog owners to walk around the site. &lt;br&gt; - Provide some on-site car parking off Alnwick Road and/or consider angle parking along part of Alnwick Road. &lt;br&gt; - Provide a double gate entrance with bins near car parking and near Acacia Avenue. &lt;br&gt; - Allow dogs off leash in the quarry section of the reserve (unfenced).</td>
<td>- Acacia Avenue Reserve is centrally located and accessible.  &lt;br&gt; - Other open space than can cater for broader recreation is located nearby and as such the allocation of the reserve for dogs off leash should not impact on the community. &lt;br&gt; - Community members have suggested this as a site through the park interviews.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrington Foreshore (Honey Suckle Reserve)</td>
<td>Wickham, Tighes Hill, Carrington</td>
<td>- Create a fenced dog park that is around 0.7ha using most of the reserve including the Crown land adjoining Young Street if this can be achieved (an agreement or land allocation will be required). &lt;br&gt; - Include some additional trees for shade, seating, a shelter and drinking water for dogs. &lt;br&gt; - Incorporate a pathway for disability access from the entrances to the shelter. &lt;br&gt; - Link a path connection to the existing pathway network but exclude the existing path along the waterway from the dog park. &lt;br&gt; - Use lower fencing to maintain views over Throsby Creek and retain an open site. However, ensure the fence height is safe for dogs and potentially the fencing could be higher nearer Elizabeth Street. &lt;br&gt; - Provide double gate entrances with bins near Hargrave Street and Young Street.</td>
<td>- The reserve is large and has limited recreation value as other parts of the Carrington Foreshore provide for recreation.  &lt;br&gt; - Community members have suggested this as a site and there is initial support from the Carrington Community Council.  &lt;br&gt; - Fencing would provide a protected environment whilst maintaining a large open space for dogs.  &lt;br&gt; - Fencing would minimise risks for users of the adjoining linear path network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambton Park</td>
<td>Lambton, New Lambton</td>
<td>- Create a fenced dog park that is around 0.6ha in the south western corner of the sports complex. &lt;br&gt; - Include some additional trees for shade, seating, a shelter and drinking water for dogs. &lt;br&gt; - Incorporate a pathway for disability access and to encourage dog owners to walk around the site. &lt;br&gt; - Consider lighting to support night use. &lt;br&gt; - Provide angle car parking along Durham Road. &lt;br&gt; - Provide a double gate entrance with bins near the Durham Road car parking and at the northern end linked to a pedestrian path to Howe Street and the sports facilities.</td>
<td>- Lambton Park is centrally located and in an area that is lacking dog off leash opportunities.  &lt;br&gt; - Community members have suggested this as a site through submissions and park interviews.  &lt;br&gt; - A good sized dog park can be achieved without impacting on other users of the sports complex or the wider community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Precinct</td>
<td>Suggested Provision</td>
<td>Rationale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Maryland Drive Reserve       | Maryland, Fletcher, Minmi | • Create two fenced dog parks, with one being for larger dogs and the other for puppies and small dogs.  
• The potential size of the two areas could be around 0.8ha for the larger dog area and 0.4ha for the smaller dog area.  
• Include trees for shade, seating, a shelter and drinking water for dogs in both dog parks.  
• Establish a defined on-site car park between the two dog parks using the existing car park space.  
• Provide double gate entrances with bins near the car parking.  
• Establish a pathway along the creekline that is outside the dog parks. | • The reserve is very large and less usable for other sport or recreation activities.  
• The opportunity for the broader community to walk or cycle along a linear pathway will not be affected.  
• There is still land in the reserve to the south that could be designed for broader community use if required. |
| O'Connell Park               | Adamstown, Kotara       | • Consider creating a fenced dog park that is around 0.5ha on the southern edge of the reserve adjoining the Merewether Golf Club. The local community will need to be consulted on this due to the potential impact on close residents.  
• Include some additional trees for shade, seating, a shelter and drinking water for dogs.  
• Incorporate a pathway for disability access from the entrance to the shelter.  
• Create some on-site car parking along the ‘sub-station entry road’ if considered safe to do so and subject to community consultation.  
• Provide a double gate entrance with a bin near the car parking. | • The area is lacking off leash areas and other opportunities for providing a fenced dog park in the area are limited. |

The priority for timing of the potential fenced dog parks could be as follows (based on demand and site potential):
1. Lambton Park: There is high demand and there is a lack of dog off leash provision in the area.
2. Maryland Drive Reserve: This is in a growth area and the provision for dogs off leash in the area is poor. Also, the site enables a separate area for small dogs and puppies.
3. Carrington Foreshore (Honey Suckle Reserve): This is a good sized and well located site that would contribute to a good spread of facilities (along with Lambton Park and Maryland Drive Reserve).
4. O’Connell Reserve: The area is lacking dog off leash areas but the site is not ideal (Gregson Reserve would have been a better site if this had been available).
5. Acacia Avenue Reserve: The reserve is centrally located but the quarry part of the reserve can be safety used for off leash and as such this is not such a high priority plus Lambton Park is in the same Ward area.
Appendix C: Community engagement report and summaries

CITY OF NEWCASTLE DOGS IN OPEN SPACES STRATEGY

ON LINE COMMUNITY SURVEY

Conducted between 18 January and 9 February 2018
Dogs in Open Spaces Strategy

Survey Results February 2018
To better understand key issues, community needs and priorities, Council has consulted with key organisations, sporting groups and park committees, held drop in sessions and attended the annual Pups in the Park event. An online survey was undertaken in addition to these face to face community engagement activities.

The survey was available to members of Council’s community reference panel, Newcastle Voice, as well as members of the broader community. A total of 1,076 people took part in the survey.

Data handling and analysis was carried out using Sparq software by NCC's Community Engagement team.

Results

Current dog off leash usage patterns
Respondents were presented with a list of all existing off leash areas within the Newcastle Local Government Area (LGA) and were able to select up to three locations that they mainly use. The highest proportion of respondents (32%) indicated that they do not use any dog off leash areas within the Local Government Area, followed by:

- Islington Park (21%)
- Area outside of the City of Newcastle (20%)
- Carrington Foreshore (14%)
- King Edward Park (14%).
- Dixon Park (13%)

The majority of respondents who use a dog off leash area do so at least two times a week (54%).

Participants who stated that they do not use off leash areas (n=226), were asked to select options from a predetermined list and/or could provide an alternative ‘other’ reason. The majority of respondents (54%) selected lack of fenced dog off leash areas as their main reason for not using a dog off leash area in Newcastle.

Benefits of dog off leash areas
Participants were able to select up to three main benefits from a predetermined list, including the option of 'other'. The benefit nominated by the highest proportion of participants (81%) was dogs are able to run free and exercise. This was closely followed by dogs learn to socialise with other dogs (73%).

Issues and concerns
Principle findings include:

- The most mentioned concern was that some people don’t pick up after their dogs (53%), followed by often dogs off leash are not kept under control (38%) and some dogs may attack your dogs (25%)
- The statements with the highest level of agreement within the survey (either strongly agreed or agreed) were:
  - Provide some fenced off leash areas in Newcastle (84%)
  - Create some new dog off leash areas in districts that are lacking off leash opportunities (81%)
  - Increase trees, shade, shelter and seating at existing dog off leash areas (78%)
Better define the area of existing dog off leash areas through paths, landscapes and signage (75%).

At the end of the survey, participants were given the opportunity to provide comments and suggestions about specific existing or potential off leash areas.

The top themes mentioned in the open questions were:

**Fencing of areas**
A wide range of responses called for the need for fenced areas in a variety of locations. When talking about fenced areas respondents mentioned that fencing would help to improve dog and human safety.

**Bins and dog waste**
Bins and the provision of disposable dog waste bags were a common topic mentioned. Respondents spoke about the lack of adequate bins at existing dog off leash sites and made suggestions to have a dog waste bag dispenser at bins for users of the area.

**Enforcement**
A number of comments were made relating to enforcement including patrols, fines and education. Some respondents felt that in order to curb bad behaviour there needs to be a greater presence by Council rangers through patrols, fines or using cameras. Others felt that better education and increased signage at sites may be a better strategy.

**Dog control and Safety**
Many responses expressed a fear of dogs that are out of control. There were also many responses that expressed concern for dogs running away or running onto nearby roads due to a lack of fencing.

**Key Suggestions**

Principle findings include:

- The top features identified for improvement for existing dog off leash areas were *trees and shade* (63%), *drinking water for dogs* (62%) and *fenced area for dogs off leash* (60%).

- The top three suggested locations for a potential fenced dog park by suburb were Lambton (16%), Islington (7%) and New Lambton (6%). Lambton Park was the most mentioned specific site (12%) for a potential fenced dog park.

NEWCASTLE DOGS IN OPEN SPACES STRATEGY
COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT: ON SITE INTERVIEWS

INTERVIEW SUMMARY FOR SITES
Islington Dog Off Leash Site
Saturday 2 December 2017, 9.00am – 12.30pm

Participant information:
62 interviews (41 female, 21 male)
Suburbs: 12 Tighes Hill, 11 Islington, 6 Maryville, 5 Mayfield, 4 Mayfield East, 3 Waratah West, 3 North Lambton, 2 Hamilton East, 2 Georgetown, 2 Armington Gardens and 1 in each of Lambton, Hamilton South, Adamstown, Warabrook, Waratah, Edgeworth, Stockton and Fern Bay (4 not recorded)

Information on Dogs
Number and type of dogs:
- Large Breed Dogs: 20
- Medium Breed Dogs: 34
- Small Breed Dogs: 18
- No Dogs: 2

Places take dogs off leash:
- Islington Park: 56
- Horseshoe Beach: 19
- Redhead Beach: 7
- Carrington Reserve: 6
- King Edward Park: 4
- Acacia Avenue Reserve: 2
- Dixon Park: 2
- Braye Park: 2
- Waratah Reserve: 2
- Michael Street Reserve: 1
- Rawson Reserve: 1
- Upper Reserve: 1
- Lambton Park: 1

PARTICIPANT COMMENTS

Comments on existing dog off leash areas

ISLINGTON:
- Islington is great, loved, fantastic, very popular, valuable (20)
- Need poo bags (9)
- Water access is good and should maintain (9)
- Need for shelters (8)
- Lack of fencing (7)
- Islington is close to home or easy to get to (6)
- People don’t pick up after their dogs (6)
- Islington is very sociable and people are pleasant (6)
- Islington is big and spacious (6)
- Increase drinking water for dogs (6)
- Need to empty bins more often (6)
- Islington is good as it is (5)
- Need more bins (5)
- Islington is the only one to go to as it is the best (5)
- A lot of people use Islington (4)
- Strong sense of community (4)
- 20–30 dogs in the evening (3)
- Like the agility equipment (3)
- Need fencing near car park because close to Maitland Road (3)
• Drive to the park and use car parking (3)
• People need to keep their dogs under better control (2)
• Love the existing trees and should retain (good for shade) (2)
• Should be better fencing (2)
• Poor ground condition (holes dug) (2)
• Islington is great for exercising dogs (2)
• Need a light for winter use (2)
• Need a light near the car park for winter months (could go off at 8pm) (2)
• In the afternoons there are 30-40+ dogs (2)
• Dog behaviour is generally good
• A lot of people stay for awhile
• People with working dogs tend to use Islington in the mornings
• A lot of big dogs come to Islington on a daily basis
• Some dogs are too boisterous for the smaller dogs
• Need signs to say ‘pick up’
• Bins are not conveniently placed
• Need spot to leave bags
• Dogs dig the soil (something trying to eat)
• A great space but can be an issue for dogs that run away
• Don’t need trees in the middle, just shelters
• Good to have seats around
• Need more seats
• Need more seats facing the water
• Need disability and pram access at the entrance
• Council maintains Islington quite well
• Like everything about Islington
• Access at east end of park
• At low tide dogs can get across the drain to the road
• Have the opening to the water at the end furthest from the car park where the water is deeper
• Great atmosphere
• Like the car parking
• Make Islington a premier dog park
• Not enough car parking
• Bindis and weeds issue

GENERAL/OTHER AREAS:
• Horseshoe Beach is too small and narrow and has too many dogs (4)
• Lack of provision in suburbs
• Need more dog parks
• Use Maryland Reserve but it is on a busy road
• Horseshoe Beach is good but it gets crowded and there are conflicts with kids swimming
• There are no specific small dog areas (puppies and small dogs are at risk)
• Small dogs go to Carrington (Honeysuckle) Park – smaller and better supervision
• Carrington (Honeysuckle) Park needs more shade
• Shelter in Carrington (Honeysuckle) Park
• Carrington (Honeysuckle) Park drinking water is outside the off leash area
• Go to Carrington as Islington is too busy most days
• Some are no good, e.g. Wallsend with busy road
• Would be good to have off leash at Adamstown – there is a small one (West End Park) but it is not a good one
• West End Park is awful
• King Edward dog area is not great as it is too hilly, too close to the road and often there is no one else there
• King Edward is not so busy and people are unsure of where to go
• King Edward has no shade or seats and fences have wrecked the space
• Dixon Park off leash is right next to play and there are conflicts
• Redhead Beach is good
- Use Braye Park – a good site and can run on paths with dog off leash
- Acacia Reserve needs fencing and facilities
- Tidy up parking at Acacia Reserve
- Acacia Reserve needs a picnic table and better maintenance
- People take their dogs off leash at the Islington Park sports area on their way to the dog off leash area
- People use the sports area at Islington because it is fenced
- Need more dog poo bins in parks and around waterways
- Don’t know many dog parks
- Purdue Park is covered in Bindis

**Fenced Off Leash Comments and Suggestions**

**ISLINGTON**
- Establish fence and gate along car park side to protect dogs from nearby road (20)
- Do not need fencing around the whole park (4)
- It would be ideal if Islington was fully fenced (4)
- Extend fence to meet fence along canal near car park (3)
- Need to retain access to the water (canal) (3)
- Fencing is good as is (2)
- Support more fencing at Islington (2)
- Fence Islington (2)
- Small fenced area for small dogs and puppies (2)
- Improve the fencing quality (2)
- Could fence part so that bikes can get through safely
- Could consider fenced area around the agility equipment
- Smaller fenced area for older people
- Islington is well fenced already
- Should fence along where bollards are near the car park
- Dogs are at risk with Maitland Road
- Needs fencing and gate for dog’s swimming
- Fence along the canal
- Michael Street is too busy and needs fencing
- Don’t fence Islington as it will spoil the character of the park
- Completely fence Islington (but opening to water)
- Islington should be fenced but need access to the river
- Keep access to the water
- Support fenced dog park
- Not realistic to fully fence Islington
- Islington is a good idea for fenced dog park but especially need better fencing near car park
- Need self locking gates
- Entrance needs to be pram friendly with ramp

**GENERAL/ OTHER**
- There do need to be some options for enclosed dog parks (6)
- Consider fenced dog park at:
  - Acacia Street Reserve (4)
  - Lambton Park (4)
  - Carrington Park (Honeysuckle) (5)
  - Harold Myers Park, Wallsend (2)
  - Islington sporting field
  - Foreshore area Carrington near Norfolk Street end of Arnold Street
  - Jesmond Park
  - Wickham
  - Off Industrial Road across from McDonalds (NSW Govt land)
- Need more fenced areas (3)
- Need double gates at entry (3)
- Support fenced dog parks (2)
- Carrington does not need fencing (2)
- Part fence Carrington (Honeysuckle) Park
- Need small dog fenced park
- It would be good to have a few fenced dog parks around the place
- There can be a need for fenced areas for certain breeds
- People are attracted to fully enclosed areas
- Feel safer with fencing
- Fenced areas close to where people live
- Have a smaller fenced area in a bigger unfenced areas for puppies and training
- Not fussed about fencing
- Braye Park is not ideal as it is not safe with heavy traffic nearby
- Braye Park is no good due to poor surveillance – dogs get off and get lost
- Don’t need to fence Waratah off leash area – it is very quiet
- Certain dogs wander off and fencing is good
- Need better fencing where dogs can get onto roads
- Fencing where dogs are in peril
- Don’t support fenced dog parks near busy roads
- Need fencing to keep dogs away from nature
- Most people don’t go to dog parks as their dogs will run and won’t come back
- There are more dogs in the inner city now and need more dog off leash in those areas

**Other comments and suggestions**

**ISLINGTON**
- Need better toilet (5)
- Toilets should be open (2)
- Islington is a great place to run dogs
- Islington is good because it is partly enclosed
- Islington is the best in Newcastle
- A ranger comes and threatens fines in the car park because it is not leash free
- People put rubbish in bins
- The bins should be emptied twice a week
- Toilets needed at Islington
- Toilets need to be better cleaned and managed (opened morning and shut at night)
- Need to open toilets daily preferably (9am – 5pm)
- A bit more car parking
- Need irrigation for dry periods
- Islington dogs are not well supervised
- If Islington gets busy with unruly dogs, would not come
- Too many dogs at Islington would discourage use
- Some organised ‘care’ groups misuse the park with 8-12 dogs
- The canal wall is slippery dangerous
- Would come to Islington as a large open dog park rather than go to a small fenced dog park
- Dog fights happen on a daily basis

**GENERAL/ OTHER**
- More water stations (6)
- Need good toilets that are open (5)
- It is great to have off leash dog parks (4)
- Should not have dog off leash on a sportsground (3)
- Need poo bag dispensers (3)
- Need to increase community education (3)
- Need more poo bins and increased bin collection (3)
- People take dogs off leash at sportsgrounds, e.g. Meyers Park, Islington Park sports are (2)
- Stockton beach is too far away (2)
- Redhead Beach is too far away (2)
- Horseshoe Beach is well used and would be an issue if lost dogs off leash (2)
- Lots of people do not pick up after their dogs (2)
- Provide shelters (2)
- People need better control of their dogs (2)
- Toilets are important for older adults (2)
- Need to increase signage of where dogs can be off leash (2)
- Improve signage at Braye Park and show definition of area off leash (2)
- Use sportgrounds before sport if people pick up the poo
- In Canberra sporting fields are off leash and there is timed use
- Sporting groups should not have preference over off leash
- Don’t know where other dog areas are
- There is no leash free area in Georgetown
- Horseshoe Beach is convenient with nearby car park
- Like Horseshoe Beach
- Horseshoe Beach is too crowded
- Would be good to have an alternative to Horseshoe Beach
- Working dogs use Horseshoe Beach and create conflicts as the space is too small for these dogs
- Dog was attached as a pup at Horseshoe Beach
- Only part of Redhead Beach is available for dogs off leash
- People use Burwood Beach off leash – there is interest in making this off leash
- It is good for dogs to have a swim
- Need leash free beaches
- Would be good to have extra off leash beaches
- Consider areas between Dixon and Bar Beach (could be off season)
- Consider Dudley Beach
- Consider an off leash link between The Ballast and Pitt Reserve
- Dogs are more controlled at Redhead Beach compared to Horseshoe Beach (different culture)
- Most people are good at picking up dog droppings
- People who don’t pick up after their dogs should be fined (they ruin it for everyone else)
- More seating
- Shade and seating are important
- Better located water stations
- Drinking water for dogs at Lambton Park
- People can bring own bags to pick up dog droppings
- Access to bins needed
- Collect bins more frequently at Horseshoe Beach
- No bins around rowing club Carrington
- Not much can do about dogs digging
- Paths are needed for families and people with a disability
- Need more water stations, seats and shelter at Carrington (Honeysuckle) Park
- Holes are created along drainage lines (water undercuts and dogs dig)
- Need to increase community awareness of where not to go off leash
- Identify times not suitable for off leash at Braye Park
- Fence the playground at Braye Park
- Irrigate around the playground at Braye Reserve
- Wickham Park is a good park for off leash
- People get confused about where they can take their dogs off leash
- Need somewhere with kids and dogs
- Smaller areas for small dogs
- Don’t know other off leash parks
- Potential off leash at Harold Myers Park
- Not sure where off leash at Carrington is
- Need greater self management, e.g. pick up after dogs
- People should not panic and pick up their dogs
- Give people the message to be responsible with their dogs (nice community messages)
• There are flights between dogs but people manage this
• Better signage
• Prefer to walk to off leash not drive
• There are a lot of parks in Newcastle but not a lot of off leash areas
• There is a gap in provision in the south east areas
• Animals are massively important for mental health and it is good to have places for people to go
• More people are getting dogs and Council needs to pay attention
• Dogs parks are a good way to socialise and meet people
• Need quiet areas for older dogs
• Consider mosquito repellent plantings
• Support timed use of areas
• Need places to exercise dogs within walking distance

Ballast Ground Dog Off Leash Site
Saturday 2 December 2017, 1.30pm – 4pm

Participant information:
19 interviews (10 female, 9 male)
Suburbs: 12 Stockton, 1 Fern Bay, 1 Fullerton Cove, 5 not recorded

Information on Dogs
Number and type of dogs:
• Large Breed Dogs: 3
• Medium Breed Dogs: 9
• Small Breed Dogs: 4

Places take dogs off leash:
• Ballast Ground: 15
• Little Beach (Rawson Park): 1
• Islington Park: 1

PARTICIPANT COMMENTS

Comments on existing dog off leash areas

BALLAST GROUND:
• Signage issue (incorrect compared to Council web site and Council information) (6)
• Want the whole area to be off leash (5)
• There is no sign at the dog area entrance/ poor signage (4)
• People use both areas (3)
• Need poo bags (3)
• Need special dog bins (3)
• Ballast Ground is valued for its larger size (2)
• Good quiet area away from cars (2)
• The bins always smell and are full (2)
• Would be great to have the larger area (both sides of car park) off leash (2)
• The correct area needs to be determined - there is Ranger confusion (2)
• Should include the larger area as the smaller area is too small
• Chester Street to Punt Street use
• People walk a large loop with dogs
• Ballast Ground is convenient for local people
• Keep as off leash
• People have been fined for using the larger area but it is part of the off leash
• Lot of rubbish left around
- Need to better manage bins
- Walk along path but keep dog on leash
- Need signs to say no golf
- Cyclists from town go too fast in the dog off leash area
- Conflict with cyclists
- Mainly used by locals
- Well used

GENERAL/ OTHER
- There are too many dogs at Little Beach (2)
- Little Beach is popular (2)
- Little Beach is too popular in holiday times
- People let dogs off leash at Stockton Beach and cause issues

Fenced Off Leash Comments and Suggestions

BALLAST GROUND:
- No fencing at Ballast Ground 111

GENERAL/ OTHER
- Need to have some fenced off leash areas (3)
- No need for fenced areas in the area (3)
- In Queensland there are large fenced dog parks
- Fenced area needed for small dogs
- Could fence Rawson park area near Little Beach
- Don’t need fenced in Stockton (have good open areas)
- Most people do not believe there should be fencing
- Seeking fenced off leash area for small dogs and puppies (near Stockton would be good)

Other comments and suggestions

BALLAST GROUND:
- People don’t pick up after their dogs (5)
- Consider beach link at southern end
- Some people backing onto the off leash area let their dogs out without owners being with them
- Need off leash spaces

GENERAL/ OTHER
- Need a program of education (3)
- A lot of people don’t pick up after their dogs (2)
- Greater effort required regarding bins and bags (2)
- Need beach areas as off leash (could be timed) (2)
- Could consider timed use of Stockton Beach (2)
- Stockton Beach is too crowded
- Want Stockton Beach to be off leash
- Would be good to have northern end of Stockton Beach off leash
- Run along Stockton Beach with dog of leash (if come upon people put dog on leash)
- People not picking up after dogs spoils it for everyone else
- People come along town because they don’t like Horseshoe Beach
- Want the other reserves along the Stockton foreshore to be on leash only
- Times use along bike tracks
- A lot of people have dogs in Stockton
- There is no local representative on Council
- There is nothing to delineate most off leash areas
- Applaud Council for providing off leash areas
- Need more off leash areas
- Consider dog friendly cafes
- Agility equipment
- Need to better promote off leash areas
- Use cricket ground in Stockton

Dixon Park Dog Off Leash Site
Sunday 3 December 2017, 7am – 10am

Participant information:
57 interviews (35 female, 22 male)
Suburbs: 22 Merewether, 6 Cooks Hill, 4 Adamstown, 3 Bar Beach, 2 Merewether Heights, 2 New Lambton, 2 Charlestown, 3 Lake Macquarie suburbs and 1 each for Adamstown Heights, The Junction, Wallsend and Hamilton.

Information on Dogs
Number and type of dogs:
- Large Breed Dogs: 30
- Medium Breed Dogs: 20
- Small Breed Dogs: 9

Places take dogs off leash:
- Dixon Park: 52
- Nesca Park: 8
- Horseshoe Beach: 7
- King Edward Park: 7
- Islington Park: 6
- Redhead Beach: 6
- Carrington Reserve: 2
- Merewether Reserve: 1
- Wentworth Park
- Nobbies Beach 1

PARTICIPANT COMMENTS

Comments on existing dog off leash areas

DIXON PARK:
- Need special bins and bags in dog park (21)
- Dedicated off leash area is too small (increase size of space) (16)
- Need more seats (15)
- Need more shade (9)
- More water stations for dogs (8)
- Off leash is too close to road (8)
- Need fence or barrier around playground (8)
- Dogs digging is an issue (8)
- Timed use of the park is good (7)
- Maintain and improve the grassed area more (7)
- Love Dixon Park for dogs (6)
- Need shelter (6)
- The drinking water area gets muddy (need to concrete) (5)
- Need good size area for dogs to run (5)
- Busy car park issues (5)
- Do not know where the actual off leash area is (4)
- Extend hours for off leash (4)
- More and better signage (4)
- Dogs are generally well behaved at the park (3)
• Need bin near top of park away from picnic area (3)
• When picnics are happening need to keep dogs away (2)
• Most people keep dogs out of play area (2)
• People pick up after their dogs at Dixon (2)
• From playground up should be off leash (2)
• East of path should be off leash (2)
• Would be good to have until 10am on Sundays
• Use southern end to stay away from big dogs
• Shelters are used when wet and cold
• Need big spaces for large dogs
• Should fence BBQ area
• Dogs are too close to play area
• Good social park for dogs
• Improve grass
• Need an evening session
• The seats and garden area make people drift into that area
• People stand near the small shelter
• Garden near road can’t be used
• No sure when times are (need to promote)
• Need link to car park
• ¾ of users are local
• Convenient site
• The park has a good feel
• Good control by owners
• Whole park should be off leash
• Concerned large dogs will harm small dogs
• People come from all over to use Dixon Park
• Don’t want to lose as an off leash area
• Support being off leash
• Times are too late in the evenings in winter
• Consider lighting for winter use

GENERAL/ OTHER AREAS:
• Love Horseshoe Beach, very social but busy (4)
• Horseshoe Beach is too small and there are always dog fights (2)
• Islington is a large site and like it (2)
• Medium density areas need spaces for dogs to run (2)
• King Edward Park is great (slope is not a problem, use as fitness space) (2)
• Rarely see other dogs at Nesca Park (2)
• Nesca Park is needed (2)
• Need bins at Nesca Park for dog poo (2)
• Need seats at Nesca Park (2)
• Islington is very social
• People don’t pick up after dogs as much at Islington Park
• Nesca Park is too isolated in the evenings (feels unsafe)
• Nesca Park is boring
• Love Nesca Park
• Barrier at Nesca Park to play areas
• King Edward Park is a wonderful spot for dogs
• The slope at King Edward Park is not so age friendly
• Use fences and shade cloth to protect the vegetation at King Edward Park
• Need drinking water at King Edward Park
• Feel safe at Islington as is almost fully fenced
• Don’t want dogs removed from coastal areas

Fenced Off Leash Comments and Suggestions
DIXON PARK:
- Should not be fenced (12)
- Fence along road if expect people to use the top area (3)
- Would be good to fence Dixon but unrealistic
- Works well not being fenced
- Fencing is not needed
- If fence part of the park people would get upset (they are used to being across the park)
- Fence Dixon Park on the hill side
- The park was fenced many years ago
- Part fencing along car park
- Fencing needed
- Dixon could work as fenced but need balanced approach
- Removed fence along road 5 years ago

GENERAL/OTHER:
- Do need some fully fenced dog parks (13)
- Don’t believe need fenced areas (9)
- Fencing is good for people with puppies and small dogs (6)
- Need separate fenced areas for large and smaller dogs and puppies (3)
- Don’t need fenced if dog is well trained (3)
- People take dogs to Learmonth Park because it is fenced (2)
- Fence Islington along car park and canal (2)
- Need fencing of all dog parks
- Old people use fenced areas
- If build fenced people will use
- Could fence Carrington Reserve off leash
- Empire Park potential fenced
- Maybe fencing along road edges
- Like parks being open
- Fenced areas feel locked in
- Fencing is expensive to maintain
- Rather than fencing dog area, fence areas don’t want people to use for dogs
- May need to fence King Edward Park
- Don’t fence King Edward Park
- Don’t like Spiers Point facility as feel caged in and on major road and too crowded

Other comments and suggestions

DIXON PARK:
- Consider café at Dixon Park (5)
- Consider a dog café (2)
- Need hump when enter car park (to slow cars) (2)
- People having parties and food near the dogs is an issue
- Some people do not pick up after their dogs
- Better bins in dog parks
- Need sign in car park to slow cars

GENERAL/OTHER:
- Desire to access beaches (timed) (16)
- Would be good to have another beach area, e.g. Burwood, Nobbies (8)
- Need dog poo dispenser bags (6)
- Need bins at off leash (6)
- Need education on owner responsibility (6)
- People who have dogs have stronger community interest (3)
- Improved signage and promotion (2)
- Need more off leash areas (2)
- More off leash in Adamstown (2)
- Dog parks are great for developing friendships (2)
- Dog poo dispensers and bins on Bathers Way (2)
- More policing of off leash
- Lambton Park would be perfect off leash
- Lambton Park has potential
- Do not feel safe at West End Park
- No shade at West End Park
- Need landscape to define off leash at Nesca Park
- Clash with bikes along path at Nesca Park
- Will go to Spears Point when open
- Take dogs to Empire Park and let off leash
- There should be off leash areas in all dog parks
- Consider commercial ventures linked to dogs
- Dogs should be allowed off leash at anytime
- Manly is a good example where poo bags are available
- Need more trees at Carrington Reserve off leash
- Norfolk Pines give no shade
- Bigger fines for people not picking up after dogs
- People do not pick up after dogs at Horseshoe Beach
- Take dogs off leash at sports oval (Pat Jordon Oval)
- Use Myamblah Oval for off leash
- Sportsgrounds for off leash
- Water for dogs on foreshore walks
- People take dogs off leash at Connolly Park
- Would be good to have part of National Park or Centennial Park as off leash
- Belmore Street used as off leash
- Need a spread of off leash areas across the City
- More timed off leash zones
- Need to have something close to Adamstown (somewhere popular that is well used)
- Consider Claremont Park for off leash
- More off leash around Hamilton
- Suggest linear path for dogs off leash
- Often have dogs off leash at Rowan Crescent
- People want to use the fenced cricket areas but understand why they can’t
- Council has been anti-dogs in the past – it is good the planning is happening
- Dog ownership is a huge part of people’s lifestyle in Newcastle
- Dogs dig holes and create trip hazards (consider dog digging pit)
- Need a track to Susan Gilmme Beach north of Barr Beach
- Don’t have many parks for dogs
- Dog parks need to be convenient
- Dog parks are very sociable and important for the community

**Upper Reserve Dog Off Leash Site**
Sunday 3 December 2017, 1.30pm – 4pm

**Participant information:**
5 interviews (4 female, 1 male)
Suburbs: 5 Wallsend

**Information on Dogs**
Number and type of dogs:
- Large Breed Dogs: 0
- Medium Breed Dogs: 0
- Small Breed Dogs: 4
- No dogs: 2
Places take dogs off leash:
Do not use Upper Reserve (residents advised hardly anyone uses – people use the sports area on the other side of the creek instead)

PARTICIPANT COMMENTS

Comments on existing dog off leash areas

UPPER RESERVE
- No bins or drinking water (3)
- People are worried about the road (too busy) (2)
- Hard to get to the site (through back streets)
- Residents don’t come here (don’t feel safe)
- Hardly anyone uses
- Most people don’t know the area is off leash

GENERAL/OTHER
- A lot of people use the oval in Wallsend Park (3)
- The southern end of the sports area on other side of creek could be an option (2)
- Consider timed use of sports area (2)
- Need poo bins (2)
- Feel safer to use the sportsground (2)
- Friends bring dogs and use the sports area (opposite side of creek)
- Need drinking water stations for dogs
- People don’t pick up after dogs
- Snake bite risks along the creekline
- People use the skate park area off leash (3 bins there)
- Don’t feel safe using Braye Park

Fenced Off Leash Comments and Suggestions

UPPER RESERVE
- Could fence road edge but people still unlikely to use (not a good location) (2)
- Need fencing due to main roads

GENERAL/OTHER
- Maryland Drive could be an option
- Fence where there are risks around off leash
- Only need for untrained dogs or for chasing balls
- No a fan of enclosed dog parks

Other comments and suggestions

UPPER RESERVE
- People park cars on the reserve when sport is on (2)
- Red belly snakes under bridge
- Too much vegetation (dogs get ticks)

GENERAL/OTHER
- Preference for paths and circuits suitable for dogs
- Look at Croudace Park pathway Lake Macquarie (timed use and signage is working)
- Potential for dogs off leash along Jesmond Park pathway
- Beach access would be good, e.g. northern end of Nobbies Beach
- Drive to Redhead Beach
- Campbelltown Sydney has good large off leash areas
- Consider timed use where there is a potential conflict
- Brickworks Park is underused and could be considered for off leash
- Consider Federal park for timed off leash

**Pups in the Park, Lambton Park**

**On-site Interview Summary (prepared by Council)**

Saturday 16 December 2018, 7am – 4am

**Participant Information:**
118 interviews (81 female, 31 male, 6 unknown)
Suburbs: 19 Lambton, 7 New Lambton, 5 North Lambton, 4 Adamstown, 4 Maryland, 4 Tighes Hill, 4 Wallsend, 4 Medowie, 4 Waratah, 3 Birmingham Gardens, 3 Georgetown, 3 Merewether 3 Lake Macquarie, 3 Charlestown, 2 Cardiff, 2 Kotara, 2 Fletcher, 2 Hamilton, 2 Mayfield, 2 Elermore Vale, 2 Broadmeadow, 2 Waratah West, 2 Jesmond, 2 Metford and 1 in each of Adamstown Heights, Belmont, Black Hill, Carrington, Cooks Hill, Newcastle East, Fullerton Cove, Garden Suburb, Heddon Greta, Islington, Kahibah, Marks Point, Maryville, Newcastle, New Lambton Heights, Stockton, Warabrook, Warners Bay and Elizabeth (7 not recorded)

**Information on Dogs**
Number and type of dogs:
- Large Breed Dogs: 36
- Medium Breed Dogs: 47
- Small Breed Dogs: 44
- Not stated: 19

Places take dogs off leash:
- Horseshoe Beach: 38
- Redhead: 16
- Islington/Tighes Hill: 15
- Acacia Avenue: 9
- Dixon Park: 9
- Lambton: 4
- Jesmond Park: 3
- Braye Park: 1
- Carrington: 1
- Henry Street: 1
- Kotara: 1
- Novocastrian Park: 1
- Medowie: 1
- The Foreshore: 1
- Thornton: 1
- Wallsend: 1
- Waratah Park: 1
- Wickham: 1
- Don't use: 11

**PARTICIPANT COMMENTS:**

**Comments on existing dog off leash areas**

DIXON PARK
- Fence Dixon (4)
- Too boring but go daily runs to beach
- More maintenance, lots of holes, wear & tear
- Too dangerous
- Unclear where boundaries are. Had to stop dogs going near BBQ's
- Fence Dixon along car-park edge

**HORSESHOE BEACH**
- Like (3)
- Aggressive dogs at Horseshoe (2)
- Can be messy and busy
- Dog attached at Horseshoe, so won't go back
- No issues
- Fully fenced
- Works well
- Need more dog bags/bins at Horseshoe

**ACACIA AVENUE**
- Needs fencing (4)
- Yes, need Acacia Avenue (3)
- Problems with waste - illegal dumping

**BRAYE PARK**
- Needs fencing

**STOCKTON**
- Fencing at Ballast Ground
- Works well

**ISLINGTON/TIGHES HILL**
- Fenced completely (6)
- General support (3)
- Dog owners do not pick up poo (2)
- Works well
- No dog bags
- No proper water station
- Not secure enough
- Car-park like agility area
- Lots of dogs at Islington so don't use much with little dogs, other dogs too big. Currently goes to fenced sportsgrounds due to fencing.
- Not concerned about Rangers. They never fine.
- At least 20 dogs every afternoon, works well because it is a bit enclosed

**STEVENVON PARK**
- Off leash at south east end under trees

**UPPER RESERVE**
- No good

**MARYLAND**
- Fence Maryland Drive (2)
- 20 dogs a day use Maryland - mainly evenings - Callan Ave

**NORTH LAMBTON**
- Very muddy and stinky, full of farmers friends

**KING EDWARD PARK**
Like but steep

GENERAL/OTHER

- Need more bins (7)
- Need more off leash (7)
- Great for socialisation (3)
- Fenced in area (2)
- Like water, open space, lots of place to run (2)
- Don't put off-leash on main roads (2)
- Did not realise that Council had so many (3)
- Not enough with access to water. Dog likes water play, more beach locations (2)
- Not close enough to shade and amenities for whole family
- Fairly happy would like some water play and water bowls with tipper
- Don’t use much, scared of other dogs
- Dogs hard to contain, so don’t utilise
- Wasn’t aware of existing spaces
- Good that we have them
- Not enough patrolling of dog off leash
- People not having control of their dogs and not picking up after their dogs
- Overcrowding at times
- Unpredictable dogs. Don't really do off-leash may try it if fenced park happens at Lambton
- Don’t like timed areas
- Would take everyday if closer and had access to amenities, toilets, water, bins, shade/shelter
- Need to be near toilets
- Need more dog dispenser bags, can’t rely on personal accountability
- Lack of people picking up rubbish
- Spraying at parks - warn owners if chemicals are bad for dogs
- Need massive education, people don’t think they have to control their dogs.
- Dog poo doesn’t get picked up
- Doesn’t use as can’t trust dog to be off leash in open area
- Thinks Jesmond is off-leash
- Not aware of our dog off leash areas other than Islington and Horseshoe
- More promotion of off-leash
- Want to be able to walk to the park
- No beach access except Horseshoe Beach

Fenced Off Leash Comments and Suggestions (including potential sites)

LAMBTON

- Wants fenced area Lambton (32)
- Believed Lambton Park was already off leash (2)
- Would like fenced ideally near play equipment so kids can play too
- Road too busy
- Need water bubbler for dogs
- Agility at park
- Want off-lease fenced at Lambton - ideally between pool and bowling club
- Away from retail
- Don’t want to take up too much space in Lambton - not everyone likes dogs
- Understanding that Lambton Park is definitely going to be off leash
- Is Lambton marshy?
- Not enough off-lease areas in Lambton

GENERAL/OTHER

- Consider fenced dog park at:
  - Waratah Park (3)
  - Islington - fenced completely (3)
  - Jesmond Park (2)
- Wallsend (2)
- Carrington (2)
- Braye Park
- Jesmond cricket Oval
- Gregson Park (near bowling club) fenced for small dogs only
- Mayfield
- Novocastrian Oval
- Off use beaches - south of Merewether baths
- More beach areas, a portion of Merewether beach/ocean baths would like to take dog, not off leash just in the area
- Harold Myers Oval
- Learmonth Park - used because fenced
- Stevenson Park - Terry Park end
- Merewether Beach
- Dixon Park Beach
- Near netball courts south of (New) Lambton Park
- Novocastrian Park (Petition)
- Nesca Park
- Elermore Vale
- Hamilton
- Wallsend Federal Park
- Wallsend (west)
- Shortland
- Birmingham Gardens/Wallsend
- Stockton
- Stockton Beach north
- Susan Gilmore Beach
- Near Cameron Park, Fletcher, Minmi
- Stockton - fencing at Ballast Ground
- Waratah
- Need water at locations (29)
- General support for fenced areas (18)
- Need separate for big and small dogs (11)
- Would like off leash fenced for smaller dogs (10)
- Would like fenced, co-mingle for big and small (4)
- Would love fenced away from main roads (4)
- Fenced area for dog safety to socialise - get aggressive on lead, fine when off (2)
- Shade (2)
- Safety (2)
- Need facilities, seats, bins, bags, bubbler, agility, shade (3)
- Would like near water (2)
- Lack of facilities/signage (2)
- Timed area for small/timid dogs (2)
- Need more interesting activities (2)
- Would travel for good off leash (2)
- Speers Point not big enough.
- Does not matter to them their dog is obedient
- Not fussed about fenced, non-fenced
- Prefer something close to home (Wallsend)
- Go to other fenced areas if available
- Some fenced areas - teach dogs recall
- 17 is plenty/does not believe fencing is necessary. Dog owners should have effective control.
- Sometimes use Novocastrian Park - didn't realise not off leash location
- Not near children’s play area
- Need balance
- Yes, not for control to show area is designated for dogs, no personal training groups etc.
- Don’t support Warabrook
- Timed off leash on cricket ovals - Jesmond, Connolly
- Yes, but could get aggressive dog, not well managed. Create false sense of security.
- Yes, especially if close to a car-park
- Willing to drive 30 mins
- Need toilets at every dog park
- Large fenced areas for athletic dogs
- Rangers don't do anything
- Needs to be big
- Not concerned about fencing
- Lake Macquarie has them and very popular
- Not needed but nice to have options for pups
- Provide in tourist areas
- Don't support Maryland if all fenced, but ok if some fenced and some off leash
- Medowie dog park - not properly enclosed - hole under fence
- Don't woodchip
- One every couple of suburbs
- Equipment for dogs boredom
- Dog sometimes runs off around other dogs
- Don't think dogs should be on sportsgrounds
- Car-parking (2)
- Fenced would be good for training purposes
- Don't mind dog is obedient
- Good to have one in inner Newcastle, not on beach reserves because of Parkrun
- Access to point between Burwood Beach and Merewether
- Islington & Horseshoe most popular

Other comments and suggestions:
- Dispensers (15)
- Bins (12)
- Shade (10)
- Dog bags (9)
- Agility Courses (9)
- Place to have bags (4)
- Timed off leash at Sportsgrounds (3)
- Tables & chairs (3)
- Wants to walk to off leash space (3)
- Better signage (2)
- Put one near water (3)
- OK with off leash in sportsfields (2)
- Blocks tunnels and equipment for dogs (2)
- More rangers
- More concerned with large spaces for running
- Does not believe dog off leash in built up residential. Potential noise issues.
- Lighting
- Walk to one, not drive
- Warning system on dogs so you can tell which dogs are nervous
- Rivercourse in dog park - Chicago
- Dogs are very important for mental health
- Good for the community
- Need more poo bins, have to carry poo a long way - Nobby's Breakwall, Stockton, Bathers Way
- More education for people before they get a dog
- CCTV in fenced parks
- Greyhound owners rehabilitate at Hamilton off-leash
- Problems with dogs that shouldn't be off-leash
- Better infrastructure is needed
- More "Pups in the Park"
- More educators - roster of local trainers
- Take turns to go to parks
- Adopted greyhounds need fenced spot
- Speers Point (LMCC) undulations cause safety concerns - can’t see behind mound
- Greyhounds often muzzled and can’t defend themselves
- Biodegradable dog poo bags
- Could you have a playground for kids in dog park? Accommodates for families
- Shouldn’t be able to walk dog without a bag
- Beach access for off-leash or on-leash
- No dog friendly water stations on Bathers Way
- Showground at Broadmeadow for off-leash - already fenced
- Can’t take dogs to markets at Broadmeadow
- Will use Speers Point park because NCC doesn’t have fenced park
- Incorporating young family can be difficult - stuck away from play equipment
- Concrete pipes dogs can go through
- Flip over dog bowls
- Lambton accessible for Adamstown
- Build dog park ASAP
## NEWCASTLE CITY COUNCIL

### DOGS IN OPEN SPACES STRATEGY

#### Sports Survey Responses Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sport and Facilities</th>
<th>Dogs Comments</th>
<th>Key Issues</th>
<th>Suggestions &amp; Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adamstown New Lambton Athletics Club</td>
<td>80-100 dogs walked off leash each week</td>
<td>People do not pick up after dogs, Potential player contact with dog faeces, Risk of dogs fighting, Sport has to clean up after dogs often</td>
<td>Okay for public to access as it is a public park. Users just need to clean up after their dogs. Increase signage and bins and provide dog bag dispensers, Suggest some fenced dog parks, improved facilities for dogs (drinking water, dog bag dispensers, bins) and increased information and education of dog owners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alder Park Fields 1 &amp; 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadmeadow Magic Youth Football Club</td>
<td>Approximately 50 walked off leash at each site per week</td>
<td>People do not pick up after dogs, Damage to fields in wet weather by dogs, Potential player contact with dog faeces, People allow dogs off leash when sport is played, Risk of dog attack to children or players, Sport has to clean up after dogs every time</td>
<td>Believe dogs should be on leash at all times, Increase signage and bins and provide dog bag dispensers, Suggest access to more beaches for dogs off leash and improved facilities for dogs (drinking water, dog bag dispensers, bins).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myers Park, Adamstown (1&amp;2) and Mandalong Oval, Adamstown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooks Hill United Football Club</td>
<td>Yes walked off leash on National Park fields but not athletics field At least 6 in first half hour of set up</td>
<td>People do not pick up after dogs, Potential player contact with dog faeces, Risk of dogs fighting, Risk of dog attack to children and players, Sport has to clean up after dogs often</td>
<td>Believe dogs should be on leash at all times, Require fines and regulations, Require dog bag dispensers, Suggest some fenced dog parks, and increased information and education of dog owners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Park (4&amp;6) and National Park Athletics Field</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton Olympic Football Club</td>
<td>Walked off leash - 60-70 Darling Street Oval and 90-100 Islington Oval per week</td>
<td>People do not pick up after dogs, Dogs dig fields or turf cricket pitch, Turf quality is impacted on, Worn grass where dogs run, Damage to fields in wet weather, Potential player contact with dog faeces, People allow dogs off leash when sport is played, Risk of dog attack to children or players, Risk of dogs fighting, Sport has to clean up after dogs every time, Darling Street Oval - Council stickers saying no dogs off leash removed by dog owners, Islington Oval - close to dog park, and people think it’s okay for dogs to run freely on Oval, Have not seen a NCC ranger ever at the ground, People take dogs to parks to go to toilet and that is a serious issue</td>
<td>Believe there should be no dogs at the sportsground when sport is played, The dog problem is compounded by people’s belief that it’s their right to let their dog on whenever they like, mostly leash free. It’s compounded by lack of rangers, signage, etc, Suggest some fenced dog parks, access to more beaches for dogs off leash and education of dog owners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darling Street Oval and Islington Oval</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport and Facilities Newcastle City and Eastern Districts Cricket Club</td>
<td>Dogs Comments</td>
<td>Key Issues</td>
<td>Suggestions &amp; Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learmonth Park (cricket oval)</td>
<td>Up to a dozen dogs walked off leash at any time</td>
<td>People do not pick up after dogs, Dogs dig fields or turf cricket pitch, Turf quality is impacted on by dogs, Damage to fields in wet weather by dogs, Potential player contact with dog faeces, People allow dogs off leash when sport is played, Risk of dog attack to children or players, Risk of dogs fighting, Damage to cricket pitch and sprinkler heads, Sport has to clean up after dogs often, A lot of time, effort and funds expended by the club, People drive to Learmonth Park to let dogs off leash due to fencing</td>
<td>Believe dogs should be on leash at all times, there should be no dogs at the sportsground when sport is played and no dogs should be allowed at the sportsground at any time, No dogs off leash should be actively policed, Suggest increased signage, fines and regulations and increased ranger presence, The ground should be securely fenced and locked to limit access, Suggest more off leash areas away from sportsgrounds, some fenced dog parks, access to more beaches for dogs off leash, improved facilities for dogs (drinking water, dog bag dispensers, bins) and education of dog owners</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Newcastle Football Limited | 2-3 each walked off leash afternoon that are aware of | Older residents and do not experience issues (dogs stay with owners) | Believe dogs should be on leash at all times, there should be no dogs at the sportsground when sport is played, Increase signage and bins and provide dog bag dispensers, Suggest some fenced dog parks, access to more beaches for dogs off leash, improved facilities for dogs (drinking water, dog bag dispensers, bins), increased information and education of dog owners |

| Newcastle Netball Association Inc | Dogs walked off leash at the ground | People do not pick up after dogs, Potential player contact with dog faeces, Risk of dog attack to children or players, Risk of dogs fighting, Dogs on lead are trip hazard for umpires, Sport has to clean up after dogs occasionally | Believe dogs should be on leash at all times and there should be no dogs at the sportsground when sport is played, Suggest increased ranger presence and information pamphlets for sport to give people, Suggest access to more beaches for dogs off leash and increased information and education of dog owners |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sport and Facilities Newcastle Suns Football Club</th>
<th>Dogs Comments</th>
<th>Key Issues</th>
<th>Suggestions &amp; Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Connelly Park</td>
<td>2-4 dogs walked off leash per week</td>
<td>People do not pick up after dogs, Dogs dig fields or turf cricket pitch, Turf quality is impacted on by dogs, Damage to fields in wet weather by dogs, Potential player contact with dog faeces, People allow dogs off leash when sport is played, Risk of dog attack to children or players, Sport has to clean up after dogs often</td>
<td>Suggest times access for dogs off leash and there should be no dogs at the sportsground when sport is played, Suggest increased signage, fines and regulations, increased ranger presence and increased bins, dog bag dispensers and information pamphlets for sport to give people, Suggest some fenced dog parks, access to more beaches for dogs off leash, improved facilities for dogs (drinking water, dog bag dispensers, bins) and increased...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Several dogs walked off leash (unsure of exact amount) - People do not pick up after dogs - Dogs dig fields or turf cricket pitch - Potential player contact with dog faeces - People allow dogs off leash when sport is played - Risk of dog attack to children or players - Risk of dogs fighting - Have had children fall into dog faeces and dogs urinating on children’s bags - Dog owners have become aggressive when asked to take dogs from fields where children are training - Young children are frightened of the dogs - Sport has to clean up after dogs often

Information and education of dog owners - Believe there should be no dogs at the sportsground when sport is played - Suggest fines and regulations and increased ranger presence - Suggest some fenced dog parks

South Newcastle Junior Rugby League Club

Learmonth Oval
CITY OF NEWCASTLE DOGS IN OPEN SPACES STRATEGY

SESSION WITH KEY ORGANISATIONS
Monday 4 December 2017

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSIONS

Participants:
Terri Nowak, Dog Rescue Newcastle and Dog Training Newcastle
Lucretia Sunderland, Newcastle Pet Resort, Williamstown
Grace McGuren, Newcastle Pet Resort, Williamstown
Debbie Jaggers, RSPCA Hunter
Julie Tolliday, Barkers in Balance
Susan Stewart, Facilities and Recreation Coordinator
Suzanne Suter, Suter Planners (facilitator)

What would you like the Strategy to achieve?

- Consider the guidelines in ‘Unleashed – A Guide to Successful Dog Parks’
- Increased safety, e.g. fencing
- More owners interacting with their dogs
- Establish some fenced dog parks - this is an unmet need
- Increased dog parks including some fenced
- Better delineation of dog parks
- Increased animal welfare at dog off leash areas and other open spaces (water, shade)
- Reduced animal aggression and better human behaviour
- An increase in responsible pet ownership (people picking up after dogs, people managing their dogs)
- Safe places for people to practice training skills, e.g. recall
- Promotion of the training services that people should use
- Education of people including when it is not okay for their dog to be in the field with others
- Increased signage and information to promote the social rules

Issues and Information

- A lot of existing dog off leash areas are near a busy road which raises safety issues
- Concern dogs will go into the canal at Islington – there is quite a current in the water and dogs are at risk
- Some people will not go to Islington due to the canal
- Having water linked to a dog off leash area is good (a place for dogs to swim)
- There could be resistance to fencing existing off leash areas
- More bins are needed
- Bins need to be cleaned out more often
- Should have bins that do not allow rubbish dumping
- Dog poo dispenser bags are good but there are difficulties in managing use and environmental risks (as experienced on the mid coast at Foster)

Potential Sites for Fenced Dog Parks

- Maryland Drive Reserve, Maryland (although would need to address drainage and mosquitoes and have fully fenced due to the busy road)
- Lambton Park (but keep away from northern end as this is used by personal trainers)
- Acacia Avenue Reserve could work
- Honey Suckle Reserve could work
- Behind MacDonald Jones Stadium, but this space is not under Council control and the sports focus could create conflicts
- Stockton is hard to access and as such there should not be a fenced dog park in Stockton

**Design Suggestions for Fenced Off Leash Areas**
- Air lock / double gates
- Landscaping with shade
- Rounded edges so dogs don’t get cornered
- No tables and limited seats (should not be encouraging food around dogs)
- Pathways that keep people moving
- Drinking water for dogs
- Division of small and large dogs (but don’t have the two groups right up against each other)
- Keep open and natural so that dogs can always be seen
- If busy roads need to have 1.8m fencing and no risk of dogs getting onto the road (ideally all fenced dog parks would have 1.8m fencing)
- Consider designated digging areas
- Agility equipment is not the way to go. Can have some mounds and equipment and interesting things to sniff such as a sensory garden but don’t need formalised agility equipment

**Beach Off Leash Areas**
- Horseshoe Beach is too small and has too many dogs in a confined space - as a result there are often dog fights
- Consider the northern end of Stockton Beach (people would travel to a beach in Stockton). Consider the area around the sportground and consider timed use.
- Consider north of Hereford Road on Stockton Beach (timed use).
- Could consider defining dog prohibited, on leash and off leash areas on beaches
- Burwood Beach is linked to a State Conservation Area and should be ‘no dogs’

**Comments on Other Off Leash Sites**
- People use Braye Park for dogs off leash so should not take that opportunity away
- Keep and extend West End Park (Adamstown) as off leash but don’t spend a lot of money on the site and don’t fence. It is not an appealing site and not many people will use it
- Look at Jesmond Park
- Consider the area behind the Adamstown Primary School

**Dogs on Sports Fields**
- Fields that are fenced would be ideal for dogs off leash. However, recognise that people not picking up after their dog is an issue

**Etiquette and Education**
- Need to change people’s behaviour
- Promote the etiquette and rules
- People love coming to events – this is a good time to promote information
- Promote dog training opportunities, e.g. the Hillsborough dog obedience club and other trainers
- Promote the 4 points of dog training (obedience, socialisation, general manners in public, good behaviour at home)
- Consider opportunities for subsidised dog training in parks
- Pay a trainer to educate people at a dog park
- Could create a DVD to promote good behaviour and address the issues with dogs
- Have a launch of the Dog Strategy and use to provide some training

**Other Comments**
- Will have fewer problems if dogs are socialised and part of the family
- Dogs have social issues due to a lack of socialisation
- Pet Resort would not take client’s dogs to an off leash area or fenced dog park
- Be aware of where there are dog issues and address the issues
- Hornsby Council has developed some good off leash areas
CITY OF NEWCASTLE DOGS IN OPEN SPACES STRATEGY

SESSION WITH PARK COMMITTEES
Monday 4 December 2017

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSIONS

Participants:
Paul Cleary, Carrington Park Foreshore
John Dar, Smith Park
Vicki McCarter, Stevenson Park
Steven McCarter, Stevenson Park
Susan Stewart, City of Newcastle Facilities and Recreation Coordinator
Suzanne Suter, Suter Planners (facilitator)

Comments on Carrington Foreshore (Honey Suckle Reserve), Carrington

- The drinking water for dogs recently provided is great
- Extra tree planting is needed – the area is quite barren
- Drainage is okay but there is some flooding at the front part
- The area is a low lying reclaimed area. A levy bank is proposed but should not lose any land
- The Aboriginal art is appealing
- The boardwalk gives people a further opportunity for walking their dog (on leash)
- The water quality of the canal is okay
- Parking is not defined or policed. People park under the palm trees and this needs to be managed
- The plantation is not maintained
- Could have angle parking in front of the park
- Lack of bins. The bin is emptied once a week and smells. It is poorly located in the park
- Itinerate camping occurs on the site
- Dogs chasing bikes on the path is an issue
- People ride motor bikes on the path
- Not sure about whether plastic bags are needed – potential environmental impact
- Fencing the dog off leash area is desired

Comments on Stevenson Park

- Have held two public meetings and have a list of what people would like to see and one of the items is a fenced dog off leash area
- The park is in a high traffic area and dogs are at risk
- People use the sports fields for dogs off leash and this has impacts on the fields with people not picking up after dogs and a risk of conflict
- Want to get dogs off the fields as having to constantly pick up dog poos and there are dog fights (and some small dogs have been killed by larger dogs)
- There is a lack of control by dog owners and a lack of care for others
- People come in off Purdie Avenue and let their dogs off
- A dog off leash area would need a bin and water station
- Would need a car park to support people using the fenced off leash area
- Clear signage on the field that says ‘dogs are not allowed off leash’ is required

Comments on Smith Park

- Dogs use the Smith Park sports field and there are impacts with people not picking up after dogs
- Don’t want dogs off leash at Smith Park
- There is a desire for Smith Park to be upgraded including the need for a car park, play equipment and a pathway. John Dar talked separately with Susan Stewart regarding the desired sportsground upgrade at
the session, and these notes are not included as the focus of the session was on Dogs Off Leash and not sportsground upgrade

- Fenced Off Leash Opportunities
  - Honey Suckle Reserve (Carrington Foreshore) would be a good option for a fenced dog park. The rowing club area would not be suitable (the rowing club would object)
  - The western corner of Stevenson Park could be fenced
  - Richardson Park would make a great dog off leash area but it would need to be fenced as it is on a busy road

- Sports Fields
  - Dogs should not be on sports fields at all – not even timed
  - Dogs off leash should not be allowed on the casual areas around the fields

- Off Leash Provision
  - Need to redistribute the off leash areas – some areas have high provision and others have none
  - Surprised Dixon Park is still a dog off leash area given this is a busy recreation park
  - The play equipment at Dixon Park needs to be fenced for the safety of the children
  - Dixon Park should remain as timed use if it continues to be off leash
  - Islington needs a ramp or steps into the canal so that dogs and people can get out more easily if a dog needs to be retrieved

- Off Leash Beaches
  - Horseshoe Beach is valuable but it is too busy and people do not control their dogs
  - Could have a push back from communities if suggest beaches are off leash
  - The eastern side of Nobbies Beach could be an off leash beach area
  - Consider Burwood Beach around Glen Rock Lagoon, although the area could be a National Park
  - The beach near Kennedy Cove adjacent to Pat Jordon Oval could be possible
  - Little Beach at Stockton should remain an off leash beach area
  - Don’t let dogs off leash on Dixon Beach

- Education and Etiquette
  - An education program is needed
  - Better signage and information is required
  - Get information out there to increase community awareness about appropriate behaviour by dogs and owners
  - Consider a TV advert showing appropriate dog behaviour – consider a link with the TAFE media course to develop this and could involve schools
  - Advertise the fines for not complying with requirements
  - Promote responsibilities and the dog behaviour that is considered to be appropriate
  - More resources are required for compliance officers to do the rounds at times when people use the parks
  - Promote compliance with the Act

- General Issues and Information
  - Cyclists on paths take over the path and clash with dogs off leash
  - Should sign post paths as shared-use
  - Bins and bags are needed with regular collection of the bins
  - Need drinking water for dogs away from playgrounds
  - There needs to be good car parking linked to dog off leash areas
  - Think about making most recreation parks timed morning and evening dogs off leash
Other

- A strategic approach to planning for open space is required and Council needs to be more aware of the condition and provision of assets.
CITY OF NEWCASTLE DOGS IN OPEN SPACES STRATEGY

SESSION WITH SPORTS GROUPS
Tuesday 5 December 2017

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSIONS

Participants:
Con Gounis, Hamilton Olympic Football Club
Wayne Richards, Mayfield United Football Club
Cathy Rae, Adamstown Rosebud Junior Football Club
Nigel Dale, South Newcastle Junior Rugby League Football Club
Susan Stewart, Facilities and Recreation Coordinator
Suzanne Suter, Suter Planners (facilitator)

Off Leash Sports Field Use
- People use sports fields off leash
- People use Islington Oval off leash as they see it as an extension of the Islington dog park
- At the no. 1 field at Adamstown Oval a sign says “No Dogs” - not sure of the basis
- The Gardens which is private land says “No Dogs”
- As far as the sports know, dogs are not allowed at grounds that have fences and can be locked
- At Learmonth Park, the sports make phone contact with a ranger if they see a dog off leash

The Issues
- Hamilton Olympic Football Club uses Darling Street Oval and Islington Park and has issues with dogs off leash at both grounds
- Sports prefer dogs not to be around children and young people playing sport due to safety concerns
- The issues with dogs on sportsgrounds are:
  - Dog poo and people not picking this up
  - Sports continually picking up dog poo and filling in holes
  - Owners not being responsible
  - The safety aspects with potential danger to children
  - Balls are lost to dogs (and some are expensive)
  - People let dogs off leash when training is happening
  - Risk of dog attacks
  - The sporting club bins are used for dog poo
  - In wet weather people with dogs still use the fields (and impact on the turf quality)
  - Damage to the grounds with dogs digging holes
- At Adamstown Oval the main issue is dog poo, otherwise do not have major issues
- A lot of money has been spent by the sports at Mayfield Park and dogs impact on the field. The field was fenced 12 months ago and dog use has increased significantly since fencing (from 5 to 20 dogs at a time)
- Dogs piddle on kids bags while they are training and playing sport
- When people talk to each other they don’t watch their dogs
- Most dog owners do the right thing but some are not responsible. Some people believe they can do what they want

Fencing of Fields
- At Myers Park (Adamstown) there are hardly any dogs but at Learmonth Park there are lots of dogs due to the ground being fenced
- Now lock the main gate at Learmonth Park to reduce dogs off leash (lock the main gate but 3 entries remain open). The sports are requesting that the sportground be fully locked at all times (this would mean a loss of open space to the broad community)
- At Darling Street Oval, fencing has helped address cars on grounds. People with dogs can still get into the ground and the club has to clean up after the dogs

**Timed Use of Sports Fields**
- Sports will still have the same issues (doo poo, digging)
- Expect dogs would increase

**Signage and Information**
- There is a lack of signage advising people to have dogs on leash at sportgrounds
- Signs that exist have graffiti

**Off Leash Options**
- O’Connell Reserve would make a good off leash area
- See people using West End Park

**Support to Sports**
- Sports need help to provide a service to the community (including assistance with managing dogs)
- Clubs pay a lot of money to upgrade fields and facilities and there needs to be care taken to minimise impacts on the fields
- There is currently nothing to stop people with dogs using sportgrounds. People are strong and expect access
- Sports are crying out for sportgrounds and cannot afford to lose any fields to dogs

**Other Points Raised**
- Sports believe they have exclusive use of fields for the times of their lease (Council needs to confirm this to sports)
- The grounds look good now after the rains but dogs impact on ground quality more when it is dry
- At Learmonth Park the sports provide bags and empty bins are locked away to help manage the issues
- In general, there seems to be some inequity in the support given to sports. Some put in a lot of money and others do not

**Suggested Solutions and Recommendations (by the Sports)**
- Do not allow dogs to be off leash on sports fields or around sportgrounds
- Do not allow timed use at any sportground
- Dogs should not be allowed to be at sportgrounds at all (the view of one person)
- High profile sites should be ‘dogs prohibited’
- There should be alternative off leash areas provided including some fenced areas, but not on sport fields
- There should be improved signage giving information on where people can go off leash (suggest provide this right now, including a sign that says “dogs must be on leash at sportgrounds”)
- Need ranger support and enforcement
- Provide bag dispensers to encourage people to pick up after their dogs
- Increase the number of bins
- Educate the community on appropriate behaviour including dogs on leash at sportgrounds
- Ideally sportgrounds would be locked up and people could not use them, but in reality this is unlikely
CITY OF NEWCASTLE DOGS IN OPEN SPACES STRATEGY

CONSULTATION WITH PARK COMMITTEES

Session with Kotara Parks Committee Member
Tuesday 5 December 2017

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSIONS

Participant:
Tony Griffiths, Park Committee President
Susan Stewart, Facilities and Recreation Coordinator
Suzanne Suter, Suter Planners (facilitator)

About the Reserves

- The Kotara Parks Committee is responsible for three open spaces including:
  - Nesbitt Park (sport)
  - Lugar Park (sport)
  - Kotara Park (the part of the park used for sports training)
- There is high sports use of all three grounds over 7 days (weekdays and weekends) plus school use.
- Sports catered for include soccer, cricket, athletics and netball, as well as personal trainers. Soccer has 650 registrations and athletics has 400.
- The basin is a growth area with families and children and the reserves cater for Lake Macquarie communities as well as Newcastle. The demographics are changing from an older population to family oriented which is increasing demand for sport.
- Nesbitt Park is the most used ground and tends to be overused. Need extra reserves for training, e.g. Pickering sportsground.
- Remodelling the creek along Kotara Park will reduce the field size and relocate the amenity. It will only be suitable for junior soccer and junior cricket.

Experience with Dogs of Leash

- All three sportsgrounds get used by dogs off leash all day.
- Always see people at the reserves in the mornings, during the day and evenings.
- Was approached by a dog trainer to use Kotara Park but felt the reserve was not appropriate.

Issues with Dogs Off Leash

- Dog poo is found everywhere. Continually have to pick up. This is a major issue.
- Risk of dogs going onto the fields when used for sport and concerned about player safety.
- At Lugar Park the turf cricket pitch was destroyed by a dog skidding through and it had to be redone.

Desired Approach to Dogs Off Leash

- Need to minimise the risk of damage to grounds.
- Do not allow sportsgrounds to be off leash.
- Need better signage saying on lead only at sportsgrounds.
- Direct people to other off leash areas (not sportsgrounds).
### Comments on Dogs in Open Space Strategy  
*(Email Submissions summarised by Council)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Dixon park is unsuitable off leash area. Sites concerns regarding dogs and children, lack of responsible dog ownership regarding control of dogs and cleaning up faeces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Concerns regarding dogs and children interacting in the same space. Therapist who has worked with children who have suffered the ongoing effects of dog attacks. Dog owners not being responsible and are offended that children do not “love” their dogs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Requests that we remind dog owners to pick up faeces and dogs should always be on leads when not in designated “off-leash” areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>We are already currently an open space and are not happy with the way the dogs just poo all over the park and we don’t have people cleaning after them if their owners don’t.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Our club are winter users of two ovals in the NCC area, Darling Street Oval, and Islington Park, and to be honest, we have a number of concerns and issues with people not doing the right thing at both the Ovals re-dogs. Would like invite to workshop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>It would be amazing to have a fenced off dog area. It would be great to have a park, with a fenced off area separate to the rest of the park too.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Resident of Carrington. Would like more off leash areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Would like Waratah Park a dog friendly park.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 9  | Islington Dog Park fenced so dogs owners can keep their kept dogs out of the drain.  
Islington Oval to be timed off leash 6am-10am  
Dixon Park - great example of off leash dog park, children’s playground & bbq work well together. |
| 10 | Pro dog off leash areas.  
Would like leash free area on part of Stockton Beach or Little Beach.  
Would like Stockton Caravan Park to be "pet friendly". |
| 11 | Phone Message: Received ‘dogs in open spaces’ letter and would like to discuss, please call back. He objects.  
Better signage in non-leash free areas eg: Newcastle Ocean Baths. Retractable and/or long leashes are trip hazard and doesn’t believe the owners have proper control. Has almost been tripped a number of times. |
| 12 | Lives in Carrington across from Rowing Club. Dog owners are using this area as an off leash area. Dog owners do not have control over their animals. Dog owners not cleaning up faeces and disposing of it correctly. |
| 13 | Concerns:  
- Dog faeces on Islington Oval  
- Unleashed Dogs on Islington Oval  
- Unleashed dogs in the children’s play area  
- Unleashed dogs on the cycle path  

Risk Control Measures  
- Clear signposting at all entrances to the park  
- Clear signposting at the entrances to Islington Oval  
- Clear signposting around the children’s play area  
- Clear signposting along the cycle path  
- Enforcement |
| 14 | Stockton - Ballast Ground. Dogs are also off leash and not controlled on the pathways around ballast ground. Lack of compliance signage and enforcement. |
| 15 | Stockton - the whole of Stockton seems to be a dog off leash area.  
- Runs daily - has been bitten, threatened and tripped by the dogs as well as threatened and insulted by the dog owners.  
- Leash free dogs on Stockton Beach daily - owners not cleaning up faeces.  
- Council rangers never in the area to police council ordinances.  
- Owners don’t have “control” of their animals when off leash.  
- Feels this is a public safety issue. |
| 16 | Has attended Dixon Park Dog Beach since 2004 twice daily. Feels that dog parks offer friendships and community feel.  
Suggestions:  
- Reinstatement of park bench and garbage bin.  
- Would like extension of times. Extended until noon in the morning and start the evening time at |
3.30pm.

- A beach area somewhere between Bar Beach and the far end of Merewether to be dog friendly even if during restricted hours.

18 Dixon Park dog off leash area.
Suggestions:
- 1 mtr concrete extension to pad at BBQ area tap
- 1 mtr concrete apron around top dog watering tap
- 6 mtr digging area
- Depending on rainfall, top dress eroded areas with good soil & turf

19 Uses dog parks.
- More waste bins.
- Access to water.
- Dogs with toys not tolerating other dogs playing with the toys and causing fights.
- Non dog owners using the park and complaining about dogs.

20 People not making an effort to properly restrain their dog which can be confronting for pedestrians especially the elderly.

21 Supportive of fenced dog off leash areas.

22 Supportive of fenced dog off leash areas. Would like further infrastructure in Wallsend for dog off leash parks.

23 User of off leash areas. Concerned about minimising footprint would like NCC to provide a composting system for faeces. Compostable scoops.

24 Sportsgrounds users National Park No.4 & 6 during winter season. Club members are regularly cleaning the ovals of dog faeces on Saturday/Sunday and for mid week training. Dog owners behaving irresponsibly.

25 Feels that dog owners have preferential treatment over non dog owners. Does not like cafes that allow dogs as he feels that waitresses are not washing hands after petting dogs. Rangers do not enforce dogs being on leads.

My general submission is that Council should be much more aware that dog owners are in the minority and should therefore be proactively made aware of their obligations to the silent majority who have these behaviours unwillingly thrust upon us.

26 Feels that there is an overpopulation of dogs in the city. Doesn't think that dog owners are respectful of children who are frightened of children.

Feels that dogs should be banned from coastal walks and public places.

27 Lives at Maryville and walks a 5km loop around Carrington with his dogs on a daily basis. Believes that are problems with:-
- Dog owners who have dogs off lead in on leash areas and have no control over their animals.
- People who have dogs off lead in off leash areas who have no control over their animals.

There is not enough signage regarding off leash areas and would like the signage to include information to remind dog owners about their responsibilities in regards to off leash areas.

28 New Lambton Heights Park Group. Owners use the park for off-leash and it doesn’t seem to interfere with other users where dogs are supervised and obedient.

Our park is a ‘walk to’ pocket park which has no provision for additional parking in surrounding streets due to its proximity to the John Hunter Hospital. Parking would be a very relevant consideration for dog owners travelling to a designated off-leash area that is not within walking distance of their home.

Would like more waste bins.

29 Use dog off leash areas twice a day and has used almost every off-leash area provided.

All our fellow dog-park visitors are very diligent dog owners who pick up after their dogs and call them back if they go near other park users that may not be interested in having a doggie running around them. The dog owners I know are also very aware of any cricket pitches or wet areas that might be deteriorated by dog foot traffic and keep their dogs away from those areas. They also keep their dogs out of any sections of the park beyond the off-leash exercise areas

If this strategy results in any off-leash areas becoming closed down or reduced in size/time of use, the dog-owning community will be aggrieved.

Does not want any changes to Dixon Park but would like an additional area at Empire Park. Does not want Dixon Park fenced as it would become more intensively used.

Believes that Henry Park, Thomas St Hamilton South would be a well suited dog off leash area.
30 Issues with dog off leash areas:
   1. You need to drive to a location.
   2. The areas are often overcrowded creating an unpleasant experience for the dog and their owner
   3. There aren’t enough of them.
   4. Socialisation of dogs

   Believes all open spaces should be reviewed. Believes that some parks could be sectioned off with natural foliage as fences would limit space.

   Lives in Adamstown Heights and uses the Claremont Avenue Reserve with children and dogs. Both the children and the dogs haven’t been restricted to an area within the park. Fenced dog off lead areas are unsightly and limit the use of the park for the whole community.

31 Lives in Anzac Pde Newcastle. Visits Nesca Park, KEP & Horseshoe Beach.

   - Nesca Park needs boundaries repositioned to include shade and bins.
   - Crickets nets area at No. 1 could become fully enclosed to become a dog off leash area.
   - National Park No. 5 & 6 could also become a timed off leash area.

   Has included a map.

32 Wants to be included in survey.

33 Would like swimming water, drinking water, jumps, sandpits, bins, plastic bag dispensers, seats, shade area & lots of trees.

34 Owns two dogs that are walked daily in Stockton.

   - More dog poo bag dispensers
   - More signs about picking up the dog poo
   - More dog friendly water dispensers in Stockton.

35 Resides in Adamstown Heights. Believes there has been an explosion in dog ownership.

   - Dogs Barking an issue
   - Irresponsible dog owners - not picking up dog poo.
   - Dogs on sportgrounds running off leash
   - Believes Council should be developing a strategy to curb the growth of dog ownership and limit the freedom of these owners who seem to think that their dog is more important than a human in society.
   - Is a dog owner.

36 I am a dog owner and I run a companion animal services business and I welcome Council’s proactive approach to dogs in open spaces however, from my observations and experiences this needs to be part of a larger program of dog management and owner education. Well managed off lead areas can be one part of a balanced approach to healthy dog ownership but without owner education regarding the law and appropriate dog behaviour, off lead areas will continue to be spaces where dogs are often bullied and undesirable behaviours rewarded. Many dog trainers and behaviourists in Australia and overseas advise clients to stay away from off lead areas and to actively socialise their dogs in alternative healthy ways that promote desirable behaviours. There is no evidence that the construction of more off lead areas will necessarily help to reduce dog attacks or increase healthy dog socialisation, in fact anecdotal evidence suggests the opposite, poorly educated owners and ill managed off lead areas increase the potential for unregulated aggressive behaviours and increased human conflict.

   In my experience the majority of dog owners in Newcastle city area are either unaware of the Companion Animal Act and their legal obligations or they choose to ignore signage, direction or advice regarding their obligations to have their dog on lead and under effective control at all times. In my local area of Carrington, as well as Wickham, Tighes Hill and Nobby’s Beach I regularly encounter dogs illegally off lead in shopping areas, main streets, at the beach, in local streets, parks, cycleways and cafes. Sadly, most owners believe it is their right to have their dog off lead whenever and wherever they choose - in direct conflict with the actual law - and if politely asked to restrain their dog, they frequently respond with verbal abuse, and demonstrate an inability to effectively control their dog and to understand its body language. Every day 70-80% of the dogs I observe are off lead - and nowhere near an off leash area - and inevitably the owners response reflects their belief that they and their dog are entitled to do what they want, where they want - regardless of its effect on anyone else’s amenity.

   Whilst the creation of more off lead areas may be popular, the problems of undesirable dog behaviours,
attacks and stray dogs require a broader program of management that includes a public awareness campaign of the law (and the penalties); and a public education campaign focused on understanding dog body language and communication, and how to use off leash areas safely for the benefit of dogs and their owners. For these reasons, I would ask Council to proceed with caution in planning additional off leash and to consider a broader dog management approach that includes the effective combination of regulation and education to improve compliance.

37 On Sunday, I choose to use the BBQ and playground area of Dixon Park Beach with my children. There were numerous people with dogs off leash in this park. I note on your website that the top are of this park is a designated off leash area. However, dog owners were not restricting their animals to this area. Dogs were freely roaming thru the children’s play area and the bbq area. I remind council that the Companion Animals act that this is not permitted either leashed or unleashed. 14 Dogs prohibited in some public places (1) Dogs are prohibited in the following places (whether or not they are leashed or otherwise controlled): (a) Children’s play areas (meaning any public place, or part of a public place, that is within 10 metres of any playing apparatus provided in that public place or part for the use of children). (b) Food preparation/consumption areas (meaning any public place, or part of a public place, that is within 10 metres of any apparatus provided in that public place or part for the preparation of food for human consumption or for the consumption of food by humans). These are great facilities that should be enjoyed by all without the interference of other persons pets so I request Council either heavily police the dog activates in the park, fence the dog exercise area to delineate the spaces or relocate the DEA to another park without children’s play areas or food preparation areas (bbq’s).

38 Will not be participating in survey as she feels it’s a waste time.

39 Would like Horseshoe Beach to remain leash free. Would like toilet & shower facilities installed.

40 Would like further comment included:

NCC should not locate dog exercise areas in close proximity to parks with recreational infrastructure of playgrounds and bbqs. In variablility, dogs owners do not control their animals and they end up near children on swings or sniffing around bbq area. This situation occurs all to regularly at Dixon Park Beach. If located on same park, some form of separation needs to be provided. Dog owners just do not respect their responsibilities under the companion animal act.

NCC should not locate dog exercise areas at Sportsgrounds. These are spaces are set aside for sport and need to be kept as such. Tighes reserve is a field that is needed in the inner city for sport and needs to be reinstated a sports field. Unfortunately, due to inconsiderate dog owners not cleaning up after their animals co using these spaces is not possible.

NCC needs to look for opportunities in the inner city to use smaller underutilised areas of parkland for fenced dog exercise area. DEA do not need to be flat areas so underutilised pocket parks with some level changes could works well. Fencing DEA at Dixon Park would resolve the issues there. Locating a fenced area at Islington park will allow Tighes Reserve to become a sports field again.

Lastly, policing of dog areas and dog ownership is required. This will address the imbalance of dog owners taking over public space intended for all the communities enjoyment.

41 Does not want any part of Lambton Park to be a dog off leash area.

42 Resident living near Lambton Park. Does not want Lambton Park to become an off-leash area.
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Attachment A:  Wallsend Public Domain Plan and Traffic Plan
New pedestrian crossing and refuge
Separate bridge raising project provides opportunity to treat bridge crossings as gateways, highlighted with paving treatments and lighting.

Upgrade bus terminus.
Childcare Centre - Increase privacy from overlooking buildings & embellish blank walls with murals. Relocate existing bus stop to south of pedestrian crossing.

Upgrade pedestrian/cycle shared path connection within Wallsend Park including new shared bridge.

Make Council St one way northbound. Allow for additional car parking with bike threading on the western side, no stopping on eastern side.

Extend shared path to Federal Park and install barrier along open drainage channel to maintain safety.

Investigate special treatment of gateways to Wallsend Local Centre at detail design stage.

Plan for the long term goals of improved flood performance and improved public amenity. Investigate bridge raising, channel widening and opportunities for naturalisation, public access and activation by neighbouring properties.

Council has limited control over private land & current standards of infrastructure & maintenance. However, for community benefit, Council to look at long term solutions through planning reg's. Work with Stockland when site redevelopment occurs including improved car parking layouts & incorporation of WSUD, CPTED and sustainable tree planting.

Investigate the likelihood of raising floor levels and orientation of built farm towards creek to capitalise on location. In long term, re-assess current building envelope away from channel to allow creek naturalisation and pedestrian access to occur. Strengthen link through Stockland staff carpark to Nelson St.

New traffic calming devices for Burn St

Investigate provision of a 2.5m wide shared path on Newcastle Rd and Low St

Remove bridge and pedestrian link between Newcastle Rd and Kemp St to improve safety (refer CPTED notes)

New traffic lights at Cowper/ Kockara St intersection to enable safe crossing by pedestrians.

Consider footpath widening both sides of Nelson St for outdoor dining opportunities

Remove Stockland bridge to improve safety.

Investigate provision of a 2.5m wide shared path on Newcastle Rd and Low St

Remove bridge and pedestrian link between Newcastle Rd and Kemp St to improve safety (refer CPTED notes)

New traffic lights at Cowper/ Kockara St intersection to enable safe crossing by pedestrians.

Consider footpath widening both sides of Nelson St for outdoor dining opportunities

Remove Stockland bridge to improve safety.

Investigate provision of a 2.5m wide shared path on Newcastle Rd and Low St

Remove bridge and pedestrian link between Newcastle Rd and Kemp St to improve safety (refer CPTED notes)

New traffic lights at Cowper/ Kockara St intersection to enable safe crossing by pedestrians.

Consider footpath widening both sides of Nelson St for outdoor dining opportunities

Remove Stockland bridge to improve safety.

Investigate provision of a 2.5m wide shared path on Newcastle Rd and Low St

Remove bridge and pedestrian link between Newcastle Rd and Kemp St to improve safety (refer CPTED notes)

New traffic lights at Cowper/ Kockara St intersection to enable safe crossing by pedestrians.

Consider footpath widening both sides of Nelson St for outdoor dining opportunities

Remove Stockland bridge to improve safety.
IRONBARK CREEK BRIDGES

Separate bridge raising project provides opportunity to treat bridge crossings as gateways, highlighted with paving treatments, signage and lighting.

COUNCIL STREET

Make Council Street one way northbound to simplify traffic movement & allow for additional 1hr timed parking in the western side of the street, with no stopping on the eastern side of the street. Explore the potential to plant trees on the eastern side of the street where there are no power lines.

STOCKLAND SHOPPING CENTRE CONNECTION TO NELSON STREET

Maintain & improve useability & legibility of existing pedestrian connections. Investigate options for new direct link between Stockland Mall and Nelson St and negotiate with private landowners to provide pedestrian access.

WALLSEND PUBLIC DOMAIN - MASTERPLAN DETAILS

30th of April 2018
Intersections have been tested for compliance for vehicular turning circles by ADW Johnson – Engineering. Final layouts will be subject to a detailed design process and investigation of all service and technical requirements.

- Treat Kemp St as an access lane way with a raised continuous footpath treatment across its junction with Nelson Street to facilitate all ability access to Nelson Street shops.

- Make Council Street one way northbound to simplify traffic movement & allow for additional 1hr timed parking along the western side of the street, with no stopping on the eastern side of the street. Explore the potential to plant trees on the eastern side of the street where there are no power lines.

- New traffic lights at Cowper/Kokera St intersection to enable safe crossing by pedestrians.

- New roundabout to control traffic flow at Newcastle Rd/Cowper St intersection

- New roundabout to control traffic flow at Newcastle Rd/Cowper St intersection

- Removal of Stockland bridge to improve safety

- Redesign curb of Nelson St to create a gateway feature

- Create median to prevent dangerous right-hand turns

- 40km/hr zone replaces 60km/hr between Newcastle Rd & Bulkara St. Include traffic devices at key locations to support speed limit change.

- MSE plant section of R5 shared path to be minimum 3.0m wide to complete existing network. Investigate existing signage locations/service infrastructure as part of shared path construction.

- Construct new shared path & shared bridge link through Wallsend Park.

- New path between Kokera St & Cowper St bridge.

- Proposed NIMA fast charger for electric cars.

- Improve pedestrian connections between Stockland and Nelson St along Dan Rees St. Improve levels, safety and legibility in TPI House area.

- Improve pedestrian path transitions/levels adjacent to Collery Inn.

- Install kerb extensions to Murnin & Metcalfe Streets.

- Retain heritage coal hopper on alignment of historic tramway and move west.

- RETAIN Murnin Street bus in current location.

- Upgrade council carparks (Dan Rees St & Kemp Street carparks), including rationalising layout, circulation, delineation of pedestrian paths/link to bus stops, carpark and tree planting.

- Allocate ten 2P timed car parks within Kemp St Carpark close to Wallsend Baptist Church.

- Control vehicular access to public land consider formalising parking near Pioneer Community Hall.

- Provide two additional pedestrian/cyclist crossing phases to facilitate safe crossing of Cowper & Nelson St and to link proposed R5 shared path. Redesign the bus stop to make space for the shared path and 2 buses.

- Install kerb extensions to Murnin & Metcalfe Streets.

- Retain heritage coal hopper on alignment of historic tramway and move west.

- Retain Murnin Street bus in current location.

- Upgrade council carparks (Dan Rees St & Kemp Street carparks), including rationalising layout, circulation, delineation of pedestrian paths/link to bus stops, carpark and tree planting.

- Allocate ten 2P timed car parks within Kemp St Carpark close to Wallsend Baptist Church.

- Control vehicular access to public land consider formalising parking near Pioneer Community Hall.

- Provide two additional pedestrian/cyclist crossing phases to facilitate safe crossing of Cowper & Nelson St and to link proposed R5 shared path. Redesign the bus stop to make space for the shared path and 2 buses.
COWPER ST/KOKERA ST INTERSECTION

Replace roundabout with signalised intersection to facilitate safe pedestrian & cyclist movement between McDonald’s, Stockland & Wallsend Park and linking proposed and existing shared paths. Create a gateway/entry statement using flags & tree planting.

COWPER ST/NELSON ST INTERSECTION

Provide two additional pedestrian/cyclist crossing phases to facilitate safe crossing of Cowper & Nelson Sts, and to link the proposed R5 shared path. Redesign the bus stop to make space for the shared path and two buses.

TPR HOUSE (WALLSEND ENTERPRISE CENTRE) OPEN SPACE

Redesign open space and carpark. Relocate heritage coal hopper to the TPI House curtilage to make room for separate car park entry and exit points. Retain the coal hopper on the alignment of the historic tramway. Improve access, legibility and safety for pedestrians moving through the space including connections and levels within the TPI House area. To improve safety remove the Rees-Stockland bridge connection and direct pedestrians across Cowper St bridge. Retain valuable large trees and supplement with additional trees, clear out low shrubs for improved sightlines.

WALLSEND PUBLIC DOMAIN - COWPER STREET DETAILS

20th of April 2018
**LEGEND**

- **PROPOSED KERB ALIGNMENT**
- **REMOVED KERB**
- **PIRAM RAMP**
- **EXISTING BUILDINGS**
- **PEDESTRIAN CROSSING**
- **TRAFFIC LIGHT INTERSECTION**
- **FLAGPOLES**
- **COUNCIL CARPARKS**
- **BUS STOPS**
- **EXISTING TREE**
- **PROPOSED TREE**
- **TURF**
- **MASS PLANTING**
- **TREE TO BE POTENTIALLY REMOVED DUE TO RAISED BRIDGES**
- **PROPOSED PEDESTRIAN PATH SUBJECT TO FURTHER INVESTIGATIONS**

**KEY**

2. Provide at grade pedestrian crossing closer to the Boscawen street intersection.
3. Make no stopping zones standard at existing pedestrian crossings.
4. Negotiate with private landowners to provide a pedestrian connection. Investigate opportunity for new direct link through arcade style shop front.
5. Consider footpath widening on both sides of Nelson St to 4.4m wide to create outdoor dining opportunities.
6. Improve visual and physical connectivity of Rotunda Park with neighbouring heritage buildings with sympathetic materials.
7. Upgrade public toilets within Rotunda Park.
8. Treat Kemp St as an access laneway with a raised continuous footpath treatment across its junction with Nelson street to facilitate all ability access to Nelson Street shops.

**NOTES**

1. **GREEN FRAMEWORK** - Creating a green framework within the town centre was considered important to the community. Improving green cover within Nelson St will help considerably in reducing heat summer temperatures (heat island effect), improving environmental comfort levels & increasing aesthetic appeal. Selection, size, location and technical planting requirements must be carefully considered to ensure longevity and health of future tree planting.
2. **STREET FURNITURE** - Renew street furniture using technical manual as a guideline. Consider installation of community art projects within streetscape (e.g. pot project).
3. **FOOTPATHS** - Renew footpaths & road pavements on Nelson St using technical manual as a guideline. Use coloured ashlar pavement treatment within Nelson St to highlight heritage buildings.
4. **STREET TREES** - Assess existing street trees and replace as required with improved growing conditions. Provide new trees with awnings, carparking & services considered.
5. **SMART LIGHTING** - Investigate the installation of smart lighting on Nelson St, which can incorporate pedestrian lighting controls for special events, will and device pop stations.

**SECTION A - NELSON STREET - OUTDOOR DINING**

**SECTION B - NELSON STREET - STREET VERGE PLANTING**
These plans have been produced for communication purposes only at masterplan level and are not detailed civil designs. Final layouts will be subject to a detailed design process and investigation of all service and technical requirements.

**KEY**

1. Extra parking: street light and banners.
2. Kerb extensions at the entrance to Murnin St and Metcalfe St.
3. Proposed roundabout at Charles/Harris St intersection.
4. Investigate relocation of Cowper St bus stop & shelter westward.
5. Retain Murnin St bus stop in current location.
6. Proposed at grade pedestrian crossing and median refuge at the junction of Nelson St & Boscawen St.
7. Proposed kerb extensions at the junction of Boscawen Street and Harris St.
8. Footpath widening on both sides of Nelson St between Boscawen St & Cowper St to accommodate outdoor dining.

**NOTES**

- Proposed/Centred/Median/Refuges
- Existing RAISED/PEDESTRIAN CROSSING
- Proposed/AT GRADE PEDESTRIAN CROSSING
- Proposed/Untimed Parking
- Proposed/Upgrade Parking
- Proposed/New signalised intersection, 3 legs of controlled pedestrian crossing, includes right hand turning lane westbound from Cowper St into Kokera St.

**COUNCIL CAR PARK UNTIMED**

- Parking is to be untimed.

**COUNCIL CAR PARK TIMED**

- Parking is to be timed for 1 hour.

- One way commences.
- One way terminates.

**EXISTING AT GRADE PEDESTRIAN CROSSING**

- Existing pedestrian crossing.

**EXISTING RAISED PEDESTRIAN CROSSING**

- Existing raised pedestrian crossing.

**NEW SIGNALISED INTERSECTION**

- New signalised intersection.

**INTRODUCTION OF ROUNDABOUT**

- Introduction of roundabout and median refuges at the Newcastle/Cowper St intersection. Median refuges assist in safe crossing for pedestrians/cyclists.

**PROPOSED SHARED PATH**

- A shared path & a 40km/hr zone with associated traffic devices is proposed for Cowper Street between Bulkara Street and Newcastle Road.

**PROPOSED UNTIMED PARKING**

- Proposed untimed parking.

**PROPOSED/UPGRADED MEDIAN REFUGES**

- Proposed/Upgraded median refuges.

**PROPOSED SPEED CUSHION**

- Proposed speed cushion.

**NO STOPPING BUS ZONE**

- No stopping bus zone.

**PROPOSED T/L PAVING**

- Proposed t/l paving.

**REMOVED KERB PRAM RAMP**

- Removed kerb pram ramp.

**STUDY AREA**

- Study area.

**REMOVED KERB**

- Removed kerb.

**RE-LIGNED BYPASS**

- Re-lined bypass.

**RE-ALIGNMENT**

- Re-alignment.

**EXISTING BUS STOP**

- Existing bus stop.

**RELOCATED BUS STOP**

- Relocated bus stop.

**PROPOSED ONE WAY STREET**

- Proposed one way street.

**PROPOSED SHARED PATH**

- Proposed shared path.

**PROPOSED SPEED CUSHION**

- Proposed speed cushion.
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Attachment B: Wallsend Public Domain Planning Process Flow Chart

DISTRIBUTED UNDER SEPARATE COVER
Wallsend Local Centre: Public Domain Planning Process Flow Chart

We are here

Site analysis and photographic survey.

Presentation of site analysis. Community were invited to identify issues.

Advertised at Wallsend Winter Fair, with six signs in Wallsend Local Centre, and Have Your Say postcards delivered to properties within Local Centre.

Council produced report on the results of the Consultation Session.

Draft Wallsend Local Centre Public Domain Plan and Traffic Plan prepared based on site analysis and community issues.

Community invited to submit comment.

Advertised with: eight signs in Wallsend Local Centre, a poster in Stockland Mall and a display in Wallsend Library, Newcastle Herald 3 May 2017, Novopulse, social media, leaflets delivered to properties within Local Centre, exhibition information posted on Council’s webpage.

Draft plan presented to Wallsend Business Association meeting 1 May 2017.

Community information session held 8 May 2017.

Review of submissions and finalisation of Wallsend Local Centre Public Domain Plan and Traffic Plan.

Exhibition of separate traffic plans for Bunn St and Cowper St to address issues raised by the community. Exhibited from 12 March to 11 April 2018.

Letters to exhibition respondents, and website updated with final plans.

The Plan will be broken into stages for preliminary costing. Project stages will be budgeted for in Council’s forward program. Ongoing investigations such as geotechnical survey and underground utilities location will be undertaken. Detailed costings will be undertaken.

Internal or external construction resources will be procured and a construction environmental management plan (CEMP) will be developed.

Timeframes and staging for construction work will be defined.

Council will provide the community and business owners with information about the timing and process for Stage 1 construction work.

Council will continue to communicate with the public to minimise disruption during construction phase.

Council will determine approval of the Wallsend Local Centre Public Domain Plan and Traffic Plan.

Final Wallsend Local Centre Public Domain Plan and Traffic Plan is communicated to public and Council Staff.

Public Exhibition Cowper and Bunn: 12 March to 11 April 2018.

Final Public Domain Plan and Traffic Plan.

Council will determine approval: 22 May 2018.

Community Consultation Session: Held on 16 Nov 2016.

Consulation Report

Public Exhibition of Draft Plan: 12 March to 11 April 2018.


We are here

Planning for construction

Detail Design

Community information about construction

Construction of Stage 1

Staging and costing

We are here

Construction

Stage 1
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Attachment C: Traffic survey results
Observations - No Queueing issues.

All U Turns relate to parking on Nelson St.

Normal Pedestrian activity, most Nelson St activity relates to Parking.

Note: Arrows "<" indicate the end time for the peak hour for each turning movement.
16/2/2017 - NELSON ST / BOSCAWEN ST, WALLSEND

17:45 - HOUR ENDING Thursday

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NELSON ST</th>
<th>BOSCAWEN ST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 0 7 0 0</td>
<td>2 0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Light Vehicles</th>
<th>Total Heavy Vehicles</th>
<th>Total Pedestrians</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>581</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observations:

- No Queueing issues.
- All U Turns relate to parking on Nelson St.
- Normal Pedestrian activity, most Nelson St activity relates to Parking.
- PM Pedestrian activity in Boscawen St seems to relate to Gym attendance South of the Intersection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>16/2/2017 - NELSON ST / BOSCAWEN ST, WALLSEND</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Total Vehicles</th>
<th>Pedestrian</th>
<th>Cyclists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16:45 Light Vehicles</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14 1 12 4 0 4 35 0 104</td>
<td>6 5 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:00 Light Vehicles</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>11 3 12 7 0 4 48 0 141</td>
<td>6 3 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:15 Light Vehicles</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>17 2 23 7 0 1 59 0 161</td>
<td>7 9 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:30 Light Vehicles</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>26 1 &lt; 14 &lt; 3 0 6 40 0 141</td>
<td>6 &lt; 8 &lt; 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:45 Light Vehicles</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>21 1 &lt; 8 7 &lt; 0 7 &lt; 44 &lt; 0 138</td>
<td>5 5 6 &lt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:00 Light Vehicles</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>22 &lt; 1 11 4 0 4 &lt; 39 0 125</td>
<td>1 0 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:45 Heavy Vehicles</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1</td>
<td>2 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:00 Heavy Vehicles</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:15 Heavy Vehicles</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:30 Heavy Vehicles</td>
<td>1 &lt; 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 &lt;</td>
<td>0 &lt; 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:45 Heavy Vehicles</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:00 Heavy Vehicles</td>
<td>1 &lt; 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 &lt;</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:45 All Vehicles</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14 1 12 4 0 4 35 0 105</td>
<td>2 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:00 All Vehicles</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>11 3 12 7 0 4 48 0 141</td>
<td>6 5 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:15 All Vehicles</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>17 2 23 7 0 1 59 0 162</td>
<td>6 3 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:30 All Vehicles</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>26 1 &lt; 14 &lt; 3 0 6 40 0 142</td>
<td>7 9 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:45 All Vehicles</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>21 1 &lt; 8 7 &lt; 0 7 &lt; 44 &lt; 0 138</td>
<td>6 &lt; 8 &lt; 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:00 All Vehicles</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>22 &lt; 1 11 4 0 4 &lt; 39 0 126</td>
<td>1 0 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Arrows "<" indicate the end time for the peak hour for each turning movement.
Summary:

NEWCASTLE RD / COWPER ST

15/96 Total Light Vehicles
59 Total Heavy Vehicles
16 Total Pedestrians

**Observations** -
Cowper St Eastbound Right Turn Maximum Queueing of 5 Cars & 2 Heavy Vehicles (61m) with a Delay of 43 seconds.
Newcastle Rd Northbound Left Turn Maximum Queueing 8 Cars (56m) with a Delay of 43 seconds.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>16/2/2017 - NEWCASTLE RD / COWPER ST, WALLSEND</th>
<th>17:45 &lt;&lt; Hour Ending Thursday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Light Vehicles</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total Vehicles</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 MIN HOUR</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Vehicles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:45</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:00</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:15</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:30</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:45</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:00</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Vehicles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:45</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:00</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:30</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:45</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Vehicles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:45</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:00</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:15</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:30</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:45</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:00</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Arrows "<" indicate the end time for the peak hour for each turning movement.
## Cowper Street/ Kokera Street, Wallsend – Traffic, Pedestrian & Cyclist Survey

Survey Date: Thursday, 11 February 2016

### Traffic, Pedestrian & Cyclist Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>Traffic</th>
<th>Pedestrians</th>
<th>Cyclists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>7 9 11</td>
<td>8 10 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08:00 – 09:00</td>
<td>380 164 589 182 122 187</td>
<td>25 0 41 0 5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30 – 13:30</td>
<td>311 211 327 151 157 213</td>
<td>49 8 58 21 0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:45 – 17:45</td>
<td>490 377 410 220 196 294</td>
<td>24 6 50 11 2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Summary:

**COWPER ST / NELSON ST**

- **Total Light Vehicles:** 1484
- **Total Heavy Vehicles:** 83
- **Total Pedestrians:** 37

#### Observations -

No significant queuing & all pedestrians used the signalised crossings.

---

### 16/2/2017 - COWPER ST / NELSON ST, WALLSEND

**Summary:**

- **9:00**
  - **HOUR ENDING**
  - **Thursday**
  - **COWPER ST**
  - **NELSON ST**

- **1484** Total Light Vehicles
- **83** Total Heavy Vehicles
- **37** Total Pedestrians

---

#### Observations -

- All vehicles

---

#### Observations -

- No significant queuing & all pedestrians used the signalised crossings.

---

### 16/2/2017 - COWPER ST / NELSON ST, WALLSEND

- **COWPER ST**
- **NELSON ST**

---

### Observations -

- No significant queuing & all pedestrians used the signalised crossings.

---

### Notes:

- Arrows "<" indicate the end time for the peak hour for each turning movement.
Observations - No significant Queueing & All Pedestrians used signalised crossings.

### Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Light Vehicles</th>
<th>Total Light Vehicles</th>
<th>Heavy Vehicles</th>
<th>Total Heavy Vehicles</th>
<th>Pedestrians</th>
<th>Cyclists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17:30</td>
<td>1739</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Observations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Light Vehicles</th>
<th>Total Light Vehicles</th>
<th>Heavy Vehicles</th>
<th>Total Heavy Vehicles</th>
<th>Pedestrians</th>
<th>Cyclists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16:45</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:00</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:15</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:30</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:45</td>
<td>49 &lt;</td>
<td>120 &lt;</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:00</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 &lt; 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Arrows "<" indicate the end time for the peak hour for each turning movement.
Observations - Newcastle Rd Southbound Right Turn & Through Queueing got up to 6 cars (42m) with a Delay of 51 seconds.

Most pedestrian activity on Cowper St West of Newcastle Rd use the median strip as a refuge.

Note: Arrows "<" indicate the end time for the peak hour for each turning movement.
Crash Collision Diagram

Crash Period: 1 July 2011 to 30 June 2016

Legend
(T) – Towaway crash
(I) – Injury crash
ORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING
22 MAY 2018
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Attachment D: Wallsend Public Domain Plan Summary of Proposals

DISTRIBUTED UNDER SEPARATE COVER
Wallsend Local Centre Public Domain Plan -
Summary of Proposals

WHOLE OF WALLSEND LOCAL CENTRE

Issues:
- Disparate and unconnected uses.
- A lack of public domain cohesion and definition.
- Poor infrastructure and lack of trees and greenery.
- Poor connectivity and safety for pedestrians and cyclists.
- Traffic congestion and poor traffic safety.

Proposals:
- Create primary gateway entry features at Cowper Street's intersections with Kokera Street, Nelson Street and Newcastle Road.
- Create secondary gateway entry features at the Tyrrell Street, Nelson Street and Boscawen Street bridges.
- Use a consistent and aesthetically pleasing internal design language, including lighting, paving, street furniture and planting that celebrates Wallsend's unique heritage.
- Increase tree and groundcover planting throughout the centre.
- Upgrade key transport stops on Bunn Street and Cowper Street.
- Provide a safe and legible vehicular, pedestrian and cycle network.

COWPER STREET

Issues:
- Currently a busy 60 km/h sub-arterial road with approximately 14,000 vehicles per day including heavy trucks.
- RMS crash database (1 July 2011 - 30 June 2016) indicates 23 accidents between Bulkara Street and Newcastle Road. The crash collision diagram is shown at Attachment D.
- Functions as an access road for Wallsend Local Centre and as a through route to Newcastle Link Road and the M1.
- Significant traffic congestion at peak times associated with the Lake Road/Newcastle Link Road intersection.
- Travel lanes are dangerously misaligned at the Newcastle Road intersection.
- Newcastle Road slip road funnels traffic onto Cowper Street at speed.
- Between Murnin Street and Newcastle Road eastbound vehicles have to prop in traffic to turn right.
- Traffic volume and lack of safe crossing facilities form a barrier to safe pedestrian and cycle connectivity from north to south and east to west.
- A section of the R5 regional shared path connecting Newcastle University and Glendale TAFE is missing within Wallsend Local Centre.
Proposals:

a. Between Newcastle Road and Bulkara Street make Cowper Street a 40 km/h High Pedestrian Activity (HPA) area zone, consistent with the rest of Wallsend Local Centre.

b. At Kokera Street/Cowper Street intersection - replace the existing roundabout with traffic signals to facilitate safe pedestrian and cycle crossing between the park, shopping centre and McDonalds.

c. At Nelson Street/Cowper Street intersection - upgrade the existing traffic signals with an additional pedestrian crossing leg on Cowper Street to facilitate safe pedestrian and cycle crossing. This is in accordance with Roads and Maritime Services (RMS) traffic signal design guidelines.

d. Newcastle Road/Cowper Street intersection - replace the existing four-way intersection with a roundabout to slow traffic, improve safety and provide an opportunity for traffic to enter Wallsend via Tyrrell Street.

e. Between Murnin Street and Newcastle Road provide a concrete median to stop dangerous right hand turns into Henny Penny and BWS.

f. Between Murnin Street and Newcastle Road provide a mid-block pedestrian refuge in the proposed concrete median to facilitate safe pedestrian and cycle crossing.

g. Provide the R5 shared path minimum 3.0 metres wide on the northern side of Cowper Street. This proposal removes 13 on-street parking spaces.

h. Provide traffic lane widths suitable for accommodating safe on-road cycling.

i. At the intersections of Murnin Street and Metcalfe Street, provide kerb extensions which will act as entry treatments for the proposed 40 km/h HPA area and also narrow carriageway widths to improve pedestrian and cyclist safety.

WALLSEND PARK

Issue:

a. Poor pedestrian and cycle connectivity between Wallsend Park and Wallsend Local Centre.

Proposal:

a. Provide a 3.0 metres wide shared pedestrian/cyclist connection within Wallsend Park including a new shared bridge across Ironbark Creek.

b. Provide a footpath extension on the southern side of Cowper Street between Cowper Street Bridge and Kokera Street intersection.
NELSON STREET

Issues:
a. Currently a busy main-street with high demand for on-street parking.
b. Connectivity with neighbouring Stockland Mall is very poor.
c. Between Tyrrell Street and Boscawen Street there is no safe pedestrian crossing facility.
d. Footpaths are in poor condition with limited outdoor trading such as outdoor dining.
e. There is peak hour traffic congestion at the southern end of Nelson Street associated with the traffic signals and traffic generated by council car parks in Dan Rees Street and Kemp Street.
f. No safe crossing for cyclists using the existing R5 on-road route at the busy Nelson Street intersection with Dan Rees Street and Kemp Street.

Proposals:
a. Retain on-road parallel parking
b. Negotiate with private landowners to provide a direct connection between Stockland Mall and Nelson Street.
c. At the Bulkara Street/Nelson Street intersection provide a pedestrian crossing with kerb extensions. The traffic survey indicates that the location would meet the stipulated RMS traffic and pedestrian volume warrants.
d. Widen footpaths and provide free Wifi to create an attractor.
e. Provide an additional pedestrian crossing leg at the Nelson Street traffic signals to facilitate safe crossing for users of the proposed R5 shared path.

BOSCAWEN STREET

Issue:
a. There is no safe pedestrian crossing facility to cater the north-south pedestrian desire line at Nelson Street.
b. Difficulty crossing at the Harris Street intersection.

Proposal:
a. Provide a pedestrian refuge intersection to improve pedestrian and cyclist safety.
b. Provide upgraded kerb extensions at the Boscawen Street/Harris Street intersection to facilitate pedestrian and cyclist safety and provide an entry treatment to the existing 40 km/h HPA area zone.

COUNCIL STREET

Issues:
a. Very narrow, currently two-way and difficult to navigate, with limited parallel parking on the eastern side of the road (due to driveways) and timed no parking on the western side.
**Proposals:**

a. Make Council Street one way northbound between Dan Rees Street and Tyrrell Street to improve safety due to narrow carriageway width and alleviate traffic congestion at the Dan Rees Street/Nelson Street intersection.

b. Relocate timed parallel parking to the western side of the road (less driveways) and implement no stopping on the eastern side of the road.

**DAN REES STREET**

**Issues:**

a. Unsafe backstreet pedestrian connection to Stockland Mall via TPI House curtilage and footbridge.

b. Lack of footpath along southern side of road to connect with existing pedestrian crossing.

c. Council car park - poor internal vehicular flow due to lack of separated entry and exit.

d. Existing on-road section of R5 cycle route unsafe due to lack of space and conflict with manoeuvring vehicles.

**Proposals:**

a. Remove footbridge to Stockland car park and upgrade TPI House curtilage to provide safe access to Stockland Mall via the proposed Cowper Street shared path.

b. Provide footpath along southern side of Dan Rees Street.

c. Council car park - redesign to provide separated entry and exit - to make space relocate heritage coal hopper into the TPI House curtilage.

d. Retain the heritage coal hopper on the original alignment of the heritage tramway.

e. Remove on-road section of R5 and provide a shared path on Cowper Street.

**KEMP STREET**

**Issues:**

a. Unsafe backstreet pedestrian connection to Newcastle Road via footbridge.

b. Council car park - very poor pedestrian connectivity between the car park and Kemp Street and Cowper Street.

c. Council car park - existing trees causing substantial damage to infrastructure due to poor design.

d. Kemp Street/Nelson Street intersection - no safe north-south crossing facility.

e. Existing on-road section of R5 cycle route unsafe due to lack of space and conflict with maneuvering vehicles.
Proposals:

a. Remove footbridge and unsafe backstreet pedestrian connection to Newcastle Road and direct pedestrian flows via the Cowper Street shared path.

b. Council car park - redesign to provide adequate space for trees and pedestrian connectivity between the car park and Kemp Street and Cowper Street.

c. At the Nelson Street intersection provide a continuous footpath treatment giving pedestrians priority over vehicles.

d. Remove on-road section of R5 and provide a shared path on Cowper Street.

HARRIS STREET

Issues:

a. The intersection of Harris Street with Charles Street and William Street is poorly defined and confusing to drivers.

Proposal:

a. Install a mountable roundabout at the intersection of Harris Street with Charles Street and William Street to manage traffic flows.

BUNN STREET

Issues:

a. Antisocial behaviour at the northbound bus stop including foul language and smoking. The bus stop is directly next to the childcare centre outdoor play area and at times such behaviour has resulted in children not being able to use the outdoor play area.

b. There are complaints that traffic speeds frequently exceed the existing 40 km/h speed limit within the HPA area.

Proposal:

a. Move the bus stop away from the childcare centre to the front of the library - south of the pedestrian crossing. Swap 1P timed parking spaces from in front of the library to the north of the pedestrian crossing. This will result in the net loss of two 1P parking spaces.

b. Implement speed cushions.
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Attachment E: Wallsend Public Domain Plan and Traffic Plan exhibition leaflet
To The Business Owner/Property Owner/Resident

Wallsend Local Centre: Draft Public Domain Plan and Traffic Plan

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

- Reduce the speed limit on Cowper St between Bulkara St and Newcastle Rd from 60km/h to 40km/h by implementing a 40km/h High Pedestrian Activity Area (HPAA)
- Traffic calming devices to improve pedestrian safety and amenity
- Provide the missing R5 cycle link between Kokera St and Newcastle Rd, as an off road shared path along the northern side of Cowper St
- Amend the existing set of traffic signals at the intersection of Nelson St and Cowper St to provide a new crossing phase on Nelson St and an additional crossing phase on Cowper St
- A new set of traffic signals at the intersection of Kokera St and Cowper St to facilitate safer crossing between Stockland Mall, McDonalds and Wallsend Park.
- A new roundabout at the intersection of Newcastle Rd and Cowper St to create a gateway and facilitate vehicular movements to and from the Local Centre via Tyrrell St
- A new pedestrian crossing and refuge at the junction of Boscawen St and Newcastle Rd
- A traffic roundabout at the intersection of Harris St and Charles St
- One way northbound on Council St to improve traffic flow and safety
- Other streetscape improvements include footpath widening in Nelson St to accommodate outdoor dining, street trees and kerb extensions

Your feedback on the questions below is important to assist Council in making a final decision. The plan is on exhibition from Wednesday 3 May until Wednesday 31 May 2017. Full coloured copies of the Public Domain Plan and Traffic Plan are available at: Wallsend and Newcastle City Libraries, Council’s Customer Enquiry Centre and on Council’s website: www.newcastle.nsw.gov.au/YourSay. If there are no submissions received Council will assume there are no objections to the proposed changes.

Please provide feedback by 5pm Wednesday 31 May 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: Sarah Horan, PO Box 489, NEWCASTLE NSW 2300 or Email: mail@ncc.nsw.gov.au (marked Attention Sarah Horan). For further information please contact Sarah Horan, Council Landscape Architect on telephone 4974 2151.

Do you agree with the proposed 40 km/h High Pedestrian Activity Area (HPAA) on Cowper St? □ Yes □ No
Do you agree with the proposed traffic signals at Cowper St / Kokera St intersection? □ Yes □ No
Do you agree with the proposed roundabout at Cowper St / Newcastle Rd intersection? □ Yes □ No
Do you agree with the proposed footpath widening on Nelson St to accommodate outdoor dining? □ Yes □ No
Do you agree with the proposed northbound one-way traffic flow on Council St? □ Yes □ No
Do you agree with the proposed additional crossing phases at the Nelson St / Cowper St intersection? □ Yes □ No

Name (Optional):
Address: __________________________________________
Comments: __________________________________________

PLS NOTE: When writing comments or submissions to Council, the following information should be considered – Should an objector consider that the disclosure of their name and address would result in detriment to them the words “OBJECTION IN CONFIDENCE” must be printed prominently at the top of the submission. Council may, however, be obliged to release full details of the submission including the name and address under the relevant access to information legislation, even if these words are in the submission.
These plans have been produced for communication purposes only at masterplan level and are not detailed civil designs. Final layouts will be subject to a detailed design process and investigation of all service and technical requirements.

**KEY**
1. Cowper Street median to accommodate low level planting, street lights and banners.
2. Kerb extensions at the entrance to Murnin St and Metcalfe St.
3. Council St made one way. Parking on the western side clear of rear lane access to Fashion Street shop fronts.
4. Proposed roundabout at Charles/Harris St intersection.
5. Investigate relocation of Cowper St bus stop & shelter westward.
6. Investigate relocation of Murnin St bus stop southward.
7. Proposed at grade pedestrian crossing and median refuge at the junction of Nelson St & Boscawen St.
8. Proposed kerb extensions at the junction of Boscawen Street and Harris St.
9. Footpath widening on both sides of Nelson St between Boscawen St & Cowper St to accommodate outdoor dining.

**NOTES**
- A shared path & a 40km/hr zone with associated traffic devices is proposed for Cowper Street between Bulkara Street and Newcastle Road.
- All existing car parking and one way arrangements are retained unless shown on plan.

**CAR PARKING CAPACITY**
Nelson St parking number:
- Existing: 100
- Proposed: 101
Cowper St parking number:
- Existing: 20
- Proposed: 4

**Notes:**
- A shared path & a 40km/hr zone with associated traffic devices is proposed for Cowper Street between Bulkara Street and Newcastle Road.
- All existing car parking and one way arrangements are retained unless shown on plan.

**Legend**
- Study Area
- Proposed Kerb Re-alignment
- Removed Kerb
- Pram Ramp
- Existing at Grade Pedestrian Crossing
- Proposed at Grade Pedestrian Crossing
- Proposed Speed Cushion or Speed Hump
- Proposed Raised Paved Threshold
- Council Car Park UnTimed
- Council Car Park Timed
- Existing Traffic Light
- Proposed Traffic Light
- Proposed Shared Path Minimum 2.5m Wide
- No Stopping
- Bus Zone
- Timed Street Parking
- Proposed/Upgraded Median Refuges
- Existing Bus Stop
- Relocated Bus Stop
- Proposed One Way Street

**Draft Wallsend Local Centre Traffic Plan**
PO Box 489 Hunter Region Mail Centre Newcastle 2300

**Note:** This is the Traffic Plan. For the full Public Domain Plan please view Council’s website for more detail: www.newcastle.nsw.gov.au/YourSay
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Attachment F: Summary of Wallsend Public Domain Plan and Traffic Plan exhibition responses
Summary of Wallsend PDP and Traffic Plan exhibition responses (Exhibition May 2017)

Total individual submissions = 100 (some did not answer all traffic questions)
Also a petition with approx. 480 signatures was sent in from Wallsend Baptist Church

Traffic Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you agree with the proposed 40 km/h High Pedestrian Activity Area (HPAA) on Cowper St?</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you agree with the proposed traffic signals at Cowper St/ Kokera St intersection?</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you agree with the proposed roundabout at Cowper St / Newcastle Rd intersection?</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you agree with the proposed footpath widening on Nelson St to accommodate outdoor dining?</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you agree with the proposed northbound one-way traffic flow on Council St?</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you agree with the proposed additional crossing phases at the Nelson St / Cowper St intersection?</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Submission</td>
<td>Number of related submissions</td>
<td>Solutions suggested by community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallsend Baptist Church</td>
<td>Approx. 480</td>
<td>Change plan. Take shared path proposal off Cowper St. Keep regional path on Kemp St operating as a shared zone. Put shared path in car park garden bed instead.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to lot 30 owned by Wallsend Baptist Church is blocked off and site is shown as green space.</td>
<td>Approx. 480</td>
<td>Show access on plans. Take off green space tone on plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childcare Centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Submission</td>
<td>Number of related submissions</td>
<td>Solutions suggested by community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus exhaust present all day at neighbouring bus stop, also swearing, smoking, foul</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Relocate bus stop away from childcare centre to left hand side of library.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>language and violence. Buses create a traffic hazard during drop off and pick up of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>small children, due to lack of visibility and manoeuvring of buses. Litter thrown over</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wall, vandalism of childcare centre and theft. Children are exposed to cigarette</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>smoke and people climb on top of the bus shelter and childcare wall. People engage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with the children, often the children have to be brought inside.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parking</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not reduce car parking spaces in Kemp St or Dan Rees car parks.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Multistorey car parking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson St car parking at a premium.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No ticketed parking on Nelson St. Do not take parking away.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 hour parking instead of 1 hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No motor cycle parking in Stockland car park means motorbikes take up a whole car</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Dedicated motorcycle parking in Stockland car park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>space.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public domain improvements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council previously opposed a new restaurant on Nelson St - why now widen for outdoor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dining?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support more street trees</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support road and footpath upgrades</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support protecting green space in Wallsend</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Wifi (none at Stockland or Nelson St)</td>
<td>Wallsend Library staff</td>
<td>Support WIFI for Nelson St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Submission</td>
<td>Number of related submissions</td>
<td>Solutions suggested by community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise and antisocial behaviour in Wallsend skate park at night</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Remove tall flood lighting associated with Kokera/Cowper roundabout to prevent lighting of skate park at night. Use low level pedestrian lighting for shared path and don’t light skate park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abandoned supermarket trolleys a problem as people don’t have cars</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Provide trolley bays for efficient trolley pick up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Traffic Issues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40km proposal for Cowper St not a good idea - it is an arterial. 40km/h unnecessary with proposed traffic lights to help pedestrians cross.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Remove from plan. Use fencing in middle of road to divert peds to marked crossings. Fully block Cowper St at Newcastle Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t have a roundabout at Newcastle Rd/Cowper intersection</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Traffic lights instead.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right hand turn from Council St onto Tyrrell is dangerous because buses block sight lines</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Move bus stop to the left of the intersection. Make Council St one way southbound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowper St unsafe to cross</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Additional pedestrian crossings across Cowper - eg at Murnin St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banked up traffic on Cowper since removal of Lake Road roundabout</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t have traffic signals at Kokera/Cowper junction, right hand turn lane into Kokera won’t handle peak traffic flow</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Keep roundabout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Submission</td>
<td>Number of related submissions</td>
<td>Solutions suggested by community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection of Metcalfe St and Cowper St is difficult and dangerous to negotiate for cars and people. Multilane and traffic backs up at peak times.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Traffic lights. Central refuge instead of kerb extensions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near misses at ped crossing on Bunn St and cars going too fast despite 40 zoning.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Improved traffic calming such as speed bumps and raising the ped crossing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficult to turn right from Bunn St into Kokera St.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Roundabout at intersection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little used bus stop on Murmin St outside old library</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Combine with bus stop on Cowper St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus stop on Cowper St blocks views for cars turning right out of Murmin St.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Move bus stop on Cowper St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian crossing at Boscawen St not needed.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Remove from plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congestion on Nelson St at traffic lights</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>'Keep Clear' painted on road at Kemp St intersection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roundabout at Charles/Harris St will take away parking spaces and cause congestion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Remove roundabout from plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic pressure on Minmi Rd and potential for rat running through back streets including Low St, Charles St and Macquarie St - encouraged by a roundabout at Cowper St/Newcastle Rd intersection.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Flooding**

Proposed traffic lights at Kokera St would require roadway changes that could have upstream flooding impacts on properties. 1

**Out of Scope**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Submission</th>
<th>Number of related submissions</th>
<th>Solutions suggested by community</th>
<th>Council Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fund flood mitigation to reduce flood risk.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>Out of scope - being undertaken as a separate project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ugly roundabout at Bousfield St.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Improve presentation.</td>
<td>Out of scope. Refer to LATM maintenance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More street trees in Stockland Plaza - many lost over years.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Out of scope until Stockland redevelops, let Stockland know this is an issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficult to enter/leave Cowper St from residences east of Newcastle Rd.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Widening of shoulder eastbound would allow cars to turn right into driveways without obstructing traffic.</td>
<td>Out of scope - and widening roadway conflicts with proposals for a future shared path.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooks St is used as a rat run for vehicles avoiding queues at the Lake Rd lights - dangerous when combined with weekend parking for sports and children on road.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Close Brooks St at the Thomas St end.</td>
<td>Out of scope - but for consideration as part of Wallsend Park project. Brooks St cannot be blocked off at Thomas St because it is an important overland flow path. Council will investigate the provision of traffic control devices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High pedestrian activity at swimming pool and school.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Extend 40km zone along Clarke St and Boscawen St to swimming pool.</td>
<td>Out of scope - this proposal has already been considered by Newcastle Council Traffic Committee.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Attachment G: Bunn Street Traffic Plan and Cowper Street Traffic Plan exhibition leaflets
Community Consultation

To The Owner / Occupier

BUNN STREET, WALLSEND

Proposed Bus Stop Relocation South of Existing Pedestrian Crossing

12 March 2018

Council conducted a public exhibition on the proposed Wallsend traffic plan, as part of the Wallsend public domain plan, from 3 May 2017 to 31 May 2017. The proposed traffic plan showed retention of the existing northbound bus stop on Bunn Street outside the child care centre. Council received requests to relocate the bus stop for a number of reasons, including the waiting passengers reportedly peeping over the fence into the centre's play area, throwing rubbish into the centre, smoking and using foul/abusive language while waiting for the bus.

Council has reviewed the responses received during the public exhibition period and now proposes to relocate the bus stop/shelter to the south of the existing pedestrian crossing. The proposal will result in the net loss of two parking spaces as seven angle parking spaces will be lost and five parallel parking spaces will be gained at the existing bus stop location. The proposed bus stop location will not obstruct sight lines at the crossing as buses would stop within the indented bay.

The proposal intends to address the child safety issues that have been raised at the existing bus stop location. It is also anticipated to improve safety as passengers would be naturally encouraged to use the crossing while changing buses on the opposite side of the road.

A concept plan of the proposal is attached. The plan and consultation responses will be tabled at the next available Newcastle City Traffic Committee meeting for consideration and, if supported, will be included in the revised traffic plan (public domain plan). Council welcomes your comments on this proposal and your feedback will shape the final decision. 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 11 April 2018 to The Chief Executive Officer, Newcastle City Council, Attention: Transport & Traffic, PO Box 469, NEWCASTLE NSW 2300 or email: mail@ncc.nsw.gov.au, Phone: 4974 2000, Fax: 4974 2222. For further information on the proposal please contact Dipen Nathwani, Traffic Engineer, on 4974 2663.

Name: ___________________________  Address (Mandatory): ___________________________

Comments: ___________________________

______________________________

______________________________

Protecting your privacy: Newcastle City Council is committed to protecting your privacy. We take reasonable steps to comply with relevant legislation and Council policy. Purpose of collecting personal details: Council is collecting this information to determine the local community’s views and opinions on the proposal outlined. Intended recipients: Information provided as part of the consultation will be used as part of the investigation into the proposal, and may be included in future reports on the issue. Storage and security: Information provided will be stored on Council's database and will be subject to Council’s information and privacy policies. Access: Individuals can access data to check accuracy by contacting Council. Please note: When making written comments or submissions to Council, the following information should be considered – Should an objector consider that the disclosure of their name and address would result in detriment to them the words “OBJECTION IN CONFIDENCE” must be stated prominently at the top of the submission. Council may, however, be obliged to release full details of the submission including the name and address under the relevant access to information legislation, even if these words are in the submission.
Note:
If approved this plan will be incorporated into the Final Wallsend Public Domain Plan and Traffic Plan. All existing parking arrangements are maintained unless shown on plan.

Legend
- Existing and proposed footpath
- Existing driveway
- No stopping
- Existing and proposed bus zone
- Proposed 1 hour timed parking spaces
- Relocated disabled parking spaces

Wallsend Public Domain Plan - Traffic Plan
Bunn St bus stop relocation
March 2018
Council conducted a public exhibition for the proposed Wallsend traffic plan, as part of the Wallsend public domain plan, from 3 May 2017 to 31 May 2017. The proposed traffic plan included constructing a shared path on the northern side of Cowper Street which resulted in the loss of 16 on-street two hour (2P) parking spaces. Council has received concerns from the community regarding the loss of parking. Council has also been requested to consider installing a concrete median along Cowper Street to prevent eastbound drivers from turning right into Henny Penny Foods and BWS. The right turning drivers have been reported to interrupt eastbound traffic flow, resulting in increased congestion and near misses especially during peak hours.

Council reviewed the responses received during the public exhibition period and now proposes to construct an indented bay on Cowper Street to accommodate three on-street two hour (2P) parking spaces, construct a concrete median between the proposed Newcastle Road roundabout and Murnin Street and accommodate a mid-block pedestrian refuge within the median. The proposal also includes implementing two hour (2P) parking restrictions within a section (10 spaces) of the Kemp Street car park which currently permits unrestricted parking.

The proposal intends to improve safety and traffic flow on Cowper Street by constructing a concrete median. Eastbound traffic will still be able to access the affected businesses (Henny Penny Foods and BWS) by turning at the proposed roundabout on Cowper Street and Newcastle Road. The proposal also intends to offset the loss of short-term parking spaces by encouraging parking turnover within the Kemp Street car park section.

A concept plan of the proposal is attached. The plan and consultation responses will be tabled at the next available Newcastle City Traffic Committee meeting for consideration and, if supported, will be included in the revised traffic plan (public domain plan). Council welcomes your comments on this proposal and your feedback will shape the final decision. 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 11 April 2018 to The 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 Dipen Nathwani, Traffic Engineer, on 4974 2663.

Name: ___________________________  Address (Mandatory): ___________________________

Comments: ___________________________

Protecting your privacy: The City of Newcastle is committed to protecting your privacy. We take reasonable steps to comply with relevant legislation and Council policy. Purpose of collecting personal details: Council is collecting this information to determine the local community’s views and opinions on the proposal outlined. Intended recipients: Information provided as part of the consultation will be used as part of the investigation into the proposal, and may be included in future reports on the issue. Storage and security: Information provided will be stored on Council’s database and will be subject to Council’s information and privacy policies. Access: Individuals can access data to check accuracy by contacting Council.

PLEASE NOTE: When making written comments or submissions to Council, the following information should be considered – Should an objector consider that the disclosure of their name and address would result in detriment to them the words “OBJECTION IN CONFIDENCE” must be stated prominently at the top of the submission. Council may, however, be obliged to release full details of the submission including the name and address under the relevant access to information legislation, even if these words are in the submission.
Note:
If approved this plan will be incorporated into the Final Wallsend Public Domain Plan and Traffic Plan. All existing parking arrangements are maintained unless shown on plan.
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Attachment H: Summary of Bunn Street Traffic Plan and Cowper Street Traffic Plan exhibition responses
Summary of Bunn St Traffic Plan and Cowper St Traffic Plan Exhibition Responses
Exhibited 12 March to 11 April 2018 - as part of the Wallsend Public Domain Plan

Wallsend Public Domain Plan (PDP) was put on public exhibition from 03 May to 31 May 2017. In response to the exhibition the community raised a number of issues. The two main issues were:

- Request from the Childcare Centre on Bunn St to move the bus stop outside their premises due to the antisocial behaviour of bus patrons.
- Objection by Wallsend Baptist Church (WBC) to loss of on-road parking - to make space for a shared path - outside their premises on Cowper St.

Council investigated potential solutions for Bunn St and Cowper St. This included meeting with WBC representatives to discuss their needs on 23 Jan 2018. Traffic plans for Bunn St and Cowper St were developed and exhibited to affected property owners and businesses from 12 March to 11 April 2018 under the Wallsend PDP banner.

Community submissions (issues and requests) are summarised below, along with Council's responses to them:

**Bunn St:**
- Total two responses - two supportive, nil negative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue to be addressed</th>
<th>Traffic Plan proposal</th>
<th>Community Submission</th>
<th>Council Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antisocial behaviour of bus patrons outside Childcare Centre on Bunn St</td>
<td>Relocate the northbound bus stop south of the existing pedestrian crossing - to in front of Wallsend library.</td>
<td>Please omit parking space to south of Childcare Centre driveway to assist sightlines.</td>
<td>Council cannot omit a parking space as the parking lane will not have formally marked spaces, and Council does not usually mark no stopping zones in association with driveways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Please relocate southbound bus stop to the south of the pedestrian crossing requested - due to the antisocial behaviour of bus patrons.</td>
<td>Council cannot relocate the bus stop because there is not enough space for it south of the pedestrian crossing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Please make the existing pedestrian crossing a raised pedestrian crossing to slow traffic.</td>
<td>Council cannot raise the existing pedestrian crossing because it would block an overland flow path. Council will investigate the installation of speed cushions on Bunn St.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cowper St:**
- Total seven responses - two supportive, three negative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue to be addressed</th>
<th>Traffic Plan proposal</th>
<th>Community Submission</th>
<th>Council Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loss of 16 on road parking spaces on Cowper St outside Wallsend Baptist Church (WBC) due to removal of eastbound parking lane to create a shared path</td>
<td>Providing three on-road parking spaces on Cowper St outside WBC. Providing ten 2 hour parking spaces in Kemp St car park near to WBC. Remainder to be untimed as existing on-road parking on Newcastle Rd.</td>
<td>Change to Kemp St car park was not widely exhibited - need to consult businesses more broadly. Parking very important to Wallsend businesses, please provide additional parking including on-road parking.</td>
<td>As per Council’s standard approach, only businesses and properties directly affected by the proposed traffic changes were consulted. Only ten spaces are proposed to be 2P and Council has undertaken a numberplate survey which indicates excess capacity in Kemp St car park. Usage of Council car parks and business requirements can be investigated further if required. Supporting businesses is a PDP objective and maintaining parking is recognised as important, but it has to be balanced with other public domain objectives such as pedestrian and cycle access. Council has undertaken a numberplate survey which indicated excess capacity in Kemp St car park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of parking on Newcastle Rd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customers travelling eastbound on Cowper St wishing to turn right into Henny Penny and BWS prop in traffic, running the risk of being rear ended, with one such accident recorded and many near misses reported.</td>
<td>Installation of a concrete median to prevent right hand turns from Cowper St eastbound into Henny Penny and BWS.</td>
<td>By providing a roundabout Council is enabling customers travelling eastbound on Cowper St to access BWS and Henny Penny more safely, which is a benefit to both the customers and the broader community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety risks will be increased due to:  - More people using Murnin St which is an unsafe intersection  - U-turns in Murnin St  - Customers trying to enter BWS via the exit driveway  - Encouraging pedestrians to cross Cowper St from parking on the northern side</td>
<td>There will be no change to the existing situation whereby customers exit BWS via Murnin St and have to move back out into Cowper St.  - Proposed kerb extensions will prevent unsafe U-turns at the intersection of Murnin St and Cowper St, any U-turns performed will be mid-block on a quiet residential street.  - Existing customers will already be aware of the locations of the BWS entry and exit driveways. New customers will be able to identify the entry and exit if clear signage is provided.  - Existing desire lines and community feedback indicate that people are already parking in Kemp St car park on the northern side of Cowper St and crossing Cowper St to access businesses on the southern side.  - It is Council’s objective to make it safer for pedestrians and cyclists to cross Cowper St, this will benefit businesses on the southern side of Cowper St (see below).</td>
<td>In Council’s view spending an extra minute navigating the proposed roundabout is a minor inconvenience and unlikely to deter customers. Any potential business impact is likely to be minimal and far outweighed by the public benefit of improved safety.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right hand turns into Murnin St have not been restricted - traffic will still prop dangerously in the eastbound lane to make right hand turns into Murnin St.</td>
<td>Customers will be lost due to prevention of right hand turns into Henny Penny and BWS.</td>
<td>Safety risks will be increased be encouraging pedestrians to cross Cowper St from parking on the northern side.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right hand turns into Murnin St have not been restricted - traffic will still prop dangerously in the eastbound lane to make right hand turns into Murnin St.</td>
<td>Difficult to cross safely from the northern side of Cowper St to businesses on the southern side.</td>
<td>It is Council’s objective to make it safer for pedestrians and cyclists to cross Cowper St with:  - a new 40km/hr zone - reducing the speed from 60km/hr,  - additional pedestrian legs at the existing Nelson St/Cowper St traffic signals,  - a concrete median with a mid block pedestrian refuge.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council is proposing:  - a new 40km/hr zone - reducing the speed from 60km/hr,  - additional pedestrian legs at the existing Nelson St/Cowper St traffic signals,  - a concrete median with a mid block pedestrian refuge.</td>
<td>Difficult to cross safely from the northern side of Cowper St to businesses on the southern side.</td>
<td>The pedestrian refuge was located taking into account pedestrian flows, safety and infrastructure as follows:  - It was not possible to locate the pedestrian refuge closer to the Murnin/Cowper intersection due to space restrictions in the roadway and the existing bus stop.  - The pedestrian refuge has been located midblock to prevent pedestrians crossing at the busiest exit of the proposed roundabout.  - Pedestrians wishing to access Centre Link from the south will be able to move anticlockwise around the roundabout.  - Council anticipates that able bodied pedestrians will use the full length of the concrete median to cross and those wishing to use the pram ramp and median refuge will make the required minor detour.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposed mid block pedestrian refuge doesn’t line up with existing desire lines</td>
<td>Safety risks will be increased be encouraging pedestrians to cross Cowper St from parking on the northern side.</td>
<td>The maximum number of on road parking spaces possible have been proposed outside WBC taking into account constraints such as level changes and underground utilities, the number of spaces would not be changed by relocating the proposed mid-block pedestrian refuge.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposed mid block pedestrian refuge doesn’t line up with existing desire lines</td>
<td>It is Council’s objective to make it safer for pedestrians and cyclists to cross Cowper St with:  - a new 40km/hr zone - reducing the speed from 60km/hr,  - additional pedestrian legs at the existing Nelson St/Cowper St traffic signals,  - a concrete median with a mid block pedestrian refuge.</td>
<td>A pedestrian crossing cannot be installed at the Murnin St/Cowper St intersection because it would be too close to the signalised crossing at Nelson St, additionally it would not meet the required user warrant.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A pedestrian crossing cannot be installed at the Murnin St/Cowper St intersection because it would be too close to the signalised crossing at Nelson St, additionally it would not meet the required user warrant.</td>
<td>The maximum number of on road parking spaces possible have been proposed outside WBC taking into account constraints such as level changes and underground utilities, the number of spaces would not be changed by relocating the proposed mid-block pedestrian refuge.</td>
<td>The maximum number of on road parking spaces possible have been proposed outside WBC taking into account constraints such as level changes and underground utilities, the number of spaces would not be changed by relocating the proposed mid-block pedestrian refuge.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Difficult to cross safely from the northern side of Cowper St to businesses on the southern side.**

**Council is proposing:**
- a new 40km/hr zone - reducing the speed from 60km/hr,
- additional pedestrian legs at the existing Nelson St/Cowper St traffic signals,
- a concrete median with a mid block pedestrian refuge.

**Difficult to cross safely from the northern side of Cowper St to businesses on the southern side.**

**It is Council’s objective to make it safer for pedestrians and cyclists to cross Cowper St with:**
- a new 40km/hr zone - reducing the speed from 60km/hr,
- additional pedestrian legs at the existing Nelson St/Cowper St traffic signals,
- a concrete median with a mid block pedestrian refuge.
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1 Introduction

A Public Domain Plan is being prepared for Wallsend local Centre in 2016. This plan will inform investment in the public infrastructure of the local centre in the short and medium term. A key component of the development of the Public Domain Plan is consultation with key users of the local centre and the general public.

This report provides an overview of the process and key findings of the first stage of public consultation to inform the development of the draft public domain plan.

1.1 Objectives

The engagement process aims to capture what the stakeholders' value within the areas and what things they would like to see improved or changed, so that these can be considered in the development of the draft public domain plan. This draft public domain plan will be placed on public exhibition for comment when prepared.

2 Methodology

It was determined that a workshop would be the best way to capture what aspects of the local centre the community currently enjoy and would like to see retained; and how they would like to see change in the future. These workshops fall under the consult category of the IAP2 framework endorsed in Council's Community Engagement Framework.

Figure 1: Public Participation Spectrum, International Association of Public Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inform</th>
<th>Consult</th>
<th>Involve</th>
<th>Collaborate</th>
<th>Empower</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To provide the public with balanced and objective information to assist them in understanding the problems, alternatives, opportunities and/or solutions.</td>
<td>To obtain public feedback on analysis, alternatives and/or decisions</td>
<td>To work directly with the public throughout the process to ensure that public concerns and aspirations are consistently understood and considered.</td>
<td>To partner with the public in each aspect of the decision including the development of alternatives and the identification of the preferred solution.</td>
<td>To place final decision-making and/or devolved budgets in the hands of the public.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We will keep you informed.</td>
<td>We will keep you informed, listen to acknowledge concerns and provide feedback on how public input influenced the decision.</td>
<td>We will work with you to ensure that your concerns and aspirations are directly reflected in the alternatives developed and provide feedback on how public input influenced the decision.</td>
<td>We will look to you for direct advice and innovation in formulating solutions and incorporate your advice and recommendations into the decisions to the maximum extent possible.</td>
<td>We will implement what you decide.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.1 Workshop

The workshop was held on Wednesday 16th November at Wallsend library from 6pm to 7.30pm. A total of 15 people attended the workshop.

2.2 Workshop promotion

The invitation to participants in the community workshops were promoted via the following channels:

- Signage (coreflutes) in the Wallsend town centre
- Distribution of postcard in local shops, service centres and library
- Enews
- Facebook
- Flyers and information handed out at Wallsend fair
- Invitation by email to Wallsend Business Improvement Association, Wallsend Diggers, Stockland Mall and Wallsend Baptist Church
- Memo to all Councillors and Lord Mayor
- Letter to the State Member for Wallsend.

Registration was required either by phone or by a website form.

An example of signage is provided in Appendix II.

2.3 Workshop activities

At the workshop an overview of the project was provided by Council’s landscape architect Sarah Horan. Consultants Group GSA also provided an overview of the site analysis work that had been undertaken to date, and the opportunities that have been identified.

There were two distinct activities undertaken in the workshop. These were:

1. Sticky wall

Participants were given six sheets of two different coloured (three pink and three green) large sticky note paper. On one colour, participants were asked to indicate in five words or less what they currently like most about Wallsend local centre. On the other coloured sheets, participants were asked to describe what 'issues' they would like to see addressed. These sheets were then placed on a 'sticky wall' for all participants to see.

2. Map work

Six tables were set up, each with a large (AO size) aerial photograph of the local centre and markers. Each table was allocated a theme to guide or prompt discussions.

The six primary themes of the workshops reflect the major elements of the proposed domain plans. These were:

- Traffic
- Access and Use
Participants were asked to write on the map their ideas and issues associated with each of the themes. After five minutes participants were asked to move to another table, this happened six times until all participants had had the opportunity to write their ideas on each theme’s aerial photograph.

Finally, each participant was given three green and three red sticky dots, and asked to use these to prioritise what they felt were the most important theme (green) and the most important specific idea/issue (red). They could put all their dots on one item or spread them across multiple items.

2.4 Report presentation
The workshop report should be read in conjunction with viewing the original workshop maps. These have been provided to the team preparing the draft public domain plans.
3 Wallsend Local Centre workshop findings

3.1 Sticky note issues

Table 1 (what I like about Wallsend) and Table 2 (issues that need to be addressed in Wallsend) show an edited and condensed list of the items and issues that were written on the sticky notes at the Wallsend workshop. A table containing all of the verbatim comments on the sticky wall is provided in Appendix I.

Table 1: What I like about Wallsend sticky notes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What I like about Wallsend Local Centre</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community/village feel</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic/heritage</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business network/social media</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community planter project</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town layout/parking/traffic access</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardens</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library building</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flow of water Iron bark creek</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotunda</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railway goods shed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's artwork - school could be responsible</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results indicate that:

- *The community/village feel* of Wallsend was the aspect of the local centre that participants most valued
- *The historic/heritage nature* of the area as well as *the business network and the use of social media* were also aspects that were mentioned by several participants
- *The community planter project* and *ease of access through the town* were also highly valued.
### Table 2: Issues to be addressed in Wallsend local centre

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues in Wallsend town centre</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance/graffiti issues</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIB building taking up too much parking</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More/better maintained greening</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streetscape, aesthetics and amenities</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking issues general</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic flow/connectivity issues</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More/different businesses on main street</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better cycleways</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garbage collection issues</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better disability access</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More police presence</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron bark creek needs to be restored as a feature</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foot crossing to have some lights</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage - (flooding)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complimentary interaction between existing (future) public domain &amp; private development</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Issues that need to be addressed that were raised by at least five participants were:

- Maintenance/graffiti issues
- The position of the NIB building affecting the availability of parking
- The need for more/better maintained greening.

### 3.2 Map work - Wallsend

Six aerial photo maps were used in the workshop for people to spatially locate their issues and ideas relating to each of the major project themes. An example is provided in Figure 3.
Figure 3: Wallsend map work

Figure 4 shows how many green dot votes each theme map received. That is how many people used their green dots to indicate that they felt the theme was a major priority.

**Figure 4: Map activity priority theme voting results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes voted a priority with green dots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trees and Plantings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access and Use</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Chart showing the vote distribution among different themes]
Table 3 highlights all the issues/items that received red dot votes on each of the six themed maps. Where participants used their green dot to 'vote' for an issue or idea rather than a theme these have been included in the tables below.

**Table 3: Map issues dot voting by theme**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aesthetics (Green dots 10)</th>
<th>Red dots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gateway - Definition - Cowper Street main- low - Nelson - and existing roundabout in Cowper Street</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trams - Nelson Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of sense of community space interaction- need for increase sense of place - city centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council maintenance program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree management program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyrrell Street and Nelson Street intersection</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green, green, green</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavement consistency - sign posting of historical sites</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flags/banners on Thomas Street of history, retail etc.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flag pole is already at the top end of Nelson Street  40 in total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPI house Gardens need to be up kept from council, looks unsafe &amp; tired signage to Nelson Street, retail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle Road and Cowper Street intersection -rose garden</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron Bark Creek</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trees and Plantings (Green dots 9)</th>
<th>Red dots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planting along banks of iron bark creek</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trees that don’t cause safety issues or drainage problems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve planting - Cowper Street - Nelson St</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beautification along drain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs clearing attracts undesirables - Cowper Street -next to iron bark creek</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTBA- already has 20 additional pots for beautification of Nelson/Tyrrell Street &amp; funding for pot project</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top dress the footpath instead</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove NIB from Nelson Street this will create more parking DON'T widen footpath in Nelson Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green areas that will create passive cool, minimal confusion or loss of parking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotunda - RE Green and Bindii</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traffic (Green dots 6)</th>
<th>Red dots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One way : traffic flow - Council Street</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Install roundabout - Low and Cowper Streets</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Street -all wrong</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One way angle parking - Nelson Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve gateway (speed reduction)- Clarke and Nelson Streets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to consider Medcalf Street</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tram - Cowper Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowper Street Kokkera Street Crossing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Rees carpark entrance - One big entrance needs an in and out</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Problem area for crossing - Cowper and Murnin Streets
- Dan Rees Street one way

### Solution - roundabout - existing in Cowper Street

#### Drainage (Green dots 6) Red dots
- Tyrrell Street carpark flooding
- Fix ASAP Higher bridge on Tyrrell Street (5)
- Not concrete keep green - iron bark creek - Cowper Street to Nelson Street (3)
- Tree roots - major drain Nelson Street North (2)
- Council water tank
- Naturalised creek (2)
- Syphon Brooks Street near Cowper Street

#### Parking (Green dots 4) Red dots
- Improve public transport
- Federal park - trees vs park - private vs public
- More parking - or University addresses problem - Council Street students park in Stockland and Cowper Street council park area and catch bus to university (2)
- Remove NIB in main Street - Nelson Street
- Follow Lambton, lease to council make continuous carpark behind shops on Council Street both sides of Tyrrell Street (1)

#### Access and use (Green dots 2) Red dots
- Make into a zebra crossing due to high pedestrian (gym) on Nelson Street between Tyrrell and Boscawen Streets
- Connect Nelson Street - Council Street
- Access to Main Street clear and shop to give connectability
- Bike track from Wallsend Diggers through Stockland car park, over ironbark creek and along to connect to a roundabout at Low Street and Newcastle Road (1)
- Huge disconnect between centres (Stockland and town centre) (6)

The results indicate that:
- The theme that received the most priority green dots was Aesthetics followed by Trees and Planting. These themes are reflective of the 'issues that need to be addressed in Wallsend' raised in the sticky wall exercise; two of the three top issues were Maintenance/graffiti issues and More/better maintained greening
- Specific ideas/issues that received at least five priority red dots were:
  - Huge disconnect between centres (Stockland and town centre) n=6; under the theme Access and use
  - Fix ASAP Higher Bridge on Tyrrell Street n=5; under the theme Drainage
  - One way traffic flow - Council Street n=5; under the theme Traffic
  - WTBA - already has 20 additional pots for beautification of Nelson/Tyrrell Street and funding for pot project n=5; under the theme Trees and Planting.
### 4 Appendix I - Verbatim sticky wall results

Table 4: What I like about Wallsend Local Centre - all comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What I Like about Wallsend - all comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Railway goods shed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotunda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flow of water  Iron bark creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy access to get around</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage of Nelson St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Heritage of the area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking in the centre is good - most retail outlets within walking distance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road access to/from in the Wallsend centre is good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pour area (gardens)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People - Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a small network of business that promote each other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Op shops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New generation of locals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great community feel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social media -face book pages-e.g.: Wallsend town business assoc and Wallsend now /Then</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community spirit when it comes to Anzac day/ Remembrance day  etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village feel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro -Active WTBA trying to build Wallsend profile * Community *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community minded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New pot project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community minded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pots new in main street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country feel of town - gardens that are neglected -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of village feel - Not to big Not to small -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical significant sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artistic pots - bike racks - community garden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pot project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big pots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children Artwork school could be responsible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What issues need to be addressed in Wallsend Local Centre - all comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of aesthetics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>graffiti not be cleaned up - more street maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIB in main street - preventing extra parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIB in main street - less parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connection Stockland to Nelson Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of tree scape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disability access to shop fronts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parallel parking in Nelson St difficult (to much traffic) - roundabout at Low st &amp; Newcastle Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron bark creek needs to be restored as a feature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footpath maintenance needs work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main street died - needs work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back of shops parking like Lambton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seating in main street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trees attended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foot crossing to have some lights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking - removal of NIB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste space that needs landscaping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access for people with disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs more retail/restaurants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tied looking - lack of street scape (gardens, new footpath, paving, sufficient lighting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unkempt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street NIB that takes up parking space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garbage collection - doesn't happen regular day - supposed to be every Friday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disjoint between Main St and shopping centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garbage collection - re addressed council street in Tyrrell street car park end</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need police presence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic flow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street scape &amp; amenities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disconnect between Wallsend main street &amp; Stockland mall - access for cyclists off main though</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pathway not provided for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More small business - e.g. Greengrocer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better, safer bicycle paths, access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More green - passing cooling (streets) for hot weather</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graffiti - council clean-up of graffiti when its reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More police presence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trees in main street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nib in nelson st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus stops that are not used bus shelters that are damaged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footpaths that are not safe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council street traffic layout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage - (flooding)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graffiti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complimentary interaction between existing (future) public domain &amp; private development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark out parking in street to generate more spaces -(Nelson St)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix II - Example of signage

---

**Wallsend Local Centre Public Domain Plan Workshop**

Come along to our workshop to share what you value about Wallsend local centre and identify areas for Improvement.

Feedback gained through the workshop will assist with future planning and developing a Public Domain Plan.

**When:** Wednesday 16 November 2016  
**Time:** 6 - 7.30pm  
**Location:** Wallsend Library, 30 Bunn Street, Wallsend

**RSVP:** Before Monday 14 November 2016

To RSVP please visit [www.newcastle.nsw.gov.au](http://www.newcastle.nsw.gov.au), go to the community tab, get involved and then have your say or phone 4974 2238 before Monday 14 November 2016.

For enquiries please call 4974 2238  
For more information visit: [www.newcastle.nsw.gov.au](http://www.newcastle.nsw.gov.au)
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Outdoor Exercise Facility Strategy provides options for the future provision, location and design of outdoor exercise facilities in Newcastle.

The Strategy will assist to contribute to achieving broader Council directions included in the Newcastle Community Strategic Plan: Newcastle 2030 and the City of Newcastle Parkland and Recreation Strategy, as well as in other plans.

Newcastle currently has outdoor exercise facilities at four sites: Braye Park, Islington Park, Lambton Park, and Warabrook Park. Three of these sites are in the central west area, and there appears to be a lack of facilities in the eastern, central, southern and far western parts of Newcastle.

Whilst an additional six outdoor exercise sites have been proposed by Council, four of these are in the eastern areas, one is in the south and one is in the north. This still potentially leaves a gap in provision in the central and far western areas. The study has found that at least four sites should be considered to cater for the ‘gap areas’.

If all four of the existing sites are retained and Council wishes to achieve all proposed six outdoor exercise sites, this will total ten sites. A further four sites in the central and far western areas would result in a total 14 sites across Newcastle.

Based on a projected 2026 population of 180,000, 14 sites would represent one outdoor exercise site per 12,857 people. A review of benchmarks in other Council areas suggests this is a high provision compared to other regional areas but similar to progressive metropolitan areas. The University of Newcastle suggests demand over time could justify additional sites (beyond 14) in the future and there should be some flexibility.

Newcastle City Council includes higher density and coastal areas which attract visitors as well as residents, and this could justify a higher provision. A staged approach is recommended so that Council can assess the popularity and economic implications of outdoor exercise facilities and consider the University of Newcastle research findings over time.

The options in the Outdoor Exercise Facility Strategy have given consideration to various research findings to ensure facilities are appropriately provided, located, designed and well-used.

Based on the research, 10 overriding principles have been developed as summarised below.

1. Provide an equitable spread of accessible facilities across Newcastle.
2. Locate equipment in visible and accessible regional and district sites.
3. Provide diverse types of equipment to support various age and fitness levels, including easy to use equipment to support older and less fit people.
4. Consider connected equipment pieces rather than single units, unless there is a benefit to connected single units along a trail.
5. Connect equipment to other recreation or sport facilities and trail networks.
6. Design equipment to be good quality, functional, safe and easy to maintain.
7. Provide quality settings and infrastructure.
8. Provide easy to follow instructions.
10. Ensure inclusive opportunities are provided through applying universal design principles.

Site selection principles have also been provided to assist Council to locate future new outdoor exercise facilities (refer page 9).

In addition, strategies have been developed for three Themes including:

- THEME 1: Exercise Equipment Provision
- THEME 2: Design Strategies
- THEME 3: Connecting Communities to Outdoor Exercise

A summary of the strategies in each Theme is provided on the following page.

Priorities have also been identified and these relate to:

- Facility Provision
- Existing Equipment Enhancement
- Diverse Exercise Equipment
- Improved Signage
- Activating Exercise Equipment

To achieve the Strategy, directions should be included in Council budgeting, asset management plans and Development Contribution Plans. In addition, grant funding and partnership opportunities should be sought. A staged approach to implementation is suggested to enable Council to monitor the success of facilities and consider University of Newcastle research and changing needs and opportunities.
Summary of the Strategies*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THEME 1</th>
<th>THEME 2</th>
<th>THEME 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exercise Equipment Provision</td>
<td>Design Strategies</td>
<td>Connecting Communities to Outdoor Exercise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Establish at least 14 exercise equipment sites across Newcastle City Council through a staged approach.</td>
<td>2.1 Increase the scope, diversity and uniqueness of outdoor exercise facilities including equipment and connected activities.</td>
<td>3.1 Promote the location and benefits of outdoor exercise equipment to communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Maintain, replace and enhance the existing exercise equipment.</td>
<td>2.2 Establish some unique outdoor exercise trails that encourage a mix of strength building, mobility, flexibility and cardiovascular activities.</td>
<td>3.2 Establish clear and readable directional and instruction signage at outdoor exercise sites and linked to equipment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Review the Braye Park outdoor exercise equipment as part of any future major upgrade and redesign of the park. In the absence of an upgrade consider removal at end of useful life.</td>
<td>2.3 Improve the quality of settings around outdoor exercise equipment.</td>
<td>3.3 Facilitate and support organised fitness and community activities linked to outdoor exercise equipment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Consider establishing at least four new exercise equipment facilities including within the gap areas (in addition to the existing and proposed facilities).</td>
<td>2.4 Design outdoor exercise equipment to be accessible, including for older adults and people with a disability.</td>
<td>3.4 Establish promotion and activity partnerships with organisations that have an interest in encouraging a healthy and active community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Assess site options for new facilities using the Site Selection Principles (in the report).</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.5 Review the usage and effectiveness of outdoor exercise equipment in Newcastle including through University of Newcastle research.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Details and suggestions for how the strategies can be achieved are included in the report, together with a rationale for each strategy.
1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 About the Study

Across NSW and Australia there is an increasing commitment to supporting communities to be physically active, including through recreation facilities and the activation of parks and other open spaces. Increased physical activity combined with healthy eating will contribute to reducing obesity and health risks.

Outdoor exercise facilities that are appropriately located and designed can encourage communities to be more active and increase the use of a park or open space. Research has found that exercise outdoors is considered to be refreshing, gives a sense of wellbeing and reduces tension and depression, even more so than exercise indoors.

The Newcastle City Council Outdoor Exercise Facility Strategy will guide the future provision, location and design of outdoor exercise facilities across the City. The Strategy aims to ensure outdoor exercise facilities will benefit the community, contribute to activating open spaces and best use available resources.

The Strategy draws on research that has been undertaken over recent years to determine appropriate principles and best practice for outdoor exercise facilities.

The University of Newcastle is currently undertaking a major research project on ‘scalable physical activity promotion in community parks’ in collaboration with Newcastle City Council and Lake Macquarie Council. The research will evaluate outdoor exercise equipment and trails and has the potential to influence the design and implementation of outdoor fitness parks across Australia. The research will examine the effectiveness of the equipment on behaviour use and health outcomes for various segments of the population.

The University of Newcastle has participated in the Strategy development and the research findings will guide future reviews of the Strategy.

1.2 Definitions

The term ‘outdoor exercise facilities’ refers to equipment and structures that are located in publicly accessible to support outdoor exercise by the general public and are freely available and accessible.

Exercise refers to ‘planned physical activity with bodily movements that are structured and repetitive, performed for the purpose of improving or maintaining physical fitness’.

Physical activity refers to ‘any bodily movement produced by skeletal muscles that results in energy expenditure’.

The exercise and physical activity definitions are based on US National Institutes of Health (NIH) definitions and used by the Australian Department of Health.

Two types of equipment are defined in other studies and research, including:

- Static equipment: equipment designed for exercise that has no moving parts such as bars and steps. This equipment can have greater strength building benefits.
- Dynamic or mechanical equipment: equipment with moving parts activated by the weight of a user’s body such as a bike or bench press. This equipment can have greater cardiovascular benefits.

Definitions relating to the number of exercise equipment provided are as follows:

- Single unit: a standalone piece of equipment
- Fitness station or hub: one area with a number of connected pieces of equipment (usually 6 or more pieces)
- Cluster: Several areas each containing a few pieces of equipment, grouped in close proximity on one site
- Trail: A number of exercise pieces or stations spread along a path, track or trail over a distance.
1.3 Relevance to Other Planning

The Newcastle City Council Outdoor Exercise Facility Strategy will contribute to achieving elements of Council’s strategic plans and is consistent with other Council planning.

Newcastle 2030

The Newcastle Community Strategic Plan (2013) Newcastle 2030 is Council’s overriding strategic document that determines commitments and priorities. The vision is for Newcastle to be a Smart, Liveable and Sustainable city. The strategic directions and objectives that are most relevant to the Outdoor Exercise Facility Strategy are below.

Newcastle 2030 Strategic Directions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Directions</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vibrant and Activated Public Places</td>
<td>- Public places that provide for diverse activity and strengthen our social connections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A city of great public places and neighbourhoods promoting people’s health, happiness and wellbeing</td>
<td>- Culture, heritage and place are valued, shared and celebrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Safe and activated places that are used by people day and night</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring and Inclusive Community</td>
<td>- A welcoming community that cares and looks after each other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A thriving community where diversity is embraced, everyone is valued and has the opportunity to contribute and belong</td>
<td>- Active and healthy communities with physical, mental and spiritual wellbeing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- A creative, culturally rich and vibrant community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Particularly relevant strategies are as follows:

Vibrant and Activated Public Places

- 3.1b Increase opportunities for active and passive recreational use of the city’s parks, inland pools and Blackbutt Reserve through the provision of attractive, safe and accessible spaces and amenities.
- 3.1d Create welcoming and accessible community facilities that support opportunities for people to meet and connect with one another.
- 3.3d Provide welcoming facilities and open space that provide for a range of ages and combination of uses and can be easily adapted to suit the changing need of community over time.

Caring and Inclusive Community

- 4.2c Provide a broad range of recreation, health and wellness programs to target the age-specific needs of residents including younger children, older children, adolescents, families and seniors.
Parkland and Recreation Strategy

The City of Newcastle Parkland and Recreation Strategy (2014) provides a framework for open space and recreation and is therefore a key relevant document.

The Vision is ‘The City of Newcastle will provide, promote and support a range of facilities, events and programs aimed at:

- Meeting the diverse parkland and recreational needs and interests of residents, visitors, students and workers;
- Creating vibrant, activated and sustainable public places; and
- Promoting health, happiness, community connections and wellbeing.’

The most relevant strategic objective is:

Equitable Provision and Development of Facilities

Quality parkland and recreation facilities that are diverse, accessible and responsive to changing needs and will provide positive experiences for current and future residents and visitors. A clear decision making framework is essential to guide development and sustainable provision.

The general focus of the strategy is to improve and promote the provision of recreation facilities and to support an active and healthy community. Key actions are:

- Action 1.16: Provide pathways, bicycle lanes, courts and fitness equipment to encourage informal and unstructured recreation participation.
- Action 1.3: Continue to plan for the provision of a range of parkland recreation facilities for the future population within the Western Planning Corridor.

Other Plans and Objectives

Various other planning is relevant to achieving healthy and connected communities including environmental, social and economic planning.


In addition, the 2036 Draft Greater Newcastle Metropolitan Plan and the Hunter Regional Plan 2036 provide overriding directions for Newcastle.

The Outdoor Exercise Facility Strategy ensures there is no impact on broader planning.
2 BACKGROUND FINDINGS

2.1 Existing Provision in Newcastle

Newcastle City Council currently provides outdoor exercise facilities at four locations:

- Braye Park, Waratah West (1 station)
- Islington Park, Islington (2 stations)
- Lambton Park, Lambton (currently 2 stations and 4 additional planned)
- Warabrook Wetlands Reserve, Warabrook (2 stations)

An analysis of the existing outdoor exercise facilities has been undertaken through site visits and aerials. A detailed analysis is provided in Appendix A and the main findings are below.

Analysis of Existing Exercise Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Braye Park</td>
<td>A basic facility with two pieces of static equipment located near a pathway away from other recreation facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islington Park</td>
<td>Two stations with static equipment that are well located on a popular pathway but are beginning to age.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambton Park</td>
<td>Two basic stations with single unit static equipment linked to sport and a pathway, located some distance apart but four new stations are proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warabrook Wetlands Reserve</td>
<td>Two stations with static equipment, where one is located near a path and the other is away from other facilities and lacks shade and shelter.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overriding concerns at the existing sites are:

- Limited equipment pieces and variety
- A lack of shade and shelter
- A lack of readable signage to guide the use of equipment
- A lack of directional signage
- Disconnection from other recreation and sport facilities

The University of Newcastle also provides exercise equipment through four single units spread around two sports fields. However, access to this equipment to the public is difficult due to the location of the fields and the need to pay for car parking. As such, the University equipment is not considered in the assessment of provision.
As shown on Map 1 on the following page, three of the existing Newcastle outdoor exercise sites are located towards the western part of the Council area. The University of Newcastle facility is located nearby.

The central, eastern and far western areas are significantly lacking access to outdoor exercise facilities, with only one facility at Islington.

Suburbs with a larger population and/or high density are listed below and shown on Map 1. These suburbs could have a greater need for outdoor exercise facilities due to the larger population size and higher demand for open space activity opportunities where the population is younger and backyard space is lacking.

### Suburb Population and Density

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suburb</th>
<th>Population (2016 ERP)</th>
<th>Density (people per ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wallsend</td>
<td>12,878</td>
<td>8.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merewether</td>
<td>11,382</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Lambton</td>
<td>10,240</td>
<td>18.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayfield</td>
<td>9,748</td>
<td>30.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>7,919</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adamstown</td>
<td>6,226</td>
<td>20.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fletcher-Minmi</td>
<td>6,014</td>
<td>5.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elermore Vale</td>
<td>5,654</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton South &amp; Hamilton East</td>
<td>5,262</td>
<td>31.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambton</td>
<td>5,013</td>
<td>17.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>4,314</td>
<td>29.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooks Hill</td>
<td>3,848</td>
<td>52.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Lambton</td>
<td>3,549</td>
<td>26.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Hill</td>
<td>2,131</td>
<td>34.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown</td>
<td>1,938</td>
<td>36.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Newcastle City Council Community Profile 2016
Map 1: Existing Provision and Potential Higher Need Areas
2.2 Proposed Provision in Newcastle

Council is proposing an additional six outdoor exercise sites. Possible locations include:

- Camp Shortland, Newcastle (removable for Newcastle Supercars 500)
- South Newcastle Beach (Bathers Way)
- Nesca Park, Cooks Hill
- National Park, Newcastle West
- Griffith Park, Stockton
- Fernleigh Track, Adamstown Heights

These sites will be evaluated against the site selection criteria detailed in section 3.2.

As shown on Map 2 on the following page, four of these sites are located in the eastern parts of Newcastle. This is due to the regional and district value of the coastline and a desire by Council to activate and improve some sites (particularly Camp Shortland and South Newcastle Beach) and support visitors as well as residents.

Even with the proposed and existing sites, there will still be a gap in provision in the central and far western areas as highlighted on Map 2.

Ideally facilities would also be considered in the following areas to address the potential gaps in provision:

- Adamstown (northern part) or New Lambton
- Wallsend or Maryland
- Minmi (linked to future development)
- Beresfield or Tarro
Map 2: Existing and Proposed Provision and Potential Gaps
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- Ward Boundary
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2.3 Benchmark Comparison

The existing provision of four outdoor exercise sites for a 2016 population of 155,416 represents one site per 38,854 people.

The Newcastle population is projected to increase to around 180,000 by 2026 and if no additional outdoor exercise facilities were provided, the ratio would be one site per 45,000 people.

However, if six outdoor exercise sites proposed by Council are achieved, there would be 10 exercise facility sites. This represents one site per 15,542 based on a 2016 population and one site per 18,000 people by 2026 (based on 180,000). This is a higher rate of provision compared to similar regional areas and metropolitan areas.

If four additional exercise facilities are provided to address the other gap areas, there would be 14 exercise facility sites. This would represent one site per 12,857 people, which is a relatively high provision that matches progressive metropolitan areas. However, the University of Newcastle believes that, in the future, there could be justification for more than 14 facilities and suggests Council consider University research findings to determine the future provision.

A benchmark comparison with other Councils across Australia as at 2016 is provided on the following page, with a particular focus on progressive regional and metropolitan areas.

As 14 outdoor exercise facility sites is a relatively high provision for a regional area, a staged approach to provision should be adopted to enable Council to consider future University of Newcastle research findings and monitor the demand before committing resources to new facilities.
### Comparison of Outdoor Exercise Facilities Provision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council Area</th>
<th>Current and Planned Provision (based on available data as at February 2018)</th>
<th>2016 Population</th>
<th>Benchmark (based on 2016 population)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of Newcastle (NSW)</strong></td>
<td>4 sites existing (excluding University of Newcastle)</td>
<td>155,416</td>
<td>1: 38,854 current 1: 15,542 planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 sites planned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of Lake Macquarie (NSW)</strong></td>
<td>4 sites (current and proposed) Other sites may be considered</td>
<td>197,373</td>
<td>1: 49,343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of Wollongong (NSW)</strong></td>
<td>4 sites</td>
<td>203,632</td>
<td>1: 50,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of Sydney (NSW)</strong></td>
<td>10 existing and a further 7 planned (17 in total)</td>
<td>208,373</td>
<td>1: 20,837 current 1: 12,257 planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of Fairfield (NSW)</strong></td>
<td>13 sites</td>
<td>198,814</td>
<td>1: 15,293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of Wollongong (NSW)</strong></td>
<td>4 sites</td>
<td>203,632</td>
<td>1: 50,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of Port Phillip (Vic)</strong></td>
<td>5 plus one being developed in 2018</td>
<td>100,877</td>
<td>1: 20,175 current 1: 16,813 planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of Whittlesea (VIC)</strong></td>
<td>3 full gyms, 2 trail facilities, 3 minor equipment (8 in total)</td>
<td>197,478</td>
<td>1: 24,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of Port Adelaide Enfield (SA)</strong></td>
<td>6 (including 2 on ocean Esplanades)</td>
<td>121,247</td>
<td>1: 20,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of Campbelltown (SA)</strong></td>
<td>5 (located at key reserves and linear open space)</td>
<td>50,159</td>
<td>1: 10,032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mount Barker District (SA)</strong></td>
<td>3 (located at regional and district reserves)</td>
<td>33,406</td>
<td>1:11,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of Charles Sturt (SA)</strong></td>
<td>10 (some are very basic or are spread across more than one site)</td>
<td>111,170</td>
<td>1: 11,117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of Darwin (NT)</strong></td>
<td>5 sites located at regional and district reserves</td>
<td>78,792</td>
<td>1: 15,758</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note that the planned benchmark will alter as the populations increase over time*
2.4 Trends and Benefits

The main trends and benefits identified in research and previous studies are summarised below and further details are included in Appendix B.

- Outdoor exercise equipment that is freely available at any time and affordable is of particular benefit to young and older people.
- Outdoor exercise equipment is used by various generations including children, young people, middle aged and older adults.
- Exercise in a natural surrounding with fresh air is found to increase the sense of fun and make exercise more efficient.
- The main reasons for Local Councils providing outdoor exercise equipment are:
  - Facilities are popular
  - Increasing resident interest
  - Community recreation benefits
  - Development of family oriented spaces
  - Connection to beach areas
- Outdoor exercise equipment can provide opportunities for:
  - Building muscular strength (usually through static equipment)
  - Providing cardiovascular benefits (usually through dynamic equipment or movement along a trail between stations)
  - Improving flexibility and mobility
- Body weight leverage resistance equipment is good for people who are less fit including older adults. Low impact exercises and units that are designed to increase flexibility, balance, agility and motion tend to be more appealing to seniors.
- There is an increasing focus on providing diverse types of outdoor exercise equipment including:
  - Trails (equipment at key points along a path)
  - Hubs, stations or clusters of equipment
  - Static equipment (no moving parts)
  - Dynamic or mechanical equipment (moving parts)
- Clusters of outdoor exercise equipment along a trail should be considered as well as single pieces of equipment as this will broaden activity opportunities, create social spaces and increase the time spent at the station. Clusters of equipment work well at the beginning and end of a walk or run.
- Outdoor exercise equipment is often linked to other recreation or sporting facilities (play, sport). If exercise equipment is near playgrounds, children will use the equipment and become accustomed to exercising outdoors in public at an early age.
- Dynamic and mechanical equipment is more likely to be used by a wider range of people. Relevant research findings are:
  - Simple stretch equipment is less well used by people who have a low intensity of physical activity (Sibson et al, 2017)
  - Dynamic and mechanical equipment provides opportunities to increase the heart rate and obtain a cardiovascular workout (Caldwell 2010)
- Dynamic and mechanical equipment is likely to require greater maintenance than static equipment. The City of Sydney Park Fitness Equipment Plan 2015 highlights that extreme weather conditions and salt-laden wind in exposed harbour locations may impact on the lifespan and maintenance requirements for dynamic equipment.
- There is evidence of social interaction when using exercise equipment including with friends and family.
- New technology is being developed that will support people to use outdoor exercise equipment such as the eCoFit app (a guide on facility provision and how to use exercise equipment).
- People can feel embarrassed to use exercise equipment or lack the confidence to do so. This highlights the need for information and activity demonstrations to increase awareness and people’s sense of comfort, as well as good instructions.
- People will drive or cycle to outdoor exercise facilities. However, local facilities are also provided, particularly in higher density areas. Active parks are most successful in densely populated areas.
2.5 Good Practice

Good practices drawn from research and previous studies are summarised below and further details are included in Appendix B.

- Key factors for the success of outdoor exercise facilities include:
  - Location (access, safe, visible)
  - Safety (including good passive surveillance)
  - Variety of equipment and physical activity types
  - Close to other facilities and amenities
  - Targeted marketing
- Outdoor exercise equipment should cater for advanced to beginner skills, different levels of fitness and adults of all ages.
- Outdoor exercise equipment should be good quality, durable and functional.
- The design of outdoor exercise equipment should:
  - Allow for different levels of intensity to match the objectives of individuals
  - Enable increases in load for weight bearing exercises
  - Support adults of all ages and fitness levels
  - Be accessible (particularly for older adults)
- To increase the use and popularity of outdoor exercise equipment:
  - The equipment should be unique and interesting (to draw people to the equipment and sustain use)
  - Diverse exercise equipment choices should be provided
  - The surface should be level and accessible
  - There should be a path link (active pedestrian route)
- Outdoor exercise equipment should be linked to quality and appealing settings and infrastructure including:
  - Instruction signage
  - Sun shade and appealing landscape
  - Toilets, seating and bins
- Outdoor exercise equipment should be connected to recreation and sports facilities and spaces to achieve active spaces. Walking, running and cycling are popular activities and outdoor exercise equipment can be linked to path networks to connect to these activities. A connection to playgrounds can create popular family oriented spaces.
- It is important for outdoor exercise equipment and surrounds to be well maintained. Minimising the number of moving parts will assist to manage maintenance requirements.
- Detailed information on how to use equipment should be provided. Instruction signage increases knowledge of the correct and effective use of the equipment.
- Community events and free fitness classes that increase the awareness and use of outdoor exercise equipment should be considered, e.g. group exercise classes provided free to the community.
- Outdoor exercise facilities should be promoted to raise awareness and encourage use, including through facility launches and activity events and demonstrations.
- New technology such as the eCoFit app (a guide on facility provision and how to use exercise equipment) and Smart Parks should be promoted.
3 OUTDOOR EXERCISE FACILITY PRINCIPLES

3.1 Strategic Principles

Based on the research and analysis, 10 outdoor exercise facility principles are recommended for Newcastle.

1. Provide an equitable spread of outdoor exercise facilities across Newcastle, taking population size and density into consideration.

2. Locate outdoor exercise equipment in visible and accessible sites, generally within regional and district open spaces. Local and smaller parks are not suggested unless they are high profile and well used (as the focus should be on benefiting as many people as possible).

3. Provide diverse types of outdoor exercise equipment to support a range of adult age groups and levels of fitness (Exercise Hubs, Clusters and Trails). This includes easy to use outdoor exercise equipment to support older and less fit people.

4. Provide connected equipment pieces and single units options to broaden activity and social opportunities, unless there is a benefit to connected single units along a trail.

5. Connect outdoor exercise equipment to other recreation or sport facilities and trail networks. However, avoid sites that are at capacity or where the exercise equipment will impact on other users.

6. Design outdoor exercise equipment to be good quality, functional, safe and easy to maintain.

7. Provide quality settings and infrastructure around outdoor exercise equipment, including shade and appealing landscapes.

8. Provide easy to follow instructions to ensure the correct use of outdoor exercise equipment.

9. Promote outdoor exercise equipment through signage, community activities and Council promotions to raise community awareness.
3.2 Site Selection Principles

The following principles are provided to assist Council to identify and assess parks and reserves that could incorporate outdoor exercise equipment. This includes using the principles to confirm that facilities proposed by Council are appropriately located.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Principles (site assessment criteria)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchy</td>
<td>The park or reserve site should be regional or district level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Profile</td>
<td>There should be good existing community awareness and use of the site or potential to create a higher use site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Capacity</td>
<td>The site should have the capacity to support additional activities and users. The potential impact of exercise equipment on high use sites should be considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Access</td>
<td>The site should have easy road access for motor vehicles, and adequate and inclusive on-site or street parking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People Access</td>
<td>The site should prove inclusive access for pedestrians and cyclists, including through existing or potential pathway networks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connections</td>
<td>There should be potential to connect the outdoor exercise equipment to other recreation and sport facilities (children’s play spaces, picnic areas, sports amenity or sports field).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Path Links</td>
<td>There should be potential to link exercise equipment to pathways to ensure inclusive access, attract pedestrians and enable exercise equipment trails where appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visibility</td>
<td>The site and the equipment location should be visible, with good passive surveillance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Space</td>
<td>There should be an open area of land within the site large enough for outdoor exercise equipment (at least 300 m²).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>The site should include or have the potential to include inclusive seating and shelter and ideally have inclusive access to toilets. In addition, existing site infrastructure should be compatible, e.g. shade trees not impacting on floodlights or court surfaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>The site should include or have the potential for shade and landscaping.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 4 Strategic Plan

### 4.1 THEME 1: Exercise Equipment Provision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facility Provision</strong></td>
<td>1.1 Consider provision of at least 14 exercise equipment sites strategically located across Newcastle, including:                                 14 sites is equivalent to 1: 12,857 people, which is a very good provision compared to other Council areas. However, this allows for the existing and proposed sites, as well as 4 sites across the gap areas. It also reflects the visitor focus in Newcastle. A staged approach to provision is suggested to enable Council to assess the popularity of facilities and determine whether all facilities are justified.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 4 existing sites (refer 1.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 6 proposed sites</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- at least 4 other sites (in order to address gap areas, refer 1.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A staged approach is suggested, with an initial focus on higher profile existing and proposed sites.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing Equipment Enhancement</strong></td>
<td>1.2 Maintain, replace and enhance existing exercise equipment to provide quality and safe facilities that support diverse age groups and levels of fitness. This includes adding some new and unique equipment to broaden the scope of facilities.</td>
<td>The existing outdoor exercise equipment needs to be maintained and enhanced to ensure the equipment is appealing, safe and used by communities. Diverse and unique equipment is lacking at existing facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equipment Removal</strong></td>
<td>1.3 Review usage of the Braye Park outdoor exercise equipment and consider relocation at the end of its life. If Braye Park undergoes major redesign and upgrade in the future, include new outdoor exercise equipment linked to other recreation facilities as part of a quality recreation destination.</td>
<td>Whilst Braye Park is well located and has the potential to be a quality recreation destination, it is currently poorly designed and has quality and design issues. The existing exercise equipment is basic, ageing and poorly located.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Addressing Gap Areas</strong></td>
<td>1.4 Consider establishing at least four new exercise equipment facilities including within the following gap areas:</td>
<td>Although there are four existing exercise facilities and six new facilities proposed by Council, the central and far western areas will not be well serviced by these facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Adamstown (northern part) or New Lambton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Wallsend or Maryland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Minmi (linked to future development)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Beresfield or Tarro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Selection</strong></td>
<td>1.5 Assess the suitability of sites for outdoor exercise equipment (including new sites proposed by Council) using the Site Selection Principles provided on the previous page.</td>
<td>Appropriately locating outdoor exercise equipment will increase the potential use and value of the facilities and ensure Council resources are well spent.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4.2 THEME 2: Design Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Diverse Exercise Equipment   | 2.1 Increase the scope, diversity and uniqueness of outdoor exercise equipment including:  
- Investigate options for a greater diversity of equipment that reflects unique and modern design approaches  
- Include equipment that is appealing and easy to use for ageing and older adults, smaller women and youth and people with lower levels of fitness  
- Consider some modern and dynamic mechanical exercise equipment (with moving parts) to support cardiovascular activity, flexibility and mobility  
- Incorporate equipment and exercises that require cardiovascular activities (a run/fast walk, skip or jumps around or near the equipment)  
- Review the style and design of equipment on an ongoing basis to reflect University of Newcastle research findings | Existing outdoor exercise equipment in Newcastle lacks diversity and uniqueness.  
Static equipment can be difficult for older people, smaller women and less fit people, and innovative design that supports these groups is required to benefit a greater range of people in the community.  
Given a main aim of exercise equipment is to increase physical activity, equipment that targets all levels of fitness should be provided. |
| Exercise Trails              | 2.2 Establish some unique outdoor exercise trails that encourage a mix of strength building, mobility, flexibility and cardiovascular activities. This could include providing clusters of equipment located along well-used trails. | An exercise trail that is well designed, unique, good quality and linked to an existing busy trail should have the potential to attract good use and broaden activity opportunities. |
| Quality Settings             | 2.3 Improve the quality of settings around outdoor exercise equipment including:  
- Trees and shade (generally natural) around the equipment  
- Appealing turf and landscape  
- Shelters and shaded seating nearby  
- Access to drinking water  
- Links to other recreation or sport facilities (play, picnic, amenities) | Quality settings and particularly shade, seating and landscapes are likely to encourage people to stop at and use exercise equipment.  
Connecting outdoor exercise equipment to other recreation or sport facilities will contribute to achieving recreation destinations and increased facility use. |
| Universal Design and Access  | 2.4 Adopt universal design principles to ensure outdoor exercise facilities are accessible to all young people and adults, including older adults and people with a disability. This includes:  
- Pathway links to equipment  
- Equipment pieces accessible to older adults and people with a disability  
- Accessible surfaces under equipment  
- Usable equipment gradients and heights for different ages and sizes  
- Flexible and diverse equipment designed to be usable by all young people and adults | Opportunities for all young people and adults, including older adults and people with a disability, to participate in outdoor exercise and have equitable access to facilities should be considered. |
### 4.3 THEME 3: Connecting Communities to Outdoor Exercise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Promotion and Awareness** | 3.1 Promote the location and benefits of outdoor exercise equipment to communities through:  
- Mapping and facility information  
- Council’s web site and media outlets  
- Launches of new outdoor exercise facilities through a site event  
- Targeted information sent to interest groups | If the community is made aware of health and fitness related facilities, they are more likely to consider using the facilities. |
| **Improved Signage** | 3.2 Establish clear and readable signage at outdoor exercise sites and stations, including:  
- Clear directional signage and maps within open spaces and street connections to promote the location of exercise equipment  
- Clear mapping of exercise equipment trails to show the location and distance of each exercise station  
- Clear and readable instructional signage with good size visuals and print, showing how to use each equipment piece | Directional signage in open space is lacking for existing exercise facilities and instruction signage is difficult to read, particularly for ageing and older adults who could have failing eye sight. Good directional signage will contribute to a greater community awareness of facilities. Clear and readable instruction signage will encourage the correct use of equipment and increase the safety of users. |
| **Activating Exercise Equipment** | 3.3 Facilitate and support organised fitness and community activities linked to outdoor exercise equipment. This includes supporting and promoting:  
- ‘Come and try’ and demonstration activities with a qualified fitness instructor  
- Organised park events and competitions involving exercise equipment  
- New technology such as the eCoFit app and Smart Parks | There is evidence that organised community activities linked to outdoor exercise equipment will increase the ongoing use of the equipment by the community (due to a greater awareness and sense of comfort). |
| **Partnerships** | 3.4 Establish promotion and activity partnerships with organisations that have an interest in encouraging a healthy and active community and who could either hold events and promotions linked to outdoor exercise equipment or provide research information. This could include the Heart Foundation, active ageing groups, community fitness groups, corporate fitness, wellness programs and NSW Health. | Council may not have the resources to be a direct provider of activities linked to outdoor exercise equipment, and as such partnerships with other interested groups in the community who could provide or promote activities should be considered. Research undertaken by the University of Newcastle will assist Council to understand community needs and ensure the best approach to providing, designing and locating outdoor exercise facilities. |
| **Review** | 3.5 Review the use and effectiveness of outdoor exercise equipment in Newcastle on an ongoing basis and modify the approach to future provision as appropriate. The review will involve the University of Newcastle as part of its outdoor exercise facility research project. | The suitability and success of existing facilities and changing needs and opportunities should be considered when planning for new facilities, with the aim to achieve well used and valued facilities. The University of Newcastle is undertaking a major research project and findings should be considered as part of facility review. |
5 ACHIEVING THE STRATEGIES

5.1 The Priorities

Recommended outdoor exercise facility priorities are outlined below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THEME</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Priorities</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Potential Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| THEME 1 Exercise Equipment Provision | 1.1 Facility Provision            | Consider provision of up to 6 of the outdoor exercise facility sites currently proposed by Council, with a particular focus on sites that are either high profile or will contribute to the activation of key sites including:  
- Camp Shortland, Newcastle  
- South Newcastle Beach (Bathers Way) | High      | Government grant funding  
University of Newcastle for design ideas |
|                                | 1.2 Existing Equipment Enhancement | Maintain, replace and enhance existing exercise equipment, with particular priority given to:  
- Islington Park, Islington: upgrade and replace equipment, improve instruction signage  
- Lambton Park, Lambton: increase equipment scope and uniqueness including through diverse equipment stations, and improve directional and instruction signage | Medium to High | Government grant funding  
University of Newcastle for design ideas  
Communities (contributions to site improvements) |
| THEME 2 Design Strategies      | 2.1 Diverse Exercise Equipment    | Increase the scope, diversity and uniqueness of outdoor exercise equipment, with a particular focus on higher profile existing and proposed sites, including:  
- Islington Park, Islington  
- Lambton Park, Lambton  
- Camp Shortland, Newcastle  
- South Newcastle Beach (Bathers Way)  
- Fernleigh Track, Adamstown Heights | Medium    | Government grant funding  
University of Newcastle for design ideas |
| THEME 3 Connecting Communities to Outdoor Exercise | 3.2 Improved Signage              | Establish clear and readable signage at outdoor exercise sites and stations, with particular priority given to improved instruction signage.                                                                 | High      | Government grant funding |
|                                | 3.3 Activating Exercise Equipment | Facilitate and support organised fitness and community activities linked to outdoor exercise facilities.                                                                                                                                               | Medium    | Government grant funding  
Health and community organisations |
5.2 Implementation Considerations

Staged Approach

Whilst the Outdoor Exercise Facility Strategy provides options for 14 sites, the need for these and additional facilities should be assessed on an ongoing basis, taking University of Newcastle and other community engagement and research findings into consideration.

The best approach to implementation will therefore be to stage the provision, focusing on the high profile sites or where facilities will contribute to activating high profile sites as recommended in The Priorities. The appropriateness of establishing other outdoor exercise facilities can then be assessed on an ongoing basis according to demand and resource availability.

Management Implications

The development of new outdoor exercise equipment and improvements to existing facilities will require an injection of capital funding. Whilst grant funding through the NSW Office of Sport and other government departments can be sought, it is likely that the greater allocation of funds will need to come from Council. Some funding could be achieved through Development Contributions.

Additional and improved facilities will also have an ongoing maintenance and operational implication that will require appropriate funding and people resources.

The recommended strategies should be reflected in appropriate Council planning and works budgets to enable implementation. This includes Council’s asset management plans, works budgets and Development Contribution Plans.

Ongoing Assessment

Continual assessment of the use and popularity of outdoor exercise facilities should be undertaken to ensure existing equipment is appropriate and sites are suitable. This can be through observations and community engagement. In addition, there should be ongoing consideration of new equipment designs and the potential to cater for a greater range of people in the community.

The University of Newcastle research project can inform Council of changing needs, trends and demands. This research should be used to guide the design and location of future outdoor exercise facilities. This is another reason for staging the provision of facilities, so that the future facilities can benefit from this research and better reflect community needs and modern approaches to provision.

Partnerships

A key recommendation is to better connect communities to outdoor exercise equipment through demonstrations and other organised events and activities. To achieve this, opportunities to connect to health and community organisations with an interest in communities being physically active should be pursued.

In addition, the partnership with the University of Newcastle established by Councils in the region should be continued to obtain up to date research findings and enable relevant University staff to contribute ideas to the future design and location of outdoor exercise facilities as appropriate.
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APPENDIX A
Existing Newcastle Exercise Facilities Analysis

Braye Park, Waratah West

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site and Facility Information</td>
<td>One location next to park internal roadway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location Profile</td>
<td>Located towards the western suburbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The park has a lower profile due to its design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link to Other Recreation and Sport Facilities</td>
<td>Poorly located within the reserve away from other recreation facilities (near roadway)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Type and Suitability</td>
<td>Basic static equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two pieces of equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disconnected from other recreation facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connections and Infrastructure</td>
<td>Connected to path within park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disconnected from amenities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shady space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rubber matting under equipment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Islington Park, Islington

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site and Facility Information</strong></td>
<td>Two stations/locations within grassed recreation area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location Profile</strong></td>
<td>Park is in central location within Newcastle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Main road connections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facility 1: located nearer to play along pathway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facility 2: located closer to Pacific Highway along pathway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facility 2 is some distance from facility 1 and it is difficult to see the next facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Link to Other Recreation and Sport Facilities</strong></td>
<td>Connection to recreation area but located away from the playground and sports field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Could consider another exercise station nearer to play (ideally more dynamic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equipment Type and Suitability</strong></td>
<td>Facility 1: 3 pieces of equipment (2 basic metal bars, 1 metal, wood and plastic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facility 2: 3 pieces of equipment (2 basic bars, 1 with moving part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mainly static equipment pieces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Connections and Infrastructure</strong></td>
<td>Connected to path within park along the waterway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shelters and other infrastructure linked to playground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rubber matting under equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some shade from nearby trees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equipment is becoming worn and evidence of rust due to good use and age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instruction signage relatively good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of directional signage between 2 facility stations and to other facilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lambton Park, Lambton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Site and Facility Information           | - Two stations/locations  
- Four more proposed                                                                        |
| Location Profile                        | - Park is centrally located with link to central and western suburbs  
- Key sportsground that is high profile  
- Distributor roads nearby                                                                 |
| Link to Other Recreation and Sport Facilities | - Good connection to sport and recreation spaces  
- Spread of stations is not ideal due to distance between stations and lack of equipment at each station |
| Equipment Type and Suitability          | - Basic static equipment (wooden and metal benches and bars)  
- Each station only has one piece of exercise equipment (resulting in a lack of activity opportunities) |
| Connections and Infrastructure          | - Path connections  
- Rubber matting under equipment  
- Other infrastructure provided within the park  
- Limited shade around existing exercise stations  
- Lack of instructional signage  
- Lack of directions signage to other stations within the park |
### Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site and Facility Information</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two stations/locations, with one nearer to play</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location Profile</th>
<th>Smaller catchment due to Hunter River and Newcastle University nearby</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whilst the park is large it is accessed through local residential streets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Link to Other Recreation and Sport Facilities</th>
<th>Appealing park with treed recreation area and link to wetland water body</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facility 1: exercise station location is near play and waterway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility 2: location is in open area away from other facilities (but can see the other station and play space)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment Type and Suitability</th>
<th>Relatively new equipment in good condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Youth focus with high bars and steps (requiring strength and height)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Static equipment but a number of pieces and a good range</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility 1: combined exercise pieces with 6 activity opportunities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility 2: 3 structures with 7 exercise opportunities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Connections and Infrastructure</th>
<th>Rubber matting under equipment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facility 2 is located in an open area away from other facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility 2 is lacking a path connection and lacks shade and shelter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small print on instructional signage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site and Facility Information</strong></td>
<td>Eight equipment pieces spread across university playing fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location Profile</strong></td>
<td>The University is located towards north and western suburbs. Need to drive through the university to access the fields and car parking fee applies. Therefore not easily accessible to general public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Link to Other Recreation and Sport Facilities</strong></td>
<td>Connected to sports fields (each equipment piece is located in the corners of 2 sports fields)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equipment Type and Suitability</strong></td>
<td>Separated single units of equipment around the playing fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Connections and Infrastructure</strong></td>
<td>Some equipment pieces are located away from amenities and amenities may not be available to the general public, Bark chip surface under equipment, Generally good shade</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B
Outdoor Exercise Facility Strategy Research


- The benefits of outdoor physical activity are:
  - Physical health – reduced weight and blood pressure
  - Emotional – reduced depression and stress
  - Behaviour – increased environmental responsibility

- The main reasons for Local Councils providing outdoor exercise are:
  - Facilities are popular
  - Increasing resident interest
  - Community recreation benefits
  - Development of family oriented spaces
  - Connection to beach areas

- Exercise equipment is often linked to other recreation or sporting facilities. Based on 60 outdoor exercise facilities provided at the time:
  - 78% were near other sporting facilities
  - 68% were adjacent to pedestrian routes
  - 42% were near children’s play

- Values of outdoor exercise equipment in fresh air include refreshing, invigorating, increased sense of wellbeing, increased Vitamin D and increased variety.

- Fitness trails give a cardiovascular and muscle strength workout. Each station along a trail should have a purpose and should each include 2-3 exercise pieces.

- Modern equipment includes moving parts. It increases the heart rate and ensures correct muscular strength activity. A combination of muscular strength and cardiovascular exercise is a good outcome.

- Exercise equipment near play makes children accustomed to exercise outdoors.

- Best practice principles include:
  - Install high quality equipment with a variety of static and mechanical equipment choices (diverse exercise opportunities)
  - Need high quality construction and durable material choice
  - Design equipment to encourage a range of advanced and beginner skills
  - Mechanical equipment increases heart rate and provides a cardiovascular workout and is therefore more popular
  - Along paths, increase visual awareness that the equipment is part of a fitness trail
  - Trails are an attraction to walkers and joggers. Place exercise equipment on active pedestrian routes
  - Need a level surface under outdoor exercise equipment
  - Aim for good passive surveillance of the equipment


- Interviews of 54 park users found that:
  - 72.2% were 18-44 years of age
  - 57.4% of those interviewed used outdoor exercise equipment in a park
  - 71% of those who used equipment visited a park more since outdoor exercise equipment was installed
  - 64.5% of those who use equipment socialised while using the equipment
  - The exercise equipment provided an opportunity to improve cardio respiratory fitness and muscle strength
Units should be clustered together or there should be several pods rather than individual units spaced out along a trail. Clusters of equipment create social spaces, encouraging users to exercise with friends and family and also encourages people to spend more time at the station. There is a risk of vandalism when units are isolated. Walkers or joggers will lose momentum if they stop at units. A cluster of exercise equipment immediately before or after a trail run or walk is the best approach. Advancement of technology has given birth to a largely sedentary lifestyle and those suffering from its effects are unable to perform exercises on static equipment (pull ups, dips and push ups). Therefore body weight leverage resistance equipment is good for these users. Entry to intermediate users require less challenging exercise opportunities. Low impact exercises and units designed to increase flexibility, balance and agility and a range of motion are more appealing to seniors. Should include equipment that is designed for maximum accessibility. Equipment should be placed in a visible area with high people traffic volumes.

There is little evidence that outdoor gyms can increase park use and physical activity in the long term. To facilitate the use of exercise equipment consider: Pleasant surroundings Social opportunities Access and proximity to other facilities Features and amenities Condition and maintenance Aesthetics and safety

Key factors for the success of outdoor existing facilities include: Location Safety Social and environmental support Targeted marketing Variety of physical activity types Community consultation and engagement

Exercise equipment should be designed for adults of all ages and fitness levels. Include instructional signage to ensure the correct use of equipment. Provide for graded exercise and modifications. The location of exercise facilities should be: Accessible In a safe and visible area Close to other facilities and amenities There should be a variety of equipment suitable for the target group.
Jennifer L. Copeland, Cheryl Currie and Ali Walker, University of Lethbridge, Outdoor fitness equipment in public parks: Is it an effective physical activity intervention?, WellSpring June 1, 2017

- The study involved observing two active parks in Lethbridge, Alberta for 100 hours across three seasons (spring, summer, and autumn). More than 1,000 people visited the two active parks during the observation period. Walking and running were the most common types of physical activity observed. Less than 3% of adults were observed using the fitness equipment.

- The study also involved interviewing 140 individuals by talking to people in the parks and going door-to-door in neighbourhoods with active parks. Most people interviewed (86%) were aware of fitness equipment in the park.

- Most residents noted the equipment was rarely used by others. Those interviewed spoke about “the potential” the equipment had to improve health, increase physical activity, and enhance a sense of community in their neighbourhood. Many also appreciated that it was freely accessible.

- The study found that the installation of park fitness equipment in smaller cities is not likely to be an effective intervention without additional efforts. Strategies to increase use include:
  - Better marketing
  - Provide durable and functional equipment
  - Cater for different levels of fitness
  - Ensure the environment around the equipment supports public use (proper drainage and upkeep of the equipment)
  - To reach people who are not already regular exercisers, provide workout suggestions for the equipment, e.g. via posters on-site and online.
  - Drop-in fitness classes at exercise stations can increase use
  - Consider community launch of new facilities and publicised free classes
  - Community-based organizations and Primary Care Networks should be encouraged to take advantage of outdoor fitness equipment as a novel and low-cost idea for their programming

- Don’t just install equipment and expect people to use it. Need a program of promotion, information and activities.

Geoff Bates, Ellie McCoy, Rebecca Murphy, Natalia Kornyk & Dominic Suckley, Evaluating the provision of outdoor gym equipment Uptake and impact in Sefton Merseyside, Centre for Public Health Liverpool, John Moores University, 2014

- 162 participants provided useable data through online and onsite surveys across 10 outdoor gyms in Sefton in 2013.

- Average time of use is 19 minutes and 22 minutes for those who use at least once a week.

- Over one half of the respondents found the equipment had a positive impact on health.

- 70% said outdoor gyms were more beneficial for health than indoor exercise.

- 80% said outdoor gyms were more enjoyable than indoor exercise.

- The survey respondents suggested:
  - Being embarrassed or lacking confidence is a constraint to facility use
  - Need to increase community awareness of the social benefit of exercising with friends and family
  - Need to increase information on how to use equipment (to increase use)
  - Should increase the amount and quality of information aimed at people with different levels of fitness experience

- Recommendations include:
  - Actively promote outdoor gyms
  - Increase and improve instructions on the use of outdoor exercise gyms
  - Enable group exercise classes at outdoor exercise gyms
  - Ensure locations and equipment are well maintained
  - Monitor the use of equipment and public perceptions
  - Invest in activities and facilities
  - Link outdoor exercise gyms to other recreation facilities
City of Sydney Park Fitness Equipment Plan, 2015

- The benefits of physical activity are:
  - Revitalisation
  - Positive engagement
  - Reduced tension, anger and depression
  - Increased self esteem

- Outdoor fitness equipment provides a variety of benefits to users and the community including:
  - Improved physical and psychological health (Chow 2013)
  - Greater social capital (Chow 2013)
  - Greater level of activity within parks and public open space, which increases passive surveillance and discourses antisocial behaviour and vandalism
  - Enabling more effective exercise, as natural surroundings and fresh air in an outdoor environment help make exercise more fun and more effective (Thompson Coon 2011)
  - Improved agility, balance, coordination and muscular and bone strength
  - Expansion of the benefits associated with physical activity to a wider audience
  - Relieving the pressure placed on park infrastructure and furniture not intended for physical activity

- Best practice design for outdoor fitness equipment is based on three general principles.
  - 1. Functional activities - find exercises that mimic day-to-day or naturally occurring movements that involve large muscle groups and multiple joints
  - 2. Intensity – match the intensity of the workout to the fitness level and objectives of the participant
  - 3. Increasing load – find ways to use the equipment provided, as well as external equipment such as ropes, resistance bands and suspension training devices, to provide participants with a variety of body weight and weighted exercises

- Static equipment provides the following opportunities:
  - Functionality - a variety of exercises can be performed using one piece of equipment for greater overall fitness
  - Customisation - it can have other items, such as ropes and resistance bands, attached to it
  - Flexibility - it provides a flexible facility for those who are less mobile or with limited strength
  - Cost effective - it can be cheaper than dynamic equipment. This allows more equipment to be installed for the same amount of money
  - Robust - it has minimal moving parts and is more suited to shoreline installations where the equipment can be subject to salt, sand and wind-exposure
  - Low maintenance - it has minimal or no maintenance requirements
  - It is suited to CrossFit exercising, which is rapidly growing in popularity

- Dynamic equipment provides the following opportunities:
  - Aerobic - it offers a greater selection of equipment for aerobic exercise than static equipment
  - Fitness level – most dynamic equipment does not require an existing level of fitness, making it readily accessible to new and lower fitness level users
  - Accessibility – many dynamic equipment suppliers offer a range of all abilities equipment
  - Innovation – some dynamic equipment suppliers offer a green energy range (converting human energy into usable electricity)
  - Familiarity - It mimics well-known indoor fitness equipment, such as treadmills and cross trainers

- The strategic objectives of the Plan are as follows:
  - 1. Increase provision of outdoor fitness equipment so all members of the community are within a 10-minute walking distance (800 metre radius)
  - 2. Encourage greater participation in physical activity to help all members of the community reach their recommended levels of physical activity.
  - 3. Prioritise installation of outdoor fitness equipment to ensure areas with greatest walking distance from existing outdoor fitness equipment are provided for in the next five years
  - 4. Engage the community to ensure outdoor fitness equipment facilities meet the needs of the community and promote greater social inclusion
The research is based on 400 self-completed questionnaires of park visitors. It examined people’s use, perception and attitudes of a stretch station circuit installed in an urban public park in a suburb of Perth, WA.

The data highlights equipment is positively perceived by existing park users (seen to add value to the park) and is considered to be a ‘good investment’ by the local government authority. Users of the equipment enjoy it and want more installed.

There appears to be little perceived benefit in terms of the stretch station’s contribution to the physical activity levels of park users, particularly for a key target group (those people who engage in little leisure-time physical activity).

Outdoor fitness equipment (OFE) placed in public parks has the potential to encourage physical activity.

Based on onsite and video observations of OFE usage, a park in Xihu Park in Tainan located in southern Taiwan attracted considerable use, particularly in the early morning and late afternoon. In peak-hours approximately 12 users per hour used the OFE, with the majority being females and seniors.

The triple arm stretch and air walker were the most popular stations. However, most OFE users interacted with less than three of the available six OFE stations.

Users spent an average of less than nine minutes on all OFE stations combined.

While OFE equipment was well-used in the urban park, it appears users did not interact with OFE at rates to produce a sufficient bout or level of physical activity during their park visit.

The study examined public use and perceptions of park fitness equipment in a small urban centre.

Of the 1,013 adults observed across 106 hours in active parks, only 2.7% used the equipment and most were male.

Activity intensity was higher among users of the equipment compared to other parks users.

Of 139 residents interviewed, 22.3% reported regular park fitness equipment use.

Residents viewed the accessibility of the equipment as beneficial for community health, sense of community, and families.

Improved advertising, lighting, equipment, instructions, ground materials, maintenance, and onsite trainers were suggested to increase public use.
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The 17 Sustainable Development Goals are a universal call to action to end poverty, protect the planet and ensure that all people enjoy peace and prosperity. The Newcastle Affordable Living Plan contributes to the following goals.

Goal 1: End poverty in all its forms everywhere

Goal 3: Ensure healthy lives and promote well-being for all at all ages

Goal 7: Ensure access to affordable, reliable, sustainable and modern energy for all

Goal 10: Reduce inequality within and among countries

Goal 11: Make cities inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable

Goal 12: Ensure sustainable consumption and production patterns

Goal 17: Revitalize the global partnership for sustainable development
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Newcastle City Council’s Affordable Living Plan identifies the current and projected housing needs of the Newcastle community and builds upon the strategic directions for residential lands identified in the Newcastle City Council Local Planning Strategy (2015). It also looks at other factors that Council can influence which affect the cost of living, as housing is only one aspect of affordable living.

The Plan identifies steps that Council can take in working towards the shared Newcastle 2030 community vision:

"In 2030 Newcastle will be a Smart, Liveable and Sustainable City. We will celebrate our unique city and protect our natural assets. We will build resilience in the face of the future challenges and encourage innovation and creativity. As an inclusive community, we will embrace new residents and foster a culture of care.

We will be a leading lifestyle city with vibrant public places, connected transport networks and a distinctive built environment. And as we make our way toward 2030, we will achieve all this within a framework of open and collaborative leadership."

What is affordable housing?
The Department of Family and Community Services (2016) define affordable housing as housing that is appropriate to the needs of a range of very low to moderate income households and priced so that these households are also able to meet other basic living costs. As a rule of thumb, housing is usually considered affordable if it costs less than 30% of gross household income.

Affordable housing or affordable living?
Many factors influence housing affordability including the type of housing, construction costs, climate, land and infrastructure costs, approval processes and the overall supply and demand for housing. Housing influences other non-shelter outcomes including access to transport, jobs, education and services, family stability and

---

health. All of these factors play a role in the affordability of living. By focusing on affordable living the hidden costs associated with inappropriately located or designed housing are not overlooked.

Newcastle City Council recognises that access to secure, appropriate and affordable housing is not only a basic requirement for all people, it is an essential component of an inclusive, dynamic and sustainable city. This plan focusses on actions that Newcastle City Council can implement to facilitate affordable living opportunities for our community.

**Context**

Affordable living in Newcastle and local policy response is influenced by legislation and policy at all levels of government. This is summarised below. Detailed information about key policies and legislation is provided in Appendix 1.

---

**Key housing terms**

**Social housing** - rental housing provided by not-for-profit, non-government or government organisations to assist people who are unable to access suitable accommodation in the private rental market.

**Affordable housing** - housing that is appropriate to the needs of a range of very low to moderate income households and priced so that these households are also able to meet other basic living costs. As a rule of thumb, housing is usually considered affordable if it costs less than 30% of gross household income.

---

COMMUNITY

Who are we?³

The wider Newcastle LGA is the largest regional centre in NSW and the second largest non-capital urban centre in Australia. Newcastle is the service and administrative centre for the Hunter Region.

160,919 people Newcastle LGA population.
37 years old is the median age in Newcastle.

We are growing:
0.95% population growth each year since 2011 with 190,000 people predicted to call Newcastle home by 2031.
16,000 additional households by 2031 and 17,300 new dwellings are needed over this time to keep pace with the growth in single and couple only households.

We are diverse:
3.5% of the population are Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people.
14% of people are born overseas, a 1.6% increase from 2011.
5.9% need help in their day-to-day lives due to disability.

We are ageing:
21.4% of the population were aged 60 years or over, which is an increase of 0.7% from 2011.

What do we do?⁴

$1368 is the median weekly household income in the Newcastle LGA compared to $1750 in Sydney.
59% of employed people work full time and 39% part-time.

In December 2017 5.8% of the labour force was classed as unemployed⁵.

19.8% of households earn a high income and 20.1% have a low or very low income (those earning less than $650 per week).

This is a higher proportion of low income households compared to NSW (17.8%) and a lower proportion of high income households (23.1%).

The proportion of households with low and very low incomes varies widely across the Newcastle LGA. Jesmond had the largest proportion of low income households and Fletcher-Minmi had the smallest proportion of low income households.

How do we live?[^6]

35% of people rent their home and the median rent is $395[^7].

In 2016, 31% of renting households were experiencing housing stress and 7.3% of households purchasing their home were experiencing mortgage stress.

Housing stress varies across the LGA with 52.2% of households in Birmingham Gardens - Callaghan experiencing rental stress and 11.1% of households in Shortland-Sandgate experiencing mortgage stress.

$580,000[^8] is the median home purchase price

---


Single dwellings make up 68.6% of the housing stock.

Medium density housing has been the fastest growing housing type since 2011. It now comprises 22.5% of the housing stock.

An additional 1565 medium density dwellings were constructed between 2011 and 2016 compared with 185 additional single dwellings.

4 bedroom homes were the fastest growing dwelling type between 2011 and 2016, with an increase of 11%.

582 two bedroom dwellings were lost from the housing stock between 2011 and 2016.

42.3% of all homes contain 3 bedrooms.

Lone person and couple households comprise 63% of all households.

36.6% of households had access to 1 motor vehicle and another 48% had access to 2 or more motor vehicles.

Private motor vehicles are the main way that people travel to work with 68.9% as a driver and 4.7% as a passenger.

The average work trip length is 9km and the average trip length for social / recreation activities is 7km.\(^9\)

78.4% of homes in the Newcastle LGA have an internet connection.

---

**WHAT IS COUNCIL ALREADY DOING?**

All levels of government have a role to play in promoting affordable living outcomes. Commonwealth taxation policies, commonwealth and state housing assistance programs, state and local land use and transportation planning processes and infrastructure programs all have a role in facilitating affordable living. The private sector, as the major provider of housing in Australia, also has a significant role. The large variety of factors that play a role in affordable living can be broadly grouped into 4 themes under which Newcastle City Council can support affordable living.

These themes are:

**Housing**

Social housing is rental housing provided by not-for-profit non-government or government, organisations to assist people who are unable to access suitable accommodation in the private rental market. In NSW, the Department of Family and Community Services partners with the community, industry and individuals to provide social housing for those most in need, such as those on very low incomes and people with special needs.
Compass Housing is a non-government, not-for-profit housing provider operating in NSW and Queensland including the Newcastle region. Compass Housing provides secure and affordable housing, as well as delivering housing products for disadvantaged people, who have difficulties sourcing adequate and affordable housing.

Low to moderate income households are often caught in the middle between social and above average market housing, and left without housing provision or housing support.

Rising housing costs not only affect moderate income households, the increasing competition for affordable rental housing pushes more people into inappropriate or unsafe accommodation or homelessness, and puts more pressure on the limited government and community housing resources.

Although Newcastle City Council does not have a role in the provision of social housing, we can play a role in supporting low to moderate income households by facilitating and advocating opportunities for affordable living. In turn, this supports social housing providers by reducing pressure on their limited resources.

The Newcastle Local Environmental Plan 2012 is the main planning tool used to guide development across the Newcastle local government area. It supports a diversity of dwelling forms by allowing all types of residential buildings, in different residential land use zones. Floor space ratios and building heights guide the density of development within each zone.

The Newcastle Local Planning Strategy identifies ‘Residential Growth Precincts’ which incorporate a range of residential density standards to assist in planning for residential growth across the Newcastle local government area. The identified Residential Growth Precincts, including urban release areas, provide sufficient capacity to accommodate the predicted growth.

Transport

Land use planning decisions influence both development and transport outcomes. Newcastle City Council has identified five corridors that provide important links between centres and support centres, as well as being centres in themselves. The five corridors are: Islington, Mayfield, Hamilton, Broadmeadow and Adamstown. These corridors have been identified as having opportunities for economic and/or housing renewal and intensification as they have good access to existing services, retail and public transport. Planning controls have been developed to support the renewal and growth of these corridors through increased density.

The Newcastle City Council Transport Strategy (2014), and the Cycling Strategy and Action Plan (2013), aim to improve access to public and active transport options throughout the Newcastle LGA. Many of the actions proposed in these strategies will also support affordable living.

Although Newcastle City Council does not have a direct role in the provision of public transport, we do have an advocacy role to other levels of government, for improvements in transport and funding to meet transport costs.

Recreation and services

Access to quality public open space is an important consideration in supporting affordable living. These areas not only contribute to the character and biodiversity of the city, but the health and lifestyle of the community. Parkland and recreation areas have been found to improve the wellbeing of individuals and communities as quality open space provides opportunities for physical
exercise, food production and social interaction.

The Newcastle City Council Parkland and Recreation Strategy (2014) identifies strategic directions and actions to ensure parkland, sport and recreation meet the needs of the community. Many of the actions in this strategy will also support affordable living in the Newcastle LGA, for example, supporting the equitable development of facilities.

Newcastle City Council also provides a range of other services and facilities that support affordable living. Newcastle library provides lifelong learning opportunities with regular free learning events. The library provides free Wi-Fi and desktop computers for browsing the web or using Microsoft Office software. Newcastle Art Gallery and Newcastle Museum provide free general admission.

The Newcastle Smart City Plan (2017) includes actions which will also facilitate affordable facilities and services, including the provision of free Wi-Fi in public spaces and the creation of "We Lend Tech", a lendable collection through the Newcastle Region Library that provides affordable access to internet, mobile devices, virtual and augmented reality and other emerging technologies.

**Education, collaboration and advocacy**

Newcastle City Council's Housing Management and Development Committee (HBC Committee) oversees the implementation of the HBC Demonstration Housing Program. Over the past several years the HBC Committee has successfully funded two major innovative housing projects for Newcastle to the value of $2.6M including the This Way Home Project in partnership with Housing NSW in Mayfield.

Newcastle City Council is a member of the Urban Development Institute of Australia (UDIA) and the Property Council of Australia and this provides ongoing opportunities for education and collaboration in relation to affordable living issues.
KEY CHALLENGES FOR AFFORDABLE LIVING IN NEWCASTLE

Supply of quality affordable housing

By 2036, the population of Newcastle is predicted to be around 198,350 with an increase of around 33,500 people. The growth in single and couple only households is likely to continue, with a predicted need for around 16,800 new dwellings over this time.\(^{10}\)

There is likely to continue to be very strong demand for affordable housing in the Newcastle LGA, with low to moderate income households comprising the largest proportion of all households and the continuing long term growth in housing purchase and rental prices. For example, between 2011 and 2017, rents in Newcastle increased by almost 25% while household incomes have increased by only 16%.

A significant proportion of new house supply in the Newcastle LGA will be through infill development within existing urban areas such as the identified renewal corridors. Development of infill sites can be more costly due to the higher purchase price, and additional construction costs to address site constraints such as mine subsidence or contamination or visual and acoustic amenity. Higher development costs will be reflected in the purchase price.

A diverse housing supply

The size of households in general follows the life-cycle of families. Households are usually small at the stage of relationship formation, and then increase in size with the arrival of children. They later reduce in size again as these children reach adulthood and leave home and partners pass away.

There are a variety of reasons for people to move into or out of a suburb, however, the unavailability of appropriate housing should not require people to move elsewhere. A diversity of housing types may encourage older people to downsize within the community and for young families to stay in the area.\(^{11}\)

A diversity of bedrooms contributes to housing choice which may create more affordable options. The Newcastle LGA does not have a good match of bedroom mix to household type and the fit between household type and bedroom number is worsening over time. Like much of Australia, single person and couple households will continue to be the dominant household configuration; however, the housing stock is largely built for families (3+ bedrooms) and has not adapted to change (see: How do we live?). Between 2011 and 2016, there was a 2.2% increase in homes with four or more bedrooms while the number of two bedroom homes declined by 1.6%.

The mismatch between bedroom numbers and household size may result from limited housing choice, but may also be attributed to household expectations. As households pass through the different life cycle stages, particularly child rearing and the period after children leave home, their utilisation of housing changes. While having spare bedrooms indicates a capacity to

---

\(^{10}\) Department of Planning & Environment. (2016). Hunter Regional Plan 2036. NSW Government.
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accommodate more people in reasonable comfort, it does not necessarily mean that dwellings are not being fully utilised. Households may put these ‘spare’ rooms to various uses (eg study, office, gymnasium, craft or hobby room, children’s play room, guest bedroom or store room).  

Profit driven development is the primary method of housing development in Australia. Developers are generally conservative in regard to the product they offer and the locations they target in order to reduce risk and ensure financing can be obtained. As a result, most greenfield areas are developed with large detached homes, and renewal areas are developed with apartments aimed either at the luxury end of the owner occupier market or at investors seeking rental yields in the short term and capital gain in the longer term. Because much of the apartment supply of apartments is marketed to investors, there is little focus on addressing the needs of occupants or diversity of supply. 

It will be a challenge to provide a mix of housing types and sizes across the LGA so that a range of housing can be provided to fit the various household types. Urban fringe areas often have little diversity in housing types and sizes. For example, in the Fletcher-Minmi locality, the predominant form of housing is detached dwellings with four or more bedrooms and in 2016, this form of housing comprised 80.4% of the housing stock. In contrast, in the Newcastle, Newcastle East and Newcastle West locality, the predominant form of housing is high density dwellings with two bedrooms or less. In 2016, 54.9% of dwellings in this locality had two or less bedrooms.

The ageing population also has implications for housing diversity in Newcastle. Existing homes may not be suitable for aging in place because the home may not be easily adaptable or may be too large and difficult to maintain. Newcastle City Council currently has limited design controls for new dwellings to incorporate adaptable design features to facilitate ageing in place or to accommodate people living with disabilities.

State Environmental Policy (Housing for Seniors or People with a Disability) sets aside some local planning controls to encourage development of housing suitable for seniors and people with a disability. Between 2012 and 2016, Newcastle Council has granted consent to 19 developments under the Policy. The developments include a mix of residential care facilities and self-contained dwellings.

**Equitable access to transport and services**

Access to jobs and services is strongly influenced by access to transport. A lack of affordable housing near well serviced centres can put pressure on key workers to seek more affordable housing further away from their job and services. More affordable areas are generally located on the urban fringe and often do not have good access to public transport or other services. As a result, households in more affordable areas without a car can be disadvantaged. The cost of car ownership and transport from outer suburbs to work

---


can also negate the savings associated with cheaper housing on the fringe.

In 2016, Fletcher – Minmi had the highest proportion of households with two or more vehicles, while Jesmond had the highest proportion of households without a motor vehicle. Improving transport links and access to services in existing affordable areas may help to reduce the spatial distribution of disadvantage.

The ageing population also has implications for equitable access to transport and services. Common conditions that are part of the ageing process can have a major impact on the ability of a person to safely control a car. These include a loss of hearing and vision, decreased perception and memory, or reduced strength, flexibility and movement.\textsuperscript{15} As a result, many people start to change their driving habits, or are required to give up driving, and become more reliant on public transport. Increasing transport choice through access to public transport, bicycle and pedestrian networks will also be important in ensuring equitable access to transport and services.

**Neighbourhoods that support health and wellbeing**

Housing on the urban fringe is largely detached housing and may provide less opportunity to incorporate physical activity into daily activities. Limited public transport and long commutes reduce opportunities for walking and cycling and result in high reliance on private vehicles.

Various studies have shown that long commutes are linked to poor health outcomes. It has also been reported internationally that every ten minutes spent commuting reduces all forms of social capital by 10%.\textsuperscript{16}

Some people choose to live in new houses on the urban fringe and the provision of a range of quality open spaces and pathways throughout the area can support health and wellbeing. The Newcastle Development Control Plan 2012 contains specific development principles to ensure new subdivisions on the urban fringe address the principles of walkability, connectivity, permeability, legibility and safety in the design of the access and open space network.

It is also important to provide opportunities for affordable housing close to jobs and services, to reduce commute times and increase opportunities for physical and social activities for people who would prefer not to live on the urban fringe.

Most of the housing growth in the Newcastle LGA will be within existing urban areas. A high quality public domain will be important to maintain liveability in these areas.


Based on the identified key challenges and the four themes under which Newcastle City Council can support affordable living, it is recommended that the following opportunities are investigated to find the right mix of tools that will best support affordable living within Newcastle.

1. Housing

1.1 Urban development program

To enable sufficient capacity across the local government area, and ensure housing is appropriate to the needs of the community it is important to monitor the supply of housing being developed across the local government area. The Department of Planning and Environment is working with councils across the Hunter region to develop an urban development monitoring program. Newcastle City Council should continue to work with the Department of Planning and Environment to implement an effective urban development program.

1.2 Inclusionary zoning policy

Inclusionary zoning refers to the requirement for a percentage of floor space to be made available as affordable housing, or payment of developer contributions when land is up-zoned to achieve greater residential densities, and when sites in key locations (such as existing centres) are redeveloped for greater residential density. Generally, this housing would be transferred to a community housing provider for ongoing management.

Inclusionary zoning has been successfully used around the world to increase the stock of affordable housing in cities, including in the City of Sydney.

Inclusionary zoning - City of Sydney

As part of the long term strategy to redevelop the Ultimo/Pyrmont area, the Sydney Regional Environmental Plan No. 26 City West set out the planning principles for affordable housing that enabled contributions from the private sector towards affordable housing in the area.

The scheme is currently regulated through State Environmental Planning Policy No. 70 - Affordable Housing (revised schemes) and the Sydney Local Environmental Plan 2012.

Affordable housing may be provided in-kind or as a monetary contribution and contributions form a condition of development consent. The contribution is calculated on the basis of the total floor area that would otherwise be required to be dedicated for affordable housing. Current rates are calculated at 0.8% of the total floor area for residential uses and 1.1% of the total floor area for non-residential uses.

The Ultimo/Pyrmont scheme aims to provide about 600 rental units for very low to moderate income households as development continues in the area over the next 15 to 20 years. To date more than 450 affordable rental housing units have been built under the scheme (City of Sydney, 2016).

The development and management of affordable housing units is managed by a not-for-profit, community based organisation, City West Housing.

Newcastle City Council would not currently be able to replicate the system used by the City of Sydney due to legislative restrictions. State Environmental Planning Policy No. 70 - Affordable Housing (Revised Schemes) is the mechanism used by the City of Sydney to levy contributions for affordable housing. This State planning policy only enables a small number of councils in the Sydney metropolitan area to collect developer contributions through a condition of
Despite this limitation, Newcastle City Council can still consider inclusionary zoning through planning agreements. This approach relies on private developers voluntarily offering affordable housing (or a contribution) to Council as part of a planning proposal or development application. The affordable housing units or contributions would then be transferred to a not-for-profit community housing manager. The Newcastle City Council Planning Agreements Policy 2014 includes affordable housing as a matter that Council can consider in the negotiation of a voluntary planning agreement. A Council Policy on inclusionary zoning would show Council's interest in facilitating affordable housing, identify locations where affordable housing is needed, determine how contributions would be managed or distributed and allow a consistent approach to the consideration of planning proposals that include affordable housing elements.

1.3 Housing Strategy

The draft Greater Newcastle Metropolitan Plan includes a specific action for councils to prepare local housing strategies. In addition, Direction 3 of the Hunter Regional Plan 2036 is to ‘Revitalise the Newcastle City Centre’ and details a specific action for Newcastle Council to “Develop local housing strategies for student and visitor accommodation and social and affordable housing”.

Newcastle City Council addresses housing holistically, within the Local Planning Strategy. With the release of the new regional plans and Council's commitment to the New Urban Agenda and Sustainable Development Goals, the Local Planning Strategy should be reviewed to identify and plan for housing needs across the housing supply continuum.

1.4 LEP and DCP controls

The strategic directions for residential lands detailed in the Newcastle Local Planning Strategy identify broad principles to guide the review and development of the Local Environmental Plan and Development Control Plan to facilitate dwelling supply and diversity.

Housing diversity

Boarding houses provide an alternative form of low cost rental housing for a wide range of tenants and are sometimes used as student housing. A boarding house generally contains individual bedrooms and some shared facilities such as kitchen, bathroom and common areas. There are currently 67 registered boarding houses in the Newcastle LGA\textsuperscript{17}. Boarding houses can be found throughout the area, although a large number are clustered around the Mayfield/Tighes Hill area. This clustering is likely due to the proximity to the University of Newcastle and Hunter TAFE.

Caravan parks can provide housing to people that may not be able to afford anything else, or need flexibility, or cannot access the private rental market for other reasons. Newcastle has a single caravan park offering permanent accommodation. This caravan park is located at Tarro, and although it may provide affordable accommodation, other factors such as distance to services and transport are not favourable to affordable living and are generally best considered as a short term solution.

The Local Environmental Plan and Development Control Plan can be used to support the retention of existing affordable housing and encourage diversity in the local housing supply. Some examples that have been used in other NSW councils that could

be considered to support affordable living in the Newcastle LGA include:

- A specific aim within the Local Environmental Plan to encourage a mix of housing types, including affordable and adaptable housing.

Examples include Randwick Local Environmental Plan 2012 and Byron Local Environmental Plan 2014.

- A development standard that requires a diverse mix of dwelling sizes in new multi-dwelling residential developments.

For example, Leichardt Local Environmental Plan 2013 requires all residential flat buildings and mixed use development with four or more dwellings to have at least 25% of all dwellings as studio or one bedroom dwellings and not more than 30% of dwellings as three bedrooms.

**Housing affordability**

The Newcastle Local Planning Strategy includes a specific action to investigate an incentive clause in the Local Environmental Plan to facilitate affordable housing. An incentive clause would provide bonus development yield in return for part of the development being set aside for affordable housing. Further investigation is needed to look at development feasibility, suitable locations and appropriate height and floor spaces bonuses to determine the suitability of this mechanism.

**Adaptable housing**

An incentive clause may also be considered for the provision of adaptable dwellings. For example, Great Lakes Local Environmental Plan provides a 10% floor space bonus where development in the R3 medium density zone has lift access to each level in the building, and the building is designed to be consistent with Australian Standard 4299–1995, Adaptable housing. However, a broader and more cost effective way of achieving a range of dwellings that are adaptable may be through guidelines in the development control plan.

**Case Study: Manufactured Home Estate, Newcastle**

A manufactured home estate containing 100 sites located near the Newcastle CBD.

The estate was approved under State Environmental Planning Policy 36 - Manufactured Home Estates, although it specifically caters to over 55's. The estate contains a range of 2 and 3 bedroom manufactured homes that incorporate energy design features such as LED lighting, gas hot water and passive cooling systems. The homes also incorporate universal design features to facilitate access and adaptability.

The cost to purchase a home* is comparable to the median price of other similar sized units / villas in the locality, although the estate provides features that facilitate more affordable living than existing buildings by providing energy efficient, low maintenance and adaptable homes close to commercial areas, the city centre and a range of services.

*Note: In Manufactured Home Estates, the house only is purchased by occupiers and the land is leased.

The Liveable Housing Design Guidelines detail core design elements that can be incorporated into new dwellings to make homes easier and safer to use for all occupants, and easily adaptable in the future. By including the core liveable housing design elements in new dwellings, home occupants are provided with the opportunity to reduce or avoid the costs

---

associated with retrofitting a home to improve access in the future, should it be required. The core elements can be incorporated into new dwellings without significantly increasing the building cost.

The core elements detailed in the Liveable Housing Design Guidelines could be incorporated into the Newcastle Development Control Plan 2012, to facilitate adaptable housing. The seven core design elements in the basic (silver) level are:

1. A safe continuous and step-free path of travel from the street entrance and/or parking area to a dwelling entrance that is level.
2. At least one, level (step-free) entrance into the dwelling.
3. Internal doors and corridors that facilitate comfortable and unimpeded movement between spaces.
4. A toilet on the ground (or entry) level that provides easy access.
5. A bathroom that contains a hobless (step-free) shower recess.
6. Reinforced walls around the toilet, shower and bath to support the safe installation of grab rails at a later date.
7. A continuous handrail on one side of any stairway where there is a rise of more than one metre.

**Intergenerational housing**

Intergenerational housing refers to housing that can accommodate different generations together. This can be achieved through a variety of means including secondary dwellings (granny flats) or house designs that can easily be altered and divided into two dwellings as the life-cycle of families evolves. This can make housing more affordable by providing opportunities for young families and older people to remain in their local area. Existing state policies and the Local Environmental Plan provide opportunities for secondary dwellings to be constructed in residential zones. The Development Control Plan can be used to support and encourage intergenerational housing models by ensuring controls support these forms of development.

**Deliberative development**

Deliberative development is a development model in which the designer or future owner-occupiers of a multi-dwelling property take on the roles traditionally held by a speculative developer. This type of development can result in cost savings through the removal of unnecessary extras such as marketing, display suites or through design features or shared facilities. Dwellings are tailored to suit the needs of the occupants and can deliver better quality, design and social outcomes. These include better environmental performance, reduced operating and maintenance costs and the inclusion of spaces that foster a sense of community.

Deliberative housing models align with the principles of affordable living. This type of development can be undertaken within all residential zones using existing permissible forms of development in the LEP. However, the DCP will need to be reviewed to ensure that development controls encourage and support these forms of development.

**Relocatable housing**

The use of temporary housing, such as relocatable, tiny and prefab homes on appropriate sites, including the temporary use of vacant sites awaiting development provides another opportunity to provide affordable housing.

For example, The Tiny Homes Foundation has received development approval to build a tiny house project for homeless people next to Gosford hospital. The project consists of four tiny homes, a common
lounge, a common laundry/workshop and community vegetable garden. The development is supported by a network of training, employment and social support services.

To facilitate similar projects in the Newcastle LGA, the Local Environmental Plan and Development Control Plan should be reviewed to reduce barriers to undertaking this type of development in appropriate locations.

1.5 Incentives

In addition to incentive clauses in the planning controls, there may be opportunities for Newcastle Council to offer other types of incentives to encourage the development of smaller low consumption dwellings and to the use of deliberative development models. For example, to encourage the development of smaller, energy efficient homes, Newcastle City Council could consider reducing developer contributions for new dwellings that meet particular sustainable design standards in well serviced locations such as identified renewal corridors.

Newcastle City Council does not have the mechanisms or resources in place to provide direct financial support, or surplus land that could be provided for affordable housing.

---

**Cohousing and Housing Co-operatives**

Cohousing creates intentional communities by deliberative development of private homes clustered around shared space. Each home has traditional amenities, including a private kitchen, and the shared spaces include areas such as community kitchen, laundry, vegetable garden and recreational space. The focus is on mutual sharing (eg car pooling) and support to create a more affordable, connected and sustainable lifestyle and promote well-being for participants and the broader community.

Cohousing contributes to affordable living through reduced construction and recurrent costs, more diverse housing supply and increased density of housing in targeted locations. It provides adaptable living arrangements and supports ageing in place. It can also promote socially and environmentally sustainable living through good design to lower energy and water use and promote increased use of public transport and reduced parking needs.

Co-operative housing offers an alternative legal model of home ownership, which through pooling of resources and low-profit financing, provides members with affordable housing solutions. Housing co-operatives are well-suited as the legal entity for cohousing development but other legal structures may be used.

Housing co-ops use the co-operative model to own and or manage housing for its members. They deliver a variety of housing solutions, including student accommodation, senior housing and affordable units for single households. In NSW, the Not for profit developer, Common Equity provides rental housing using the co-operative model. Membership secures long-term tenancies and encourages active participation in the management of the co-operative. Housing co-ops may also use equity models where members own or partly own their own homes in a co-operative development e.g. apartments, eco-village or community co-operatives. Some cohousing features, can be offered more easily by co-ops than traditional strata ownership models, e.g. embedded solar power generation in Stucco student housing co-operative in Sydney.19

19 The Conversation, Get in on the ground floor: how apartments can join the solar boom, https://theconversation.com/get-in-on-the-ground-floor-how-apartments-can-join-the-solar-boom-79172
However, there may be indirect methods of supporting affordable housing projects. Further investigation into the feasibility of alternative support mechanisms such as grant funding, using Council land as security, or investment in local capped profit deliberative development demonstration projects (e.g., NewCoh Co-Housing project) could be considered.

1.6 Monitoring

It is important to track the implementation of the actions outlined in this Plan, and to measure their effectiveness in improving affordable living in the Newcastle LGA. Further work is needed to determine key indicators and how these can be measured over time.

2. Transport

2.1 LEP and DCP Provisions

Through its development control function, Council can influence the way people move around. At a broad level, the location of trip attractors such as schools, shops and employment, their density and mix, in relation to where people live, affects the length of day to day trips and how much the car is used to get around. The density of development and mix of uses are important elements in creating neighbourhoods that facilitate active transport such as walking and cycling.

The Local Environmental Plan and Development Control Plan can be used to support the goals and actions detailed in Council's Transport Strategy (2014) and Cycling Strategy and Action Plan (2012), which in turn support affordable living. In particular, the following actions from the Transport Strategy:

- **Strengthen development provisions to facilitate walking and riding** - Council will review development controls and contributions plans to incorporate public pedestrian and cycle links where they can contribute to desirable connections and through routes, and to include provisions for design of new residential subdivisions at 40km/h local traffic areas.

- **Review development controls for parking** - In line with best practice management, consideration is to be given to stipulation of maximum parking rates of parking provision and facilitation of opportunities for sharing of spaces. Other matters to be addressed include the impacts of exempt and complying development controls, as they relate to car parking.

- **Facilitate opportunities for establishment of car share schemes** - Dedication of parking spaces for car sharing purposes; flexible development controls and developing a car share policy are examples of ways in which council can facilitate car sharing.

These initiatives are also consistent with actions for Councils identified in the Hunter Regional Plan 2036 to achieve Direction 17: Create healthy built environments through good design. Action 17.3 is: ‘Enhance the quality of neighbourhoods by integrating recreational walking and cycling networks into the design of new communities to encourage physical activity.’

Car parking can add significant cost to the purchase and rental price of housing. Separating car parking spaces from individual units, can facilitate more affordable housing, particularly for people who choose not to own a car, as well as facilitating opportunities for sharing of spaces, provided these cost savings are passed on by developers.

The Newcastle Development Control Plan currently contains requirements for ‘end of trip facilities’ to be provided in new developments with a construction value.
greater than $250,000. To further support these requirements, a clause could be considered which allows end of trip facilities to be excluded from the calculated floor space. For example, Sydney City Local Environmental Plan 2012 provides a floor space bonus for commercial buildings located in central Sydney that have all of end of journey facilities (showers, change rooms, lockers and bicycle storage) together in one area of the building.

2.2 Development contributions

Provisions in the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 allow Council to charge development contributions for public infrastructure necessary as a consequence of new development. Contributions are generally monetary payments but can also be made by way of land dedications and works in kind in specific circumstances. Newcastle City Council has a Section 94A Development Contributions Plan which details the type, location and time-frame of works that will be undertaken with the development contributions that have been collected. The Section 94A Development Contributions Plan can be used to support affordable living. Council’s Transport Strategy identifies opportunities to review the Section 94A Development Contributions Plan and support affordable living through transport initiatives:

- **Review Council’s development contribution plans.** - Review Council’s development contributions plans to ensure the extent of transport works supports the desired development patterns and projections of the Local Planning Strategy.

- **Review Council’s development contribution plans to allow expenditure of contributions on a range of transport facilities** - In conjunction with A2, review Council’s development contributions plans to allow for expenditure of contributions on a range of transport facilities including sustainable transport measures, such as park and ride.

3. Recreation and services

3.1 LEP and DCP Provisions

Newcastle City Council’s Parkland and Recreation Strategy (2014) has been developed to guide the provision of parkland and recreation facilities for current and future communities. A key objective of the Strategy is to ensure equitable levels and standard of provision for recreation facilities across the LGA.

In addition to ensuring that a variety of parkland and recreational facilities are provided and distributed equitably across the Newcastle LGA, the Plan contains some specific actions that support affordable living. In particular:

- **Where Council chooses not to sell un-required parkland, undertake an expression of interest for the external management of undersized parkland by community groups for community gardens as a method to reduce Council’s expenditure whilst encouraging Place Making initiatives.**

- **Implement and support the Community Gardens Toolkit.**

These initiatives are also consistent with actions for Councils identified in the Hunter Regional Plan 2036 to achieve Direction 17: Create healthy built environments through good design. Action 17.2 is ‘Enhance access to fresh food by promoting initiatives that increase urban food production and access to produce from local farmers’.

Community gardens support affordable living through the sustainable production of fresh, healthy locally grown food as well as offering opportunities for social interaction and community participation. As well as utilising
undersized parks for community gardens, there are opportunities to increase local food production through roof-top gardens in residential flat buildings and the use of street gardens to grow edible plants. The Local Environmental Plan and Development Control Plan can be used to support these goals.

3.2 The sharing economy

A number of cities around the world such as Amsterdam and Seoul have developed "sharing city" programs with supporting policies and legislation. These programs incorporate sharing of Council facilities, such as free-of-charge use of Council fleet vehicles, office space and tools.

The sharing economy has significant potential to facilitate affordable living opportunities. Local examples include:

- **The Share Shop - A library of Things** (Renew Newcastle). This library allows members to borrow all sorts of 'things' instead of buying something new, using it once and having to store it. Membership and borrowing is free with voluntary contributions invited to contribute to the maintenance of items and running costs.

- **Liftango** - is a locally based unique rideshare and on-demand bus application. The service is free and it matches drivers with people needing a lift to the same place, such as a workplace or university.

- **Newcastle City Council Smart City Strategy 2017 - 2021** - includes actions based on the sharing economy such as the development of the "We Lend Tech" program that will provide affordable access to internet, mobile devices, virtual and augmented reality and other emerging technologies.

The concept of a 'sharing city' aligns with both affordable living and smart city initiatives. The development of a policy should be investigated to identify the ways in which Newcastle City Council can support new sharing economy initiatives, and to identify where intervention may be needed to prevent adverse impacts.

4. Education, collaboration and advocacy

4.1 Education

Newcastle Council has an existing role in community education across a broad range of topics and this can be broadened to support affordable living opportunities including:

- Continuing to educate, promote and support low consumption, sustainable lifestyles.

- Implementing a program to educate the community, building designers, developers and builders on the benefits of incorporating adaptable design elements in residential buildings.

Recent projects throughout the city have highlighted differences between community perceptions and the reality of affordable housing developments, yet housing affordability remains a big issue in the community. A program of community engagement to explain what affordable housing is, and the benefits of it to the community may improve understanding and reduce negative perceptions when affordable housing developments are proposed.

4.2 Advocacy

Newcastle City Council has an existing role in advocating other levels of government on behalf of the Newcastle community and this can be broadened to incorporate affordable living opportunities including:

---

20 Amsterdam Action Plan for a Sharing Economy, https://www.slideshare.net/shareNL/amsterdam-actionplan-sharing-economy
• Changes to state environmental planning policies and the standard instrument local environmental plan to make it easier for Councils to implement affordable living initiatives, such as inclusionary zoning.

• Continuing to advocate for public transport improvements.

• Advocate for changes to State Government Policy so that surplus land can be sold below "highest and best use" market rates for affordable rental housing and/or deliberative housing development.

• Changes to the National Construction Code to incorporate standards for liveable housing.

• Supporting the Federal government in the development of affordable housing schemes such as bond aggregation, or rent to buy schemes.

A group of not-for profit and community housing organisations have partnered to create the 'Everybody's Home' campaign. 'Everybody's Home' advocates for the Federal Government to take action to fix the broken housing system. The campaign outlines 5 simple things the government can do to fix Australia's housing system so that it works for everyone. These are:

• support for first home buyers
• a National Housing Strategy
• a better deal for renters
• immediate relief for Australians in chronic rental stress
• a plan to end homelessness by 2030.

Supporting this program is consistent with this Affordable Living Plan.

4.3 Collaboration

Newcastle City Council currently works with other levels of government, not-for-profit sector and other industry groups to support opportunities for affordable living and this should be continued. In particular:

• Continue to provide support to community organisations to improve their ability to plan and deliver appropriate and accessible services to the community.

• Continue to support community housing providers and state government housing providers to plan and deliver affordable housing.

• Collaborate with Newcastle University/TAFE for the provision of appropriate student accommodation and undertaking research into local housing affordability issues.

• Continue to work with Hunter Development Corporation to explore affordable housing opportunities as part of the City Centre Renewal Program.

• Continued membership of the Urban Development Institute of Australia and the Property Council of Australia.

An Affordable Living Round Table was facilitated by Council prior to finalising this Plan. The Round Table brought together people with an interest in affordable living. As a result, an Affordable Living Focus Group has been established to bring together stakeholders to share knowledge and support affordable living opportunities across the housing supply continuum in the Newcastle LGA. There was strong support at both the Affordable Living Round Table and within the Affordable Living Focus Group for a single point of information, such as a webpage, to provide information including the existing controls and incentives for affordable housing, and identification of parties interested in participating in affordable housing developments.

The feasibility of hosting a web page, developing an app or other tools to support education, collaboration and information
exchange between people and organisations interested in affordable living should be investigated. Consideration could be given to developing this portal in conjunction with action 3.4 of Program 3 of the Smart City Strategy which is to "Create an online portal informing industry and start-ups about current and future partnering opportunities and as a mechanism to receive innovative partner proposals."

**Bond Aggregation and Rent to Buy Schemes**

Bond aggregation schemes are designed to aggregate and source large amounts of capital from the bond market so as to provide lower interest, long-term loans to not-for-profit community housing providers (CHPs) developing housing for lower income households. The intention is that money would be raised efficiently with reduced financing costs rather than inexpensive one-off transactions such as when borrowing from a bank.

The benefits of a bond aggregator scheme are that it is relatively simple and transparent; minimises the impact of debt on government budgets; draws on the successful experience and expertise of other countries; provides lower cost finance to community housing providers and therefore is likely to maximise the sustainable expansion of affordable housing stock.

Rent to buy schemes can be used to assist people to enter the housing market. The United Kingdom currently operates a rent to buy scheme which is designed to ease the transition from renting to buying a home. The scheme is managed by housing associations. Newly built homes are provided to eligible people for rent at approximately 20% below the market rate for up to five years. During that period the occupier has the option to buy the property or to buy part of the property.
## Actions for affordable living

This section summarises the opportunities identified in the previous section of this plan ‘Opportunities for affordable living in Newcastle’ and recommends timeframes for investigation of the specific actions.

# 1. Opportunities for housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Area</th>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Timeframe (years)</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.1 Urban development program | Work with the Department of Planning and Environment, to effectively monitor the delivery of housing, including affordable housing, to achieve dwelling targets contained in the Hunter Regional Plan (ie 6,000 new dwellings for the city centre and 16,800 dwellings across the LGA to 2036) to:  
  - minimise upward pressure on house purchase and rental prices; and  
  - ensure the provisions in the LEP and DCP are facilitating greater residential development in the five renewal corridors and the residential growth precincts. | Ongoing           | DPE    | Council                   |
| 1.2 Inclusionary zoning | (a) Investigate the development of a policy for inclusionary zoning which can be used in connection with planning agreements to facilitate the supply of affordable housing when land is being zoned for increased residential development.  
  (b) Engage with the Department of Planning and Environment to make relevant amendments to State Environmental Planning Policies/Local Environmental Plan to allow inclusionary zoning. | 1-2               | Council| Industry                  |
| 1.3 Housing Strategy | Review the Local Planning Strategy to ensure that it identifies and plans for housing needs across the housing supply continuum consistent with the Hunter Regional Plan 2036 and draft Hunter Metropolitan Plan. | 1-2               | Council| Community/ Government /Industry |
| 1.4 LEP and DCP provisions | Investigate amendments to the Newcastle Local Environmental Plan 2012 and Newcastle Development Control Plan 2012 to:  
  (a) include a specific aim within the | 2-4 and ongoing   | Council| Community/ Government /Industry |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>LEP to encourage affordable and adaptable housing including a mix of housing types.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(h)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **1.5 Incentives** | **(a)** | Investigate incentives to encourage:  
- the development of smaller low consumption dwellings  
- the use of deliberative housing development, such as housing co-operatives.  
For example, reduce developer contributions for new dwellings that meet particular sustainable design standards in well serviced locations such as identified renewal corridors. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>(b)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|---|---|---
| | 4+ | Council |
funding, using Council land as security, or investment in local capped profit deliberative development demonstration projects (e.g. Nightingale Model)

| Monitoring | Identify key indicators and tools to measure the implementation and effectiveness of this Plan. | 1 | Council | Affordable Living Focus Group |

### 2. Opportunities for transport

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Area</th>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2.1 LEP and DCP provisions | Ensure the provisions in the LEP and DCP support the goals and actions detailed in Council’s Transport Strategy and Cycling Strategy and Action Plan. In particular:  
- strengthen development provisions to facilitate walking and riding  
- review development controls for parking  
- facilitate opportunities for establishment of car share schemes  
- consider whether bicycle parking rates and end of journey facilities are appropriate  
- investigate the inclusion of an LEP provision to support the existing DCP requirements for the provision of end of trip facilities by excluding end of trip facilities from the floor space calculation in commercial developments. | 2-4 | Council | Community / Government / Industry |
| 2.2 Development contributions | Review Council’s development contribution plans to:  
- ensure the extent of transport works supports the desired development patterns and projections of the Local Planning Strategy  
- allow for expenditure of contributions on a range of transport facilities including sustainable transport measures, such as park and ride. | 2-4 | Council | Community/ Government/ Industry |
## Sharing Economy

Investigate the development of a policy to identify the ways in which Newcastle City Council can support new sharing economy initiatives, and to identify where intervention may be needed to prevent adverse impacts.

### Opportunities for and recreation and services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Area</th>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3.1 LEP and DCP provisions | Ensure the provisions in the LEP and DCP support the strategic directions and actions detailed in Council’s Parkland Recreation Strategy. In particular:  
- Consider the inclusion of guidelines that encourage and promote sustainable food initiatives and access to fresh food locally such as rooftop edible gardens; community food gardens and use of street gardens to grow edible plants. | 2-4       | Council |          |

### Opportunities for education, collaboration and advocacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Area</th>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Education (a)</td>
<td>Work with relevant industry groups such as the Architects Institute of Australia and the Building Designers Association to implement a program to educate the community, building designers, developers and builders on the benefits of incorporating adaptable and sustainable design elements in residential buildings.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>Develop a community engagement program to explain the meaning of affordable housing and the benefits that such housing brings to the community.</td>
<td>1 and On-going</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 4.2 Advocacy (a) | Advocate for changes to state environmental planning policies and the standard instrument local environmental plan to make it easier for Councils to implement affordable living initiatives, such as inclusionary zoning. | On-going | Council |          |
(b) Advocate for changes to State Government Policy so that surplus land can be sold below market rate for affordable rental housing and/or deliberative housing development. **On-going**

(c) Continue to advocate for public transport improvements. **On-going**

(d) Advocate to Federal and State governments for a minimum 10% affordable housing to be provided in appropriate scaled residential and mixed use development. **On-going**

(e) Advocate for changes to the National Construction Code to incorporate standards for liveable housing. **On-going**

(f) Support the Federal government in the development of affordable housing schemes such as bond aggregation, or rent to buy schemes. **On-going**

(g) Support the ‘Everybody's Home’ campaign. **On-going** **Compass Housing**

<p>| 4.3 Collaboration | (a) Continue to provide support to community organisations to improve their ability to plan and deliver appropriate and accessible services to the community. | On-going |
| (b) Continue to support community housing providers and state government housing providers to plan and deliver affordable housing. | On-going |
| (c) Collaborate with Newcastle University / TAFE for the provision of appropriate student accommodation and undertaking research into local housing affordability issues. | On-going |
| (d) Continue to work with Urban Growth, to explore affordable housing opportunities as part of the City Centre Renewal Program. | On-going |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>Continued membership of the Urban Development Institute of Australia and the Property Council of Australia.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f)</td>
<td>Continue to facilitate the Affordable Living Focus Group focus group of key stakeholders to share knowledge and support affordable living opportunities across the Newcastle area.</td>
<td>On-going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g)</td>
<td>Investigate the feasibility of hosting and/or collaborating with other organisations to host a web page, develop an app or other tools to support education, collaboration and information exchange between people and organisations interested in affordable living. This may include organisations such as Hunter Councils, University of Newcastle, Hunter Development Corporation.</td>
<td>1-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX 1 - Legislation and Policy

New Urban Agenda and Sustainable Development goals

Habitat III, the third United Nations conference on housing and sustainable development was held in Quito, Ecuador in 2016, where world leaders, including Australia, adopted a New Urban Agenda. The new Urban Agenda sets a new global standard for sustainable urban development, and provides a roadmap for building cities that can serve as engines of prosperity and centres of cultural and social well-being while protecting the environment (United Nations, 2016). National governments and local authorities will be responsible for implementing the Agenda, with technical and financial partnerships and assistance from the international community.

The key commitments in the New Urban Agenda are:

• provide basic services for all citizens
• ensure that all citizens have access to equal opportunities and face no discrimination
• promote measures to support cleaner cities
• strengthen resilience in cities to reduce the risk and impact of disasters
• take action to address climate change by reducing their greenhouse gas emissions
• fully respect the rights of refugees, migrants and internally displaced persons regardless of their migration status.
• improve connectivity and support innovative and green initiatives
• promote safe, accessible and green public spaces.

This Affordable Living Plan supports the goals of the New Urban Agenda.

State Legislation

The Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 and the Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation 2000 regulate the planning and development assessment functions of Council. Providing and maintaining affordable housing is one of the objectives of the Act.

The NSW State Government has also implemented a number of State Environmental Planning Policies to increase the supply and diversity of affordable housing across the state. These include:

• State Environmental Planning Policy (Affordable Rental Housing) 2009. This Policy includes incentives to encourage the retention of existing affordable rental housing and deliver new affordable rental housing. Some of the incentives include: expanded zoning permissibility, floor space ratio bonuses and non-discretionary development standards. This Policy provides opportunities for the development of infill affordable housing, secondary dwellings (granny flats) and boarding houses.

• State Environmental Planning Policy (Housing for Seniors or People with a Disability) 2004. The aim of this Policy is to increase the supply and diversity of housing that meets the needs of seniors or people with a disability. The Policy sets aside local planning controls that may prevent the development of housing for seniors or people living with a disability. The Policy provides development standards for residential care facilities, hostels and self-contained dwellings.
• **State Environmental Planning Policy No. 36 - Manufactured Home Estates.** The aim of this Policy is to facilitate the establishment of manufactured home estates as a contemporary form of medium density residential development and to encourage the provision of affordable housing. The Policy ensures that manufactured home estates are permissible wherever a caravan park is permissible. It also sets out matters that a Council must consider when determining a development application for a manufactured home estate.

**Hunter Regional Plan 2036**

The Hunter Regional Plan 2036 is the NSW government's plan to guide land use planning priorities and decisions over the next 20 years. The plan provides a framework to guide more detailed land use plans, development proposals and infrastructure funding decisions. The plan includes overarching directions, goals and actions as well as specific priorities for each local government area in the Hunter region. The Hunter Regional Plan 2036 includes four goals for the Hunter Region:

**Goal 1:** the leading regional economy in Australia

**Goal 2:** a biodiversity-rich natural environment

**Goal 3:** thriving communities

**Goal 4:** greater housing choice and jobs.

Specific directions and actions identify a range of initiatives needed to meet each goal. The concept of affordable living also aligns with the goals for the Hunter Region.

**Draft Greater Newcastle Metropolitan Plan 2036**

The Draft Greater Newcastle Metropolitan Plan 2036 sets out strategies and actions that will drive sustainable growth across the five local government areas, including Newcastle, which make up the Greater Newcastle metropolitan area. Whilst the Hunter Regional Plan set the vision for the Hunter, the draft Greater Newcastle Metropolitan Plan delivers a collaborative framework for a significant part of the Regional Plan, by setting out outcomes and strategies to be an integrated metropolitan city. It also provides strategies and actions to create great places across Greater Newcastle and align infrastructure and services in catalyst areas.

This Affordable Living Plan supports the vision of the draft Greater Newcastle Metropolitan Plan which is:

"Australia’s newest and emerging economic and lifestyle city, acknowledged globally:

- as a dynamic and entrepreneurial city, with a globally competitive economy, the excitement of the inner city and green suburban communities;
- as a place that offers great lifestyles minutes from beaches or bushland, the airport or universities, and from the port to the lake; and
- as a national leader in the new economy, with collaborative governance that makes it a model to others in creating and adapting to change."
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Newcastle 2030 Community Strategic Plan

The concept of affordable living aligns with the community vision of a smart, liveable and sustainable city identified in the Newcastle 2030 Community Strategic Plan. This vision has been developed with the guiding principles of ecologically sustainable development, social justice and local democracy. The seven strategic directions detailed in Newcastle 2030 are:

- **Connected City** - Transport networks and services will be well connected and convenient. Walking, cycling, and public transport will be viable options for the majority of our trips.
- **Protected and Enhanced Environment** - Our unique environment will be understood, maintained, and protected.
- **Vibrant and Activated Public Places** - A city of great public places and neighbourhoods promoting people’s health, happiness, and wellbeing.
- **Caring and Inclusive Community** - A thriving community where diversity is embraced, everyone is valued and has the opportunity to contribute and belong.
- **Liveable and Distinct Environment** - An attractive city that is built around people and reflects our sense of identity.
- **Smart and Innovative City** - A leader in innovations with a healthy, diverse and resilient economy.
- **Open and Collaborative Leadership** - A strong local democracy with an actively engaged community and effective partnerships.

This Affordable Living Plan details the opportunities for Council to facilitate affordable living within the Newcastle local government area and complements actions identified in other Council strategies and plans to make Newcastle a smart liveable and sustainable city. These Strategies and Plans include:

- Local Planning Strategy (2015)
- Social Strategy (2015)
- Cultural Strategy (2015)
- Newcastle Transport Strategy (2014)
- Parkland and Recreation Strategy (2014)

**Newcastle Local Planning Strategy and Newcastle Urbanism**

The concept of affordable living aligns with the principles of 'Newcastle Urbanism' and the specific principles, directions, and neighbourhood visions for residential lands described in the Local Planning Strategy (2015). The Local Planning Strategy can be viewed on the Newcastle City Council website [www.newcastle.nsw.gov.au](http://www.newcastle.nsw.gov.au)

'New Urbanism' is an urban design movement which promotes walkable neighbourhoods that contain a range of housing and job types. It is strongly influenced by urban design standards that were prominent until the rise of the car and embodies principles such as traditional neighbourhood design based upon a framework of centres and transit-orientated development. These principles have been adapted to be locally relevant and termed "Newcastle Urbanism".

Newcastle Urbanism has been embodied in the strategic directions for residential lands identified in the Local Planning Strategy. These are:
1. Ensure sufficient housing capacity for our future population.
2. Ensure sufficient housing diversity to meet community needs.
3. Encourage adaptable housing that can meet the needs of residents throughout the life cycle to enable people to 'age-in-place', supporting more sustainable housing growth in our city.
4. Facilitate affordable living.
5. Concentrate housing growth around transport and centres, where appropriate services and amenities exist.
6. Streets are the primary public spaces for access and exchange between people, and should be made safe, friendly, attractive and efficient.
7. Ensure permitted land uses are consistent with the zone directions.
8. Development will enhance the City's identity through:
   - consideration of the neighbourhood visions and objectives
   - compatible built form, landscaping and activation of public spaces.

Increasing the density of housing in existing urban areas can reduce housing costs because of savings in infrastructure costs, reduced lot sizes and greater choice in dwelling types. Smaller, well designed, low-rise medium density homes are desirable because they:
   - are less expensive to build;
   - do not need major site amalgamation
   - perform better environmentally than most high-rise housing
   - can deliver a greater mix of more affordable housing types
   - fit into existing streets and neighbourhoods
   - suit a wide range of demographic groups (Department of Planning and Infrastructure, 2011)

Housing located close to work and play also has other benefits. It can reduce living costs associated with transport and also improve health outcomes and social interaction as people spend less time commuting to and from work, are able to walk to services and shops and have greater opportunities to participate in community activities.

To embed these principles in local planning all residential land has been placed into one of the following categories.

- **Renewal corridors** - these include areas based on high transport accessibility and are focused upon (and between) the major local commercial centres of Islington, Mayfield, Hamilton, Broadmeadow and Adamstown. The renewal corridors provide for the highest residential density of development outside of the Newcastle city centre.

- **Substantial Growth Precinct** - this precinct covers the areas which are within a SAFE 10 minute walk of major local centres and some railway stations. This provides for the greatest density of development (outside the renewal corridors) to facilitate and support the major local centres and Newcastle Urbanism.

- **Moderate Growth Precinct** - this precinct covers areas within a SAFE 5 minute walk of minor local centres or neighbourhood centres. This precinct forms a transition between the substantial and limited precincts.

- **Limited Growth Precinct** - this precinct covers the remaining residential zoned land outside of the
substantial and moderate precincts. Development in this precinct is intended to be limited as it does not satisfy the principles of Newcastle Urbanism.

Local Environmental Plan

The Newcastle Local Environmental Plan 2012 details what development may be undertaken in different locations within the local government area. Encouraging a diversity of housing types in suitable locations is one of the aims of the Newcastle Local Environmental Plan.

In the Newcastle local government area, residential lands are zoned:

- **R2 Low Density Residential** - this zone provides for a diversity of small scale housing forms, such as houses, dual occupancies and townhouses, which respect the character, heritage and amenity of the surrounding development.

- **R3 Medium Density Residential** - this zone provides for a diversity of medium scale housing types, such as townhouses and residential flat buildings, where larger numbers of people can be accommodated and provide support to commercial centres.

- **R4 High Density Residential** - this zone provides for large scale housing types such as residential flat buildings in areas that are within walkable distances of commercial centres and within transport corridors.
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Attachment B: Summary of submissions
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-housing and Co-operative housing</td>
<td><strong>Co-housing and co-operative housing have now been addressed in the Affordable Living Plan and a specific action included to review the DCP to ensure that it facilitates different housing models such as co-housing and co-operative housing.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>An action has been proposed to investigate the feasibility of hosting a webpage to support education, collaboration and information exchange including co-housing and co-operatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Noted</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing supply</td>
<td><strong>Noted</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Noted</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Noted</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Noted</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Noted</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Noted</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Noted</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Noted</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cohousing and co-operative housing models support the objectives of the Affordable Living Plan as these developments are able to reduce the cost of delivering housing, reduce environmental impact, promote community cohesion and reduce the social isolation of residents.

The Plan is an opportunity for Council to integrate innovative solutions to housing problems using the co-operative and co-housing models.

The Plan should include a specific reference to co-housing as a strategy which can assist achievement of affordable and sustainable living and housing.

NCC develop a policy and actively assist groups seeking to establish co-housing communities in Newcastle.

Important to understand that where costs increase for housing in the open market, this will have an impact on affordable and social housing.

While the affordable housing sector needs investment, there also needs to be a significant release and development of new supply in the broader market to close the residential dwelling gap.

Declining affordability for first home buyers has implications for the rest of the housing system. The housing market is a continuum and high prices impact on the rest of the market.

The promotion of housing renewal and intensification along corridors in close proximity to public transport and other services supports the actions of the Hunter Regional Transport Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Housing Diversity             | • Encourage Council to look at incentives for the delivery of diverse housing typologies.  
• Caravan parks and boarding houses are best considered as a short term option rather than a viable alternative to social and affordable housing.  
Council already permits a broad range of diverse housing typologies across each residential zone.  
An action has been proposed to review DCP controls to facilitate new forms of housing.  
Noted                                                                 |
| Urban Development Program     | • Support the use of an urban development program (UDP), however we strongly encourage NCC to keep its own records on population growth and housing starts. The NCC UDP should be publicly available and updated regularly (eg quarterly).  
An action has been proposed to investigate the feasibility of hosting a webpage to support education, collaboration and information exchange. A local UDP may form part of such a program. |
| Incentives                    | • Interested in feasibility of LEP incentive clause for bonus development yield if part affordable housing provided.  
• Reduced DA fees and rates should be considered  
Noted                                                                 |
| Inclusionary zoning           | • Inclusionary zoning and any policies that increase the costs of housing more broadly should not be adopted until the full impacts are understood as it could serve to drive up the price of market dwellings.  
• Welcome Council's commitment to inclusionary zoning, however, also cognizant of the state legislative restrictions that currently prevent it being implemented.  
• Council should carefully consider the use of inclusionary zoning as a planning tool for affordable housing. In our experience it works better in higher value locations and may not work in all locations across the LGA.  
• If an inclusionary zoning policy is pursued where a levy is used, the economics of this should be investigated.  
• In our experience, one of the more easy incentives is a reduction in S94 fees for affordable housing (eg Port Stephens Council).  
Due to legislative restrictions, inclusionary zoning would only be undertaken on a voluntary basis through the planning agreement process. It is proposed to develop a policy to ensure transparency and consistency in the negotiation of planning agreements that include affordable housing. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • If Council uses Planning Agreements it is recommended that Council have a transparent policy.  
• Collection and spending of any funds needs to be transparent.  
• Mandatory inclusionary zoning or targets for affordable housing are not supported. | |
| DCP and LEP controls | • The assumption that design elements from the Liveable Housing Design Guidelines can be incorporated without significantly increasing cost is not sound.  
The silver level does not result in significant construction cost increases as this design level focuses on simple changes to key structural and spatial elements that are critical to ensure future flexibility and adaptability of the home. The Liveable Housing Design Guidelines are supported by a number of major development companies, industry groups such as the Property Council of Australia and community organisations. The state government have also included compliance with the silver level design guidelines as a mandatory requirement for medium density complying development. |
| New Urban Agenda | • Pleased to see Council's recognition of the central place the New Urban Agenda must play in government responses to the challenge of providing the basic human right of adequate and affordable housing.  
Noted |
| Collaboration | • University and FBusL can be a collaborative partner by providing co-operative education, training and research  
• Compass would be receptive to working in collaboration with Council of future education and advocacy initiatives that would influence changes to state planning policies and the standard instrument LEP to make it easier for Councils to implement  
Noted |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| affordable living initiatives.| • Council should also be a member of the HIA to ensure greater connection between the Council and Industry.  
• Common Equity would welcome an opportunity to be part of further workshops, consultations or advisory groups relating to the affordable living plan. |