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### Operating progress at a Glance as at 28 February, 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><strong>Executive Management</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO's Office</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication and Engagement</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning &amp; Regulatory</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning &amp; Regulatory Director</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>(95)</td>
<td>-48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development &amp; Building</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Increased fees arising from larger and more complex applications</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Planning</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Services</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Overall higher revenue in fines than expected</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Facilities</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>113</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Corporate Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Services Director</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>(65)</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Services</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>77</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Service</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal and Governance</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>(49)</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Infrastructure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Director</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Planning</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>157</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Works</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>134</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects and Contracts</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities &amp; Recreation</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>278</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Management</td>
<td>❗</td>
<td>- Expenditure on the NSW State Waste Levy is above budget due to higher than forecast tonnages.</td>
<td>(1,028)</td>
<td>-16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Operating Analysis as at 28 February, 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department / Service Unit</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Var ($'000)</th>
<th>Var(%)</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating Revenue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rates and charges</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User charges &amp; fees</td>
<td></td>
<td>437</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Council is generating above budget revenue through development applications - Development applications - $0.3m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other operating revenues</td>
<td></td>
<td>263</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Increase in fines in relation to Annual Fire Safety Statements - Fine revenue - $0.1m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants &amp; contributions - Operating</td>
<td></td>
<td>(49)</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Operating Expenses**    |           |              |        |       |             |
| Employee costs            |           | (151)        | 0%     |       | - Lower than forecast staff costs due to timing of the project program and general vacancies - Staff costs |
| Borrowing costs           |           | (2)          | 0%     |       |             |
| Materials & Contracts     |           | (437)        | -1%    |       |             |
| Depreciation & Amortisation|       | 7            | 0%     |       |             |
| Other operating expenses  |           | 928          | 3%     |       | - Expenditure on the NSW State Waste Levy is above budget due to higher than forecast tonnages - State waste levy - $0.7m |
| Net Loss from Disposal of Assets | | 0 | 0% | | |
### Overall Budget Funding Summary

**Result for the financial period ending 28 February, 2018**

#### Full Year Revised Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YTD Revised Budget $'000</th>
<th>YTD Actual Result $'000</th>
<th>Variance $'000</th>
<th>Variance %</th>
<th>Financial Impact +ve / -ve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating Revenue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rates &amp; charges</td>
<td>156,106</td>
<td>103,279</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User charges &amp; fees</td>
<td>81,934</td>
<td>56,775</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>9,242</td>
<td>5,976</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other operating revenues</td>
<td>10,417</td>
<td>8,028</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants &amp; contributions - Operating</td>
<td>16,090</td>
<td>7,779</td>
<td>(49)</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating Revenue</strong></td>
<td>273,789</td>
<td>181,186</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating Expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee costs</td>
<td>96,893</td>
<td>62,550</td>
<td>(151)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowing costs</td>
<td>3,742</td>
<td>2,706</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; contracts</td>
<td>75,951</td>
<td>51,430</td>
<td>(427)</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation &amp; amortisation</td>
<td>41,422</td>
<td>27,142</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other operating expenses</td>
<td>49,741</td>
<td>36,996</td>
<td>928</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Loss from disposal of assets</td>
<td>6,029</td>
<td>4,019</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating Expenses</strong></td>
<td>273,778</td>
<td>183,915</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating Revenue Less Operating Expenditure</strong></td>
<td>(2,729)</td>
<td>(2,433)</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>-11%</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Revenues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants &amp; contributions - Capital</td>
<td>18,838</td>
<td>13,849</td>
<td>1,290</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proceeds from the sale of Assets</td>
<td>2,548</td>
<td>1,804</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Capital Raising revenue</strong></td>
<td>21,386</td>
<td>15,653</td>
<td>1,395</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Surplus/(deficit) after capital revenue</strong></td>
<td>21,397</td>
<td>11,528</td>
<td>1,691</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adjustments for Non Cash Items</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add back Depreciation</td>
<td>41,422</td>
<td>27,142</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add back loss on Disposal</td>
<td>6,029</td>
<td>4,019</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less land &amp; infrastructure donations</td>
<td>(4,600)</td>
<td>(3,067)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding available for capital expenditure</strong></td>
<td>64,248</td>
<td>41,321</td>
<td>1,698</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital Expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asset renewals</td>
<td>22,641</td>
<td>21,273</td>
<td>1,172</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 SRV Priority Projects</td>
<td>14,134</td>
<td>7,673</td>
<td>(2,248)</td>
<td>-23%</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New / upgrade</td>
<td>7,493</td>
<td>3,397</td>
<td>(2,535)</td>
<td>-43%</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Infrastructure Projects</td>
<td>10,677</td>
<td>4,824</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total capital spend</strong></td>
<td>54,945</td>
<td>37,167</td>
<td>(3,147)</td>
<td>-8%</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan Principal Repayment</td>
<td>2,882</td>
<td>1,921</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Funds Generated / (Used)</strong></td>
<td>6,421</td>
<td>(2,613)</td>
<td>2,233</td>
<td>-185%</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note 1** - Actual and Budget results include an estimate for the Newcastle Airport
## Newcastle City Council

**For the month ending 28 February, 2018**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Executive Management</th>
<th>Planning &amp; Regulatory</th>
<th>Corporate Services</th>
<th>Infrastructure</th>
<th>Airport</th>
<th>The City of Newcastle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>YTD Budget</strong> $'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>YTD Actual</strong> $'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Var ($)</td>
<td>Var(%)</td>
<td>Var ($)</td>
<td>Var (%)</td>
<td>Var (%)</td>
<td>Var (%)</td>
<td>Var (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating Revenue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Rates &amp; charges</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>89,377</td>
<td>89,377</td>
<td>13,112</td>
<td>13,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>103,279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 User charges &amp; fees</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>10,587</td>
<td>11,047</td>
<td>2,619</td>
<td>2,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Interest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,771</td>
<td>5,771</td>
<td>33,459</td>
<td>33,459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>56,338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Other operating revenues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,477</td>
<td>3,502</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7,765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Grants &amp; contributions - Operating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,186</td>
<td>5,155</td>
<td>1,805</td>
<td>1,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7,828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating Revenue</strong></td>
<td>483</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>15,909</td>
<td>16,654</td>
<td>48,773</td>
<td>48,711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9,591</td>
<td>9,591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>181,186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>181,837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating Expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Employee costs</td>
<td>8,655</td>
<td>8,633</td>
<td>15,906</td>
<td>15,931</td>
<td>29,106</td>
<td>28,914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,819</td>
<td>1,819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Borrowing costs</td>
<td>2,551</td>
<td>2,549</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>2,704</td>
<td>2,704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Materials &amp; contracts</td>
<td>3,012</td>
<td>3,009</td>
<td>3,125</td>
<td>3,031</td>
<td>51,480</td>
<td>51,003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Depreciation &amp; amortisation</td>
<td>687</td>
<td>687</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>51,275</td>
<td>50,821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Other operating expenses</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>2,431</td>
<td>2,523</td>
<td>36,496</td>
<td>36,196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Net Loss from disposal of assets</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,019</td>
<td>4,019</td>
<td>4,019</td>
<td>36,496</td>
<td>36,196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating Expenses</strong></td>
<td>12,949</td>
<td>12,923</td>
<td>29,170</td>
<td>29,252</td>
<td>117,947</td>
<td>118,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7,002</td>
<td>7,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>183,915</td>
<td>184,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>355</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating Revenue Less Operating Expenditure</strong></td>
<td>(12,466)</td>
<td>(12,427)</td>
<td>(13,251)</td>
<td>(12,598)</td>
<td>(89,583)</td>
<td>(89,557)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Executive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CEO Office</th>
<th>Human Resources</th>
<th>Information Technology</th>
<th>Communications &amp; Engagement</th>
<th>Executive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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><strong>Operating Revenue</strong></td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Rates &amp; charges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>306</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 User charges &amp; fees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>303</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Interest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Other operating revenues</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>194</td>
<td></td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Grants &amp; contributions - Operating</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>194</td>
<td></td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating Revenue</strong></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating Expenses</strong></td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Employee costs</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>5,454</td>
<td>5,472</td>
<td>1,759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Borrowing costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Materials &amp; contracts</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>2,026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Depreciation &amp; amortisation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Other operating expenses</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating Expenses</strong></td>
<td>955</td>
<td>938</td>
<td>5,859</td>
<td>5,875</td>
<td>4,885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating Revenue Less Operating Expenditure</strong></td>
<td>(955)</td>
<td>(939)</td>
<td>(5,682)</td>
<td>(5,681)</td>
<td>(4,579)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Development &amp; Build.</td>
<td>Strategic Planning</td>
<td>Regulatory Services</td>
<td>Cultural Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YTD Revenue</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>790</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>1,931</td>
<td>2,069</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User charges &amp; fees</td>
<td>2,441</td>
<td>2,734</td>
<td>5,285</td>
<td>5,337</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1,347</td>
<td>1,392</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other operating revenues</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Operating Revenue</td>
<td>2,441</td>
<td>2,734</td>
<td>1,790</td>
<td>1,793</td>
<td>7,942</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operating Expenses</th>
<th>YTD Budget $'000</th>
<th>YTD Actual $'000</th>
<th>YTD Budget $'000</th>
<th>YTD Actual $'000</th>
<th>YTD Budget $'000</th>
<th>YTD Actual $'000</th>
<th>YTD Budget $'000</th>
<th>YTD Actual $'000</th>
<th>YTD Budget $'000</th>
<th>YTD Actual $'000</th>
<th>Var ($)</th>
<th>Var(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee costs</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>3,277</td>
<td>3,265</td>
<td>3,569</td>
<td>3,565</td>
<td>3,287</td>
<td>3,279</td>
<td>15,906</td>
<td>15,931</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowing costs</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>2,780</td>
<td>2,754</td>
<td>2,002</td>
<td>2,005</td>
<td>7,534</td>
<td>7,499</td>
<td>(35)</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; contracts</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>1,785</td>
<td>1,785</td>
<td>1,086</td>
<td>1,086</td>
<td>3,299</td>
<td>3,299</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation &amp;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>991</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>2,431</td>
<td>2,523</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amortisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other operating expenses</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>991</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>2,431</td>
<td>2,523</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Operating</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>3,345</td>
<td>3,306</td>
<td>7,174</td>
<td>7,115</td>
<td>4,872</td>
<td>4,954</td>
<td>29,170</td>
<td>29,252</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Total Operating Revenue Less Operating Expenditure | (198) | (293) | (557) | (5,322) | 3,070 | 3,312 | (4,917) | (4,804) | (13,261) | (12,598) | 663 | 5% |
|                  | Director YTD Budget $’000 | Director YTD Actual $’000 | Finance YTD Budget $’000 | Finance YTD Actual $’000 | Property Services YTD Budget $’000 | Property Services YTD Actual $’000 | Customer Service YTD Budget $’000 | Customer Service YTD Actual $’000 | Legal &amp; Governance YTD Budget $’000 | Legal &amp; Governance YTD Actual $’000 | Corporate Services YTD Budget $’000 | Corporate Services YTD Actual $’000 | Var ($) | Var(%) |
|-----------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------|--------|
| Operating Revenue |                                          |                            |                          |                          |                                  |                                  |                                  |                                  |                                  |                                   |                                   |         |        |
| 1 Rates &amp; charges | 89,362                    | 89,362                    | 15                      | 15                       |                                  |                                  |                                  |                                  |                                  |                                   |                                   |         |        |
| 2 User charges &amp; fees | 286                      | 303                       | 2,109                    | 2,087                    | 220                              | 185                              | 4                                | 5                                |                                  |                                   |                                   |         |        |
| 3 Interest       | 5,771                     | 5,771                     | 15                      | 15                       |                                  |                                  |                                  |                                  |                                  |                                   |                                   |         |        |
| 4 Other operating revenues | 1,342       | 1,303                     | 2,061                    | 2,195                    | 3                                | 3                                | 71                               | 1                                |                                  |                                   |                                   |         |        |
| 5 Grants &amp; contributions - Operating | 5,186       | 5,155                     |                          |                          |                                  |                                  |                                  |                                  |                                  |                                   |                                   |         |        |
| Total Operating Revenue | 101,947     | 101,894                   | 4,185                    | 4,297                    | 223                              | 188                              | 75                               | 6                                | 106,430                          | 106,385                          | (45)    | 0%     |
| Operating Expenses |                                          |                            |                          |                          |                                  |                                  |                                  |                                  |                                  |                                   |                                   |         |        |
| 6 Employee costs | 226                       | 226                       | 3,140                    | 3,137                    | 498                              | 568                              | 2,170                            | 2,147                            | 1,030                            | 1,024                            | 7,064   | 7,102  |
| 7 Borrowing costs | 2,514                     | 2,514                     | 37                      | 35                       |                                  |                                  |                                  |                                  |                                  |                                   |                                   |         |        |
| 8 Materials &amp; contracts | 21                      | 3                        | 500                      | 477                      | 1,498                            | 1,455                            | 706                              | 702                              | 400                              | 394                              | 3,125   | 3,031  |
| 9 Depreciation &amp; amortisation | 306         | 304                       | 12                      | 12                       | 35                               | 35                               | 353                              | 351                              | 353                              | 351                              | 353     | 351    |
| 10 Other operating expenses | 1,942       | 1,980                     | 268                      | 280                      | 4                                | 3                                | 1,540                            | 1,532                            | 3,754                            | 3,795                            | 41      | 41     |
| 11 Net Loss from disposal of assets |              |                           |                          |                          |                                  |                                  |                                  |                                  |                                  |                                   |                                   |         |        |
| Total Operating Expenses | 247          | 229                       | 8,096                    | 8,108                    | 2,607                            | 2,642                            | 2,892                            | 2,864                            | 3,005                            | 2,985                            | 16,847  | 16,828 |
| Less Operating Expenditure |              |                           |                          |                          |                                  |                                  |                                  |                                  |                                  |                                   |                                   |         |        |
| Total Operating Revenue |              |                           |                          |                          |                                  |                                  |                                  |                                  |                                  |                                   |                                   |         |        |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infrastructure Projects &amp; Contracts</th>
<th>Waste Management</th>
<th>Infrastructure Planning</th>
<th>Civil Works</th>
<th>Director</th>
<th>Operating Revenue</th>
<th>YTD Budget $'000</th>
<th>YTD Actual $'000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rates &amp; charges</td>
<td>1,055</td>
<td>1,055</td>
<td>13,112</td>
<td>13,112</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User charges &amp; fees</td>
<td>2,781</td>
<td>2,777</td>
<td>33,440</td>
<td>33,459</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other operating revenues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>214</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>1,745</td>
<td>1,745</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Operating Revenue</td>
<td>1,495</td>
<td>1,474</td>
<td>1,474</td>
<td>1,511</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Operating Expenses                |                 |                        |            |          | -1%              |                 |                 |
| Materials & contracts             |                 |                        | 7,926      | 7,815    | -1%              |                 |                 |
| Interest                           | 37,594          | 37,299                 | 21,645     | 21,645   | 0%               |                 |                 |
| Total Operating Expenses          | 266             | 252                    | 44,026     | 43,848   | 0%               |                 |                 |

| Total Operating Revenue            | (266)           | (252)                  | (42,531)   | (42,374)  | -1%              |                 |                 |
| Less Operating Expenditure         | (11,483)        | (11,349)               | (1,926)    | (1,861)   |                 | (19,433)        | (19,155)        |
|                                    | 6,465           | 5,437                  | (69,174)   | (69,554)  | -1%              |                 |                 |
# Rates Income as at 28 February, 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rates and Charges</th>
<th>YTD Budget (000's)</th>
<th>YTD Actual (000's)</th>
<th>Variance (000's)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Rates</td>
<td>87,938</td>
<td>87,938</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Waste</td>
<td>13,055</td>
<td>13,055</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater</td>
<td>1,313</td>
<td>1,313</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levies</td>
<td>964</td>
<td>964</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Rates</strong></td>
<td><strong>103,270</strong></td>
<td><strong>103,270</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- [Graph showing YTD Budget and YTD Actual for General Rates, Domestic Waste, Stormwater, and Levies]
Debtors Report as at 28 February, 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>128</td>
<td>$680,149.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Arrangements</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>$236,082.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferral against estate</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>$673,104.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>283</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,589,336</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Aged Debtors Report (Major Debtors Report)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Feb-18</th>
<th>Jan-18</th>
<th>Feb-17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>2,146,724</td>
<td>1,648,030</td>
<td>2,001,519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Days</td>
<td>147,620</td>
<td>1,941,638</td>
<td>1,405,635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 Days</td>
<td>368,278</td>
<td>1,483,844</td>
<td>230,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90 Days</td>
<td>1,353,603</td>
<td>827,045</td>
<td>852,779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,016,225</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,900,557</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,490,443</strong></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>412,336</td>
<td>412,336</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veolia Environmental</td>
<td>Waste Management</td>
<td>432,022</td>
<td>432,022</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enviropacific Services</td>
<td>Waste Management</td>
<td>599,471</td>
<td>25,104</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>141,353</td>
<td>433,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMCC</td>
<td>Waste Management</td>
<td>319,107</td>
<td>319,107</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transpacific Cleanaway</td>
<td>Waste Management</td>
<td>102,372</td>
<td>102,372</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beresfield Child Care</td>
<td>Strategic Planning</td>
<td>118,437</td>
<td>118,437</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Stephens Council</td>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>129,651</td>
<td>129,651</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jemena</td>
<td>Civil Works</td>
<td>121,996</td>
<td>36,905</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>44,648</td>
<td>40,403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter Development Corporation</td>
<td>Infrastructure Planning</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Local Government</td>
<td>Corporate Services</td>
<td>148,183</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>148,183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasury/Crown Finance Entity</td>
<td>Strategic Planning</td>
<td>283,438</td>
<td>283,438</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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Portfolio/Program</th>
<th>Full Year Revised Budget $,000</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>Buildings, Structures and Places</td>
<td>29,688</td>
<td>20,417</td>
<td>21,385</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic Centres</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>-10%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackbutt Reserve</td>
<td>2,262</td>
<td>1,262</td>
<td>817</td>
<td>-35%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings - Council Support Services</td>
<td>2,803</td>
<td>1,676</td>
<td>1,775</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caravan Parks and Commercial Properties</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-67%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Centre Revitalisation</td>
<td>1,587</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>-56%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Revitalisation</td>
<td>11,387</td>
<td>8,533</td>
<td>10,488</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Buildings</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>847</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Facilities</td>
<td>4,023</td>
<td>2,447</td>
<td>1,814</td>
<td>-26%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>1,330</td>
<td>1,711</td>
<td>1,374</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>103%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Parks and Sporting Facilities</td>
<td>2,928</td>
<td>1,595</td>
<td>1,851</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Toilets</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>-68%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retaining Walls</td>
<td>1,460</td>
<td>1,420</td>
<td>1,641</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>112%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads</td>
<td>27,227</td>
<td>23,633</td>
<td>24,607</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridges</td>
<td>1,870</td>
<td>1,225</td>
<td>989</td>
<td>-19%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footpaths</td>
<td>1,569</td>
<td>1,363</td>
<td>1,322</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Furniture</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>-48%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Rehabilitation</td>
<td>11,791</td>
<td>9,457</td>
<td>9,071</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Resurfacing</td>
<td>11,202</td>
<td>11,018</td>
<td>12,931</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>115%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>5,824</td>
<td>3,188</td>
<td>2,667</td>
<td>-16%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycleways</td>
<td>2,236</td>
<td>1,551</td>
<td>1,159</td>
<td>-25%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Area Traffic Management</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-86%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Infrastructure</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-83%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Access and Mobility Plan</td>
<td>3,008</td>
<td>1,468</td>
<td>1,483</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater</td>
<td>7,948</td>
<td>4,373</td>
<td>2,660</td>
<td>-39%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Planning</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-97%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater System</td>
<td>7,310</td>
<td>4,100</td>
<td>2,653</td>
<td>-35%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>8,117</td>
<td>5,074</td>
<td>3,341</td>
<td>-34%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bushland and Watercourses</td>
<td>1,043</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>-19%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coast, Estuary and Wetlands</td>
<td>1,406</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>1,016</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street and Park Trees</td>
<td>1,159</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>-30%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Management</td>
<td>4,509</td>
<td>2,811</td>
<td>1,305</td>
<td>-54%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>4,724</td>
<td>2,743</td>
<td>2,082</td>
<td>-25%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation and Upgrade of Applications</td>
<td>2,151</td>
<td>1,433</td>
<td>1,142</td>
<td>-20%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Improvements</td>
<td>1,594</td>
<td>809</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>-41%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Systems Analysis</td>
<td>979</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>-11%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic</td>
<td>7,373</td>
<td>4,166</td>
<td>2,731</td>
<td>-34%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smart City</td>
<td>6,951</td>
<td>3,846</td>
<td>2,434</td>
<td>-37%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>-8%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Plans</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleet Replacement</td>
<td>3,847</td>
<td>1,916</td>
<td>1,411</td>
<td>-26%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleet Replacement</td>
<td>3,847</td>
<td>1,916</td>
<td>1,411</td>
<td>-26%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Capital</td>
<td>1,302</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Gallery Works of Art</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>118%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Resources</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>-6%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Meter Replacement</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Purchases</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleet Replacement</td>
<td>3,847</td>
<td>1,916</td>
<td>1,411</td>
<td>-26%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Works Program</td>
<td>95,850</td>
<td>66,326</td>
<td>61,661</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The Budget above is inclusive of operational and capital works
### Ward 4 Capital Works at 28 February, 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><em>(i) Wallsend bridge replacement</em></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>2018</td>
<td></td>
<td>Services and property interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(ii) Minmi Road footpath and road widening between Cowper Street and Macquarie Street</em></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><em>(iii) Water main replacement and road re-sealing Anderson Drive Tarro</em></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></td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(iv) Wallsend and Beresfield Public Domain Plans</em></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></td>
<td>Due for Traffic Committee in April and Council in June 2018. Councillor workshop on 5 December 2017. Meeting held with Wallsend Baptist Church Feb 2018. CPTED review and traffic</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 $313,110,436 comprising $304,338,218 of invested funds, and $8,772,218 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 28 February of 2.94%, against the benchmark of 1.75% 90d Bloomberg AusBond Bank Bill Index.

Council’s Investment Policy mandates a KPI Active Return (Net Return less benchmark) of 0.50%. The Active Return for the 12 months to February remained consistent with the prior month at 1.19%.

5. **Interest Income Budget**: The 2017/18 adopted budget from Council’s cash and investments was $8,470,000 (excluding Newcastle Airport and non-investment portfolio sources of interest). This has been revised upward at the December 2017 budget review to $8,714,000. The revised position represents a 5% 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 continuing declining total yield.

6. **Interest Income Actual**: Cumulative 2017/18 interest income from Council’s cash and investments is $5,770,010 (excluding Newcastle Airport and non-investment portfolio sources of interest). Year to date performance aligns with December’s revised budget. The revised budget position remains achievable should the forecast variables continue to perform as forecast.

The budget to actual interest report as at 28 February 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 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>Investment type</th>
<th>Current month Feb '18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash At Call</td>
<td>8,772,218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term Deposit: Fixed rate</td>
<td>91,278,847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term Deposit: Floating rate</td>
<td>37,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floating Rate Note</td>
<td>157,045,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Rate Bond</td>
<td>19,014,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>313,110,436</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commentary:
Throughout the 12 months to February 2018 the proportion of funds invested in Floating Rate Notes has increased whilst Fixed rate term deposit allocations have declined. This reallocation is a result of purposeful lengthening of the average duration of the investment portfolio whilst at the same time limiting exposure to interest rate risk from forecast upward movements in interest rates.

February 2018 has seen a spike in Councils exposure to Term Deposits: Fixed rate. This spike is a direct result of seasonal cash inflows that have been invested to align with short term liquidity requirements.
# 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
Performance measurement:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current month Feb '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.

The above graphs indicate an overall downward trend in Council Portfolio Yield. The downward trend is principally due to the downward trend in the benchmark. This downward trend in the benchmark has eased in recent months as the impact of the most recent interest rate cuts in 2016 became fully entrenched into the rolling 12 month benchmark. As a result the flattening trend is expected to continue and become more pronounced.

The Active Return generated by Council however is expected to start coming under downward pressure due to a downward trend in bond market credit spreads, a trend that commenced in early 2016.

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 Feb '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>175,939,749</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A+ and below</td>
<td>133,170,687</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BBB+ and below</td>
<td>95,158,009</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 is purely a result of favourable pricing offered from Institutions 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:

### Credit allocation: February 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Institution abbreviation</th>
<th>Credit rating (S&amp;P)</th>
<th>Current month Feb '18</th>
<th>Prior month Jan '18</th>
<th>Prior year Feb '17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANZ</td>
<td>ANZ</td>
<td>AA-</td>
<td>30,985,666 10%</td>
<td>30,986,587 10%</td>
<td>29,985,754 9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonwealth Bank</td>
<td>CBA</td>
<td>AA-</td>
<td>46,860,186 15%</td>
<td>34,049,581 11%</td>
<td>36,556,845 11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Australia Bank</td>
<td>NAB</td>
<td>AA-</td>
<td>52,593,129 17%</td>
<td>40,593,129 14%</td>
<td>53,278,847 17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westpac</td>
<td>WBC</td>
<td>AA-</td>
<td>46,500,767 15%</td>
<td>46,500,889 16%</td>
<td>35,001,461 11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabobank</td>
<td>RABO</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>5,000,732 2%</td>
<td>5,000,974 2%</td>
<td>2,001,692 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suncorp Metway</td>
<td>SUN</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>17,005,382 6%</td>
<td>17,005,382 6%</td>
<td>16,009,858 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMP Bank</td>
<td>AMP</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>8,506,565 3%</td>
<td>8,507,051 3%</td>
<td>5,508,442 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit Suisse AG</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>3,000,000 1%</td>
<td>3,000,000 1%</td>
<td>3,000,000 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ING Bank</td>
<td>ING</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>- 0%</td>
<td>- 0%</td>
<td>4,000,000 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macquarie Bank</td>
<td>MQG</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>7,500,000 2%</td>
<td>7,500,000 3%</td>
<td>7,500,000 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bendigo Bank</td>
<td>BEN</td>
<td>BBB+</td>
<td>18,507,811 6%</td>
<td>18,510,566 6%</td>
<td>20,018,634 6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank of Queensland</td>
<td>BOQ</td>
<td>BBB+</td>
<td>20,141,027 6%</td>
<td>20,141,235 7%</td>
<td>22,502,420 7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Bank</td>
<td>HBS</td>
<td>BBB</td>
<td>4,050,000 1%</td>
<td>4,050,000 1%</td>
<td>2,000,000 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beyond Bank</td>
<td>BEY</td>
<td>BBB</td>
<td>- 0%</td>
<td>- 0%</td>
<td>3,000,000 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit Union Australia</td>
<td>CUA</td>
<td>BBB</td>
<td>2,000,000 1%</td>
<td>2,000,000 1%</td>
<td>4,500,747 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Bank</td>
<td>GBS</td>
<td>BBB</td>
<td>18,500,000 6%</td>
<td>18,500,000 6%</td>
<td>17,000,000 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME Bank</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td>BBB</td>
<td>16,980,227 5%</td>
<td>16,980,418 6%</td>
<td>24,509,958 8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle Permanent</td>
<td>NPBS</td>
<td>BBB</td>
<td>13,978,095 4%</td>
<td>21,978,095 7%</td>
<td>24,968,695 8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers Mutual</td>
<td>TMB</td>
<td>BBB</td>
<td>1,000,849 0%</td>
<td>1,000,849 0%</td>
<td>1,001,313 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maitland Mutual</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>Not rated</td>
<td>- 0%</td>
<td>- 0%</td>
<td>3,000,000 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>313,110,436</strong></td>
<td><strong>296,304,756</strong></td>
<td><strong>318,344,666</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

During February 2018 a seasonal increase in cash and investments occurred in alignment with the quarterly residential rates cycle. New investment placements during the month focused on durations of 0-1 years to align with short term liquidity requirements.

![Maturity profile: February 2018](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term to Maturity</th>
<th>Actual performance</th>
<th>Policy Framework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>February</td>
<td>Minimum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 1 Year</td>
<td>110,561,042</td>
<td>35.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 1 Year</td>
<td>202,549,393</td>
<td>64.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 3 Years</td>
<td>73,473,945</td>
<td>23.47%</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 December 2017 budget review to $8.7m.

Total interest income generated in the month to February ‘18 was $0.68m, resulting in cumulative interest income tracking in alignment with 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 January 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>3 Jan 2018</td>
<td>ME Bank</td>
<td>Term Deposit: Fixed rate</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
<td>2.52%</td>
<td>145 days</td>
<td>11 Aug 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Jan 2018</td>
<td>NAB</td>
<td>Term Deposit: Fixed rate</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>141 days</td>
<td>24 Aug 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Jan 2018</td>
<td>NAB</td>
<td>Term Deposit: Fixed rate</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>2.52%</td>
<td>140 days</td>
<td>29 Aug 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Jan 2018</td>
<td>CBA</td>
<td>Floating rate note</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>90d bbsw + 0.95%</td>
<td>5 yrs</td>
<td>25 Jan 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Jan 2018</td>
<td>CBA</td>
<td>Floating rate note</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>90d bbsw + 0.94%</td>
<td>4.5 yrs</td>
<td>28 Jun 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Jan 2018</td>
<td>AMP Bank</td>
<td>Term Deposit: Fixed rate</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td>3.40%</td>
<td>2 yrs</td>
<td>30 Jan 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>9 Jan 2018</td>
<td>18 Jan 2018</td>
<td>ANZ</td>
<td>Floating rate note</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>90d bbsw + 0.77%</td>
<td>5 yrs</td>
<td>18 Jan 2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Jan 2018</td>
<td>30 Jan 2018</td>
<td>AMP Bank</td>
<td>Term Deposit: Fixed Rate</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td>2.60%</td>
<td>171 days</td>
<td>20 Jul 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Jan 2018</td>
<td>31 Jan 2018</td>
<td>BankWest</td>
<td>Term Deposit: Fixed Rate</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>2.54%</td>
<td>135 days</td>
<td>15 Jun 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
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 Dec 2017</td>
<td>Bank of QLD</td>
<td>Term Deposit: Floating rate</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
<td>90d bbsw + 1.20%</td>
<td>4.0 years</td>
<td>6 Dec 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Dec 2017</td>
<td>ANZ</td>
<td>Floating rate note</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>90d bbsw + 0.77%</td>
<td>4.8 years</td>
<td>15 Feb 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Dec 2017</td>
<td>ANZ</td>
<td>Floating rate note</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>90d bbsw + 0.71%</td>
<td>4.7 years</td>
<td>22 Feb 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Dec 2017</td>
<td>NAB</td>
<td>Term Deposit: Fixed rate</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>2.46%</td>
<td>126 days</td>
<td>11 Aug 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>8 Dec 2017</td>
<td>8 Dec 2017</td>
<td>Westpac</td>
<td>Term Deposit: Fixed Rate</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>2.58%</td>
<td>12 mths</td>
<td>14 Dec 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Dec 2017</td>
<td>20 Dec 2017</td>
<td>Me Bank</td>
<td>Floating rate note</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>90d bbsw + 1.20%</td>
<td>2.9 years</td>
<td>9 Nov 2020</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 release of the Shepherds Hill Cottage Expression of Interest (EOI) process on 14 February. Graphic design of the EOI document highlighted the stunning clifftop position of the heritage-listed building and informed a marketing campaign spanning editorial, advertising and social media.

During February, the team compiled all reporting for our extensive Community Strategic Program (CSP), which informs Council’s long-term strategies. The completed two-volume engagement report will be available in March. More than 2,700 people got involved in our CSP engagement activities from May to November 2017.
COMMUNICATIONS & ENGAGEMENT

We provided marketing and communications to promote:

Surfest, Australian Bowl Riding Championships and Aust Boardriders: Major communications campaign and social media competition.

Beresfield and Carrington local centre renewal: Communication and media support for construction commencing in February/March.

Cycleways education and promotions (Cycleways priority project): Ongoing communications support.

Hop into March environmental frog workshops: Communications plan, media release and promotions.

Clean Up Australia Day: Promotion of the annual clean-up event on Sunday 4 March to encourage the community to get involved.

Council arts and cultural grants: Media announcement of recipients of the first round of grants and opening of applications for second round.

Bangarra Dance Theatre: Media support for a visit from national Aboriginal dance company - media ops and pitches, scheduling interviews.

Launch Council’s ‘My Local Services’ app: Media announcement of new Council app to the community, encouraging people to use it to identify damage to public property and quickly assign Council officers to fix it.

Girsaille exhibition at Newcastle Art Gallery: Media releases and media ops.

Spiders and Scott Sisters Exhibitions at Newcastle Museum: Media releases and media op held with Lord Mayor on 23 February.

National Apology 10th Anniversary: Communications support for Aboriginal Flag raising to commemorate the 10th anniversary of the National Apology to the Stolen Generation.

We updated our community on these infrastructure projects:

Kotara Park upgrades to amenities.

Stockton projects - seawall, erosion, local centre, active hub, carpark.

Flood alert service rolled out to all LGA.

Civic substation upgrade.

Changes to the Development Control Plan and associated technical manual for private tree removal applications.

Pedestrian upgrade at McCaffrey Drive, Rankin Park.

Murabarnbah Park playground removal by Mine Subsidence.

Tree removals and planting across the city.

Islington Park power outage.

Key design projects:

Seniors Directory: Design and layout of 52 page document to promote facilities and activities for seniors in Newcastle.

Community Strategic Plan: Creation of infographics, flyers and a glance document to highlight the key findings of the community engagement undertaken to develop the plan.

Dream Big campaign: Develop additional marketing materials to complement the original campaign including t-shirts and back packs.

Our community were involved and provided feedback on:

Dogs in Open Spaces: 1,076 people participated in a survey to determine residents’ usage of, and preferences for, off leash dog park areas in Newcastle.

Customer Service: We conduct a quarterly satisfaction survey with people who have contacted customer service in the previous 3 month period. A total of 587 people who contacted the service between November and January took part in the February quarterly survey.
MEDIA HOT TOPICS

SUMMER EVENTS
Australian Boardriders Battle, Surfest and Bowl Riding Championships

WARREN SMITH
Freeman of the City

STOCKTON EROSION

SOCIAL MEDIA IN FEBRUARY

TOTAL FOLLOWERS ACROSS ALL CHANNELS
23,338 INCREASED BY 565%

TOTAL LIKES ACROSS ALL CHANNELS
6,186

TOTAL COMMENTS ACROSS ALL CHANNELS
775

How you had your say for the CSP

Approx. 2,700 people contributed

1,591 Surveys completed
799 Participated in Ideas Wall
319 Created a budget
115 Attended Community Workshops
810 Got involved at libraries & events
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ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Newcastle City Council acknowledges the traditional country of the Awabakal and Worimi peoples. We recognise and respect their cultural heritage, beliefs and continuing relationship with the land, and that they are the proud survivors of more than two hundred years of dispossession. Council reiterates its commitment to addressing disadvantages and attaining justice for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples of this community.
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Newcastle City Council is comprised of two distinct parts: the elected Council and the administration.

The Administration

The administration is organised into three groups, each with a range of responsibilities.

The Chief Executive Officer (CEO) leads the administrative arm of Newcastle City Council and is responsible for the efficient and effective operation of the business and ensuring that the decisions of Council are implemented.

The CEO reports to the full elected Council.

Elected Council

Twelve councillors and a popularly elected Lord Mayor make up the elected body of Newcastle City Council. The Newcastle Local Government Area (LGA) is divided into four wards, with each ward represented by three councillors who are elected for a four year term.

Under the Local Government Act 1993, councillors have a responsibility to:

• participate in the determination of the budget
• play a key role in the creation and review of Council policies, objectives and criteria relating to the regulatory functions, and
• review Council’s performance and the delivery of services, management plans and revenue policies.
THE ADMINISTRATION

Chief Executive Officer
Jeremy Bath

Director Planning and Regulatory
Peter Chrystal

Development and Building
Murray Blackburn-Smith

Strategic Planning
Jill Gaynor

Regulatory Services
Patricia McCarthy (Interim)

Cultural Facilities
Liz Burcham

Libraries
Suzie Gately

Director Corporate Services
Andrew Baxter (Interim)

Finance
Martin Swan (Interim)

Property Services
David Guest (Interim)

Customer Service
Rod Bales

Legal and Governance
Emily Kolatchew (Interim)

Information Technology
Claire Bath (Interim)

Human Resources
Fiona Leatham (Interim)

Communications & Engagement
Kathleen Hyland

Director Infrastructure
Ken Liddell

Infrastructure Planning
Joanne Rigby (Interim)

Civil Works
Greg Essex

Projects and Contracts
Iain Challis (Interim)

Facilities and Recreation
Phil Moore

Waste Management
Darren North
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ELECTED COUNCIL 2017/18

Cr Nuatali Nelmes
Lord Mayor (Labor)

Cr Emma White
(Labor)

Cr John MacKenzie
Greens)

Cr John Church
(Independent)

Cr Carol Duncan
(Labor)

Cr Kath Elliott
(Independent)

Cr Brad Luke
(Liberal)

Cr Declan Clausen
Deputy Lord Mayor (Labor)

Cr Andrea Rufo
(Independent)

Cr Peta Winney-Baartz
(Labor)

Cr Jason Dunn
(Labor)

Cr Matthew Byrne
(Labor)

Cr Allan Robinson
(Independent)
Ward 1
Bar Beach, Carrington, Cooks Hill, Islington, Maryville, Mayfield, Mayfield East, Mayfield West, Newcastle, Newcastle East, Newcastle West, Stockton, The Hill, The Junction (part), Tighes Hill, Warabrook, Wickham

Ward 2
Adamstown, Adamstown Heights, Broadmeadow, Hamilton, Hamilton East, Hamilton South, Hamilton North, Merewether, Merewether Heights, The Junction (part)

Ward 3
Georgetown, Jesmond, Kotara, Lambton, New Lambton, New Lambton Heights, North Lambton, Wallsend (part) Waratah, Waratah West

Ward 4
Beresfield, Birmingham Gardens, Black Hill, Callaghan, Elermore Vale, Fletcher, Hexham, Lenaghan, Maryland, Minmi, Rankin Park, Sandgate, Shortland, Tarro, Wallsend (Part)
WHY DO A SIX MONTH PROGRESS REPORT?

Council is required under section 404(5) of the Local Government Act 1993 to provide progress reports on the Delivery Program and Operational Plan at least every six months. Council’s six monthly progress report details Newcastle City Council’s progress on the principal activities detailed in the Delivery Program.

The six monthly progress report, along with the Annual Report are the key points of accountability between Newcastle City Council and our community.

It is not a report to the Office of Local Government or the NSW Government, it is a report to our community on our performance against our Delivery Program Strategies.

Every six months, Council reports on the key activities it has undertaken which contribute to achieving our Delivery Program and in the long term our Newcastle 2030 Community Strategic Plan (CSP).
Community Strategic Plan
10+ years

Delivery Program
4 years

Operational Plan
1 year

Resourcing Strategy
- Long Term Financial Plan
- Workforce Management Plan
- Asset Management Plan

Community Engagement

Perpetual monitoring and review

Annual Report
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- 62,336 calls taken by our Customer Contact Centre
- 73% satisfaction with our Customer Contact Centre
- 4,020 visitors to our Customer Service Counter
- Attendance at:
  - 30,528 Art Gallery
  - 74,390 Museum
  - 71,043 Civic Theatre/Playhouse
- 847 total development applications
- $641.5 million
waste and recycling talks to students and community groups

waste collections from properties every week, with a 99.9% success rate

$50 million works program

$11 million on priority projects (including Blackbutt Reserve, new cycleways, revitalising our coast including the Bathers Way project, and revitalising the CBD)

Social media following:

12,845 6,783 1,763
CONNECTED CITY

In 2030 our transport networks and services will be well connected and convenient. Walking, cycling and public transport will be viable options for getting around the city.
Performance

Eight actions were set in Council’s 2017/18 Operational Plan to support the community objectives under the CSP, with delivery results as follow:

🌟 1 completed  ✔️ 7 on track  ⚠️ 0 delayed  ⚠️ 0 revised

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions/Project</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>December</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve safety of roads through the implementation of pedestrian access and mobility planned projects and the Local Area Traffic Management Plan</td>
<td>Infrastructure Planning</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement the cycleway special rate variation projects including cycleway educations and promotion and investigation and development of future cycleway plans</td>
<td>Infrastructure Planning</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and implement the road resurfacing program, city wide roads signs and line replacement and city wide roads rejuvenation program</td>
<td>Civil Works</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement the transport stops program including the renewal and upgrades of bus stops, shelters and seating to comply with Federal Government’s legislation</td>
<td>Infrastructure Planning</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of the Hunter Street revitalisation project - Civic Public Domain Plan</td>
<td>Strategic Planning</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage Council’s off street multi-use car park to meet parking demands and a commercially competitive environment</td>
<td>Regulatory Services</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforce the parking provisions of the NSW road rules to achieve traffic and pedestrian safety and turnover of parking spaces</td>
<td>Regulatory Services</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete Bathers Way improvements to the Hill traffic and parking</td>
<td>Infrastructure Planning</td>
<td>🌟</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROTECTED AND ENHANCED ENVIRONMENT

IN 2030 OUR UNIQUE ENVIRONMENT WILL BE UNDERSTOOD, MAINTAINED AND PROTECTED.
Performance

19 actions were set in Council’s 2017/18 Operational Plan to support the community objectives under the CSP, with delivery results as follows:

- 🌟 0 completed
- ✔️ 19 on track
- 😥 0 delayed
- ☹️ 0 revised

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions/Project</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>December</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drainage rehabilitation - replacement of deteriorated stormwater infrastructure</td>
<td>Civil Works</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactively monitor and regulate activities to minimise environmental impact, including implementing Council’s business pollution prevention program and erosion and sediment control program</td>
<td>Regulatory Services</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage contaminated land information and seek appropriate remediation through the development application process</td>
<td>Regulatory Services</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactively monitor and regulate onsite sewage management systems to minimise the risk of water pollution and public health impacts</td>
<td>Regulatory Services</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement the tree inspection program in line with the City Wide Maintenance Policy</td>
<td>Civil Works</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote and manage community based groups in provisions of environmental projects to help restore natural areas in accordance with relevant plans of management</td>
<td>Facilities and Recreation</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify and deliver projects to achieve energy and water savings under the energy and resource management investment – energy and water programs identified as part of the 10 year financial plan and the Newcastle 2020 Carbon and Water Management Plan</td>
<td>Projects and Contracts</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design, development and construction of landfill for cell 9</td>
<td>Waste Management</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expansion and enhancement of the small vehicle receival centre at Summerhill Waste Management Centre (SWMC)</td>
<td>Waste Management</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuation of the flood education campaign</td>
<td>Infrastructure Planning</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operate and maintain the flash flood alert services for high risk flood areas in Newcastle</td>
<td>Infrastructure Planning</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliver the community urban forest program and street tree planting</td>
<td>Civil Works</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide environment projects across the LGA on natural area reserves including street tree planting and urban forest program</td>
<td>Civil Works</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliver water quality monitoring program</td>
<td>Infrastructure Planning</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actively encourage and promote use of open space through junior ranger programs at Blackbutt Reserve, community planting days and volunteer groups</td>
<td>Facilities and Recreation</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement hazardous and difficult waste drop-off at SWMC and Libraries</td>
<td>Waste Management</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop new education ‘experience’ for schools in cooperation with Hunter Waste Education Group</td>
<td>Waste Management</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roll out new recycling and waste stations to all public beaches and foreshore areas</td>
<td>Waste Management</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City wide stormwater quantity and quality modelling</td>
<td>Infrastructure Planning</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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VIBRANT AND ACTIVATED PUBLIC PLACES

IN 2030 WE WILL BE A CITY OF GREAT PUBLIC PLACES AND NEIGHBOURHOODS PROMOTING PEOPLE’S HAPPINESS AND WELLBEING.
### Performance

24 actions were set in Council’s 2017/18 Operational Plan to support the community objectives under the CSP, with delivery results as follows:

- **2 completed**
- **18 on track**
- **1 delayed**
- **3 revised**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions/Project</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>December</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design, develop and present public and education programs for the Newcastle Art Gallery annually for general and specialised audiences represented in the Newcastle LGA that link to both the exhibition program and collection that are educational, enjoyable and relevant</td>
<td>Cultural Facilities</td>
<td>✭</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park safe, play safe initiative</td>
<td>Regulatory Services</td>
<td>✭</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relaunch and rebrand Newcastle libraries, including the refurbishment of Newcastle Region Library</td>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support local community initiatives through Place Making Grants and Community Assistance Grants</td>
<td>Strategic Planning</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning for a district sports and recreation complex to serve the long term needs of the growing western corridor Comment: Report delayed due to State Environment Planning Policy requirements. Feedback provided to NSW Government on draft plan impacts</td>
<td>Facilities and Recreation</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop criteria to guide capital projects in particular sports field improvement projects</td>
<td>Facilities and Recreation</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote appropriate environmental and recreational community use of Blackbutt Reserve facilities</td>
<td>Facilities and Recreation</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreshore Park Plan of Management Implementation Comment: The project delivery date has been revised and listed for 2018/19, some modification like additional trees have already happened in the preparation for the Supercar event</td>
<td>Facilities and Recreation</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliver a range of events for our community including New Year’s Eve, Australia Day and Anzac Day</td>
<td>Strategic Planning</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliver the dual naming project across Council Comment: Delay in attaining approvals for finalised wording and art work for signs. Signs now expected to be in place by May 2018</td>
<td>Strategic Planning</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement various programs and outreach services for libraries for learners of all ages, interests and readers. Activities include programs for children, author talks, book chats, craft and technology sessions</td>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement revitalisation projects across the city centre</td>
<td>Strategic Planning</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction of a playground for Richley Reserve recreation at Blackbutt Reserve</td>
<td>Projects and Contracts</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue Bathers Way upgrades</td>
<td>Projects and Contracts</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan for improvements to local and neighbourhood centres</td>
<td>Infrastructure Planning</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expose local stories through cultural programming and build Newcastle’s cultural identity</td>
<td>Cultural Facilities</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase display of Newcastle Art Gallery works of art</td>
<td>Cultural Facilities</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Align and integrate 2017 programs, partnerships and events calendar to the Newcastle 2030 Community Strategic Plan and the Cultural and Social Strategy</td>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop customer driven collections with a review of Collection Development Policy to reflect a best practice industry approach</td>
<td>Cultural Facilities</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliver one collaborative cross institution project per year</td>
<td>Cultural Facilities</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In consultation, develop a strategic discussion paper to inform a future focussed Strategic Plan for libraries and an Infrastructure Plan</td>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Align and integrate 2017 programs, partnerships and events calendar to the Newcastle 2030 Community Strategic Plan and the Cultural and Social Strategy</td>
<td>Strategic Planning</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish the parameters for digital service delivery via online access points Comment: The establishment of a virtual service delivery model is linked to the approval of The Library Strategy 2018/19</td>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement a Multicultural Plan 2017/18</td>
<td>Strategic Planning</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CARING AND INCLUSIVE COMMUNITY

In 2030 we will be thriving community where diversity is embraced, everyone is valued and has the opportunity to contribute and belong.
Performance

16 actions were set in Council’s 2017/18 Operational Plan to support the community objectives under the CSP, with delivery results as follows:

- ⭐ 1 completed
- ✅ 13 on track
- ⚠ 1 delayed
- ⏳ 1 revised

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions/Project</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>December</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deliver on the community development projects including youth and seniors week</td>
<td>Strategic Planning</td>
<td>✅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage early childhood centre assets</td>
<td>Strategic Planning</td>
<td>✅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote awareness of the requirements of the Companion Animals Act with respect to the ownership of companion animals</td>
<td>Regulatory Services</td>
<td>✅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in Hunter Region Health Education Committee</td>
<td>Regulatory Services</td>
<td>✅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actively encourage use of open space through junior ranger programs at Blackbutt Reserve, community planting days and volunteer groups</td>
<td>Facilities and Recreation</td>
<td>✅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquire new works by artists for exhibitions and the Newcastle Art Gallery collection</td>
<td>Cultural Facilities</td>
<td>⭐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position and promote City Hall as an accessible and multi-use venue with diverse hiring potential for local, regional and national clients</td>
<td>Cultural Facilities</td>
<td>✅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliver an integrated crime prevention platform utilising smart city technologies across the city centre (including Honeysuckle, Darby Street, Hamilton and the Junction)</td>
<td>Strategic Planning</td>
<td>⏳</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment: Initial grant application not supported. A revised project has been resubmitted as a new grant funding application in late 2017.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engage with the community through the Youth Council and Guraki Committee</td>
<td>Strategic Planning</td>
<td>✅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide access to technology and internet through library computers complemented by free wifi network. This technology will be supported by regular training sessions at various sites</td>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>✅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction of a playground and skate park at South Stockton</td>
<td>Facilities and Recreation</td>
<td>✅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various playground renewal and replacement across Newcastle</td>
<td>Facilities and Recreation</td>
<td>✅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliver community connection programs with partnerships with local high schools</td>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>⚠️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment: Formal documentation outlining the collaborative partnerships planned or delivered between libraries and high schools has commence in the new school year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliver the Community Assistance and Make Your Place grants program annually</td>
<td>Strategic Planning</td>
<td>✅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase programming of works by Aboriginal and Torres Strait Island people</td>
<td>Cultural Facilities</td>
<td>✅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actively invest in programming and communications targeted to young people</td>
<td>Cultural Facilities</td>
<td>✅</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LIVEABLE AND DISTINCTIVE BUILT ENVIRONMENT

IN 2030 WE WILL LIVE IN AN ATTRACTIVE CITY THAT IS BUILT AROUND PEOPLE AND REFLECTS OUR SENSE OF IDENTITY.
**Performance**

Nine actions were set in Council’s 2017/18 Operational Plan to support the community objectives under the CSP, with delivery results as follows:

- 🌟 1 completed
- ✅ 6 on track
- ⚠️ 2 delayed
- ⚠️ 0 revised

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions/Project</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>December</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintain Council’s urban planning framework incorporating the Local Planning Strategy (LPS), the Local Environment Plan (LEP), Development Control Plans (DCP) and section 94 plans</td>
<td>Strategic Planning</td>
<td>✅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery of business sector energy and resource management projects in accordance with the Newcastle 2020 Carbon and Water Management Action Plan</td>
<td>Projects and Contracts</td>
<td>🌟</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliver the LPS short term actions</td>
<td>Strategic Planning</td>
<td>✅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amend the LEP and DCP with the LPS and the Hunter Regional Strategy</td>
<td>Strategic Planning</td>
<td>✅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement the Newcastle after Dark: Night time Economy Strategy to improve the safety and amenity of the city centre and other neighbourhoods at night Comment: Completion of strategy behind schedule as resources deployed to Smart City project. Draft strategy scheduled for Council in March 2018</td>
<td>Strategic Planning</td>
<td>⚠️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review western corridor traffic schedules and update the section 94 contributions plan</td>
<td>Strategic Planning</td>
<td>✅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery Council’s energy saving project</td>
<td>Projects and Contracts</td>
<td>✅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement Public Art Management Framework and adopt new Public Art Policy Comment: Final draft of Policy being completed in preparation for approval process</td>
<td>Cultural Facilities</td>
<td>✅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue restoration of City Hall facade</td>
<td>Projects and Contracts</td>
<td>✅</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SMART AND INNOVATIVE CITY

IN 2030 WE WILL BE A LEADER IN SMART INNOVATIONS WITH A HEALTHILY, DIVERSE AND RESILIENT ECONOMY.
Performance

14 actions were set in Council’s 2017/18 Operational Plan to support the community objectives under the Community Strategic Plan, with delivery results as follows:

- 1 completed
- 13 on track
- 0 delayed
- 0 revised

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions/Project</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>December</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identify opportunities to partner with other groups to deliver activation and development projects</td>
<td>Strategic Planning</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement the Economic Development and Events Sponsorship programs</td>
<td>Strategic Planning</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliver the Newcastle Smart City Initiatives Program to continue to develop and establish Newcastle as a smart innovative city</td>
<td>Strategic Planning</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement the Events Management Strategy</td>
<td>Strategic Planning</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote Newcastle as a visitor and event destination to drive economic growth and investment</td>
<td>Strategic Planning</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue to support and promote the Library In Your Pocket App. The library app offers library members the opportunity to access e-resources such as e-books, e-audio books, magazines, newspapers, music and movies and much more</td>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue to support and promote Australia’s first digital library bar and café. Civic Digest offers the community the opportunity to engage with cultural institutions in a non-traditional format. Digital touchscreens offer state of the art technology and a platform to access library content, Council information, event information and have fun with apps and games</td>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote Newcastle as a visitor and event destination to drive economic growth and investment - continue to deliver the Newcastle Destination Management Plan</td>
<td>Strategic Planning</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement Council Support of Sustainable Arts and Cultural Organisations in Newcastle Policy</td>
<td>Cultural Facilities</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliver sponsorship and grant programs annually for economic development and events</td>
<td>Strategic Planning</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend STEAM (Science, Technology, Engineering, Arts and Maths) program and activities to the library programming and implement collaborative high tech spaces on first floor of War Memorial Cultural Centre including a makerspace</td>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide free wifi access in all Newcastle libraries</td>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support, in partnership with The Telstra Foundation and The Alannah and Madeline Foundation a national e-smart program to connect library users with the information and skills they need for smart, safe and responsible use of technology</td>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>⚫</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliver Smart City Strategy and the Hunter II project</td>
<td>Strategic Planning</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OPEN AND COLLABORATIVE LEADERSHIP

IN 2030 WE WILL HAVE A STRONG LOCAL DEMOCRACY WITH AN ACTIVELY ENGAGED COMMUNITY AND EFFECTIVE PARTNERSHIPS.
Performance

12 actions were set in Council’s 2017/18 Operational Plan to support the community objectives under the Community Strategic Plan, with delivery results as follows:

- 0 completed
- 12 on track
- 0 delayed
- 0 revised

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions/Project</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>December</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ensure the management of Council’s budget allocations and funding alternatives are compliant with Council policy and relevant legislation to ensure the long term financial sustainability of the organisation</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve investment performance of Council’s reserved funds within agreed risk</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement the initiatives from the Workforce Management Plan including, the Aboriginal Employment Strategy and the Equal Employment Opportunity Management Plan</td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify redundant assets for disposal and for the proceeds to be placed in the Land and Property Reserve to assist with reducing the infrastructure backlog</td>
<td>Property Services</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliver a comprehensive plan to transition to the cloud for corporate systems and data storage</td>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain the key modules for Council’s Enterprise Resource Planning software to ensure it continues to provide the optimum IT solution for the organisation in the latest, best and effective version (ie CiAnywhere)</td>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undertake a media engagement strategy to maximise positive exposure opportunities and effectively manage any potential issues</td>
<td>Communications and Engagement</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and implement an extensive engagement strategy to inform the development of the Newcastle 2030 Community Strategic Plan</td>
<td>Communications and Engagement</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand the community engagement program as outlined in option 3 of the 2015 special rate variation</td>
<td>Communications and Engagement</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase online engagement with community and stakeholders including staff through increases social media presence</td>
<td>Communications and Engagement</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduce innovation and emerging engagement tools to increase participation in engagement activities</td>
<td>Communications and Engagement</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase measures to improve quality and productivity outcomes of the Customer Contact Centre</td>
<td>Customer Service</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEASURING OUR SUCCESS

Corporate performance measures

The below table identifies the key performance areas which allow the Council and the community to monitor the success of the Delivery Program and Operational Plan. Newcastle City Council will report six monthly and annually against its corporate objectives using the following key performance indicators:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deliver on the key civic projects determined as the priorities for the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key civic projects are delivered in accordance with the budget and timeframes identified in the 2013-2018 Delivery Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six monthly and annual performance on outcomes of project implementation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Upgrading Blackbutt Reserve

Construction of the major access and playground works underway at Richley Reserve. Stage one access works are nearing completion with the construction of pathways, driveway access and three new shelters. Stage two playground works have commenced with major ground shaping works being undertaken. Major equipment has been ordered and stage two works are due for completion in June 2018. Stage one and two will result in a transformation of the Richley Reserve area, providing a key new playground space, new shelters, pathways, seating, open space, connections, and activation.

Design for a new administration building, kiosk and amenities are now underway for Richley Reserve along with designs for upgrading the car park and kiosk at Carnley Avenue to allow a continuation of works at Blackbutt Reserve.

Providing new cycleways

Council has continued to progress a number of key cycleway projects:

Maud Street (R6 - University to Newcastle City Centre Cycleway)

A proposal for mid-block signals on Maud Street between Prince and Vera Streets, Waratah and other changes to calm traffic in the vicinity of the cycleway was exhibited from mid-July to mid-August. Modifications to the proposal were made following public exhibition. Council approved installation of mid-block signals in December 2017 and construction is expected to occur in June 2018.

Merewether to Newcastle City Centre

A design has been completed and a traffic study to assess the impacts of the proposed bicycle boulevard on Corlette Street undertaken. The next steps involve referral of potential traffic changes for consideration by the Newcastle City Traffic Committee and community consultation.

City Centre Revitalisation

City Centre Revitalisation has focused on three key areas in the last six months.

The first is working with State Government agencies on Newcastle Light Rail and urban renewal projects in the city centre. This has allowed Council to work with the Light Rail contractors to deliver streetscape improvements while the street is closed for light rail works.

The second focus area was the continuation of the planning process for the city centre. This includes the commencement of the public domain plans for the East End, continuation of the West End planning and advancement of the City Centre Signage and Wayfinding Strategy. Planning also continued on the Smart City project infrastructure rollout, including a new $10 million project called Smart Moves after Council was successful in gaining significant Federal Government grant funds and industry contributions.

The third focus area of revitalisation was delivering economic development and activation projects across the city centre to help revitalise Hunter Street and surrounds. These projects include the 360 degree attraction program, Christmas in the park, the Union Lane installation and economic data projects.
Broadmeadow to Newcastle West
Construction of the cycleway from Beaumont Street to Selma Street was completed. Investigation of options to improve the final section of this route (namely the section over the Donald Street Bridge) is underway.

Cycling education and promotion
Cycle skills classes were conducted; a NSW Bike Week community breakfast was held; map of Newcastle cycleways was printed and distributed; and work on a cycling benefits campaign undertaken.

Clyde Street level crossing
In response to community requests, safety improvements at the level crossing at Clyde Street have been investigated and scheduled for implementation in the first quarter of 2018. The proposed measures, which will relieve the current pinch point at the crossing, are consistent with longer term plans for a cycleway on Chatham Road and Clyde Street connecting the east-west cycleway at Griffiths Road/Chatham Road to the University to Newcastle City Centre route at Chinchen Street.

Glebe Road at Park Avenue traffic signals
This intersection is a notable blackspot. Construction of traffic signals at this intersection was approved by Council several years ago and Federal funding secured, however interface with Sydney Trains has prolonged the program. Significant progress on the design was made in the second half of 2017. Further community consultation will be carried out in early 2018 and civil works are expected to start in mid-2018. Prior to the installation of traffic signals some major drainage construction will be undertaken.

Newcastle City Hall refurbishment
Conservation work to the southern and eastern facades is nearing completion. Approximately 700 individual stones have been replaced, 900 synthetic stone patches have been completed and 35 steel framed windows have been refurbished, including replacing 1,100 individual panes of glass. Reconstruction of the vehicle ramps is well underway and is due to be completed toward the middle of 2018.

The next stage of works has commenced and will restore the western and northern facades. This work involves extensive stone replacement and refurbishing of steel framed windows, lead weatherings, copper downpipes and rainwater heads. Repairs to the waterproofing membranes on the roof and balconyettes will also be undertaken. Works are scheduled for completion at the end of 2019.

Coastal Revitalisation achievements
Construction of the Bathers Way at the Hill is now complete, resulting in improvements in traffic movement and pedestrian safety. The Bathers Way at Shortland Esplanade and the South Newcastle Sea Wall Rehabilitation project are also complete, involving major road and retaining wall upgrades and securing the infrastructure required to deliver the Bathers Way path between King Edward Park and Newcastle Beach. Upgrades to Nobbys and Cooks Hill Surf Life Saving Clubs have also been completed as part of the Coastal Revitalisation program.

Designs for Bathers Way at South Newcastle, King Edward Park and Memorial Drive are underway, and once completed will enable the final stages of the Bathers Way to be implemented.

Preliminary investigations have commenced at Newcastle Ocean Baths and Newcastle Beach to inform the next stages of design for Coastal Revitalisation projects.
THE NEWCASTLE COMMUNITY WAS ACTIVELY ENGAGED ACROSS A RANGE OF PROJECTS IN THE SECOND HALF OF 2017. ALONG WITH TWO MAJOR ENGAGEMENT PROJECTS, COUNCIL LAUNCHED A NEW ENGAGEMENT PLATFORM.

Newcastle 2030 Community Strategic Plan:
An extensive community engagement program has been undertaken to inform the update of the CSP.
A Communications and Engagement Strategy was endorsed by Council in May 2017 with activities from late May to the end of November 2017. The program included a diverse range of the activities and events to ensure wide community representation, including from hard to reach groups. The graphic below highlights the high level of community participation in these activities.

Better Together
Our 2030 plan

Approx. 2,700 people contributed and thousands more informed

1,598 Surveys completed over two surveys
799 Participated in Ideas Wall
319 Created a budget
115 Attended five Community Workshops
810 Got involved when out & about

Objective 2
Engage with the Newcastle community on projects that have a high level of impact on the community

KPI
Consultation undertaken for all projects which have a high level of impact on the community

Measure
Evidence that consultation has taken place is reported in the annual report

Supercars: After months of planning and preparation for the inaugural Newcastle 500, the successful event was held from November 24-26 and saw the culmination of our extensive communication and engagement activities. Members of the team regularly spoke with residents and businesses, both informally and formally through the management of the Major Events Residents Working Group.

During the event, high quality photography drove our story telling, from the convoy of trucks delivering the Supercars on in the days before the event to the presentation of the winner’s trophy on Sunday evening. Social media posts aimed to engage and grow our audience.
New online engagement platform

In May 2017, Council expanded its engagement program to include a new online hub where residents can undertake a range of engagement activities on one site. This includes undertaking surveys, posting ideas on an ideas wall, participating in online forums, downloading documents and lodging formal submissions.

Visitors to the site can see timelines for the engagement activity and register for workshops or information sessions, making it ideal for large projects.

The graphic below outlines the high level of interest in engaging with Council online.

Increasing community involvement in decision making - public exhibitions

The engagement hub is revolutionising the way Council seeks input through public exhibitions. It offers an alternative to the traditional method of relying on residents to lodge formal submissions for items on public exhibition through email or a letter to the organisation. For public exhibitions featured on the site, residents can download relevant documents and lodge submissions electronically directly from the page.

Not only is this more efficient for those wanting to lodge submissions, it means that for Council, interest in the documents on public exhibition can be quantified with views, downloads and comments, something not possible when they are on display solely at Council’s Administration Centre and libraries. Public exhibitions featured on the engagement hub in the July - December 2017 period include:

- South Stockton Active Hub Urban Skate Plaza and Playground
- Draft Smart City Strategy 2017-2021
- Maud Street, Waratah - Proposed traffic changes
- Open and Transparent Governance Strategy
- Rail Corridor Rezoning, Development Control Plan and Planning Agreement.

Objective 3

| KPI | Improve financial sustainability of Council |
| Measure | Net budget operating surplus ratio 2.7% |

The December Quarterly Budget Review is forecasting a balanced operating position and positive generation of funds.

The actual operating position for year to date (YTD) December was a deficit of $6.7m. This result was driven primarily by projects brought forward into the works program and delivered within the first six months of the 2017/18 financial year. There was both an above average level of work delivered and an above average amount expensed rather than capitalised.

Council is forecasting a balanced operating position at the end of the financial year.
**Objective 4**

Maintain a strong cash and liquidity position to ensure financial sustainability

**KPI**

Implement the budget principles endorsed by Council on 18 April 2014

**Measure**

Achievement of budget principles

Council currently has a strong cash and liquidity position; this is demonstrated with the following ratios:

**Unrestricted current ratio 2.49:1 (Benchmark is greater than 1.5:1)**

This ratio is an indicator of Council's liquidity and has remained relatively stable in recent years, and reflects the impact of the requirement of Accounting Standards to classify investments as current or non-current, depending on the maturity date.

The unrestricted current ratio has been calculated for the purposes of assessing the capability of Council to meet its short term obligations (current liabilities) using current assets.

**Rates and annual charges outstanding ratio 4.16% (Benchmark is <5%)**

This ratio assesses the impact of uncollected rates and annual charges on liquidity and the adequacy of recovery efforts. The rates and annual charges outstanding ratio of 4.16% has continued to fall. This is an improvement on the result due to a more proactive approach taken over the last few years with Council’s mercantile agent.

**Cash expense cover ratio 8.66 (Benchmark is greater than three months)**

This liquidity ratio indicates the number of months a Council can continue paying for its immediate expenses without additional cash inflow.

Our most recent customer satisfaction survey completed December 2017, showed 62% of those who had contact with Council in the last 12 months were satisfied or very satisfied with their customer service experience. This is an increase of 1% from the 2016 results.

Of all survey respondents 57% had contacted Council via telephone in the last 12 months and 56% by email/web form these were the most popular method for contacting Council. Performance ratings for in person and telephones customers services were notably higher than the ratings for email and mail based customer service.

**Telephone customer service**

Telephone customer service was rated good or excellent by 73% of respondents. Results indicate good scores for professionalism, staff knowledge and degree of helpfulness.

**In person customer service**

In-person customer service was rated good or excellent by 73% of respondents. Professionalism, helpfulness and staff knowledge were all scored as good.

**On line email/webform customer service**

Just over half (53%) of respondents rate email customer service as good or excellent overall. Just under half of respondents rated degree of helpfulness (46%) and professional (48%) as good or excellent. There has been an increased amount of customer contact with Council using the mail@ncc.nsw.gov.au address rather than emailing staff directly.

**Summary**

Council is on track with improvements to telephone and face to face service. Council is committed to improving its service levels regarding customer requests received by email.

**Objective 5**

Provide better and more efficient services to customers through the implementation of improved systems and processes by 2017

**KPI**

Improve responsiveness and quality of customer experiences

**Measure**

Improve customer satisfaction scores in the Customer Service Survey by 2% 2014, 5% 2015, 7% 2016, 10% 2017
Objective 6
Renew and maintain assets within a sustainable range

KPI
Annual renewal ratio

Measure
Minimum of 10% variance in the maintenance renewal budget

Infrastructure renewals ratio 79.5%
This ratio compares the proportion spent on infrastructure asset renewals and the asset's deterioration measured by its accounting depreciation. Asset renewal represents the replacement or refurbishment of existing assets to an equivalent capacity or performance as opposed to the acquisition of new assets or the refurbishment of old assets that increase capacity or performance. NSW Treasury Corporation benchmark is greater than 100% and Council does not yet meet this benchmark but is working towards it.

Maintenance renewal budget variance
Renewal represents just under 50% of the capital work program, 72% of the maintenance program has been spent with projects brought forward and delivered in the first six months of 2017/18 financial year.

Objective 7
Identify opportunities for asset rationalisation to fund the infrastructure backlog

KPI
Infrastructure backlog: infrastructure backlog ($m) less internally available infrastructure funding ($m) = unfunded infrastructure backlog ($m)

Measure
Target backlog is 2% of value of infrastructure ($)

The 10 year target for asset sales (2013/14 to 2022/23) has been revised down from $47 million (December 2014) to $37.8 million. This is due to the combined impact of properties being removed from the sale list and the reappraisal of the potential sale proceeds for the remaining properties. These funds will be restricted for the purpose of infrastructure renewal.

The following property was sold during 1 July 2017 to 31 December 2017.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Description</th>
<th>Proceeds from Disposal</th>
<th>Carrying amount of assets sold</th>
<th>Net Proceeds on Sale (GST excl)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21 Bradford Close, Kotara</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$40,471</td>
<td>$59,529</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Objective 8
Ensure a strong organisation that has the skills and talent to support the delivery of services that meet community needs

KPI
Critical skills known and succession plans in place to ensure continuity of service delivery to community

Measure
Succession plans in place for all critical positions by 2015

Critical roles have been identified and were recently reviewed as part of the preparation of the Workforce Plan 2018-2022. Vocational/tertiary education programs have been expanded and targeted to address the supply of suitably qualified and experienced candidates for these critical areas. Informal succession planning continues to occur at the local level. Succession planning for our workforce will become more apparent once the project work on Council’s Salary System and Performance Development Framework is established over the next 12-18 months.
## December 2017 Operating Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017/18 Adopted Budget $’000</th>
<th>Adopted changes to September 2017 $’000</th>
<th>Recommended changes to December 2017 $’000</th>
<th>Projected year end result $’000</th>
<th>Actual YTD $’000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Operating Revenue</td>
<td>260,210</td>
<td>7,986</td>
<td>5,593</td>
<td>273,789</td>
<td>139,515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Operating Expenses</td>
<td>255,405</td>
<td>7,893</td>
<td>10,480</td>
<td>273,778</td>
<td>146,173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating Revenue Less Operating Expenditure</strong></td>
<td>4,805</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>(4,887)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>(6,658)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Capital Raising revenue</td>
<td>14,403</td>
<td>4,224</td>
<td>2,737</td>
<td>21,364</td>
<td>13,453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add Back Non Cash Items</td>
<td>41,136</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1,663</td>
<td>42,851</td>
<td>20,431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding available for capital expenditure</strong></td>
<td>60,344</td>
<td>4,369</td>
<td>(487)</td>
<td>64,226</td>
<td>27,226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total capital spend</td>
<td>68,671</td>
<td>(2,527)</td>
<td>(11,198)</td>
<td>54,946</td>
<td>28,736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan Principal Repayment</td>
<td>2,882</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,882</td>
<td>2,882</td>
<td>1,441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Funds Generated / (Used)</strong></td>
<td>(11,209)</td>
<td>6,896</td>
<td>10,711</td>
<td>6,398</td>
<td>(2,951)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SNAPSHOT ON FINANCIALS

Source of funds

- Rates and charges: 57%
- User charges and fees: 30%
- Other operating revenue: 4%
- Interest: 3%
- Borrowing costs: 1%
- Grants and contributions - operating: 6%

Use of funds

- Employee costs: 35%
- Materials and contracts: 28%
- Other operating expenses: 19%
- Net loss from disposal of assets: 2%
- Borrowing costs: 1%
- Depreciation and amortisation: 15%
2012 Special Rate Variation

In 2012, we successfully applied for a section 508(2) special rate variation (SRV) of 5% above the rate cap for one year. The variation occurred in the 2012/13 financial year increasing the base rate charge. The 2012 SRV was granted for works of a capital nature for specific projects, these are outlined below.

The Delivery Program adopted by Council also includes budget principles specific to project delivery.

The 2012 SRV was introduced in July 2012 and in this time $28.4 million has been raised. This revenue is placed in a restricted reserve to fund the projects outlined in the SRV application only.

During the 2017/18 financial year we have proposed to spend over $17 million on identified projects with the majority of funding being used for coastal revitalisation.

In total $49.6 million has been spent on these capital projects since the introduction of the variation.

Special Projects
1. Revitalising Hunter Street
2. Revitalising our coast
3. Upgrading Blackbutt Reserve
4. Providing new cycleways
5. Improving our swimming pools
6. Modernising our libraries
7. Expanding parking meters
(Note: Council resolved not to expand the parking meter network.)
8. Off-street parking stations
(Note: in 2012, Council sold two of three parking stations.)
9. Expanding our Art Gallery

1 July - 30 December 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>2012 SRV</th>
<th>Budget $,000</th>
<th>Actual spend YTD $,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>City Centre Revitalisation (Hunter Street Revitalisation)</td>
<td>1,587</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Coastal Revitalisation</td>
<td>11,387</td>
<td>9,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Blackbutt Reserve</td>
<td>2,236</td>
<td>1,086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Cycleways</td>
<td>2,236</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>17,472</td>
<td>11,057</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2015 Special Rate Variation

The 2015 SRV was approved by Independent Pricing and Regulatory Tribunal (IPART) in May 2015 and will increase Council’s revenue by 46.9% over the five years to 2019/20 (an annual increase of between $8.5 million and $11.7 million over the five years).

This revenue provided by the 2015 SRV has been critical to ensure Council achieves financial sustainability. It will also allow Council to accelerate the completion of our priority projects as well as make substantial reductions to our infrastructure backlog.

Over $17 million has been raised from the 2015 SRV since the introduction in July 2015. The majority of these funds will maintain Council’s reserves to fund a sustainable asset renewal program. The remaining SRV funds received are being applied to improving Council’s services and associated assets.

2017/18 is Council’s second year of the 2015 SRV and funds have been allocated to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 July - 30 December 2017</th>
<th>2015 SRV</th>
<th>Budget $,000</th>
<th>Actual spend YTD $,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Online DA tracking</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule more pedestrian and local traffic improvements</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>411</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accelerate delivery of Blackbutt Reserve improvements</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>567</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actively contribute to the revitalisation of Newcastle</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boost road maintenance mowing and concrete footpath repair</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved operational services</td>
<td>1,741</td>
<td>397</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,146</td>
<td>1,642</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## WORKS PROGRAM

### Works program summary

Result for the financial period ending 31 December 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Portfolio/program</th>
<th>Adopted Budget $,000</th>
<th>Revised September 2017 $,000</th>
<th>Revised budget adjustment Dec 2017 $,000</th>
<th>Projected year end result 2017/18 $,000</th>
<th>Actual December YTD $,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buildings, Structures and Places</td>
<td>27,279</td>
<td>(2,434)</td>
<td>4,843</td>
<td>29,688</td>
<td>17,809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic Centres</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackbutt Reserve</td>
<td>1,950</td>
<td>(126)</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>2,262</td>
<td>634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings - Council Support Services</td>
<td>1,688</td>
<td>(680)</td>
<td>1,795</td>
<td>2,803</td>
<td>1,196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caravan Parks and Commercial Properties</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Centre Revitalisation</td>
<td>1,486</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>1,587</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Revitalisation</td>
<td>7,465</td>
<td>(2,651)</td>
<td>6,573</td>
<td>11,387</td>
<td>9,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Buildings</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>(504)</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Facilities</td>
<td>2,880</td>
<td>(328)</td>
<td>1,471</td>
<td>4,023</td>
<td>1,515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1,330</td>
<td>1,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Parks and Sporting Facilities</td>
<td>6,708</td>
<td>(335)</td>
<td>(3,445)</td>
<td>2,928</td>
<td>952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Toilets</td>
<td>1,413</td>
<td>(500)</td>
<td>(574)</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retaining Walls</td>
<td>2,805</td>
<td>(156)</td>
<td>(1,189)</td>
<td>1,460</td>
<td>1,562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads</td>
<td>19,982</td>
<td>3,254</td>
<td>3,991</td>
<td>27,227</td>
<td>20,194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridges</td>
<td>2,225</td>
<td>(300)</td>
<td>(55)</td>
<td>1,870</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footpaths</td>
<td>1,946</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>(1,189)</td>
<td>1,569</td>
<td>1,251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Furniture</td>
<td>1,135</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>(506)</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Rehabilitation</td>
<td>11,626</td>
<td>2,922</td>
<td>(2,757)</td>
<td>11,791</td>
<td>7,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Resurfacing</td>
<td>3,050</td>
<td>(346)</td>
<td>8,498</td>
<td>11,202</td>
<td>10,494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>7,101</td>
<td>(261)</td>
<td>(1,216)</td>
<td>5,624</td>
<td>1,687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycleways</td>
<td>2,657</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>(808)</td>
<td>2,236</td>
<td>1,086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Area Traffic Management</td>
<td>787</td>
<td>(27)</td>
<td>(460)</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Infrastructure</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,711</td>
<td>(2,631)</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Access and Mobility Plan</td>
<td>2,657</td>
<td>(2,332)</td>
<td>2,683</td>
<td>3,008</td>
<td>588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater</td>
<td>10,735</td>
<td>(824)</td>
<td>(1,963)</td>
<td>7,948</td>
<td>1,998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Planning</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>(262)</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater System</td>
<td>10,705</td>
<td>(1,694)</td>
<td>(1,701)</td>
<td>7,310</td>
<td>1,998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio/program</td>
<td>Adopted Budget $,000</td>
<td>Revised September 2017 $,000</td>
<td>Recom. budget adjustment Dec 2017 $,000</td>
<td>Projected year end result 2017/18 $,000</td>
<td>Actual December YTD $,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>14,615</td>
<td>(1,034)</td>
<td>(5,464)</td>
<td>8,117</td>
<td>3,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bushland and Watercourses</td>
<td>1,190</td>
<td>1,559</td>
<td>(1,706)</td>
<td>1,043</td>
<td>382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coast, Estuary and Wetlands</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>(182)</td>
<td>(212)</td>
<td>1,406</td>
<td>862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street and Park Trees</td>
<td>1,380</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(221)</td>
<td>1,159</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Management</td>
<td>10,245</td>
<td>(2,411)</td>
<td>(3,325)</td>
<td>4,509</td>
<td>1,901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>4,385</td>
<td>(69)</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>4,724</td>
<td>1,501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation and Upgrade of Applications</td>
<td>2,530</td>
<td>(1,310)</td>
<td>931</td>
<td>2,151</td>
<td>953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Improvements</td>
<td>1,430</td>
<td>806</td>
<td>(642)</td>
<td>1,594</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic and Systems Analysis</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>979</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,486</td>
<td>4,887</td>
<td>7,373</td>
<td>1,835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smart City</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>1,416</td>
<td>4,885</td>
<td>6,951</td>
<td>1,582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Plans</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleet Replacement</td>
<td>3,645</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3,847</td>
<td>739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleet Replacement</td>
<td>3,645</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3,847</td>
<td>739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Capital</td>
<td>1,552</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(243)</td>
<td>1,302</td>
<td>634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Gallery Works of Art</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Resources</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Meter Replacement</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Purchases</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(243)</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Works Program</strong></td>
<td><strong>90,294</strong></td>
<td><strong>307</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,249</strong></td>
<td><strong>95,850</strong></td>
<td><strong>49,960</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The budget above is inclusive of operational and capital works.
TOTAL WORKS

$17.8 million
Buildings, structures and places
Aquatic centres, Blackbutt Reserve, buildings, coastal revitalisation, cultural facilities, libraries, recreational and sporting facilities.

$3.6 million
Environment
Bushland and watercourses, coast, estuary and wetlands, street and park trees and waste management.

$1.7 million
Transport
Includes cycleways, parking infrastructure and pedestrian access and mobility plan.

$4.7 million
Non infrastructure projects
Information technology, fleet replacement, minor capital and strategic projects.

$20.2 million
Roads
We have been working on improving roads, drainage, kerbs and gutters across the city.

$2 million
Stormwater
Flood planning and stormwater systems.

$9 million
Waste
Construction of a waste containment cell.
OUR ASSETS ARE VALUED AT $1.7 BILLION AND INCLUDE:

Buildings and structures
68 operational buildings
56 toilet blocks
236 sporting facilities
41 cultural buildings/libraries
23 structures ie wharves
26 community halls and facilities
8 commercial buildings
21 accommodation facilities eg aged care
20 community facilities
81 bus shelters
1 parking station

Stormwater drainage
19,462 pits
454 km of pipes
18 km of culverts
254 stormwater quality improvement devices

Transport
119 bridges
1 tunnel
4 underpasses
3 weighbridges
127 transport shelters
972 km of footpaths (including
59 km of shared path)
1,489 km of kerb and gutter
804 km of roads

Library collection
369,300 general collection items
46,438 local studies collection items

Art Gallery collection
6,100 objects in the permanent collection
94 objects in the study collection

Museum collection
10,124 accessioned collection items
8,123 non-accessioned collection items
38 inward loan objects
526 intangible heritage collections items

Buildings and structures portfolio
Asset renewal within the Buildings and Structures Portfolio is on track with strong and consistent delivery of projects.

The City Hall façade renewal, Council’s largest project in this portfolio, continues with the restoration of the south and east facades nearing completion. Works to the upper levels of the east and the majority of the south sides were completed and the scaffold has been dismantled from these areas. Replacement of lower level stones, ramp and ground works is now underway.

Site investigations and preliminary works have commenced in preparation for Stage 3 (north and west facades).

Cottage Creek Bridge (Hunter Street Newcastle) replacement design was complete last financial year. The last six months has been negotiating with utility providers to move and modify services while the bridge is renewed. It is expected that this bridge renewal contract will go to tender in March 2018. Tyrell Street Bridge Wallsend, design has been completed in the last six months. Cowper Street Bridge Wallsend has been concept designed last year and is currently in the detailed design phase.

Brown Street retaining wall had rock anchors installed to improve the stability, and other ancillary works to improve the stairway have been undertaken. Shortland Esplanade retaining wall adjacent to Newcastle Beach was removed and replaced as part of the Bathers Way works. Curzon Road retaining wall works were due to be delivered before Christmas but have stalled due to the road and drainage design works. It is expected that this will move to tender later this year.

The Fred Ash Building has had the air conditioning replaced and internal repairs to remediate painted surfaces and carpet.

Playgrounds that have been replaced within the last six months include the playground located within the reserve at Bull and Tourle Streets Mayfield West, and Wallsend Park.
Environment portfolio

The Environment Program delivery of renewal projects spend is on target with the designs completed or underway for the majority of large civil and natural rehabilitation projects scheduled for construction in March - June 2017.

Bushland and Watercourse works such as, Kotara Park Waterdragon Creek Stage 1 rehabilitation works successfully completed. Urban Creek asset database field inspections for newly acquired assets has been completed. Coast and Estuary works such as: repair of the storm damage to the Mitchell Street Sea wall (northern end) at Stockton Beach; construction methodology for Shortland Esplanade slope failure repair underway; Lloyd Street Reserve Littoral Rainforest restoration (Endangered Ecological Community) ecological burning and bushfire asset protection requirement determination completed; 1C Minmi Road Wetland riparian restoration works successfully underway; Stockton sand nourishment monitoring and works delivered in October - November, Swale within Bar Beach Dune has been repaired and replanted; and Cliff stabilisation works at South Newcastle Beach - Skate Park and Kilgour cliffline rock scaling have been successfully completed.

Street and Park Tree works such as 188 trees planted across 34 suburbs including: whole of street community planting of Mayfield and Hamilton South, successful installation of large 1200litre Norfolk Island Palms to King Edward Park / Bathers way entry point; standard drawing for street tree planting in road reserve/ parking lanes has been drafted; Street Tree replanting community engagement including species selection in association with Swan Street, Council Street, Bruce Street and Frederick Street projects delivered; Street Tree planting under Living Streets delivered at Gorrick Street Mayfield involving 58 students from St Phillips Christian College; and in Parkway Ave with Hamilton Sth Public School.

Stormwater portfolio

Within the Stormwater Portfolio the stormwater program of works is on target with a large array of design and construction work completed, commenced or planned for financial year 2017/18.

Stage 1 drainage construction work at Power Street Islington was completed in August. Drainage renewal work at John T Bell Drive was completed in conjunction with the roads project in October. Sanctuary swale rehabilitation which included a pit pipe bypass construction work was completed in December. Drainage rehabilitation work for Corlette Street, The Junction commenced in November and is ongoing. Enabling works at Swan Street, Cooks Hill has commenced, including tree removal and utility relocations.

Planning and design was completed, or is currently underway, for numerous projects that are scheduled for delivery in the second half of this year and in the future years works programs. These include: Stockton laneways sag points; Brookfield Ave Fletcher drainage outlet; Gross Street Tighes Hill GPT; Ayrshire Street Sandgate GPT; and drainage improvements for Council Street Cooks Hill, Patrick Street Merewether, Swan Street Cooks Hill, Frederick Street Merewether, Moruya Parade Kotara, Croudace Road Elermore Vale.

The next round of the trenchless pipe relining work has been issued to Project Management for delivery by contractors in this financial year. This project will rehabilitate 25 pipelines which will result in approximately 860 lineal metres of pipes will being rehabilitated using trenchless technology.

Roads portfolio

Within the Roads Portfolio the renewal projects in roads program is ahead of target. Major projects completed include: Minmi Road Wallsend Road widening; road reconstruction at John T Bell Drive at Maryland; Watt Street and Nobby's Road Newcastle East and Anderson Drive watermain.

Road Resurfacing has been completed in Birdwood Street New Lambton, Wharf Road, Pasha Way and Horseshoe Beach Access Road.

Kerb and gutter replacement works in Adamstown, Beresfield, Maryland and Stockton has been undertaken in preparation for the road resealing and rejuvenation programs.
1.0 INTRODUCTION

NEWCASTLE CITY COUNCIL IS IN THE PROCESS OF PREPARING PUBLIC DOMAIN PLANS (PDPS) FOR SEVERAL PRECINCTS IN NEWCASTLE CITY CENTRE TO ALIGN WITH THE STATE GOVERNMENT AND DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS CURRENTLY UNDERWAY, OF WHICH THE WEST END - STAGE ONE - PUBLIC DOMAIN PLAN IS ONE.

1.1 PROJECT BACKGROUND

RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER PROJECTS AND STUDIES

In 2014 Minister for Transport and the Hunter announced the first stage of the heavy rail line truncation at Newcastle Station and the re-introduction of Light Rail to Newcastle. The NSW Government has made a commitment to complete the Newcastle Interchange and Light Rail works by 2019. These projects along with changes proposed in the draft Newcastle Urban Renewal Strategy will see an exciting transformation of the West End precinct into the Newcastle central business district over the long term.

The proposed public domain plans for this area will help position the west end as the city’s future CBD, implementing improvements such as a tree lined road network, increased pedestrian spaces, public transport hub, allocated bike lanes, and promoting specific physical improvements around Birdwood Park and Cottage Creek.

SITE LOCATION AND DEFINITION

The West End precinct is located between Tudor Street and Union Street and is the western gateway into Newcastle city centre. The West End Public Domain Stage 1 is the key public open space within the West End Precinct.

The Public Domain Stage 1 study area includes a mixture of parkland, being Birdwood Park and little Birdwood Park, and surrounding streetscape improvements of King Street, Parry Street and adjoining slip roads and access streets surrounding these. Importantly it does not include layout of King Street and proposed safe separated cycleway routes. (Please refer to “Figure 1 Site location and context plan”).

1.2 VISION

WEST END PRECINCT

The vision for the West End precinct is one of an emerging central business district that provides a welcoming gateway for the city centre. The West End vision includes:

- Intense land use with a commercial core zoning, creating a thriving employment node for the city
- Buildings 45m to 90m in height
- An important transportation hub (Newcastle transport interchange, main road linkages and bus interchange)
- A tree lined streetscape providing a welcoming amenity, wayfinding, shade and a reduced heat island effect
- A walkable precinct with great pedestrian links and amenity
- Separated cycleway network through the precinct
- Great wayfinding between the key precinct nodes of:
  - Newcastle transport interchange (and bus interchange)
  - Honeyeukle West future development sites
  - Cottage Creek
  - Marketown Shopping Centre and
  - Birdwood and Little Birdwood parks

WEST END PUBLIC DOMAIN: STAGE 1

The vision for this public domain plan will be about creating connectivity, legibility and spaces for the community, residential, business and visitors, to enjoy. A re-imagined Birdwood and Little Birdwood Park will bring greater vibrancy to the precinct and support the surrounding developments, existing businesses and residential community. The parks will showcase and be embedded with smart technology elements to create a premier Smart City Park for the City Centre. The improved wayfinding and tree lined streetscape through the precinct will facilitate connectivity between the key nodes and help make the West End precinct a walkable area.
Figure 1  Site location and context plan
1.3 STRATEGIC POSITIONING

ALIGNMENT WITH NEWCASTLE URBAN RENEWAL STRATEGY:
The West End Public Domain Stage 1 project is located in Newcastle's West End. The West End is positioned to become the city's future CBD and the public realm in and around Birdwood Park is located at its heart and set to become the primary civic space in this precinct. In recognition of its importance, Birdwood Park is identified as one of 10 special areas within the CBD.

Special areas were identified in recognition of their location, attributes, size and/or development potential. They have the potential to realise specific outcomes with respect to built form and/or public domain that could make major contributions to the distinct character of each locality/node.

The Newcastle Urban Renewal Strategy provides significant guidance for the outcomes being sought in this project through:
- Vision
- 9 Guiding Principles
- 17 Place-based, economic and transport initiatives which underpin the Urban Renewal Strategy;
- 10 Special Areas with supporting guidance and outcomes as specified in the City Centre DCP.

This guidance has been supplemented with the project brief for this project as prepared by Council. This brief includes reference to additional city-wide outcomes such as public art, smart technology and public domain manuals.

The following objectives for the project have synthesised these outcomes into a concise list which will be used to guide the development of the public domain plan.

WEST END PUBLIC DOMAIN OBJECTIVES:

OVERALL OUTCOMES

1. Interpret and reinforce important civic elements of the city structure, including:
   a. Birdwood Park as an important city park
   b. As a gateway into Newcastle City Centre
   c. A sense of arrival in the West-End Precinct; and
   d. King Street as one of two east-west green links with a strong landscape character for the city.

2. Reinforce, improve or develop the specific and distinctive character of this location including:
   a. Maintain and improve cultural and heritage elements through design and interpretation;
   b. Consider adaptive reuse of landscape or existing structures where applicable;
   c. Provide for the future role of West End as the city’s CBD; and
   d. Connect with the future natural green character of Cottage Creek.

3. Integrate Birdwood Park and Little Birdwood Park with adjoining streets and public spaces to create a significant and cohesive public domain precinct through strong built edges, less vehicular dominance and additional street planting.

4. Identify opportunities for incremental acquisition of public open space to ensure the precinct is well served as it evolves into a commercial core precinct.

5. Strengthen the spatial definition of streets and parks through landscape and public realm responses to enclose the park and contribute to the creation of an outdoor room within the city.

PARKS

6. Redesign Little Birdwood Park and Birdwood Park to create an attractive, safe and enjoyable place for recreation including:
   a. Diversity the users of the space;
   b. Upgrade the amenity to activate the site; and
   c. Create an allowance for activation spaces.

7. Maintain adequate sunlight to Birdwood Park.

PUBLIC REALM/ STREETSCAPE

8. Promote outcomes that reinforce safety and amenity in the public domain including:
   a. Providing legibility throughout the public domain that minimises pedestrian and vehicular conflict;
   b. Ensuring clear sight lines are maintained and adequate lighting is included for safe use of the space day and night;
   c. Consider CPTED principles to redirect the anti-social behaviour of areas like Little Birdwood Park; and
   d. Integrated lighting, way finding and signage as per the City Centre Public Domain Technical Manual.

9. Identify public realm and streetscape outcomes that contribute to the delivery of active street frontages and active footpaths.

10. Furniture, materials and tree selection to:
   a. Deliver high-quality public domain outcomes;
   b. Consider the longevity and maintenance of materials and furniture design; and

11. Embed public spaces, park and streetscapes with:
   a. Smart technology elements;
   b. Equitable access design principles; and
   c. Public art locations.

ACCESS AND MOVEMENT

12. Strengthen and improve pedestrian and cycle connections:
   a. Between the park and adjoining development;
   b. Through the park and streetscapes of the precinct;
   c. Between the park other key destinations including:
      - the Cottage Creek corridor;
      - the river foreshore; and
      - the new transport interchange at Newcastle.

13. Consider reconfiguring slip roads on either side of King Street (and potentially Parry Street) as share-ways with greater landscape areas to increase the expansion of Birdwood Park and improve pedestrian usability. Some design considerations include:
   a. Maintain vehicle access to building frontages;
   b. Reduce the carriageway width of King (access road) and Parry Streets and extending the park edge;
   c. Consider raising the street to the footpath level with special paving or marked areas to delineate between vehicle and pedestrian areas;
   d. Decrease the amount of hard surface road and providing more permeable paving, particularly in parking areas;
   e. Provide new landscaped areas and additional street trees; and
   f. Restrict new vehicle entries from all streets (access to carparking and loading area should be via rear lanes).
CONNECTING KEY CITY DESTINATIONS

Figure 2  Birdwood Park Strategic Context

Legend
- Key activity nodes
- Strategic city centre
- Subject site
- City Centre Precinct
- Honeysuckle precinct
- Special areas
- Key parkland
- Central spine
- Existing links to waterfront
- Future connections to waterfront
- Bathers Way Route
- Newcastle Train / Light Rail interchange
- Ferry stop
- Existing railway
- Light rail alignment
- Major road
- Local road
- Cottage Creek
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2.0 SITE ANALYSIS & CONTEXT

BIRDWOOD PARK HAS A LONG HISTORY AS A KEY PUBLIC SPACE IN NEWCASTLE’S CITY CENTRE. UNDERSTANDING THIS HISTORY AND INTERPRETING IT WITHIN ITS NEW ROLE AS THE HEART OF THE WEST END WILL BRING NEW LIFE TO THIS IMPORTANT SPACE.

2.1 SITE HISTORY

HISTORICAL OVERVIEW

Birdwood Park was established on the 27th February 1890 when an area of approximately 3 acres was gifted by the Australian Agricultural Company to the Municipality of Newcastle to be used for ‘public recreation’. The reserve soon became known as the West End Park. Improvements to the park were made by the Council with newspaper references announcing its ‘beautification’. This work continued with a 1918 reference warning vandals not to ‘destroy the trees, flowers and plants in the park’.

Field Marshal William Riddell Birdwood, a veteran commander of the Gallipoli campaign, visited Newcastle in April 1920. Although there is no mention of a visit to the park, Birdwood Park has a strong relationship with the adjacent heritage listed 1910 Army Drill Hall, the location of military recruitment during World War I and II. It is likely that West End Park was renamed Birdwood Park in his honour shortly after his visit.

An extension of the park had been proposed on a number of occasions. Evidence points to this being successful in 1945, with the addition of a triangular piece of land. The land, along with the proposed installation of new children’s play equipment totalled £8,000.

Birdwood Park has been both a geographic and cultural gateway to inner Newcastle. The park features prominently in the city’s history for hosting circuses, carnivals, charity events, picnics and other social activities. In 1947 it also became host to a baby clinic during the baby boom, which was located in a former air raid shelter located on the southern side of the park.

The location of the park also provided a meeting area for patrons attending events at the then nearby Greater Newcastle Stadium. The stadium, which opened in 1938 and operated for 26 years, could seat 4000 patrons and held a variety of entertainment events and boxing matches.

Birdwood Park was also a prominent site for industrial and socio-political rallies and gatherings during the 1940s, in particular during the 1949 Coal Strikes. The Coal Strikes were significant in that it was the first time the Australian Military had been used in peacetime to disrupt industrial action. Newspapers documented rallies of up to 15,000 (see “Key Events” on the following page).

The 1970s saw a major change to the park with the realignment of King Street (known at the time as State Highway 10A). Community resistance to the road was vocal, with a significant spike in references to the park in local papers. This resistance was centred around future traffic concerns and the removal of 17 large fig trees (which would have likely been an included to the current heritage listed trees in the park) in March 1973. A defining image of the community action was an elephant (from a travelling circus) taking on the excavators (refer images opposite). During this development, the air raid shelter was also demolished (see image).

No significant changes were made to Birdwood Park apart from the installation of public art, developed by local Hunter Institute of Technology students, which highlights local indigenous motifs, the park’s role as a mustering area for World War 2 soldiers and the Coal Strike period. Most recently a public art seat was installed in the park directly in front of the Drill Hall in 1999. The art seat is titled The Sitting Stone and was created by John Turier.

Birdwood Park continues to build on this tradition hosting the cabaret Circus Avalon in a big tent for the upcoming Newcastle Fringe Festival.

The 1960 Map showing proposed new highway Source: UoN Cultural Collection - Hunter Photo Bank

Figure 3

AERIAL PHOTOS

Figure 4 Aerial Photograph in 1966 Source: Newcastle Local Studies Library

Figure 5 Aerial Photograph in 1974 Source: Newcastle Local Studies Library

Figure 6 1910 Map of Newcastle showing West End Park Source: UoN Cultural Collection - Hunter Photo Bank
KEY EVENTS

1890  Australian Agricultural Company gifts a 3-acre reserve which becomes known as West End Park
1892  Newspaper references Newcastle Council 'beautifying' the park
1910  Army Drill Hall is completed
1918  Newspaper references to West End Park gardens of trees, flowers & plants in the park
1920  General Birdwood visits Newcastle – soon after the park is renamed in his honour.
1931  First reference to enlarging the park by the Mayor
1930s  Numerous references to carnivals, circuses and charity social events held in Birdwood Park
1938  Greater Newcastle Stadium opens nearby
1940s  Significant socio-political rallies occur in the park
1945  Extension of the park to include triangular piece of land and new play equipment
1947  WW2 Air Raid Shelter commences role as a baby clinic
1949  Major coal strikes with large union and ALP meetings held in Birdwood Park. Community rally activities such as anti-war meetings prior to World War 2
1950  Birdwood Park considered for War Memorial Site, however was dismissed due to future DMR plans
1972-73  Major demonstrations in the park against removal of trees and roadway construction
1973  King Street deviation opened
1999  The Sitting Stone art seat installed

During King Street construction: Abu the elephant in 1973. Source: Newcastle Herald
During King Street construction: Demolition of last WW2 Air Raid Shelter (1972). Source: UoN Cultural Collection - Hunter Photo Bank
Aerial view of Little Birdwood Park and Stadium (sawtooth roof) with tip of Birdwood Park at left. Source: Lost Newcastle/Facebook
ALP rally during 1949 coal strike: View looking east. Source: Newcastle Herald
ALP rally during 1949 coal strike: View looking west. Source: Trove
2.2 SITE CONTEXT
Figure 7  Birdwood Park Local Connectivity
2.3 PHOTOGRAPHIC AUDIT

PARRY STREET, NATIONAL PARK STREET AND KING STREET (HIGHWAY)

Open lawn area is framed by trees (however succession planting blocks sight lines to adjoining area) and reduces usable area.

Poor legibility due to winding pathway along King Street edge of park.

Fig trees within open parkland block sight lines.

Lack of facilities within parkland.

No pedestrian amenity along King Street slip road is contrasted by figs which provide shade and define park edge.

Planting blocks sight lines while providing little visual or physical protection from adjoining traffic.

Park entrance at National Park and King Street intersection is dominated by concrete and bitumen and has no function.

Parking adjacent to Birdwood Park.
PARRY STREET, NATIONAL PARK STREET
AND KING STREET (HIGHWAY)

Parry Street dead end

Historical fig tree planting marks original boundary to park

Planting and curved pathway result in poor pedestrian legibility

Recent development creating active uses to take advantage of amenity setting

Lack of pedestrian amenity to King Street access road

King Street access road dead-end has poor pedestrian connectivity and amenity
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Entrance Signage

King Street access road adjacent to Little Birdwood Park provides local access only

Little Birdwood Park pedestrian connections and seating areas poorly located and don’t continue connections

Taxi rank on King Street access road with poor pedestrian waiting area, abandoned trolleys and no natural surveillance

Camphor Laurels line Little Birdwood Park along King Street access road

Entrance to Marketown is partly concealed and provides no activation or casual pedestrian surveillance

Loading area for Marketown shopping centre on King Street access road

Little Birdwood Park (South of King Street)

Report 5 days

WestEnd Stage 1 Public Domain Plan Report
PARRY STREET, NATIONAL PARK STREET AND KING STREET (HIGHWAY)

Public Art in King Street Median

Existing King Street does not create gateway character

King Street and Stewart Street intersection at Birdwood Park

Parry Street is not a through street, over scaled and poor pedestrian amenity

Parry Street footpath is cluttered with services, driveways and no pedestrian amenity

Overhead wires dominate streetscape along National Park Street

National Park Street has single sided tree planting

Parry Street Looking east from King Street/Stewart Avenue intersection
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2.4 SITE ANALYSIS

OBSERVATIONS

SITE CONSTRAINTS - A FRAGMENTED PARK

MAJOR ROAD CORRIDORS CREATE BARRIERS TO PEDESTRIAN MOVEMENT AND FRAGMENT GREEN SPACE

CURRENTLY LITTLE KING STREET IS USED AS A SHORT CUT

VEHICLE ACCESS LANES ISOLATE GREEN SPACES FROM ADJOINING USES REDUCING THEIR FRAGMENTED OPEN SPACE WITH NO STRUCTURE / PURPOSE

Legend

- Site boundary
- Softscape area
- Major barrier
- Secondary barrier
- Minor barrier

Figure 8 Site Analysis - Fragmented Park
VEHICLE MOVEMENT & ACCESS

Legend
- Site boundary
- Main road & primary pedestrian spine
- Primary vehicle road
- Vehicle access - rat run
- Vehicle access - servicing
- No through road
- Busy local roads
- Calm local roads
- Driveway access

Figure 9  Site Analysis - Vehicle movement and access
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PEDESTRIAN ACCES & CIRCULATION

Figure 10 Site Analysis - Pedestrian Access and Circulation

Legend
- Site boundary
- Pedestrian footpath
- Zebra/signalised crossing
- Street edge without footpath
- Marketown access
- No pedestrian connection
- Existing bus stop
- Existing taxi rank

PEDESTRIAN & VEHICLE CONFLICT POINT
INDIRECT PATHWAYS DON'T FOLLOW DESIRE LINES
NO PEDESTRIAN CONNECTION
NO AMENITY ALONG FOOTPATH
POORLY DEFINED ENTRY TO MARKETOWN
NARROW FOOTPATH WITH NO AMENITY

KING ST
COTTAGE CREEK
LITTLE KING ST
PARRY ST
HUNTER ST
NATIONAL PARK ST
NATIONAL PARK ST
PACIFIC HWY / STEWART AVE
STEEL ST
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ADJOINING ACTIVITY

Figure 11 Site Analysis - Active frontages and proposed development
EXISTING VEGETATION & ECOLOGY

Figure 12 Site Analysis - Ecology and landscape features

Legend
- Site boundary
- Streets lack of trees
- Lack of perimeter planting
- Well defined street edge
- Street edge to be improved
- Ficus Macrophylla
- Camphor Laurel
- Melaleuca
- Other tree species
EXISTING FEATURES & ACTIVITIES

Figure 13 Site Analysis - Park activation and features
3.0 DESIGN DIRECTION

3.1 BIG IDEAS

CELEBRATE THE PAST
Retain and celebrate the local heritage through artwork and interpretation.
LOOK TO THE FUTURE
Respond to the future role of the West End as a major Civic Place for the new CBD.

PROVIDE OPPORTUNITIES FOR:
Cultural, recreational, social, leisure, environmental
3.2 DESIGN STRATEGIES & OPPORTUNITIES

COMPLETE THE PATHWAYS
Connected network of pedestrian pathways along key desire lines define and activate the edges.

CALM THE EDGES
Reduce pedestrian and vehicle conflicts.

ACTIVATE ADJOINING DEVELOPMENT
Program active uses in adjoining development with active uses that will enliven the edges.

A GREEN FRAME
Complete the green frame of Birdwood Park.

GREEN THE STREETS
Implement street tree planting to provide shade and amenity for pedestrians.

AN ARRIVAL BOULEVARD
Create a City Centre Gateway through boulevard planting along King Street.
3.3 PLACE MAKING

CREATE A SERIES OF DESTINATIONS
Provide a series of attractions around the edges of Birdwood Park to attract a variety of users at different times of the day and week.

MAXIMISE AMENITY
Identify opportunities to reclaim amenity for the future heart of the CBD.

A UNIFIED PRECINCT
Unite the streets, parks and shared spaces into a single precinct through a unified suite of materials.

ONE BIG PARK
Reclaim the historic boundaries of Birdwood Park.

CREATE DISTINCTIVE PLACES
A civic green, ecological parkland and linear creek are all connected by a people street.
3.4 CREATE A SENSE OF PLACE & BELONGING

Figure 14 Preliminary sketch concept plan
3.5 PLACE MAKING PROGRAMMING OPPORTUNITIES
4.0 PUBLIC DOMAIN MASTER PLAN & FRAMEWORK

This section of the report describes the vision for the West End Stage 1 Public Domain and sets out the key principles and elements of the Public Domain in a series of framework diagrams.

4.1 WEST END STAGE 1 – PUBLIC DOMAIN STRATEGIC DIRECTION

OVERALL PRECINCT STRATEGY:
- Acknowledge Birdwood Park as an important city park;
- Reinforce King Street as a gateway into Newcastle city centre with a strong landscape character;
- Maintain and improve cultural and heritage elements;
- Provide an urban park for the future role of West End as the city’s CBD;
- Connect with the existing and future natural and green character of Cottage Creek;
- Integrate Birdwood Park and Little Birdwood Park with adjoining streets and public spaces to create a significant, cohesive design for the precinct;
- Redesign the parks and streetscapes to reinforce safety, provide clear sight lines and improved lighting;
- Identify public realm outcomes that contribute to the delivery of active street frontages;
- Furniture, materials and tree selection will deliver high quality public domain outcomes in accordance with the Newcastle City Council City Centre Public Domain Technical Manual and Street Tree Selection Manual;
- Strengthen and improve pedestrian and cycle connections between key destinations and through the park and
- Where possible decrease the amount of hard surface road and provide new landscape and pedestrian friendly spaces;
- Integrate Smart City elements into the public domain;
- Address anti-social behavior through CPTED principles.

THE BIG IDEAS:
1. Celebrate the Past: retain and celebrate the local heritage through artwork and interpretation;
2. Look to the Future: respond to the future role of the West End as a major Civic Place for the new CBD;
3. Provide Opportunities for: Cultural, recreational, social, leisure, environmental
Public Art Council to investigate alternative location to best celebrate the piece of park.

Little Birdwood Park

To Newcastle Interchange

To National Park

Little King Street

Parry Street

Warrah Street

Stewart Avenue (Pacific Hwy)

National Park Street

Kings Street

Cottage Creek

Steel Street

Hunter Street

Stewart Avenue

Bellevue Street

Little Birdwood Park Plaza

Birdwood Park
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4.2 ACCESS & MOVEMENT FRAMEWORK

Figure 16 Access and Movement Framework
4.3 STREET TYPOLOGIES

Figure 17 Street Typologies Framework Plan
4.4. KEY PUBLIC SPACES & PLACES FRAMEWORK
KING STREET - CITY CENTRE GATEWAY:
The King Street spine marks a place of arrival. The place where you feel like you have transitioned from the suburban to the urban. The historic threshold to the city centre.

Key design principles include:
1. A linear gateway that the motorist will move through;
2. Avenue Tree planting;
3. Formal hedge planting to both sides of King Street;
4. Proposed smart pole lighting
5. Punctuated with large scale public art work that highlights the arrival points to Birdwood Park and Little Birdwood Park.

Figure 18 Key Spaces and Place Framework Plan
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BIRDWOOD PARK: LOCAL URBAN PARK

A LOCAL OPEN SPACE FOR THE FUTURE RESIDENTS AND WORKERS OF THE WEST END. ONE THAT IS DISTINCTLY URBAN IN CHARACTER.

Birdwood Park will become the heart of the future West End CBD. The public realm design aims to provide a platform for cultural and civic events. The master plan will create energy by providing activities and destinations to draw people in. The design responds to the existing cultures, climate and day and night time activities and will provide physical openness and accessibility for all.

The spaces have been designed to be flexible, adaptable, activated, safe and welcoming.

Key design principles include:

1. To create a layered public realm framework that ensures the park is punctuated by a series of small, medium and large scale events. The events will encourage pedestrian movement from one end to the other, drive activation and provide the infrastructure for local activities and celebrations.

2. Design a memorable pedestrian place, defined by:
   a. Formal avenue of shade trees (existing and proposed);
   b. Open flexible central parkland;
   c. Bespoke Park Café (with toilets and Council Storage & Smart City communication room) and terrace;
   d. Central promenade with feature pedestrian scale lighting;
   e. Feature paving that draws people through the space;
   f. High quality furniture;
   g. Integrated public art
   h. Smart City elements.

3. Celebrate the heritage value of the space as a place for community gathering is retained through the creation of central open space which is flexible and usable for events and meeting spaces. Heritage trees are incorporated with new planting.

4. Provide an activated and safe environment

5. Respond to the park role as a major civic place

LEGEND

1. Potential location for public art
2. Table tennis pods (active space)
3. Sculptural play elements
4. Cafe + public toilets + council store room & Smart City communication room
5. Existing fig trees + perimeter planting added
6. Open green space
7. Internal park path
8. Gateway tree planting
9. Shrub planting under trees
10. Low hedge against King Street
11. Bespoke seating / benches
12. Pedestrian lighting spaced between trees
13. Proposed RMS - REF road configuration
14. Deciduous tree grove to park entry
15. Raised pedestrian crossing
16. Existing parking

Key Plan
BIRDWOOD PARK: ARRIVAL PLAZA

Birdwood Park Arrival Plaza is a transitional space from the surrounding streetscapes (corner of King Street and National Park Street) to Birdwood Park. The public domain plan will create a small-scale pedestrian plaza that incorporates public art, lighting and seating benches along the primary path into Birdwood Park. The space is divided up into two zones that can accommodate different programs and activities.

LEGEND

1. Raised pedestrian crossing
2. Proposed deciduous tree grove
3. Birdwood Park entrance plaza
4. Potential location for public art
5. Existing street trees
6. Existing Melaleuca trees
7. Existing parking
8. Proposed street trees
9. Existing street trees

Figure 21 Birdwood Park Arrival Plaza Concept Plan
NATIONAL PARK STREET REVITALISATION:
The proposed streetscape upgrades along National Park Street will provide an enhanced pedestrian amenity along this key connection back to Hunter Street.

Key design principles include:
1. New street tree planting and rain gardens;
2. Pedestrian blisters at the intersection with Parry Street;
3. Smart poles;
4. Upgraded pavements;
5. Formalized planting at the interfaces with Birdwood and Little Birdwood Parks.
3D VIEWS - BIRDWOOD PARK ENTRANCE PLAZA
LITTLE BIRDWOOD PARK:

EMBRACE AND ENHANCE THE EXISTING NATIVE VEGETATION AND PROXIMITY TO COTTAGE CREEK. INCORPORATE OPPORTUNITIES FOR LOCAL STORMWATER TREATMENT AND ADDITIONAL NATIVE VEGETATION.

Little Birdwood Park will become unified with Birdwood park through consistent paving, furniture, lighting and planting. The master plan proposes to remove the roadway between Office works and National Park Street, replacing it with an arrival plaza to Marketown providing an opportunity to activate the frontage to King Street.

Key design principles include:

1. Improve the value of the natural environment with sustainable planting;
2. Incorporate sculptural landform, environmental artworks;
3. Formalise the arrival plaza to Marketown
   a. Provide clear sightlines to the entrance of the shopping centre
   b. Incorporate accent trees, seating benches and pedestrian scale lighting to the plaza
   c. Upgrade the connection to the bus stop on King Street
4. Improve pedestrian connection to Cottage Creek and east of the creek;
5. Inclusion of Smart City elements.

**Figure 22** Little Birdwood Park Concept Plan

**LEGEND**

- Existing trees and proposed garden bed to national park street
- Ornamental tree grove with bespoke seating + lighting
- Cafe dining zone
- Future tree planting
- Little Birdwood Park
- Existing loading dock entry
- Existing parking
- Existing road to become loading only
- Marketown parking entry
- Council to investigate inclusion of WSUD
- Existing Melaleuca's
- Existing trees
- Open lawn
- Existing parking

LITTLE BIRDWOOD PARK ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOR CONTROL STRATEGIES:

- Upgrade whole of Little Birdwood Park;
- New arrival plaza to the Park and Marketown, will include open civic design with clear sight lines and upgraded pedestrian scale lighting;
- Remove all existing furniture in the park;
- Insert a formal lawn adjacent to the arrival plaza and future outdoor cafes/tapas;
- Long term plan to activate the edge of the park by opening up the Marketown frontage;
- Improve lighting throughout the whole park;
- Integrate cycle path to provide passive surveillance of the park.
PARRY STREET: CREATIVE HUB

PARRY STREET IS ALREADY A HUB OF CREATIVE ENERGY AND BUSINESSES. STREETSCAPE IMPROVEMENTS AND IDENTIFICATION OF UNDERUTILISED AREAS WHICH COULD BECOME NEW PUBLIC SPACES PRESENT THE OPPORTUNITY TO FOSTER THIS CREATIVE ENERGY INTO THE PUBLIC REALM.

Key design principles include:
1. New street tree planting and community gardens;
2. Smart Poles;
3. Upgraded pavements
4. Reduced road surfaces that have been reclaimed as additional green parklands

The restructured street cross section provides a wonderful opportunity to close the street down to vehicular traffic for weekend markets and street festivals and celebrations.

LEGEND

- Low hedge to King Street verge
- Shared pedestrian/cycle path
- Proposed deciduous tree
- Existing figs
- Car parking
- Proposed realigned intersection
- Street tree planting
- Shared zone
- Existing trees
- Proposed trees
- Seating bench
- Proposed street trees
- Proposed pedestrian crossing
- RMS proposed road alignment
- Proposed taxi bays
- Existing bus stop
- Cycle access only

Key Plan

Figure 23 Parry Street Concept Plan
5.1 LIGHTING

NOCTURNAL PLAN

LEGEND

1. Cafe/restaurant lighting
2. Temporary cinema/outdoor cinema
3. Pedestrian lighting (4m)
4. Multi directional pole top lights (8m)
5. Up-lighting to public art
6. Strip lights to edge of bench seats
7. Stud lighting on edge of path
8. Cycle access only

Figure 24 Nocturnal Plan
The issues of safety and amenity cannot be separated. People’s perceptions of safety are influenced by factors such as visual comfort, way-finding, and the ease with which objects and places can be recognised.

Good lighting should enhance the transformation from day to night. In doing this, it should produce positive changes that enrich people’s experiences and enhance their comfort within the city.

The vision for the West End Stage 1 lighting design is to include a variety of layers for lighting that covers all users of the space with a distinctive lighting design and a seamless extension of the adjacent street lighting. This will be achieved by several designed elements including:

- Smart Pole and traditional street lighting
- Up lighting of heritage trees
- Low level pedestrian scale pole top lighting
- Integrated lighting into the public domain elements (seating benches, bollards, café, artwork) and
- Event lighting (multi directional pole top light fittings).
5.2 GREEN SPACE

The City of Newcastle acknowledges that trees are an important urban asset that provide environmental, aesthetic, cultural, wayfinding and economic benefits for the city centre. Trees also offer a contrast with the building facades that dominate most city streets, soften traffic noise, screen unwanted views, reduce glare and provide shade during the warmer months of the year.

The objectives for West End Stage 1 Public Domain will be to retain the existing establish Ficus Sp. Trees. These street trees are the predominant element that defines the green character and reinforces the historical Birdwood Park boundaries as well as the gateway to the Newcastle’s city centre. The existing Camphor Laurel and Melaleuca sp. Will be retained and expanded upon within Little Birdwood Park.

Water Sensitive Urban Design planter beds will be integrated into Little Birdwood Park and along National Park Street. These planter beds will improve the streetscape and treat as much storm water collection as possible before it enters the adjacent Cottage Creek.

All proposed trees species will be selected in accordance with the NCC Newcastle Street Tree Selection Manual. To ensure the ‘right tree is planted in the right place’.
5.3 FURNITURE

The City of Newcastle Public Domain Technical Manual (2014) identifies the need for a coordinated suite of furniture for the city centre public domain. Distinctive areas have been identified in the manual to allow for bespoke seating to be installed to express the special nature key spaces within the city centre.

West End Stage 1 will have a site specific seating benches, raised seating platforms, outdoor tables, play equipment and multifunctional sculptural play elements that will provide for individuals and groups of people.
5.4 SMART CITY ELEMENTS

The City of Newcastle is an emerging smart city and we are looking at ways to introduce new digital initiatives to our city centre. West End Stage 1 Public Domain Plan will include digital initiatives, such as a public Wi-Fi, smart information panel, smart bin, smart lighting, mobile parking app, and smart crime prevention technology.

Integration of technology into Birdwood Park and Little Birdwood Park will provide a demonstration project enabling residents and visitors to interact with and experience the benefits of smart city technologies. Smart city initiatives form a key role in enabling urban liveability, cultural activation and economic development for the city centre.

5.5 INTERPRETATION

The integration of smart city technology into Birdwood Park and Little Birdwood Park will provide a platform to tell stories about the local history of the site.

Smart phone apps will be able to communicate both the history of the site along with future public events and celebrations.
5.6 PUBLIC ART

The City of Newcastle recognises the cultural and economic benefits that flow from integrating public art into the urban fabric. The overall public art role within our city centre will range from high quality bold works on a large scale to small intricate or delicate works that add texture and intimacy to the urban experience. Public art will create opportunities to integrate a cultural layer into the city centre and enhance and strengthen wayfinding cues for people to navigate through our city with ease. Birdwood Park and Little Birdwood Park has been identified in the Newcastle Urban Renewal Strategy (2014) and the City Centre Public Domain Plan Technical Manual (2014) as a distinctive place that will incorporate seamless public art into the design of the public domain.
5.7 EVENT OVERLAYS

Events and festivals add to the vibrant atmosphere, cultural layer, activation and in the promotion of the city centre. Events and festivals also bring big economic benefits to businesses in the retail, hospitality and tourism sectors for our city centre. Events also provide engagement of the wider community to create a safe, accessible and people friendly environment for all.

BIRDWOOD PARK EVENT OVERLAY

Birdwood Park has featured prominently in the city’s history for hosting circuses, carnivals, charity events, picnics and other social activities (including industrial and socio-political rallies and gatherings during the 1940s, in particular during the 1949 Coal Strike). The design proposals will facilitate opportunities for passive, active, programmed and un-programmed cultural events.

Figure 25 Birdwood Park - Event Overlay Concept Plan
PARRY STREET EVENT OVERLAY

The restructured street cross section of Parry Street provides a wonderful opportunity to close the street down to vehicular traffic for weekend markets and street festivals and celebrations.

Figure 26 Parry Street - Event Overlay Concept Plan
Q1. Could you please tell me how strongly you agree or disagree with the design of Birdwood Park?
Agree: 28
Neutral: 2
Disagree: 5

Q2. Could you please tell me how strongly you agree or disagree with the design of Birdwood Plaza?
Agree: 25
Neutral: 3
Disagree: 7

Q3. Could you please tell me how strongly you agree or disagree with the design of Little Birdwood Park?
Agree: 28
Neutral: 2
Disagree: 5

Q4. Could you please tell me how strongly you agree or disagree with the streetscape design for National Park Street?
Agree: 26
Neutral: 4
Disagree: 5

Q5. Could you please tell me how strongly you agree or disagree with the streetscape design for Parry Streets?
Agree: 32
Disagree: 3
Neutral: 0
• Improve lighting to National Park Street
• Outside of scope of works - Connection along Cottage Creek.
• Relocate existing Public art in the middle of King Street to another city park.

• Investigate Kiosk installation into Little Birdwood Park
• Replace existing Camphor Laurels with natives
• Activate Little Birdwood with playground & new lighting

• Request for a memorial (tree) to Grandfather who was murdered in the park in 1980
• Investigate Tourist information centre into the building structure
• Include public toilet facilities in Birdwood Park
• Overall concern number of traffic lanes in King Street
• Indicate bike paths and there is a need for separated bike lane into the city
• Investigate children’s playground & separate dog area
• Increase shade & winding paths through the park
• Increase shade in Birdwood Park, question furniture & smart technology
• Include fence to Birdwood Park on King Street, add half courts, exercise equipment
• Remove vehicular access to traffic in both directions in Little King Street

• Improve lighting to Parry Street
• Alter the intersection at Parry and National Park Street to a roundabout intersection
• Remove slip lane left hand turn at King and National Park Street
• Remove car / traffic turn onto shared / paved area in Little Parry Street
• Overall carparking issues within the city

• Investigate Kiosk installation into Little Birdwood Park
• Replace existing Camphor Laurels with natives
• Activate Little Birdwood with playground & new lighting
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INTRODUCTION & PRINCIPLES

11. Introduction

This Stage One Streetscape Plan has been prepared for Newcastle City Council to guide the design of the public domain within the study area located within the Newcastle East End precinct. The study focusses on the upgrade of Hunter Street between the intersection with Scott Street to the west, and the intersection with Newcomen Street to the east. The study also considers the eastern sections including Rennies, Wallis, Thomas, Hunter, Heri Brough and Newcomen Streets as well as areas-networks of laneways and stairways between King and Hunter Streets. The study will also capture Market Square located at the southern end of Market Street.

This document defines the character of each space within the study area as well as identifying a material palette that is integrated with Council’s Technical Manual and Street Tree Master Plan documents.

Understanding the Site

Newcastle East End is a main thoroughfare within the heart of the CBD centred around the main street, Hunter Street. The precinct is comprised of predominantly commercial and mixed use buildings many of which include heritage buildings with preserved facades.

The streets within the precinct accommodate pedestrian circulation, vehicular circulation and parking as well as on street activity such as dining and markets. The ground plane and ameliorations generally of poor condition apart from the western end of Hunter Street which has already undergone an upgrade. The poor condition of the public domain provided little in regards to defining the precinct or encouraging further adaption.

Hunter Street

The continuous road paved surfaces of Hunter Street create a sense of ambiguity in regards to the delineation of pedestrian and vehicular / shared zone, therefore the corner cliff area contains for the lanes and parking spaces are defined by linear marking with an array of interrupted furniture elements used to further define pedestrian only spaces. This rudimentary vision of future provides little identity and unappeal to the precinct. An array of varying awnings and market structures inhabit the street adding visual clutter.

Vegetation lacks in most to some reach with voids existing between Heri Brough and Scott Street, with parallel parking located along the way. At Hunter Square there is limited greenery with the only other green coverage within the streets.

Side Streets and lanes

The side streets and lane ways to the north and south of Hunter Street offer little in regards to the pedestrian experience. These streets are generally narrow, provide little public amenity and a poor level street level context.

Hunter Street delineates a change in position with the side streets to the south in line with the height of the Christ Church Cathedral located at the top of the rise in Cathedral Park. Streets to the north of Hunter are fairly flat reading towards the harbours edge.

The disconnection from the waterfront together with the hostile nature of Scott Street and the heavy rail, and the rising topography to the south has meant that on street activity is mainly focused on Hunter Street.

In more recent times the side streets have been identified from initiatives such as the Street Art Walking Dia project, which has seen the injection of colour and vibrancy through street art and murals. These colourful art pieces have now become ingrained in the character of the precinct.

1.3. Rejuvenation of the Precinct

An overview of the Newcastle East End and similar urban centres will be further fuelled by the completion of major projects in the vicinity including the Newcastle East End Redevelopment, Newa City Light Rail and the University of Newcastle’s New Space building.

These projects have driven renewed energy, as well as a commitment of residents, students and locals to the precinct. Most importantly for Hunter East End is the completion of the removal of the hospital area and the spaces once rectifying the CBD with its eastern front.

The precinct has also benefited from a cultural renewal similar to more recent years. The Newwa festivals and events have continued to boost cultural events and public art projects such as  low rise short term lease scheme connecting local building owners with vacant shop fronts, creative enterprises and you community groups. This space in place of the CBD. This has then led to a diverse range of pop ups, galleries, workshops, film studios and nightclubs.

The Lock up Cultural Centre located at 204 is located out of the project site is a dedicated multipurpose community arts centre catering for arts and other events. Street art has also flourished within the latest two years spurred on by initiatives such as Street Art Walking Dia project which have seen permanent public art art works throughout the CBD be transformed by street artists.

The significant changes in local context and cultural elements emp best the importance of creating a public domain for Newcastle East End that strengthens connections within and beyond the area while facilitating an excellent place as such as shopping opportunities and public art.

1.2. Project Objectives and Vision

With the planning of a number of significant projects within and around the study area including the Newcastle East End development, Newcastle Light Rail and the University of Newcastle’s New Space building the study shall also become a significant nodal destination within Newcastle.

The following studies and technical documents have informed the design of the Public Domain is setting the core values and vision for the project.

- Newcastle City Council Hunter StreetRedevelopment Master Plan 2010

The framework described existing Hunter Street Mall as a priority urban site for site restoration. Developing the existing Hunter Street Mall as a natural meeting place and key catalyst site for future revitalisation in the city.

- Newcastle City Council City Centre Public Domain Technical Manual 2014

This document has been developed to drive the design of the public domain. These include:

- Public places that provide for diverse activity and strengthen our social connections

- Green the street

Bring people back to the city centre

- Read the street

Elevate public space and find your way around

- Shop the street

Strengthen connections within and beyond the area while facilitating an excellent place as such as shopping opportunities and public art.
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LEGEND
1. Hunter Street carriageway with bi-directional cycleway and on street parking
2. Hunter Street pedestrian friendly crossing with raised paved kerb. Vehicular and cycle lanes defined by material transitions
3. Public terraces with stair + ramped access to market street
4. Market Street shared / loading zone with raised + paved carriageway
5. Iris Capital development
6. Potential kiosk retail location
7. Morgan Street steps
8. Bin enclosure and motorcycle parking within Keightly Street
9. Market Street Lawn - Hunter Street Development Corporation
10. Light rail alignment
11. Light rail stop
12. Proposed raised pedestrian crossings

CONCEPT MASTER PLAN

Newcastle East End Stage 1 | Public Domain Plan
Description:
Hunter Street forms the high street of the East End precinct. Currently the street accommodates pedestrians and vehicles within a flush paved ground plane with little to no definition of edges. The street presents a poor public interface with limited legibility, high level of street clutter and poor quality materials.

Principles:
- Provide high quality legible lane connections that utilise the spatial character and play upon the existing urban grain of the Newcastle CBD
- Provide adequate lighting throughout the lanes to promote surveillance and safe night time use
- Provide opportunities for integrated public art throughout the laneways

Legend:
- Hunter Street

Opportunities:
- Improve public amenity through the introduction of designated café/restaurant spill out areas and improved facilities
- Upgrade paving throughout Hunter Street and surrounds to create a high quality streetscape that is accessible and robust
- Create a consolidated suite of functional, bespoke street furniture and appropriate fixtures to replace existing clutter
- Improve lighting to increase passive surveillance and security and enhance the night time economy
- Celebrate architectural qualities of heritage building façades through possible up-lighting strategy
- Minimise awning structures to shop fronts to create stronger visual connection to heritage building façades
- Retain avenue tree planting character, with possible succession of existing mature trees
- Prioritise pedestrian circulation wherever possible
HUNTER STREET

DETAIL PLAN 01

LEGEND
1. Single vehicular carriageway heading west between Newcomen and Perkins Streets
2. Bi-directional cycle lanes located on the southern side of the carriageway
3. Parallel parking bays provided on northern edge of the carriageway between street trees within planters (potential WSUD capabilities).
4. Raised cobble pedestrian crossing
DETAIL PLAN 02

LEGEND
1. Single vehicular carriageway heading west between Newcomen and Perkins Streets
2. Bi-directional cycle lanes located on the southern side of the carriageway
3. Raised pedestrian friendly crossing at Market street and Newcomen Street intersections
4. On street parking spots provided along Hunter Street
HUNTER STREET PEDESTRIAN FRIENDLY ZONE

1. Paving transitions define areas of pedestrian and vehicular movement.
2. Generous footpath widths allow for additional outdoor dining and retail spillout.
3. Removable bollards allow for large scale event overlays to occupy Hunter Street shared zone area.

Newcastle East End Stage 1 | Public Domain Plan
HUNTER STREET PEDESTRIAN FRIENDLY ZONE

KEY ELEMENTS

LEGEND

1. Stone paved footpaths with potential interpretive banding
2. Raised cobble-paved pedestrian crossing
3. 300mm wide raised kerb island
4. Planters with potential WSUD capabilities
5. One-way vehicular carriageway
6. Bi-directional cycleway
7. Market Street tree plantings
8. Bollards

Client: Newcastle City Council
Drawn: TA
Checked: SVB
Scale: 1:100 @ A3
Date: 5th March 2018
Rev: C
HUNTER STREET CARRIAGEWAY WITH PARKING

Bi-directional cycleway with broken kerb to edge of vehicular carriageway. Swale plantings provide buffer to footpath and pedestrian zones.

Generous footpath widths allow for additional outdoor dining and retail spillout.

Improved street trees and swale plantings define outdoor rooms for retail and dining spillout, whilst also providing buffer between vehicular zones and footpaths.
KEY ELEMENTS

LEGEND

1. Stone paved footpaths with potential interpretive banding
2. Proposed on street parking with permeable paving
3. 300mm wide raised broken kerb delineating cycle lane
4. Proposed deciduous street trees
5. One-way vehicular carriageway

6. Bi-directional cycleway
7. Potential locations for public furniture, on street dining and retail spillout
8. On street planting beds with potential WSUD capabilities
MARKET STREET

Description
Market Street is located between Hunter Street and Scott Street and will provide a strong link from the East End Precinct to the new market street light rail and waterfront. The intersection of Market Street and Hunter Street is highlighted as an active node punctuated by a generous raised pedestrian crossing linking across Hunter Street. A series of public terraces are provided between Hunter and Keightly Streets offering informal seating under trees. Disabled access ramps are also provided at this location. Market Street has been designed to allow pedestrian priority and minimise vehicle access to delivery and residential parking to existing underground carparking. An intimate dining square is provided at the southern end of Market Street flanked by retail, this square will be delivered as part of the East End Development Application.

Principles
• Provide strong north-south pedestrian and visual connections to the waterfront
• Offer public breakout spaces that provide informal seating and gathering space
• Encourage outdoor dining

LEGEND
Market Street

CHARACTER PRECEDENT IMAGES
LEGEND

1. Hunter street raised pedestrian crossing.
2. Public terraces with stair + ramped access to market street. Public seating located under large deciduous trees with small lawn facing market street.
3. Market street shared / loading zone with raised + paved carriageway, new street trees and removable bollards for closure during events.
4. Proposed mail zone and loading bay.
5. Bin enclosure.
7. Light rail alignment.
MARKET STREET

Flexible paved space that can be closed off to vehicles to cater for public events

Vibrant laneways with public art and fine grain paving

Small scale gathering space with generous Public seating

Opportunities for on street dining under canopies of street trees
Intimate outdoor dining zones under canopies of trees

Fine grain retail laneway

Large scale public art opportunities

Generous pedestrian friendly crossing point across Hunter Street
LANEWAYS - LAING STREET

KEY ELEMENTS

1. Fine grain retail opportunities to activate laneway network
2. Proposed seating and street tree plantings
3. Consolidated street art strategy to include existing and proposed buildings
4. Potential for installation artworks and interactive environments

Client: Newcastle City Council
LANEWAYS - KEIGHTLY STREET

KEY ELEMENTS

1. Fine grain and detailed paving changing character from service lane to pedestrian lane
2. Interpretive inlays within paving referencing the site's heritage
3. Consolidated street art strategy to include existing and proposed buildings
4. Potential for installation of catenary lighting / artworks within laneways
MORGAN STREET STEPS

Description

Morgan Street Steps is a publicly owned and accessible space comprising a flight of stairs with terraced planters transitioning between King Street and Laing Street. The indicative design proposes double height seating stairs located adjacent to access stairs providing informal north facing seating opportunities. An open paved space at the base of the stairs could provide the opportunity for informal events and performance. Public seating could be located throughout the terraces surrounded by large scaled shade trees with decorative understorey planting. The western boundary wall to adjacent Council carpark allows for integrated public art possibilities along the entire length of the terraces.

Principles

- Include planted terraces and seating areas adjacent the stairs
- Provide adequate lighting throughout the terraces that allows safe nighttime use

LEGEND

- Morgan Street Steps
MORGAN STREET STEPS

**LEGEND**

1. Access stairs with handrails and integrated lighting for night time use
2. Seating stairs, forming informal amphitheatre for small events
3. Banded planting with large evergreen feature trees
4. Upper belvedere with views across CBD
5. Boundary wall adjacent to council carpark at balustrade height
6. Adjacent council carpark

**INDICATIVE CONCEPT PLAN**
PROPOSED PUBLIC ART

LEGEND

Primary public art installation
Potential wall for street art
Integrated interpretative public art

Client: Newcastle City Council
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SMART TECHNOLOGY IN THE PUBLIC DOMAIN

WHY EMBED TECHNOLOGY IN THE PUBLIC DOMAIN?

Newcastle is an emerging smart and innovative city.

Always ahead of the urban revitalisation narrative that the city is an attractive place to live, work, meet and visit. The smart city will provide opportunities for entrepreneurs and businesses to thrive in the digital century and deepening urbanisation of the local economy and drive new investment and outward commercialisation of local and regional nations.

A smart city is also focused on sustainability, improved livability and increased public amenity. These principles are deeply related to the quality of the public domain and the city experience for residents and visitors.

Embedding technology in the public domain is a key strategy in creating a data-rich urban environment that produces insights on city populations. The city data provides a rich resource for urban administration and planning.

Technology in the built environment makes the city more navigable, accessible, responsive, informative and interesting.

INTEGRATING TECHNOLOGY WITH URBAN INFRASTRUCTURE

A smart city requires two kinds of urban infrastructure. 1. Digital Connectivity

- The first is digital connectivity. This includes fibre broadband networks and WiFi platforms. Newcastle is developing strategies for fibre-to-the-premises within a Digital Precinct and a City-wide WiFi platform in the city centre. Fibre and WiFi enable digital economy and urban data and are increasingly understood as fundamental city infrastructure.

2. Internet of Things

- The Internet of Things (IoT) is the third wave of the Internet. It relates to ubiquitous and networked computing that is connecting everything. Sensors and digital connectivity in a whole range of infrastructure and products is providing valuable real-time data that is the source of new insights and value creation. IoT is transforming wearables, smart homes, retail and industry and public utilities. Through embedding IoT technology traditional public infrastructures are made ‘smart’.

WHAT KINDS OF SMART TECHNOLOGY IS NEWCASTLE LOOKING AT?

1. WiFi

- A City WiFi network provides the digital connectivity allowing sensors to be networked and linked to the internet. It is the backbone of the IoT platform in the city centre. CityWiFi also supplies a free City WiFi service and enables improved city information.

2. Smart Lighting

- Smart lighting involves sensors and controls in the lighting infrastructure to enable real-time status awareness and responsive controls. Benefits include resource management, sustainability improvements and light-as-required.

3. Smart Parking

- Smart parking involves sensors to monitor use and availability. Real-time information on parking spaces can be used for improving urban mobility and citizen experience. The sensors provide real-time information on the city’s public transport and even information.

4. Smart Screens

- Smart Screens are interactive touch displays embedded in the public spaces of the city to create points of concentration and activation such as plazas, parks and pedestrian nodes.

5. Street Furniture

- Street furniture can be embedded with digital connectivity and sensor technology to improve citizen experience and amenity. Examples include bench seating with WiFi and device charging stations, bus stops with help points, electric vehicle charge stations.

6. Smart Bins

- Smart Bins will be fitted with sensors that indicate when a bin is nearing capacity or has a bad smell. This data is provided to waste management services and analytics. The data is used to optimise collection routes and transport to create benefits in both resource optimisation and city data.

7. Interactive Environments

- Sensor and digital technology in the built environment also enables development of interactive spaces of engagement and civic participation. Seniors might include interactive lighting, digital game spaces, media art and environmental motion and control fountains.

8. Environmental Sensing

- Sensors can collect data on environmental conditions (CO2, temperature, humidity), and patterns of movement, such as traffic and pedestrian mobility.

---
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TYPICAL STREET SECTIONS

HUNTER STREET PEDESTRIAN CROSSING

HUNTER STREET VEHICULAR CARRIAGEWAY

SECONDARY STREET

LANEWAY
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INDICATIVE MATERIALS PRECEDENTS

MATERIALS

FURNITURE

LIGHTING + WAYFINDING

PUBLIC ART
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CCL 27/03/18
ENDORSEMENT FOR PUBLIC EXHIBITION OF THE DRAFT NEWCASTLE AFTER DARK STRATEGY

Attachment A: Draft Newcastle After Dark Strategy - March 2018
Acknowledgment
Newcastle City Council acknowledges the traditional country of the Awabakal and Worimi peoples. We recognise and respect their cultural heritage, beliefs and continuing relationship with the land, and that they are the proud survivors of more than two hundred years of dispossession. Council reiterates its commitment to addressing disadvantages and attaining justice for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples of this community.

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 After Dark strategy contributes to the following Goals.

Goal 3: Ensure healthy lives and promote well-being for all at all ages

Goal 8: Promote inclusive and sustainable economic growth, employment and decent work for all

Goal 9: Build resilient infrastructure, promote sustainable industrialization and foster innovation

Goal 11: Make cities inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable

Goal 12: Ensure sustainable consumption and production patterns
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2.0 Our City at Night

The city is different at night. Shifting patterns of darkness and light change our sense of place. The mix of living, working and playing in the city centre alters as people pursue diverse entertainment options and a different cultural scene emerges in venues and on the streets. The nightlife of a city has close links to its cultural and community life. The leisure and consumer patterns of the city at night have evolved over decades to meet this demand for spaces that facilitate public and civic life and allow cultural activity to flourish. Yet, the night-time economy is equally a place of work and productivity, directly employing over twelve thousand Novocastrians and accounting for 5.4% of the total Newcastle economy ($1.358 billion in 2015). The Newcastle night-time economy is significant at a national and regional scale; presently it is the sixth largest night-time economy in the country.

A well-planned city night-time economy has a central role to play in city centre revitalisation, as well as exerting a major influence over the visitor and cultural economies of the city and the region.

The broader understanding of the economic and cultural value of nightlife has been steadily improving. At the same time, the role of alcohol in the night-time economy remains prominent, and the social and economic risks of its unmitigated and irresponsible supply and consumption are sharply in focus.

In light of this, it is critical that Council develop a comprehensive and positive strategic direction for the city at night.

Over the last decade Newcastle’s night-time economy has mainly been known for the so-called ‘Newcastle Intervention’. These supply-side-focused interventions have contributed to a decrease in alcohol-related violence and anti-social behaviour in the area that has drawn the attention of city governments and policy-makers alike. Based on these sustained successes, Newcastle is considered as a pioneer in strategic alcohol management. ‘Lockout and last drinks’ models have been replicated in nightlife precincts in Sydney and Queensland with varying effects.

Now, several years on, this work should be seen as an opportunity for re-visioning a safe and vibrant nightlife. Newcastle is not the city it was ten years ago. The city is evolving as revitalisation gathers momentum. The challenges we face now are different. Our approaches to managing the city at night must evolve apace.

Since implementation of the interventions, Newcastle has undergone significant change led by a strong growth in smaller, ‘low impact’ venues and a burgeoning creative and dining scene. Coinciding with this has been an increasing pace of urban renewal projects coming through the pipeline into fruition. City centre residential density is increasing as city living rises in popularity. With this comes the challenge of balancing the needs of those calling the city centre home, and those who visit solely for entertainment. The growing University of Newcastle city campus is bringing thousands of students into the city centre and with them the demand for more diverse nightlife options. Streetscape and public domain improvements across the city centre represent an unprecedented opportunity to create a dynamic and secure public culture of nightlife marked by ease of access, public activation and enticing and interactive public domain.

The shifting culture of nightlife in Newcastle necessitates a broadening scope of what kinds of night-time activities and city planning issues fall within the scope of a strategy for the night-time economy. Newcastle After Dark is Council’s response to this important challenge.
3.0 Newcastle After Dark

Vision

A city night-time economy characterised by its creative, vibrant and safe nightlife and that contributes significantly to the cultural and economic revitalisation of Newcastle.

Principles

In order to achieve this vision a set of shared principles were developed as the guiding framework for assessing initiatives throughout the strategy. The following principles and their definitions were collaboratively identified, tested and confirmed in the community engagement process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Newcastle After Dark Principles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vibrant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.0 About This Strategy

The Newcastle After Dark: Night-time Economy Strategy is Newcastle’s first specific strategy for guiding the development of the city’s night-time economy.

Newcastle After Dark identifies strategic principles to shape the Newcastle night-time economy over the next decade, and a four (4) year framework of programs and actions to ensure the safety, amenity and economic value of the city at night. It will guide decision-making around investment, planning and project implementation across Council, and also provide direction for key stakeholders and partners in a safe and vibrant night-time city.

The Strategy delivers on key components of Newcastle 2030, Council’s Community Strategic Plan. Newcastle 2030 is grounded in extensive consultation and focuses on seven core themes reflecting the desires and ambitions of the local community. Newcastle After Dark supports outcomes in the following core themes of Newcastle 2030.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2030 Core Themes*</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Connected city</td>
<td>Effective and integrated public transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vibrant and activated public places</td>
<td>Public Places that provide for diverse activity and strengthen our social connections. Culture, heritage and place are valued, shared and celebrated. 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. A creative, culturally rich and vibrant community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liveable and distinctive built environment</td>
<td>A built environment that maintains and enhances our sense of identity. Mixed-use urban villages supported by integrated transport networks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smart and innovative city</td>
<td>A culture that supports and encourages innovation and creativity at all levels. A thriving city that attracts people to live, work, invest and visit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open and collaborative leadership</td>
<td>Integrated, sustainable and long-term planning for Newcastle and the Region.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Newcastle 2030 Newcastle Community Strategic Plan (Revised 2013)

4.1 Parallel Planning

Newcastle After Dark has significant strategic links with a range of other Council planning documents.

- Economic Development Strategy 2016-2019
- Local Planning Strategy
- Smart City Strategy 2017-2021
- Safe City Plan 2017-2020
- Cultural Strategy 2016-2019
- Newcastle Transport Strategy 2014
- Events Plan 2016-2019
- Destination Management Plan 2016-2019
- Social Strategy 2016-2019
5.0 Defining Challenges and Key Opportunities

Newcastle is both the second largest non-capital urban centre, and the second oldest city in Australia. The Newcastle Local Government Area (LGA) is home to 152,948 people (2016 census) and at current projections is expected to grow by an additional 32,000 people by 2036. The city welcomes about 4.1 million visitors each year. Newcastle is at the centre of the Lower Hunter region (600,000 people) serving as the primary provider of business, health, education and professional services.

The city has undergone a major transformation over the last two decades, with strong growth in services, activity and employment. In particular, there has been growth in knowledge industries, with the expansion of health, higher education, professional and technical services and the creative economy. These industries, along with the traditional energy and engineering sectors, are providing the foundation for growth of Newcastle and the broader region.

These demographic and economic changes are exerting an influence over all aspects of city planning, community life and business activity. The performance of the city at night is not exempt. Within these broader structural changes there are a range of opportunities for the ongoing development of a safe, diverse and vibrant night-time economy and creative and inclusive cultural life of the city at night. Three in particular stand out as defining the present challenge:

1. Venue Diversity, Density and Availability
2. Noise and Land Use Conflicts
3. Alcohol-related Violence, Lockouts and Last Drinks

5.1 Venue Diversity, Density and Availability

When planning for density and diversity of nightlife it is important to consider that nightlife is more than licensed venues. It also takes place in a wide variety of public and commercial spaces and involves many activities unrelated to the consumption of alcohol.

A diversity of venues is understood as a key contributor to a sense of vibrancy. A cluster of homogenous venues can facilitate a dominant culture that is limited and exclusive. A diverse mix of venue styles and types will in contrast attract a diverse range of participants, in turn contributing to improved perceptions of safety.

Venue diversity is also important for the development of cultural spaces and broader social diversity which are important preconditions for an inclusive society accepting of gender, ethnic and subcultural difference.

The position and proximity of licensed premises relative to one another is an important factor. An extensive study into liquor license density and cumulative impact conducted for NSW Office of Liquor Gaming and Racing in 2012 found that clustering of liquor licenses had both positive and negative economic and social impacts. Despite ranking near the top of state-wide rankings for the total number of premises across major categories of liquor license, Newcastle ranked low in actual density (15th). This can be attributed to the traditional east-west structure of the city centre and the extended nature of Hunter Street, which still sees four nightlife precincts situated along its length (East End to Hamilton). The density of licensed venues in Newcastle city centre is of course greater than that of the LGA as a whole.
Current city revitalisation planning (*Hunter Street Masterplan 2010; Newcastle Urban Renewal Strategy 2014*) is to establish nodes or ‘activity centres’ along Hunter Street rather than attempt to foster activity the full length of the Australia’s longest main street. This model is creating north-south connections, and improving mobility along the east-west spine. These same principles stand for night-time economic development. While clusters of venues can generate adverse cumulative impacts if unmanaged, the alternative – to have a widely dispersed and dislocated nightlife – extends both the effective geography of the governance task and the degree of residential impact. The challenge is to foster nightlife clusters of diverse venues and appropriate public spaces and facilities, and to effectively manage their growth to leverage shared infrastructure benefits and network effects, while also mitigating social harms and amenity impacts.

5.2 Noise and Land Use Conflicts

As the regional centre of culture for the Hunter Region, the city has served as the primary entertainment mecca. It has been a key stop on the national touring circuit and has traditionally boasted strong live music and performance scenes. Sometimes this prominent role has strayed into notoriety (as with the Star Hotel riot of 1979) but more often the city centre serves as a place of entertainment for multiple generations. This rich cultural life of the city at night is intimately interwoven into the identity of Newcastle.

The Newcastle city centre is experiencing regeneration as a place to live, work, invest and visit. In 2016-17 private investment development pushed through the $1 billion milestone. 2017-18 is likely to see development exceed $1.5 billion. A considerable proportion of this is investment into new residential living, particularly in the East End and West End/Wickham areas. This has coincided with the growing pace of urban renewal projects transforming the city to result in a rapidly increasing city centre residential population (5,888 at the 2016 census; an increase of 1930 people from 2006).

One policy approach to managing this tension between the valuable social, cultural and creative benefits of live music and performance, and the legitimate demands of city residents not to be unduly disturbed, is called the ‘Agent of Change’ principle. This legal principle outlines that the entity responsible for introducing a change into the built environment carries the onus of mitigating the impacts of that change. Applied to city living and the night-time economy, Agent of Change would imply that a developer responsible for building a residential complex needs to ‘design in’ reasonable noise mitigation (for example double glazing). Conversely, a late night venue seeking to extend venue space or hours of live performance would need to ensure noise impacts are managed. Agent of Change distributes risk and cost fairly, while providing a level of protection for valuable live music and performance space.

There is an expectation that life in a city centre is going to involve denser social and business interactions, and that these will extend beyond the comparative time periods of suburban neighbourhoods. The premiere city nightlife precincts will have different approved uses including later trading venues and increased noise levels, whether from live entertainment or generally heightened levels of social activity. One benefit of clustering is a ‘containment’ effect of these potential land-use conflicts. However, ultimately there needs to be acceptance on behalf of city centre residents that city life involves a degree of noise and activity.
5.3 Alcohol-related Violence, Lockouts and Last Drinks

Newcastle City Council has a longstanding interest in supporting effective management of alcohol consumption and its effects. ‘Alcohol and Drug related Crime’ was identified as one of five key themes in the Council’s Crime Prevention Plan 2001. Alcohol-specific strategies in this plan focused on managing changing consumption patterns and enhancing responsible service of alcohol. The Plan specifically identified a trend of an alcohol-centric night-time economy and youth culture of binge drinking, and the importance of responsible service and quality venue management.

Community concern regarding rates of alcohol-related violence and anti-social behaviour peaked in 2007 and 2008 prompting a range of State Government agencies to develop a suite of strategies, collectively called the Newcastle ‘Intervention’ or ‘Model’, focused on the late-trading licensed premises of the Newcastle city centre. These initiatives were introduced in a voluntary capacity in the nightlife precinct of Hamilton in 2010. At their core these strategies focus on restricting supply of alcohol. The key elements of the interventions, led by the NSW Police and Liquor and Gaming NSW (LGNSW) are:

- Earlier closing times; no later than 3.30am
- 1.00am or 1.30am restricted entry policies (lock outs)
- Drink restrictions after 10pm including:
  - No shots
  - No more than four drinks
  - No drinks stronger than 30mls of alcohol
  - No Ready to Drink stronger than 5% alcohol volume

Independent research has verified that a sustained decrease in alcohol-related violence was achieved through these combined interventions including reduction in public assaults and presentations to emergency departments.

The dominant culture of nightlife in Newcastle has changed in terms of the behaviour of participants, the styles of venues that are popular, and the broader community expectations of acceptable risks and harms. This is partially due to the Newcastle interventions.

In 2017 the NSW Government announced an independent review of Newcastle liquor license conditions. Newcastle City Council’s submission proposed that the framework should be evolved to reflect the present cultural and economic state of the city at night, with a particular focus on supporting and incentivising further growth in low impact venues, and basing policy on an updated evidence base.

The Safe Newcastle: Alcohol Management Strategy 2010-2013 (AMS) was developed and implemented by Newcastle City Council in response to a growing understanding and community expectation of the need to manage potentially detrimental impacts of alcohol in the city. This award-winning strategy proposed a wide range of initiatives across multiple areas. Many initiatives have been successfully established as continuing activities, and together with those of partner agencies, have had a marked effect on the extent of alcohol-related harms.
6.0 Snapshot

FREQUENCY OF PARTICIPATION IN THE NEWCASTLE NIGHT-TIME ECONOMY

- 28% Within the last month
- 26% Within the last week
- 12% Within the last three months
- 7% Within the last 6 months
- 4% Within the last 12 months
- 3% More than 12 months ago
- 1% Never

Source: Newcastle After Dark Survey 2015, Newcastle City Council

LICENSED VENUES BY CATEGORY IN NEWCASTLE LGA IN 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>License Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Club license (Taverns, RSL’s)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel license (Nightclubs, bars, pubs)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited license (Only for set times or events, e.g. sports match, NYE)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-premises liquor license (Restaurants, cafes)</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Packaged liquor license (Bottle shop)</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Producer wholesaler license (Winemakers, brewers)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small bar licence</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NSW Liquor and Gaming 2017

ACTIVITIES AND INITIATIVES THE COMMUNITY WANTS TO SEE MORE OF AFTER DARK

- 78% Place activation events
- 68% Improved transportation options
- 65% Restaurants and cafes open for late night meals
- 64% Public spaces designed for night time use
- 60% Creative lighting

Source: Newcastle After Dark Survey 2015, Newcastle City Council

REASONS PEOPLE DON’T PARTICIPATE IN THE NEWCASTLE NIGHT-TIME ECONOMY

- Parking difficulties: 42%
- Fear for own safety: 27%
- Not interested: 18%
- I prefer not to go out at night: 20%
- No particular reason/Unsure: 9%
- Venues don’t cater to my preferred activities: 14%
- Lack of public transport: 14%
- Negative media portrayal of Newcastle nightlife: 11%
- Too difficult to get to: 10%
- Negative experience in Newcastle at night: 5%
- Other: 4%

Source: Newcastle After Dark Survey 2015, Newcastle City Council

LICENSED VENUES BY CATEGORY IN NEWCASTLE LGA IN 2017

- Club license (Taverns, RSL’s): 8.2%
- Hotel license (Nightclubs, bars, pubs): 17.2%
- Limited license (Only for set times or events, e.g. sports match, NYE): 10.3%
- On-premises liquor license (Restaurants, cafes): 47.4%
- Packaged liquor license (Bottle shop): 13%
- Producer wholesaler license (Winemakers, brewers): 2.5%
- Small bar licence: 1.4%

Source: NSW Liquor and Gaming 2017

GROWTH IN NIGHT-TIME ECONOMY BUSINESSES

Source: The Australian Night-time Economy Research Report 2017

FACTORS IMPORTANT IN ENSURING AN ENJOYABLE NIGHT OUT

- Safety: 91%
- Good range of venues: 78%
- Venue security: 73%
- Good range of activities: 72%
- Inclusive culture: 70%

Source: Newcastle After Dark Survey 2015, Newcastle City Council
**ECONOMIC OUTPUT**

The Newcastle NTE had a turnover of $1.274bn in 2015.

- 12% $159m for drinks-led businesses
- 37% $478m for entertainment-led businesses
- 51% $627m for food-led businesses

Economic output of the Newcastle NTE is up 26% since 2009 (up from $1.011bn)

Source: The Australian Night-time Economy Research Report 2017

**CITY CENTRE RESIDENTIAL POPULATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>POP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>3616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>3958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>5347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>5888</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Australian Bureau of Statistics 2017

**EVENTS**

Council supports events and cultural activities through:

- Economic Development Support
- Investment in Arts and Culture
- Events Sponsorship
- Community Assistance Grants
- Make Your Place Grants

Events approved by Council 2017-2018: 249

Events sponsored by Council 2017-2018: 10

Source: Newcastle City Council

**NEWCASTLE CITY CENTRE LATE NIGHT SAFETY**

Number of incidents of selected offences recorded by NSW Police occurring in Newcastle and Newcastle West, Friday and Saturday night, 10pm to 6am

Source: Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research

**CREATIVE INDUSTRIES IN NEWCASTLE**

The number of people employed in creative industries occupations in the city is estimated at 4070

Source: Research Report into the Creative Industries in the Hunter
7.0 Council’s Role

The Newcastle night-time economy has major impacts on the safety and amenity of the city and local centres. Council performs many key functions that influence and support the community including at night. Some of these are: safety and safe workplaces, ensuring a consistent approach to development, and encouraging economic and cultural activity in the city.

Council works collaboratively with all tiers of government, as well as community-based organisations, to ensure that adequate resources are targeted towards needs, and that we work collectively to maximise opportunities and to add value to relevant agencies work programs.

Council has a range of roles related to developing and ensuring a safe, culturally diverse and economically prosperous night-time economy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council’s Role</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provider</strong></td>
<td>We provide a range of infrastructure, services, facilities and programs that meet the needs of the community. This includes Council’s provision of a regulatory function with relation to certain requirements as laid out in the Local Government Act (year), and monitoring community and commercial behaviour to manage compliance with those regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leader</strong></td>
<td>We identify key community issues and mobilise both local and external stakeholders to respond where appropriate. Plan and provide direction through policy and practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collaborator</strong></td>
<td>We support and partner with the community, private and government organisations to deliver tangible benefits to the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planner</strong></td>
<td>We will use our professional expertise to undertake research, provide information, and in consultation with community stakeholder, develop and evaluate ways to resolve identified issues. We will undertake this work from a whole of community perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capacity builder</strong></td>
<td>We work with community groups and agencies to meet local needs. We mentor and/or assist community groups to obtain the necessary resources through partnerships with other agencies. We also distribute funding through competitive and transparent process to support activities in community and economic development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advocate</strong></td>
<td>We give a voice to the community by advocating to achieve benefits and best possible outcomes for Newcastle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Our Key Approaches

8.0 Our Key Approaches

Ours is a positive vision of the city at night. The Newcastle night-time economy encapsulates all kinds of cultural and economic activity after dark. Activity occurs throughout the city evening and into the late night. The Newcastle After Dark strategy aims to steer and encourage all night-time activity in ways that position it as a positive element in the revitalisation of Newcastle. A safe, diverse, creative city at night is one where people want to work, visit, live and play.

The Newcastle After Dark strategy, in its strategic priorities and initiatives, has been developed to account for and support the key trends driving city revitalisation. Through alignment with these major drivers, the creation of a safe and vibrant night-time economy adds great value to the renewal of Newcastle.

University of Newcastle Campus

The expansion of the University of Newcastle city campus will dramatically re-shape the Civic and Honeysuckle Precincts. The major NEW Space building, refurbishment of University House, forthcoming Innovation Hub, and further University of Newcastle spaces and facilities in Honeysuckle and rail corridor land are increasing capacity for thousands of students creating demand for a wide variety of venues across the city. The staff and servicing of the city campus also drives considerable broader employment, often well beyond traditional 9-5 work hours.

City Living

Newcastle city centre, including Wickham, is undergoing a dramatic increase in housing supply which will increase the city centre residential population by an estimated 3000 people over the next five years. City centre residential living is an important factor in a sustainable night-time economy, increasing casual demand for venues and activities.

Flagship Urban Renewal Projects

A range of major urban renewal projects are maturing which will substantially influence urban planning and economy across the Newcastle. Among these major projects are the Newcastle Transport Interchange and redevelopment of the adjacent Store building; the development of the rail corridor creating new north-south connections and new public spaces; mixed-use development of the former Hunter Street Mall; the proposed redevelopment of the old Newcastle Train Station as an entertainment precinct, and the long-awaited renewal of the Victoria Theatre as a live performance destination.

Renewed Public Domain

Council is in the process of progressively upgrading public domains throughout the city centre to provide an enhanced residential and visitor experience of the city’s public spaces. Public domains scheduled for renewal include Newcastle East End parks and streets, the Civic Park precinct and Newcastle West including Birdwood Park. These city centre improvements are in addition to the ongoing improvements to the Newcastle coastline through the award-winning Bathers Way project. Honeysuckle continues to progressively extend westward with increased residential and commercial buildings, including a new Hotel at the Cottage Creek site. These developments will continue delivery of high quality public domain along the harbour shore.

Smart City

The Newcastle Smart City project is guiding the transition of Newcastle in ways that maximise opportunities presented through integrated technology and data, toward ultimate goals of improved liveability, sustainability and economic diversity of the City. The smart city will create enhanced digital connectivity and technology-integrated infrastructure, and seed a Digital Precinct to support entrepreneurs, tech and knowledge-related start-ups in the digital economy and creative industries. It is delivering into the city centre a range of advanced technologies including Wi-Fi, digitally-interactive places and mobility advances.
Light Rail/ Integrated Transport

The introduction of light rail into the Newcastle city centre, alongside the development of a well-planned integrated transport strategy for the Hunter, will have major positive effects on the night-time economy. The East-West connectivity of the light rail will provide an easy mode of transport increasing circulation between city nightlife precincts.

In addition to the general positioning of night-time economy as a positive element of revitalisation, Newcastle After Dark adopts four central approaches to underpin the strategy.

8.1 Collaborative Partnership-based Approach

A key aspect of Council’s approach to managing Newcastle after dark is a multi-agency, multi-sector approach demonstrating the importance of collaboration between all levels of government and with non-government agencies, business and the wider community.

8.2 Precinct Level Planning

Newcastle After Dark has embraced the emergence of distinct precincts. Acknowledging that night-time activity happens in a variety of locations across the city and each has a diverse local character and identity, mix of offerings and cultural dynamics. The majority of Newcastle’s night-time economy takes place across seven nightlife precincts: East End, Civic-CBD, West End, Hamilton, Darby Street, Honeysuckle, and Junction-Merewether.

8.3 Cluster Planning and Curation

Night-time venues tend to cluster together and our approach to planning celebrates this and aims to strategically encourage cluster development.

A night-time cluster includes licensed and entertainment venues, and the surrounding public spaces and streetscapes. A good cluster is well serviced with a variety of options for activity and connectivity. Different clusters emerge to prominence at different times of night and are increasingly understood and experienced as entertainment destinations.

8.4 Time-of-night Planning

Just as activity happens across the city in different places, it also happens in different ways throughout the night. As the night goes on, different demographics and nightlife cultures emerge to prominence, and with them different kinds of activity, service needs and risk profiles.

Newcastle After Dark adopts a model that acknowledges several distinct ‘layers’ of activity, each with its own unique character and set of opportunities for alcohol management, cultural experience and economic development.

There are key times of night that signal a major change in the kinds and diversity of venues available or the easy access to public transport, or that introduce a changed compliance environment such as noise thresholds. Targeting initiatives at a specific time of night ensures a more nuanced strategic approach.
Of particular strategic interest are the overlap between these time periods, as they involve shifting demographics and can produce increased demand on resources (for example, taxis). By demarcating an overlap between time periods, this approach ensures that any initiative targeted at a key time of night must also acknowledge and accommodate the tail and emergence of the time periods both prior and following. Importantly, the boundaries of these time periods are not set in stone, but are the product of policy, culture and venue availability. They are open to change as we create our city at night.

There are also key growth periods that present greater opportunity for economic development and cultural activity of the kinds that contribute to the Newcastle After Dark vision of a safe and vibrant night-time economy. For instance, the Twilight period, while not strongly associated with the Night-time economy is important for capturing the activity of the daytime economy and transitioning into strong levels of evening economy activity in nightlife precincts. Research shows that if people can be retained through the twilight period then night-time dining and cultural activity can be significantly strengthened.

Overall, the strategy for Newcastle After Dark is to grow and expand the types of nightlife activity and amenity associated with the evening economy later into the night. These characteristics include high venue diversity, a wide variety of entertainment options, diverse and multigenerational set of participants, easy and regular transport access, and a safe public space.
9.0 Consultation Summary

The *Newcastle After Dark* strategy is the culmination of extensive research and community consultation. The following research, reports and community engagement activities provide a wealth of material specifically pertaining to the management and experience of Newcastle at night.

This research, consultation and engagement activities provides an evidence-base for understanding the complex dynamics of the local night-time economy. Integration of this body of work has informed key issues, and identified areas for collaboration as Council and partners work towards the development and maintenance of a safe and attractive nightlife in the city.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report/Engagement</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managing the Night-time Economy in Newcastle</td>
<td>Consultant’s Report</td>
<td>Dr John Montgomery</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle by Night</td>
<td>Public Consultation</td>
<td>Newcastle Voice Newcastle City Council</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with Alcohol-related Harm and the Night-time Economy</td>
<td>Research Report</td>
<td>Hunter New England Health &amp; Deakin University</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle Night-time Economy Intercept Survey</td>
<td>Public Survey and Report</td>
<td>Key Insights</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle at Night: Young People and the Night-time Economy</td>
<td>Public Survey and Report</td>
<td>Newcastle Youth Council</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night-time Economy Discussion Paper</td>
<td>Public consultation and Discussion Paper</td>
<td>Strategic Planning Newcastle City Council</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After Dark: Idea bombing Newie</td>
<td>Public Consultation Event</td>
<td>Idea Bombing Newie</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle After Dark</td>
<td>Public Survey and Report</td>
<td>NCC - Newcastle Voice</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9.1 Community Consultation

The local night-time economy has been rapidly evolving as a new culture of nightlife emerges in Newcastle in response to both local governance arrangements and reflecting national trends. It is important that the new strategy for the city at night reflects these changes and responds to the present set of city issues and opportunities.

The Newcastle After Dark community consultation program was designed to encapsulate the existing evidence base, and to provide widespread opportunity for community and stakeholder input into the identification of issues and development of strategies.

The consultation was multi-phase and included a range of engagement activities to reach different audiences. When combined with the existing knowledge base it has provided a powerful platform on which to build a positive and forward-thinking approach to creating the city at night that the Newcastle community is seeking: safe, diverse, inclusive, vibrant and creative.

The following elements made up the Newcastle After Dark engagement:

**AFTER DARK SURVEY**

The Newcastle After Dark Survey sought to identify patterns of visitation and to understand motivations and preferences of participants in the night-time economy.

853 RESPONDENTS

**COMMUNITY IDEA BOMBING SESSION**

Free community event aimed at youth and young at heart. The Idea Bombing session featured a series of short talks followed by an ideas gathering session. Predominantly attended by individuals from the creative industries.

72 PARTICIPANTS

**SOCIAL SERVICES CONSULTATION**

Sector specific consultation with social and human services coordinated through the Newcastle Interagency network.

31 ORGANISATIONS

**STRATEGIC WORKSHOPS**

The strategic workshops provided the opportunity for a diverse range of stakeholders to engage with the key issues underpinning Newcastle After Dark. These events were highly interactive and in particular enabled participants to identify objectives across priority areas and to develop the programs which deliver the strategy.

83 PARTICIPANTS

**NIGHT WALKS AND WORKSHOPS**

The night walks involved a guided tour through different precincts to understand the local characteristics and opportunities, culminating in an interactive workshop where participants engaged in collaborative precinct planning aimed at acknowledging existing and potential centres of night-time activity.

5 PRECINCTS

**STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENTS**

A series of workshops, presentations and feedback gathering sessions with key sectors and partners in the delivery of the strategy, including: NSW Police, Liquor and Gaming NSW, Hunter New England Health, Newcastle Now, Hamilton Business Chamber, Mayfield Business Group, Scentre Group Management, Newcastle Tourism Industry Group, CBD Liquor Accord, Hamilton Liquor Accord.

11 SESSIONS

**LIVE MUSIC ROUNDTABLE**

A roundtable meeting with representatives from the live music industry including musicians and artists, venues, local, state and federal level members.

30 PARTICIPANTS
9.2 What You Told Us

The Newcastle After Dark survey introduced the idea of precinct-level planning and gathered data accordingly, providing a new level of detail to city night-time economy data.

Overall, 62% of respondents to the survey were regular participants in the night-time economy (visitation frequency of monthly or more), while 7% last visited over a year ago, and 1% never participated.

The perception of Newcastle at night as safe, inclusive, diverse and vibrant was confirmed, with all scoring mean scores of 3.5/5, or higher, across all age groups and precincts. This is a particularly strong vote of confidence from the public in the future of Newcastle After Dark, with inclusivity (4.0/5) and safety (3.7/5) scoring highest.

Honeysuckle (71%) and Darby Street (63%) are the most well attended precincts, West End (32%) and the Junction (39%) the least well attended. The challenges and opportunities of the different nightlife precincts are discussed in a later section.

The general transition of our night-time economy was confirmed with dining at restaurants the most prominent activity cited across all age groups (62%). Likewise, visiting the range of new small bars and craft beer/wine venues emerged as a popular activity (27%). Yet, Newcastle's historic pub culture remains significant as the most likely licensed venue to visit (37%); however, this option declined with age with older generations more likely to follow dinner with a visit to the cinema or theatre.

Of negative experiences in Newcastle After Dark, antisocial behaviour (18%), over-intoxication (15%) and incivility (14%) were the most prominent for survey respondents, demonstrating that there is further work to be done. However, these figures are in the context of an overwhelming 71% experiencing no negative issues.

The following table identifies the kinds of things the survey respondents would like to see more of in Newcastle After Dark.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public space</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place activation events (i.e. night markets, live sites)</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public spaces designed for night-time use</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative lighting</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public performances (e.g. street performers, buskers)</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late night meals (restaurants and cafes)</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More small bars</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gourmet food vans</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More retail shops open for business</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pop-up bars (in public spaces)</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More large venues</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police foot patrol</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security surveillance systems (e.g. CCTV)</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved transportation options</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Strategic workshops and stakeholder sessions were aimed at broadening the scope of what kinds of night-time activities and city planning issues should fall within a specific strategy for the night-time economy.

The dominant overall theme from these engagements was the need to maintain and enhance a focus of strategic alcohol management as a core priority, while also introducing a range of other key strategic priority areas. Importantly, all priorities need to be treated as of equal importance in order to shape a comprehensive and holistic approach to the city at night.

Six strategic priorities have been identified. Various potential areas of interest that could form programs of activity were then aligned to these six priorities. The workshop feedback identified the following key priorities and relationships:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Strategic Alcohol Management</th>
<th>Night-time Economic Development</th>
<th>After Dark Design</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Community Engagement and Education</td>
<td>Diverse Venues and Places</td>
<td>Transport and Wayfinding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Transport and Wayfinding</td>
<td>Transport and Wayfinding</td>
<td>Streetscape and Lighting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Diverse Venues and Places</td>
<td>Events and Activation</td>
<td>Diverse Venues and Places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Precincts and Clusters</td>
<td>Marketing and Promotion</td>
<td>Events and Activation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Residential Amenity</td>
<td>Live Music and Performance</td>
<td>Live Music and Performance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Cultural performance and Activation</th>
<th>Regulation Planning Licensing</th>
<th>Research and Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Live Music and Performance</td>
<td>Diverse Venues and Places</td>
<td>Community Engagement and Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Diverse Venues and Places</td>
<td>Community Engagement and Education</td>
<td>Transport and Wayfinding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Events and Activation</td>
<td>Events and Activation</td>
<td>Marketing and Promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Transport and Wayfinding</td>
<td>Precincts and Clusters</td>
<td>Precincts and Clusters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mobile and Pop-Up</td>
<td>Transport and Wayfinding</td>
<td>Events and Activation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The night walk sessions themselves proved useful in deconstructing stereotypes of the city at night, confirming locations of existing clustered activities and suggesting desired diversity of future uses. The precinct-scale planning undertaken at the workshops have been influential in our understandings of local characters, and strengths and weaknesses of individual precincts, and the development of a model of an ideal nightlife cluster. Analysis of this engagement material has distinguished between several varieties of cluster types, and highlighted some of the potential issues associated with each. The stakeholder categorisation of clusters highlighted tensions between cumulative impacts and network effects; top-down planning and market-led economic development; and the role of cultural activity and gentrification in establishing new areas of night-time activity in the city.

Four categories of cluster were consistently identified across precincts and participant groups:

1. **Planned Cluster**: A self-sufficient planned arrangement of venues and spaces collectively targeting night-time leisure

2. **Organic Cluster**: An unplanned grouping of venues around appropriate public spaces and facilities, often led by a cultural focus or leisure theme

3. **Emerging Cluster**: A cluster currently growing in popularity as a destination, and progressively gathering additional cluster characteristics

4. **Potential Cluster**: A loose arrangement of some cluster characteristics within a location that could support a future cluster

Consultation also identified a range of characteristics of a well performing nightlife cluster:

- Self-sufficient in terms of activities, infrastructure and offerings
- A mix of different venue types and sizes
- A high volume capacity venue to anchor activity
- One or more destination venues
- A mixture of licensed and unlicensed or retail venues
- A mix of venue-based and public entertainment options
- A point of difference and competitive advantage
- A sense of place
- A time of night profile - a period of time when it is at peak activity
- Transport connectivity
- Walkability within the cluster and between neighbouring clusters
- Good opportunities for people watching
- Resilience to change in venue mix
- A shared sense of ownership and responsibility for the public spaces
- Collaborative marketing and resource management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organic cluster</th>
<th>Planned cluster</th>
<th>Emerging cluster</th>
<th>Potential Cluster</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is often market-led and hard to plan for</td>
<td>Has good facilities from the outset</td>
<td>Needs support for land-use conflicts</td>
<td>Underutilised opportunity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May not have all elements</td>
<td>Can initially be sterile and formulaic</td>
<td>Needs support for amenity impacts</td>
<td>Good location within a precinct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will not initially have coordinated brand or marketing</td>
<td>Subject to trend cycles</td>
<td>Needs quick integration into transport networks/schemes</td>
<td>Needs strategic support to realise potential</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10.0 Overview

Each precinct has its own significant sense of local character, alongside a unique set of challenges and opportunities. *Newcastle After Dark* focuses on these unique characteristics as key resources in the development of night-time economy that reflects a diversity of participants and a range of leisure, cultural and lifestyle options. This section explores the seven city centre nightlife precincts in detail.

The major town centres across the Local Government Area support minor nightlife clusters which are important in their own right, and which also play a key role in the wider city dynamics of Newcastle at night. These town centres include Wallsend, Mayfield, Lambton and Kotara.

**Traffic lights**
Green, amber and red ‘traffic light’ colours have been used to demonstrate where a precinct has been rated by survey participants in terms of being:

- Safe, Inclusive, Diverse or Vibrant

---

### CLUSTER TYPES

- **Planned Cluster**
- **Organic Cluster**
- **Emerging Cluster**
- **Possible Cluster**
- **Major Pedestrian Flow**
Newcastle’s heritage precinct is home to a growing range of cool and classy bars clustered around a few iconic hotels.

Opportunities
Major opportunities in the East End Precinct relate to the proximity to the port and the beach, the incredible heritage streetscapes that give this precinct a unique feel, and three major clusters in development as destinations: Market Street, Newcastle Train Station and Hunter Street. More small bars would be welcome here.

Survey Results

Top 5 Things People Do

- Dining at a Restaurant: 71%
- Going to a Wine Bar/Small Bar: 51%
- Walking to Another Location: 25%
- Visiting/Meting Friends: 30%
- Pub: 31%

Top 5 Things People Would Like to See

- Place Activation Events: 72%
- Public Spaces for Night Time Use: 67%
- Creative Lighting: 65%
- Improved Transport Options: 66%
- Late Night Meals: 70%

Survey Participants

- Average Participant is Likely to be: 18–39 years old
- What Makes the Precinct Unique?

- Safe: 89%
- Inclusive: 58%
- Diverse: 72%
- Vibrant: 67%

Time-of-Night

- Twilight through to night-time economy

Arrival/Departure

- 6PM to 8PM: 89%
- 10PM to 12AM: 58%

Major Challenges

1. Planning controls and complexity of development linked to the heritage building stock
2. A non-central location in the city has represented a mobility challenge to attract participants
3. The legacy of the former mall continues to affect perceptions of safety, but is also a great opportunity for reinvention

The East End is such a unique city opportunity, amazing heritage streetscapes and old buildings waiting to be brought back to the glory days...Better lighting would promote this precinct’s walkable nature.
At the geographic centre of the city’s nightlife, this precinct can also emerge to be the heart and soul of the city with diverse venues appealing to bar hoppers, culture hunters and late night revellers alike.

Opportunities

The Civic-CBD Precinct connects directly to four other nightlife precincts. In the past this has made the Civic-CBD area a thoroughfare. More recently the emergence of the cultural spine and University precinct has given this part of the city a strong identity. Major opportunities in this precinct relate to improving pedestrian connections, and leveraging off the big activity generators like the Theatre, cinema and University.

Surveys

Survey results show the Civic-CBD has a diverse offering of events including dusk to night-time economy. The most commonly visited times are dusk (6pm) and night-time (10pm).

1. Challenges
   1. Suffers unfairly in terms of safety perceptions - incidences of antisocial behaviour are quite low compared to other precincts, however overall safety perceptions are one of the lowest of all precincts
   2. Improvement of major north-south night-time public spaces: Wheeler Place, Civic Park, and connection through to Honeysuckle
   3. Needs to manage the transition from a cultural focus of evening economy to late night revelry

Top 5 Things People Do

- Dining At A Restaurant: 59%
- Going To A Pub: 28%
- Visiting/Meting Friends: 34%
- Going To A Wine Bar/Small Bar: 37%

Top 5 Things People Would Like To See

- Improved Transport Options: 74%
- Public Spaces For Nighttime Use: 62%
- Creative Lighting: 67%
- Place Activation Events: 68%
- Police Foot Patrol: 62%

The more businesses and people are in there, the better. Look at the multiplier effect of what’s happening in King St - cinema, little shops, Japanese and Italian restaurants, the Lucky. All we need is a little velvet lounge for coffee, dessert, port after a movie and that’d be a full house!"
Long the neglected end of the city, the West End of Newcastle is undergoing the start of a renaissance making it the precinct with the greatest potential to shape the city’s nightlife scene.

**Opportunities**

At present, frequent visitation to the Newcastle West Precinct is low compared to other precincts and it is one of the least positively perceived precincts in terms of safety, diversity and vibrancy. This area has an emerging identity around creative fringes and live music and performance. The major opportunities will be driven by the Transport Interchange/Store redevelopment, the emergence of mixed clusters of bars, and a reimagining of the precincts green spaces and streetscapes.

**Top 5 things people do**

- **Dining at a restaurant**: 49%
- **Visiting/meeting friends**: 34%
- **Walking to another location**: 24%
- **Going to a wine bar/small bar**: 27%
- **Going to a pub**: 46%

**Top 5 things people would like to see**

- **Place activation events**: 70%
- **Creative lighting**: 69%
- **Public spaces for night time use**: 68%
- **Late night meals**: 62%
- **Improved transport options**: 76%

**Survey results**

- **Safe**: 84%
- **Inclusive**: 41%
- **Diverse**: 41%
- **Vibrant**: 12%

**Time-of-night**

- **Arrival/departure**: 6PM – 8PM
- **Average participant is likely to be**: 18-39
- **What makes the precinct unique?**
  - **Creative lighting**: 69%
  - **Public spaces for night time use**: 68%
  - **Late night meals**: 62%
  - **Improved transport options**: 76%
  - **Place activation events**: 70%
  - **Dining at a restaurant**: 49%
  - **Visiting/meeting friends**: 34%
  - **Walking to another location**: 24%
  - **Going to a wine bar/small bar**: 27%
  - **Going to a pub**: 46%

**Challenges**

1. Maintaining the creative and edgy feel of this precinct through the gentrification process
2. Managing growth in dense residential population by providing high quality public amenity
3. Supporting growth of two emerging diverse venue clusters to balance the late night predominance of larger venues

Over the past four years since we returned here, the west end is becoming more vibrant as more development occurs. I think that when the transport hub is developed, the area will come alive.
Hamilton nightlife precinct is dominated by Beaumont Street featuring a multicultural dining heritage and the densest concentration of traditional pubs in the city.

Opportunities

Major opportunities in the Hamilton Precinct relate to maintaining the popular evening economy dining experience, while negotiating the transition into the pub dominated late-night economy. A late-night dining scene would be welcome by patrons. The linear nature of Beaumont Street limits natural public gathering spaces for activations and events, or for people to eat their takeaway dining. Live music venues offer a potential point of difference and an expanding small bar scene into Islington would add a new diversity of venues.

Challenges

1. The Hamilton precinct has the highest incidence of antisocial behaviour and the lowest safety perceptions of all precincts
2. Diversifying the licensed venues would encourage the diverse demographics of the evening economy to stay later into the night
3. Largely disconnected from the other major nightlife precincts and needs better pedestrian and transport connections

I love Hamilton so many places to try and it is always busy. The restaurants are the major drawcard for me. Lately the tone of the place has changed a little and safety is sometimes a worry.
The night life in the city is very spread out and requires a lot of walking between venues. It results in a fragmented scene and subsequent loss of atmosphere with the exception of Darby Street...the close concentration of restaurants, bars and only a few big venues is the right mix.

The Darby Street Precinct is Newcastle’s current eat street. A mixture of cafes, restaurants, old-school pubs and boutique shopping give this precinct its funky vibe.

**Opportunities**

Darby Street is well marketed as a destination compared to other precincts. It is one of the most highly visited precincts drawing a younger crowd, with strong perceptions of safety, inclusivity, diversity, and vibrancy. More small bars and pop-up bars would be welcome additions in this area. Major opportunities relate to a managed growth of low impact venues later into the night, and to establish potential clusters at North Darby and the Bull Street pubs and better connect them to the core of Darby Street. Also, an opportunity to leverage twilight retail trade into a stronger evening economy.

**Challenges**

1. To grow the evening economy venue mix later into the night while managing the residential amenity of its primarily suburban location.
2. An emerging cluster at North Darby has a very different time of night profile and needs to be managed more strategically.
3. To reinvent and remain relevant as an Eat Street destination as other precincts start to mature and market more strategically.

**TOP 5 THINGS PEOPLE DO**

- Dining at a restaurant: 74%
- Going to a wine bar/small bar: 52%
- Visiting/meeting friends: 34%

**TOP 5 THINGS PEOPLE WOULD LIKE TO SEE**

- Improved transport options: 65%
- More small bars: 69%
- Public spaces for night time use: 75%

**SURVEY RESULTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time-of-Night</th>
<th>Evening Economy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6PM-8PM</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8PM-10PM</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12AM</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AVERAGE PARTICIPANT IS LIKELY TO BE**

18-39

Dining at a cafe or restaurant

**WHAT MAKES THE PRECINCT UNIQUE?**

- Safe
- Inclusive
- Diverse
- Vibrant
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Newcastle’s waterfront precinct is maturing nicely with a good mix of restaurants, a few larger venues and the best views in the city. The value of this precinct to the city will only grow over the next decade.

Opportunities

The Honeysuckle Precinct is one of the most highly visited precincts drawing a young crowd. It has strong perceptions of safety, inclusivity, and vibrancy. Perceptions of diversity are lower in comparison. Major opportunities in Honeysuckle relate to the chance to create new nightlife destination clusters in the ongoing waterfront development towards Cottage Creek and the Marina. Increasing residential density and new tourism infrastructure will continue to drive demand for waterfront dining and leisure venues. New public spaces and the arrival of the University of Newcastle campus are also big opportunities.

Challenges

1. To ensure a diversity of venue types and styles through the development process
2. Honeysuckle would benefit from more place activation events to encourage visitation on weeknights and to improve diversity perceptions
3. Foster better physical connections between the established and potential clusters (waterfront promenades) and north-south into the city

Honeysuckle should open later. There is a lack of diversity in late night trading for 30+ patrons. After 11.30pm it is difficult to find somewhere for a drink after a show or dinner if you do not want to frequent a nightclub that targets a younger demographic.

**SURVEY RESULTS**

**TIME-OF-NIGHT**

- **93%** most likely to be visited through to night-time economy

**ARRIVAL/DEPARTURE**

- 6PM – 8PM
- 10PM – 12AM

**SAFE**

- **93%**

**DIVERSE**

- **76%**

**PUBLIC SPACES FOR NIGHT TIME USE**

- **66%**

**INCLUSIVE**

- **44%**

**VIBRANT**

- **61%**

**CREATIVE LIGHTING**

- **63%**

**WHAT MAKES THE PRECINCT UNIQUE?**

- **18-39+**

Meeting up with friends
The Junction-Merewether Precinct is a strong performer in the evening economy with a good mix of restaurants and several traditional pubs forming a launching point into the city.

**Opportunities**
The Junction-Merewether precinct is very niche in terms of the visitors it attracts; most are aged 40-69yrs. Those who report visiting here most often are less likely than average to want to see new initiatives such as creative lighting or gourmet food vans. The major opportunities for this precinct are to grow popularity beyond its local residential base to establish itself as a premier dining precinct.

**Top 5 Things People Do**

- **Dining at a Restaurant**: 78%
- **Shopping**: 33%
- **Going to a Pub**: 21%
- **Visiting/Meeting Friends**: 36%

**Top 5 Things People Would Like to See**

- **Improved Transport Options**: 64%
- **Late Night Meals**: 60%
- **Police Foot Patrol**: 62%
- **Place Activation Events**: 60%
- **Public Spaces for Nighttime Use**: 59%

**Survey Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time of Night</th>
<th>Safe</th>
<th>Inclusive</th>
<th>Diverse</th>
<th>Vibrant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6PM - 8PM</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8PM - 10PM</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average Participant is Likely to Be**

- **40-69**

**What Makes the Precinct Unique?**

- Shopping as a nighttime economy

**Challenges**

- To market the precinct effectively as an evening economy precinct
- To grow twilight activity through extended trading retail to enhance participation in the dining culture
- To improve physical connections between the Merewether and Junction clusters and into the city precincts through well-lit and walkable promenades.

---

I attend the Junction often for dinner, sometimes before heading into the city for a night out. It’s not far and I would be prepared to walk if the lighting was improved along Union Street and the southern end of Darby. A few small bars would mean you didn’t have to leave the local area though.
11.0 Strategic Priorities

Priority 1 - Strategic Alcohol Management

Newcastle City Council is recognised nationally for its pioneering strategies to reduce alcohol-related harm. The night-time economy has major impacts on the safety and amenity of the city and local centres, and a central role for local government exists in strategic alcohol management. This priority area will retain and enhance a range of initiatives aimed at maintaining and improving public order and responsible supply and consumption of alcohol, harm minimisation strategies, and licensed venue management.

Objective
To prevent and mitigate the harmful and anti-social impacts of irresponsible supply and consumption of alcohol

Outcomes
1. The city nightlife precincts are safe and inviting to all
2. A vibrant nightlife successfully co-exists with a city residential population
3. Licensed premises do not disproportionately contribute to antisocial behaviour

Priority 2 - Night-time Economic Development

The Newcastle night-time economy is significant at a regional and national scale and stands to play an important role in the city’s revitalisation by creating a diverse set of nightlife options in the city’s nightlife precincts. The night-time economy is much broader than traditional considerations of licensed premises, and includes a wide variety of leisure, entertainment, retail and business. This priority area will identify and encourage new economic opportunities for entrepreneurs and creatives, and support existing businesses to maximise potential and value.

Objective
To encourage and enable a sustainable, safe and diverse night-time economy

Outcomes
1. The city at night reflects a diversity of businesses beyond licensed premises
2. The night-time economy is a source of creative and entrepreneurial enterprise
3. The Newcastle night-time economy continues to grow and contribute to the regional economy

Priority 3 - Night-time Design

The city at night is inclusive of a wide variety of public spaces: parks, plazas, malls and footpaths. These places are intimately woven into the experience of the nightlife precincts of the city. The design of the night-time public domain is a critical element of a safe, vibrant and diverse night-time experience, and fundamental to delivering a public culture of nightlife as sites for activation and community interaction. This priority area will consider and deliver the elements needed to provide public spaces and streetscapes designed for night.

Objective
To design, implement and maintain safe, attractive and engaging public night-time spaces

Outcomes
1. The city centre public domain is activated throughout the evening and night-time
2. A public culture of nightlife (distinct from licensed premises) is a core part of the city NTE experience
3. Newcastle is internationally recognised for its creativity and innovation in night-time design
Priority 4- Cultural Participation and Activation

The night-time economies of cities are closely related to leisure and culture. The evening and night are when most people are able to freely choose their activities for themselves. In addition to alcohol consumption – which remains prominent – the night-time economy includes cultural consumption of many forms; in institutions, venues, public events and transitory activations that engage and entice. This priority area will cultivate opportunities for widespread cultural participation, and the cultural production that enables it.

**Objective**

To enable and support the city after dark as a site of diverse participation in cultural production and consumption

**Outcomes**

1. A wide diversity of nightlife participants enjoy a vibrant cultural scene in the Newcastle at night
2. The night-time economy is a source of creative innovation and cultural production
3. Live performance is a central part of the city night-time experience

Priority 5- Regulation Planning and Licensing

Effective planning of the night-time city is a constant and complex task. A balance must be struck between enabling innovation and facilitating change on one hand, while also assuring the safe and sustainable development of spaces and economies. This priority area will research and establish the policy and regulatory framework that manages competing interests and stakes in the city at night and provides for future development in accord with the principles underpinning the Newcastle After Dark strategy.

**Objective**

To establish and promote a policy and planning framework that enables and supports the Newcastle After Dark vision

**Outcomes**

1. The night-time economy develops in a way that supports city revitalisation
2. The city at night is effectively planned to account for complex issues
3. A policy and regulatory framework for Newcastle After Dark encourages innovation and sustainable development

Priority 6- Research and Evaluation

Newcastle City Council is committed to developing a strong evidence-base and relevant trend data for monitoring outcomes and benefits emerging from the Newcastle After Dark strategy. This program will establish baselines and indicators supporting effective measurement and evaluation, and conduct research and engagement activities in order to inform best and next practice guides to innovation and project implementation.

**Objective**

To implement research and evaluation programs for guiding innovation and monitoring outcomes

**Outcomes**

1. Newcastle After Dark initiatives are based on effective research and locally-specific evidence
2. Newcastle After Dark initiatives are measured, monitored and evaluated
3. Innovative methods are developed and deployed for gathering, analysing and leveraging data
12.0 Action Plan

*Newcastle After Dark* is designed to generate positive outcomes across the six strategic priorities. This will be achieved through the delivery of ten separate programs of activity. These programs were developed through consultation and reflect the types of activities the participants in the Newcastle NTE would like to see.

Each program is a coordinated approach to addressing the key issues identified through the research and consultation underpinning the strategy. Many of the issues involved in managing the night-time economy are complex and involve significant cultural change or development of economic and cultural infrastructure. A program of activities allows a more strategic and long-term approach to engaging with these issues as activities build upon one another over time.

Each individual initiative making up the *Newcastle After Dark* action plan has been specifically designed to contribute to the progressive development of a program, while also delivering outcomes within a key strategic priority area. This integrated approach yields a tightly coordinated overall strategy for Newcastle after dark.

---

The *Newcastle After Dark* approach includes planning for the diverse activities of nightlife across different locations and times of night. It is fundamentally linked to a collaborative approach with partners and the community.

---

How to read the Action Plan

The following pages provide the action plan for delivering the *Newcastle After Dark* vision of a safe and vibrant city at night. In addition to information about key partners and timeframe for delivery, each initiative is linked through the following icons to a strategic priority area, a primary time of night, and the relevant nightlife precincts.

**Strategic Priority Areas**

- 1: Not linked at all
- 2: Mildly linked
- 3: Moderately linked
- 4: Strongly linked

**Primary Time-of-Night**

- TE: 5pm-7pm Twilight (bridging period) economy
- EE: 6pm-10pm Evening economy
- NTE: 9pm-1am Night-time economy
- LNE: 12am-4am Late-night economy

**Nightlife Precincts**

- East End
- Civic-CBD
- West End
- Hamilton
- Darby Street
- Honeysuckle
- Junction-Merewether
A nightlife precinct is a defined location. It should be a nightlife destination and have a full mix of entertainment and amenity options. Each precinct has its own unique local character and offerings, and needs to be planned for in ways that can build on these strengths. A cluster is a group of venues and spaces that together make up a place. They can be seeded or grow organically.

The Precincts and Clusters program is associated with the following strategic priority areas are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Priority</th>
<th>Level of Contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Alcohol Management</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night-time Economic Development</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night-time Design</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Activation and Participation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulation, Planning and Licensing</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and Evaluation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Initiative/Action Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Initiative/Action</th>
<th>Partners</th>
<th>Delivery Year 2018-2022</th>
<th>Precinct Time-of-night</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Complete the Alcohol Mapping Project</td>
<td>NSW Police Liquor and Gaming, UON, HNE Health</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Develop cumulative impact and licensed venue saturation criteria</td>
<td>NSW Police Researchers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Identify precinct and cluster areas dedicated as late-night zones with appropriate controls (noise and closing)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Continue to establish precinct and local centre night-time identities</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>After Dark precinct and cluster curation planning</td>
<td>BIAs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>Create precinct marketing campaigns performance evaluation frameworks</td>
<td>BIAs, HDC</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Diverse Venues and Spaces program is associated with the following strategic priority areas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Priority</th>
<th>Level of Contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Alcohol Management</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night-time Economic Development</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night-time Design</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Activation and Participation</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulation, Planning and Licensing</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and Evaluation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A diverse range of venues and entertainment options is important because they attract diverse demographics into the night-time economy. Cultures need spaces in which to develop, so venue diversity is about encouraging inclusiveness in the night-time economy. Venue diversity can be about the culture or style of the venue, the entertainment they provide, their size, opening times, or the role of alcohol.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Initiative/Action</th>
<th>Partners</th>
<th>Delivery Year 2018-2022</th>
<th>Precinct</th>
<th>Time-of-night</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Develop a low Impact Venues Framework for Development Assessment and evaluation</td>
<td>Researchers, Liquor and Gaming, police, venues</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Extend closing time for low impact venues to 2am through appropriate controls</td>
<td>Liquor and Gaming</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>LNE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Work with Liquor Accords to increase venue diversity representation</td>
<td>Liquor Accord</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Continue to implement night-time design in public domain plans</td>
<td>BIAs, HDC</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Develop incentives to encourage late night meals in cafes/restaurants</td>
<td>Peak Associations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>NTE, LNE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>Increase and integrate Late Opening for Council facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>Civic/CBD</td>
<td>NTE, LNE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mobile activity is a fixed offering, but is not bound to one location, and so can be more flexible about how it can respond to demand. Pop-ups are temporary uses and offerings, often in disused or under-utilised spaces. Contrary to their image, they take lots of pre-planning. Pop-ups are good low cost ways to trial a new idea, service or product. Mobile and Pop-Up activity is a good way to introduce a new layer of economic activity into a city.

The Mobile and Pop-Up program is associated most strongly with the following strategic priority areas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Priority</th>
<th>Level of Contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Alcohol Management</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night-time Economic Development</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night-time Design</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Activation and Participation</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulation, Planning and Licensing</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and Evaluation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Initiative/Action</th>
<th>Partners</th>
<th>Delivery Year 2018-2022</th>
<th>Precincts</th>
<th>Time-of-night</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Ensure appropriate tools and process for managing alcohol impacts of mobile and pop-up activities</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Develop a complying pop-up events approvals pathway and guide</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Revise Food Trucks Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Establish food truck pads and purpose built locations in key public domain areas</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>East End</td>
<td>Civic/CBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>West End</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Develop Food Truck Fridays at key city locations (Wheeler Place, Big Birdwood and Market Street Lawn)</td>
<td>HDC</td>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>East End</td>
<td>Civic/CBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>West End</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>Create a plug and play Laneway Performance Space with online booking system</td>
<td>UON</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>East End</td>
<td>Civic/CBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The night-time economy has always been a critical part of the live music scene in Australia. Newcastle has a strong history in Australian music. Live music and performance provides a strong component of entertainment which draws people to participate in the night-time economy. It is also an important space for new creative talent to emerge and develop. Varied genres and styles can help attract diverse demographics to the city, and add to the growth of a cultural scene that can be a strong tourism drawcard.

### The Live Music and Performance program is associated most strongly with the following strategic priority areas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Priority</th>
<th>Level of Contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Alcohol Management</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night-time Economic Development</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night-time Design</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Activation and Participation</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulation, Planning and Licensing</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and Evaluation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Initiative/Action</th>
<th>Partners</th>
<th>Delivery Year</th>
<th>Precinct</th>
<th>Time-of-night</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Establish a Newcastle Live Music Roundtable and Taskforce</td>
<td>Music Industry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Develop in collaboration with partners a Live Music Strategy</td>
<td>Music Industry, Create NSW, Live Music Office</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Develop a City Precincts live music and performance venues policy framework including ‘agent of change’</td>
<td>Create NSW, Live Music Office</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>NTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Encourage licensed premises to adopt live music as a mitigation method through Low Impact Venues Framework</td>
<td>Liquor Accords, Live Music Office</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>EE NTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Develop a Busking Policy and licensing strategy</td>
<td>BIAs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>EE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>Facilitate an annual buskers licensing event in Music week</td>
<td>UON TAFE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>EE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>Deliver a Live Performance Public Spaces Network in key city sites through public domain upgrades</td>
<td>HDC UON</td>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>EE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The city centre is increasingly home to city residents. Planning and development activities underway in the city centre will increase residential density considerably, in turn transforming our night-time economy. A mixed use precinct must balance the interests of people calling the city home, and those who frequent it as a destination for entertainment. Amenity also involves providing for the needs of residents in terms of access to night-time services and entertainment, making the city a great place to live.

The Residential Amenity program is associated most strongly with the following strategic priority areas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Priority</th>
<th>Level of Contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Alcohol Management</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night-time Economic Development</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night-time Design</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Activation and Participation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulation, Planning and Licensing</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and Evaluation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Initiative/Action</th>
<th>Partners</th>
<th>Delivery Year 2018-2022</th>
<th>Precinct</th>
<th>Time-of-night</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>Establish agent of change provisions to protect residential amenity</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>Continue to monitor and enforce noise thresholds around licensed premises</td>
<td></td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>NTE, LNE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>Strengthen noise attenuation criteria in city precincts in DCP</td>
<td>Developers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>Include precinct-level nightlife identities in city marketing material to assist in residential decisions on where to live</td>
<td>NTIG</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>Provide downloadable sound files of city noise levels at different night-time thresholds</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>Research and encourage Twilight retail to improve city centre residential retail access</td>
<td>BIAS, Traders</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>All, TE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Transport is a critical component of the night-time economy. Efficient, flexible and simple to use transport options underpins a safe and vibrant city at night. Transport is concerned both with transporting participants between home and destination, and with maximising their ability to move within and between precincts. Wayfinding relates to the participant’s ability to navigate the city at night safely and assuredly. It is particularly important for pedestrians. Both transport and wayfinding define how people can move through the city.

### Initiative/Action Partners Delivery Year Precinct Time-of-night

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Initiative/Action</th>
<th>Partners</th>
<th>Delivery Year 2018-2022</th>
<th>Precinct</th>
<th>Time-of-night</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>Develop and Implement night-time wayfinding into city wayfinding system</td>
<td></td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>TE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>Implement point to point Transport on Demand within and between nightlife precincts</td>
<td>Keolis Downer Hunter, TfNSW, Liftango</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>Integrate LR nodes with existing and planned nightlife clusters</td>
<td>TfNSW</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>East End</td>
<td>Civic/CBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>Promote transport options and provide real-time data through digital platforms (screens, apps, wayfinding)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>Establish a Safe/Managed Transport node per precinct</td>
<td>Liquor Accords, TfNSW</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>NTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>Encourage safe active travel transport options within precincts including night designed bike paths / rickshaw avenues</td>
<td>Rickshaw operators</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Transport and Wayfinding program is associated most strongly with the following strategic priority areas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Priority</th>
<th>Level of Contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Alcohol Management</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night-time Economic Development</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night-time Design</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Activation and Participation</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulation, Planning and Licensing</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and Evaluation</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transport is a critical component of the night-time economy. Efficient, flexible and simple to use transport options underpins a safe and vibrant city at night. Transport is concerned both with transporting participants between home and destination, and with maximising their ability to move within and between precincts. Wayfinding relates to the participant’s ability to navigate the city at night safely and assuredly. It is particularly important for pedestrians. Both transport and wayfinding define how people can move through the city.
The Streetscape and Lighting program is associated most strongly with the following strategic priority areas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Priority</th>
<th>Level of Contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Alcohol Management</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night-time Economic Development</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night-time Design</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Activation and Participation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulation, Planning and Licensing</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and Evaluation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### New Strategic Initiatives

7.1 Develop a consistent approach to lighting in the city centre and local centres

7.2 Utilise pedestrian mobility analytics to model precinct pathways and avenues

7.3 Expand and enhance precinct pedestrian networks with creative lighting and activation

7.4 Support projection art programs and competitions e.g. Digital Civics

7.5 Hold events brokering relationships between creative night-time place making projects and funders

7.6 Deliver interactive night-time spaces projects (1 per year)

---

The use of light in the city at night is very important in communicating a safe environment. Dark spots on city streets are associated with fear regardless of actual risk, and are avoided by people if possible. Creative lighting can be a useful way of creating curiosity or activating a location. It communicates mood and adds a layer of interest to the public domain. Streetscape refers to the look and feel of the footpath and pedestrian routes, including the scale, condition and degree of shop front activation.
The Events and Activation program is associated most strongly with the following strategic priority areas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Priority</th>
<th>Level of Contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Alcohol Management</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night-time Economic Development</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night-time Design</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Activation and Participation</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulation, Planning and Licensing</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and Evaluation</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Events and activation are among the most frequently desired aspects of a dynamic nightlife, and they provide strong economic and cultural development opportunities for the city. Both events and activations are often temporary. Events can be at the scale of very large festivals and shows, or extremely intimate featuring only a few people. Activations are programs that draw people into the city at night and provide opportunity for people to discover and encounter new things. Activations can often be very low cost.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Initiative/Action</th>
<th>Partners</th>
<th>Delivery Year 2018–2022</th>
<th>Precinct</th>
<th>Time-of-night</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>Improve coordinated promotion of events and activities across digital assets</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>Provide ‘how to’ event and activation guides to streamline approval processes</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>Develop ‘needs assessment’ and event outcome survey tools to help people plan and evaluate events</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>Promote existing calendar of local precinct multicultural celebrations of food and music</td>
<td>EE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>EE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>Establish a city night festival in the annual calendar (e.g. white night, winter heat, Newcastle Open)</td>
<td>Civic/CBD</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>EE</td>
<td>NTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>Continue to liaise with events inter-agencies to manage impacts of large scale events</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Continuing the positive growth of the Newcastle NTE in a way that builds on our local strengths requires that the community is involved and can contribute to activities in Newcastle After Dark. Community engagement means providing the opportunities and platforms for people to have a say, and also to collaborate with Council and with each other. Education programs are an important means of communicating expectations around acceptable behaviour, or engaging in behaviour modification strategies.

The Community Education and Engagement program is associated most strongly with the following strategic priority areas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Priority</th>
<th>Level of Contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Alcohol Management</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night-time Economic Development</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night-time Design</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Activation and Participation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulation, Planning and Licensing</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and Evaluation</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Initiative/Action</th>
<th>Partners</th>
<th>Delivery Year 2018-2022</th>
<th>Precinct</th>
<th>Time-of-night</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>Facilitate improved and balanced community Input into Community Impact Statements and Social Impact Assessments</td>
<td>Residents Action Groups, Liquor and Gaming</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>Develop how-to start up guides for activations, events, live music, pop-up and mobile, low impact venues</td>
<td>CDAT, Liquor Accords</td>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>Develop with partners Community Education Campaigns</td>
<td>CDAT, Liquor Accords</td>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>Work with Liquor Accords to increase effectiveness and profile</td>
<td>Liquor Accords</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>Conduct bi-annually the Newcastle After Dark survey to measure longitudinal trends and impacts of strategy</td>
<td>Liquor Accords</td>
<td>2 and 4</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>Hold Annual Newcastle After Dark planning workshops</td>
<td></td>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Newcastle has a great deal happening, and an enormous amount to offer, but a consistent theme is that the city needs to be better at promoting what we have. Marketing involves tailoring offers to specific segments and demographics to increase diversity of the NTE. It also relates to creating precincts as unique destinations. Promotion is communicating more clearly what is on in Newcastle at night, where it’s happening and creating programs to drive repeat visitation and loyalty.

The Promotion and Marketing program is associated with the following strategic priority area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Priority</th>
<th>Level of Contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Alcohol Management</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night-time Economic Development</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night-time Design</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Activation and Participation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulation, Planning and Licensing</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and Evaluation</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Initiative/Action</th>
<th>Partners</th>
<th>Delivery Year 2018-2022</th>
<th>Precinct</th>
<th>Time-of-night</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>Integrate NTE theming into destination marketing campaigns</td>
<td>NTIG, Cruise Hunter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>Provide real-time promotional information on city screens, projections and beacon network push notifications</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>Promote successes and opportunities of Newcastle After Dark</td>
<td></td>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>Establish KPIs for precincts to measure marketing and promotion as part of Precinct performance Frameworks</td>
<td>BIASs, Traders</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>Utilise beacon and app data to inform precinct marketing and promotional strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>Encourage licensed venues to collect data and utilise (shared) for marketing and promotion (e.g. license data aggregated)</td>
<td>Liquor Accords</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13.0 Acknowledgements

Thanks

Many people and organisations have contributed to the development of this strategy. In particular, Council would like to thank all participants in the consultation process. The ideas and knowledge shared by community members from all walks of life have contributed to an ambitious but focused strategic plan that aims to consolidate the recent positive growth of Newcastle at night.

We look forward to working with you to deliver the Newcastle After Dark vision over the coming four years.
14.0 Sources and References


P. 15 New Space, Hunter St Newcastle, University of Newcastle
CCL 27/03/18
GLEBE ROAD FEDERATION COTTAGES HERITAGE CONSERVATION AREA - ENDORSEMENT OF AMENDMENT TO NEWCASTLE LEP 2012 AND DCP 2012

Attachment A: Planning Proposal - Glebe Road Federation Cottages Heritage Conservation Area
PLANNING PROPOSAL

Glebe Road Federation Cottages Heritage Conservation Area

Version 1.0 - Council Endorsement

March 2018
Introduction

This planning proposal has been prepared in accordance with Section 55 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 (NSW). It explains the intended effect of a proposed local environmental plan (LEP) and sets out the justification for making the plan.

'A guide to preparing planning proposals' has been used to guide and inform the preparation of this planning proposal.

This planning proposal is for everyone. It will be used to decide whether the proposal should proceed or not.

The planning proposal may evolve over time due to various reasons, such as feedback during exhibition. It will be updated at key stages in the plan making process.

Summary of proposal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Glebe Road Federation Cottages Heritage Conservation Area - to amend the Newcastle Local Environmental Plan 2012 to enable 53 to 75 Glebe Road and 4 Watkins Street, The Junction to be included within a new heritage conservation area and delete the controls for the site relating to floor space ratio and building height.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property Details</td>
<td>53 to 75 Glebe Road and 4 Watkins Street, The Junction (Lot 1 DP 7356435, Lots 10 &amp; 11 DP 1049694, Lot 1 DP 1188026, Lot 0 SP 0053274, &amp; Lots 112 to 117 &amp; 120 to 121 DP 95005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant Details</td>
<td>Newcastle City Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Background

In 2004, Hunter History Consultants Pty Ltd did a brief historical analysis of the surrounding dwellings at Glebe Road, The Junction to accompany a development application proposal for the demolition of a dwelling at 55 Glebe Road and replacement with two, two storey townhouses with attached single garages (DA 2003/0499). This application was refused by Council.

In 2005, the Land and Environment Court handed down a judgment that supported Council's refusal of the development application for demolition of the dwelling (P D Anderson Holdings Pty Ltd v Newcastle City Council [2005] NSWLEC 17). The reason was partly attributed to the observation that the area had potential heritage significance as a group of intact Federation houses. In refusing the appeal, the judgement concluded:

"There is real evidence that there is heritage significance in the streetscape, and cultural significance in the early origins of the subdivision, and the row of houses, and there is particular reference to the cultural significance of the existing house on No. 55 Glebe Road. The council is in the process of examining that."
The court also found that because the houses are relatively intact they could be considered fine representative examples of the era of construction - ie. between 1909 and 1915. The court noted:

"The reasons the streetscape is valuable also relates to heritage matters the respondent said. In this aspect:

(1) The land on which the row of houses stand was the first residential subdivision by the pioneering AA Company at The Junction.

(2) The consistency, aesthetic form, scale, detail, alignment and remnant external finishes of the row of houses are intact and demonstrate the early Federation cottage form of detached working persons' houses. Each house in the row had contributory significance for the whole row."

The court also noted that one of the dwellings, No 55 Glebe Road, was shown to have important historical associations with RJ Kilgour, a past mayor of Merewether, and whose son was the first to enlist locally in 1915 for the First World War. The judgement states "…there is a strong association with a prominent person of the locality and WWI. There was cultural heritage value in the existing house itself".

In addition to the group at 55 to 75 Glebe Road, 53 Glebe Road and 4 Watkins Street are proposed to be included within the heritage conservation area as these two properties 'bookend' and complete this clearly defined street block at Watkins Street with significant impact on its existing and desired future character and setting.

Site

The proposal consists of land at 53 to 75 Glebe Road and 4 Watkins Street, The Junction and is legally referred to as Lot 1 DP 7356435, Lots 10 and 11 of DP 1049694, Lot 1 DP 1188026, Lot 0 SP 0053274, and Lots 112 to 117 and 120 to 121 of DP 95005.

The site is approximately 0.66 hectares in size, broadly flat and irregular shaped bounded by the Junction Primary School to the south and 77 Glebe Road to the west with direct vehicular and pedestrian access from Glebe Road and Watkins Street to the north and east. Newcastle City Centre is located approximately 1km to the north-east via both Glebe Road and Union Street. The predominant use is residential with some commercial.

The character of the south side of Glebe Road is defined by single storey detached weatherboard dwellings set close to Glebe Road, and set off side boundaries. It is noted that none have attached or built in garage structures with their associated garage doors facing the street. Access for vehicles is provided at the side of the dwelling and provision for parking occurs at the side or at the rear. The lack of obvious garaging is considered a distinctive feature of the group, and is evidence of the age of the dwellings. The uniformity of the group in terms of age, height, setbacks and materials contributes to defining the character.

The fieldwork confirms that most of the houses in the group have undergone renovation and restoration that retains and enhances the intact one storey weatherboard with hipped and gabled roof character. (see Figure 1 Local context of the site).

With reference to the Newcastle Local Environmental Plan 2012 (LEP), the entire site is currently zoned R3 Medium Density Residential, with Minimum Lot Size of 400sqm, Maximum Building Height of 10m and a Maximum Floor Space Ratio (FSR) of 0.9:1. Furthermore, the entire site is acid sulfate soils Class 4, is identified by Council as flood prone land and is located within a Mine Subsidence District. There are no Council street trees in the public verge along Glebe Road in close proximity to the site, however there are three existing street trees.
(Council IDs 280037 to 280039) and four proposed street tree plantings (Council IDs 13518 to 13521) along Watkins Street adjacent to the site.

Land immediately to the north forms part of the Junction commercial area zoned B2 Local Centre by the LEP. To the west is Rowland Park and Rowland Park Fountain which are zoned RE1 Public Recreation by the LEP and are Local Heritage items (Item nos. I615 and I616). To the south the Junction Primary School is zoned R3 Medium Density Residential by the LEP and is a Local Heritage item (Item no. I618). To the north-east the War memorial at the corner of Glebe Road and Watkins Street is also a Local Heritage item (Item no. I613).

Figure 1 - Local context of the site
Figure 2 - Air photo of the site
Part 1 - Objectives or intended outcomes

To amend the Newcastle Local Environmental Plan 2012 to enable 53 to 75 Glebe Road and 4 Watkins Street, The Junction to be included within a new heritage conservation area and delete the controls for the site relating to floor space ratio and building height. The amendment will ensure the heritage significance and the existing and desired future character of the Glebe Road Federation Cottages site is protected.

Part 2 - Explanation of provisions

The proposed outcome will be achieved by making the following amendments to the Newcastle LEP 2012:

- Amending Schedule 5 and the Heritage Map by designating the site as a Heritage Conservation Area to be referred to as 'Glebe Road Federation Cottages Heritage Conservation Area'.

- Amending the Floor Space Ratio Map by deleting the allocated maximum floor space ratio for the site.

- Amending the Height of Buildings Map by deleting the allocated maximum building height for the site.
Part 3 - Justification

Section A - Need for the planning proposal

1. Is the planning proposal a result of any strategic study or report?

The Review of Heritage Conservation Areas Report, June 2016 prepared by Newcastle City Council presented the findings of a review of the five existing heritage conservation areas (HCAs) across the Newcastle Local Government Area (LGA) and investigated a number of potential new HCAs within the LGA including Glebe Road Federation Cottages. The review defined the current heritage significance of each area, produced desired future character statements, assessed the appropriateness of boundaries, examined the development control framework and the relevant planning context, identified items that contribute to or detract from each area and documented what the community valued about these areas.

Newcastle 2030 is a shared community vision developed as a guide to inform policies and actions throughout the city for the next twenty years. To guide the city forward, seven strategic directions have been set to guide the implementation of this vision. This planning proposal aligns with the Newcastle 2030 Community Strategic Plan (CSP) principles, and will contribute to a liveable and distinctive built environment, vibrant and activated public places and open and collaborative leadership.

Through the CSP, the Newcastle community has expressed its aspiration that moving towards 2030, local heritage will be valued, enhanced and celebrated. Overall, Council aims to ensure that the significant aspects of the City’s heritage are identified, cared for, celebrated and appropriately managed on behalf of residents and visitors of Newcastle. The intention is to ensure that decisions about heritage places are made with due regard to heritage significance, and that opportunities to strengthen or better appreciate heritage significance are undertaken.

The Newcastle Heritage Strategy 2013-2017 provides a framework for Council to work towards achieving the aspirations of the community articulated in the 2030 Community Strategic Plan. The Heritage Strategy is a strategic framework to guide Council’s approach to the management of heritage in the Newcastle local government area. It is drawn from the principles of the Newcastle 2030 Community Strategic Plan (Revised 2013) and the Newcastle Heritage Policy 2013. The Heritage Strategy 2013-2017 provides detailed actions and an implementation framework based on the key strategic directions of the CSP and Newcastle Heritage Policy 2013.

2. Is the planning proposal the best means of achieving the objectives or intended outcomes, or is there a better way?

Yes, amending the Newcastle LEP 2012 is considered the best means of achieving the protection of the heritage significance and the existing and desired future character of the Glebe Road Federation Cottages site.
Section B - Relationship to strategic planning framework

3. Is the planning proposal consistent with the objectives and actions of the applicable regional, sub-regional or district plan or strategy (including any exhibited draft plans or strategies)?

Hunter Regional Plan 2036

The Hunter Regional Plan 2036 (HRP) is the NSW Government’s plan to guide land use planning and infrastructure priorities and decisions over the next 20 years. The plan identifies regionally important natural resources, transport networks and social infrastructure and 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 planning proposal is consistent with Direction 19 of the HRP which seeks to identify and protect the region’s heritage. The plan notes cultural heritage is considered important to communities by providing tangible connections to the past and heritage items can also attract tourism, which can contribute to local economies. In particular, the HRP considers ‘enhancing main streets through heritage conservation creates authenticity, attracts new businesses and residents, and offers tourism potential.’

4. Is the planning proposal consistent with a council’s local strategy or other local strategic plan?

Newcastle 2030 Community Strategic Plan

The Newcastle Community Strategic Plan (CSP) reflects the community’s vision for the city and is Council’s guide for action. It contains the strategies to be implemented and the outcomes that will indicate achievement of the defined goals. Council adopted the Newcastle 2030 Community Strategic Plan in February 2011. It was revised and updated in 2013. The following relevant strategic directions and their objectives from the Newcastle CSP are addressed in relation to this planning proposal.

The planning proposal primarily aligns to the strategic direction ‘Vibrant and Activated Public Places’ identified within the Newcastle 2030 Community Strategic Plan. In particular, ‘Culture, heritage and place are valued, shared and celebrated’. The plan recognises the cultural value of the city and the historic and cultural aesthetics which make it unique. The plan aims to maintain and enhance these qualities as a reflection of civic pride and creative expression.

An objective of the planning proposal is to maintain and enhance the heritage significance of Glebe Road Federation Cottages site, which supports this direction for ‘a built environment that maintains and enhances our sense of identity’.
Local Planning Strategy

The Local Planning Strategy (LPS) was adopted by Council in 2015. It was prepared in accordance with the Community Strategic Plan.

The strategy is a comprehensive land use strategy prepared to guide the future growth and development in Newcastle to 2030 and beyond. It underpins the Local Environmental Plan.

The planning proposal is consistent with both LPS Principle P8 which seeks to ensure development will protect culture, heritage and place and LPS Principle P12 which aims to ensure the built environment will maintain and enhance the City's identity by protecting and enhancing heritage buildings, streetscapes, views and key features as well as encouraging building innovation that respects the scale and bulk of the existing urban fabric. The plan notes that it is important that there are appropriate heritage guidelines and controls within the Newcastle LEP 2012 and Newcastle DCP 2012 to ensure our heritage items and areas are protected and the land use zonings within the conservation areas are appropriate to reflect the desired character. As such, a strategic direction for heritage includes ensuring ‘development controls and zoning protect the heritage significance of items and conservation areas.’

Newcastle Heritage Strategy

The Newcastle Heritage Strategy 2013-2017 provides a framework for Council to work towards achieving the aspirations of the community articulated in the 2030 Community Strategic Plan. The Heritage Strategy is a strategic framework to guide Council’s approach to the management of heritage in the Newcastle local government area. It is drawn from the principles of the Newcastle 2030 Community Strategic Plan (Revised 2013) and the Newcastle Heritage Policy 2013. The Heritage Strategy 2013-2017 provides detailed actions and an implementation framework based on the key strategic directions of the CSP and Newcastle Heritage Policy 2013.

This review delivers on the following strategies:

- Strategy 1 - Knowing our heritage - enhancing our community's knowledge of and regard for local heritage items and places;
- Strategy 2 - Protecting our heritage - Council will protect and conserve the City's heritage places for the benefit of everyone;
- Strategy 3 - Supporting our heritage - Council will protect the integrity of heritage places by ensuring consistent and sympathetic uses, physical and aesthetic treatments and outstanding interpretations; and
- Strategy 4 - Promoting our heritage – Newcastle’s significant heritage places are a unique historical resource and represent an asset for the continuing educational, cultural and economic enrichment of the region.
5. Is the planning proposal consistent with applicable State Environmental Planning Policies?

An assessment of the planning proposal against the relevant SEPPs is provided in the table below.

**Table 1 - Relevant State Environmental Planning Policies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevant SEPPs</th>
<th>Consistency and Implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEPP 55 (Remediation of Land)</td>
<td>This policy applies to the Newcastle Local Government Area and in accordance with Clause 6 of the SEPP, land contamination aspects have been considered within the preparation of this planning proposal. The land is currently being used for a mix of residential and commercial purposes and is not listed on Council's contaminated lands register. The site is not considered to be potentially contaminated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEPP 64 (Advertising and Signage)</td>
<td>The planning proposal can satisfy the requirements of the SEPP. This SEPP does not apply to signage which is exempt development under an environmental planning instrument. The scope of what constitutes exempt development is significantly reduced for signage within heritage conservation areas. As such, SEPP 64 would more readily apply to this site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEPP 65 (Design Quality of Residential Apartment Development)</td>
<td>This policy applies to development for the purpose of a residential flat building, shop top housing or mixed use development with residential accommodation if the development consists of the erection of a new building, the substantial redevelopment or the substantial refurbishment of an existing building, or the conversion of an existing building. Furthermore, for SEPP 65 to apply, the building concerned must contain at least 3 or more storeys, and at least 4 or more dwellings. Notwithstanding that the site will continue to be zoned R3 Medium Density Residential by the LEP (where residential flat buildings are a permissible form of residential accommodation), in practice the designation of the heritage conservation area is likely to prohibit higher density built forms of development such as residential apartments. This is because the existing comparatively low density and limited building heights of the site (a uniform group of single storey cottages &quot;bookended&quot; by two storey development) is a key component which defines its protected character. As such, SEPP 65 would be less likely to apply to any future development of this site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEPP 71 (Coastal Protection)</td>
<td>The planning proposal can satisfy the requirements of the SEPP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note: Refer to draft SEPP (Coastal Management) 2016</td>
<td>*** this SEPP will be repealed by the Coastal Management SEPP***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEPP (Affordable Rental Housing) 2009</td>
<td>The planning proposal can satisfy the requirements of the SEPP, including complementing the provision that the consent authority must not consent to development to which this SEPP applies unless it has taken into consideration whether the design of the development is compatible with the character of the local area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Relevant SEPPs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevant SEPPs</th>
<th>Consistency and Implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEPP (Building Sustainability Index: BASIX) 2004</td>
<td>The planning proposal can meet BASIX requirements and satisfy overall requirements of the SEPP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEPP (Exempt and Complying Development Codes) 2008</td>
<td>The planning proposal will significantly reduce the scope of what constitutes exempt development and complying development as stipulated by the SEPP. This includes demolition works and several physical works prescribed by the SEPP which need development consent if located within a heritage conservation area or draft heritage conservation area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEPP (Housing for Seniors or People with a Disability) 2004</td>
<td>The planning proposal can satisfy the requirements of the SEPP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Coastal Management SEPP 2016</td>
<td>The planning proposal can satisfy the requirements of the SEPP.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6. Is the planning proposal consistent with applicable Ministerial Directions (s.117 directions)?

An assessment of the planning proposal against the relevant Ministerial Directions is provided in the table below.

#### Table 2 - relevant Ministerial Directions (Section 117 directions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevant Section 117 Directions</th>
<th>Consistency and implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Environment and Heritage</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Heritage Conservation</td>
<td>The planning proposal is consistent with the aims of this Direction. The proposed heritage conservation area is intended to facilitate the conservation of items, places and buildings of environmental significance to the area, in relation to the historical, scientific, cultural, social, architectural and aesthetic value of the area identified in the Review of Heritage Areas Report dated June 2016.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Housing, Infrastructure and Urban Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Residential Zones</td>
<td>The planning proposal is consistent with the aims of this Direction. The planning proposal should not significantly affect the ability of future development to create a variety of housing choice on the site and to use or adapt existing infrastructure on the site where possible e.g. roads and heritage buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Home Occupations</td>
<td>The planning proposal is consistent with the aims of this Direction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Integrating Land Use and Transport</td>
<td>The planning proposal is consistent with the aims of this Direction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Hazard and Risk</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Acid Sulfate Soils</td>
<td>The planning proposal is consistent with the aims of this Direction. The site is affected by class 4 Acid Sulfate Soils. Future development must comply with Clause 6.1 Acid Sulfate Soils of the Newcastle LEP 2012.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Mine Subsidence and Unstable Land</td>
<td>The planning proposal is consistent with the aims of this Direction. The site is within a Mine Subsidence District.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Section 117 Directions</td>
<td>Consistency and implications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Flood Prone Land</td>
<td>The planning proposal is consistent with the aims of this Direction. The site is identified as flood prone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Regional Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Implementation of Regional Strategies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.10 Implementation of Regional Plans</td>
<td>The planning proposal is considered consistent with the vision, land use strategy, goals, directions and actions contained within the HRP. See Section 3 of the planning proposal for discussion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section C - Environmental, social and economic impact

7. Is there any likelihood that critical habitat or threatened species, populations or ecological communities, or their habitats, will be adversely affected as a result of the proposal?

The land subject to the proposal does not contain critical habitat or threatened species, populations or ecological community, or their habitats.

8. Are there any other likely environmental effects as a result of the planning proposal and how are they proposed to be managed?

The planning proposal is not likely to result in development that will create any significant adverse environmental effects.

Traffic and Transport Considerations

The planning proposal is not likely to result in development that will create any significant adverse traffic and transport effects.

Environmental Considerations

Bushfire hazard

The land is not identified as bush fire-prone land in the Newcastle Bush Fire Hazard Map (2009)

Acid Sulfate Soil

The site is affected by Acid Sulfate Soils. Future development must comply with Clause 6.1 Acid Sulfate Soils of the Newcastle LEP 2012.

Flooding

The site is affected by flooding. Future development must give due consideration to flood impact.

Land/site contamination (SEPP55)

There is no known contamination of the land and the current and former uses of the land are unlikely to have caused risk of contamination.

Urban Design Considerations

The land to be incorporated into the proposed 'Glebe Road Federation Cottages HCA' currently has a maximum building height of 10m and an FSR of 0.9, which is inconsistent with the current built form on the land and would conflict with the conservation objectives of this planning proposal.

Council does not currently apply numeric building height or FSR controls to its HCAs given these controls do not adequately dictate the desired building envelope outcomes, nor would they necessarily result in a built form that respects the character and significance of the existing building stock. Hence, it is recommended that consideration should be given to amending the LEP height of building and FSR maps to remove such controls from the subject land.
In tandem with the planning proposal, detailed design guidelines will also be developed and included in Council's Heritage Technical Manual to ensure the heritage significance and character of this area is protected.

**Social and Cultural Considerations**

**Heritage impacts**

There are currently no listed items of environmental heritage on site. There are several listed heritage items in close proximity to the site including the Junction Primary School directly to the south which is a Local Heritage item (Item no. I618), Rowland Park and Rowland Park Fountain to the west which are Local Heritage items (Item nos. I615 and I616), and to the north-east the War memorial at the corner of Glebe Road and Watkins Street is also a Local Heritage item (Item no. I613). The planning proposal will strengthen planning controls on the setting of the neighbouring heritage items and so contribute to ensuring their heritage significance and character are protected.

Fieldwork was undertaken in 2015 to establish the overall level of intactness of this area. The location of contributory buildings has been mapped, see **Figure 3**. Eleven of the thirteen buildings on site were considered contributory. The proposed Glebe Road Federation Cottages Heritage Conservation Area is important at the local level in demonstrating the principal characteristics of the Federation period and the nature of residential building construction in Newcastle between 1909 and 1915. The narrow window of time in which the precinct developed is significant in providing evidence of the key features of the Federation period including construction and building technologies, fashions and key elements of the Federation style, including the single storey scale of these modest dwellings, a symmetrical street frontage, open verandah, pyramidal roof form, hip and gable roofs, bearer and joist construction with lightweight cladding material (weatherboard), and the absence of garaging.

![Figure 3: Location of contributory buildings](image-url)
**Aboriginal archaeology**

An AHIMS Search has confirmed no items of Aboriginal heritage have been identified on the site. It is unlikely given the historic land uses.

**European archaeology**

No items of European cultural heritage have been identified on the site. It is unlikely given the historic land uses.

9. **Has the planning proposal adequately addressed any social and economic effects?**

**Social and Cultural Considerations (not addressed above)**

The planning proposal is intended to ensure the heritage significance and the existing and desired future character of the Glebe Road Federation Cottages site is protected.

The planning proposal would deliver some important social benefits including protecting a built environment that maintains and enhances the community's sense of identity.

A community survey was carried out between February 2016 and March 2016. The results of the survey confirmed:

- the majority (14 of 17 people) were in agreement that a new heritage conservation area should be established to include all of the properties 55 to 75 Glebe Road, The Junction; and

- the majority (14 of 17 people) were in agreement that a locally specific set of development guidelines should be prepared to protect the single storey character of the potential new Glebe Road The Junction HCA.

**Economic Considerations**

The economic impact of the planning proposal is likely to be limited with no change to the current R3 Medium Density Residential land use zoning and no proposal to intensify or reduce the existing use of the site.
Section D - State and Commonwealth interests

10. *Is there adequate public infrastructure for the planning proposal?*

Existing infrastructure is adequate to serve or meet the needs of the proposal.

11. *What are the views of state and Commonwealth public authorities consulted in accordance with the Gateway determination?*

Public authorities will be consulted in accordance with the Gateway determination. It is suggested that the following State and Commonwealth public authorities should be consulted with prior to public exhibition:

- Roads and Maritime Services; and
- Office of Environment and Heritage.
Part 4 - Mapping

The planning proposal seeks to amend the following maps within Newcastle LEP 2012:

- Floor Space Ratio Map
- Height of Buildings Map
- Heritage Map

The Matrix below indicates (with an “X”), which map sheets (of Newcastle LEP 2012) are to be amended as a result of this planning proposal (eg. FSR_001C)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FSR</th>
<th>HOB</th>
<th>HER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>001A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>001B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>001C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>001D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>002</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>002A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>002B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>002C</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>002D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>002E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>002F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>002G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>002H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004FA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004G</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Map Codes:

- FSR = Floor Space Ratio map
- HOB = Height of Buildings Map
- HER = Heritage Map
The following maps illustrate the proposed amendments to the Newcastle LEP 2012 maps:

- **Figure 4:** Existing Max Height of Buildings Map
- **Figure 5:** Proposed Max Height of Buildings Map
- **Figure 6:** Existing Max Floor Space Ratio Map
- **Figure 7:** Proposed Max Floor Space Ratio Map
- **Figure 8:** Existing Heritage Map
- **Figure 9:** Proposed Heritage Map
Figure 4 - Existing Max Height of Buildings Map
Figure 5 - Proposed Height of Buildings Map
Figure 6 - Existing Maximum Floor Space Ratio Map
Figure 7 - Proposed Maximum Floor Space Ratio Map
Figure 8 - Existing Heritage Map
Figure 9 - Proposed Heritage Map
Part 5 - Community consultation

The planning proposal is considered as low impact in accordance with the Department of Planning and Environment's guidelines, ‘A guide to preparing local environmental plans’. It is proposed that the planning proposal will be publicly exhibited for a minimum 14 day period.

Relevant public authorities will be consulted in accordance with the requirements of the Gateway determination.

Consultation was undertaken by Council in February to March 2016 during the preparation of the Heritage Conservation Area report. The process and outcomes of this consultation is documented in the Consultation Report at Appendix A and B of this report.
**Part 6 - Project timeline**

The plan making process is shown in the timeline below. It will be undertaken in accordance with the Gateway determination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Planning Proposal Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jan 18         Feb 18      Mar 18      Apr 18      May 18      Jun 18      Jul 18      Aug 18      Sep 18      Oct 18      Nov 18      Dec 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipated commencement date (date of Gateway determination)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipated timeframe for the completion of required studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency consultation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commencement and completion dates for public exhibition period</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeframe for consideration of submissions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeframe for the consideration of a proposal post exhibition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipated date RPA* will make the plan (if delegated)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipated date RPA* will forward to the Department for notification (if delegated) or for finalisation (if not delegated)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*RPA Relevant Planning Authority

**Appendices**

Appendix A - Review of Heritage Conservation Areas - Final Report
June 2016
Review of Heritage Conservation Areas

Final Report

June 2016
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## ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA COMPANY</td>
<td>Australian Agricultural Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSP</td>
<td>Newcastle 2030 Community Strategic Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCP</td>
<td>Development Control Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP&amp;A Act</td>
<td>Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCA</td>
<td>Heritage Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA</td>
<td>Heritage Act 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSR</td>
<td>Floor Space Ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFA</td>
<td>Gross Floor Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOB</td>
<td>Height of Buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEP</td>
<td>Local Environmental Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHRS</td>
<td>Lower Hunter Regional Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPS</td>
<td>Local Planning Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEPP</td>
<td>State Environmental Planning Policy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report presents the findings of a review of five heritage conservation areas (HCAs) across the Newcastle Local Government Area. The review defines the current heritage significance of each area, produces desired future character statements, assesses the appropriateness of boundaries, examines the development control framework and the relevant planning context, identifies items that contribute to or detract from each area and documents what the community values about these areas. The review also investigated a number of potential new HCAs.

The methodology of the review is based on NSW Heritage criteria as found in the heritage assessment guidelines of the NSW Heritage Council. These guidelines are accepted as the standard methodology for assessing heritage significance. The review also considers the "Heritage Conservation Areas" best practice guidelines of the NSW Heritage Council. A literature review of previous studies and analysis of new information based on fieldworks and community surveys was undertaken. The results of the community surveys are treated as the baseline data to determine the social significance of each HCA.

The final recommendations made in this report are a result of the analysis of the submissions made by the community, agencies, and the survey results conducted by Newcastle Voice, during the exhibition period (1 February - 14 March 2016).

The review finds support from residents of HCAs to maintain the special character of these areas and to maintain existing conservation area boundaries. There was also general support in the community for the creation of proposed new HCAs. The preparation of design guidelines to be included in the Newcastle Development Control Plan (DCP) 2012 is considered to be an appropriate way to reinforce character along with revisions to the Heritage Technical Manual.

The review concludes that Council should develop a program to amend relevant planning controls, ie. the Local Environmental Plan (LEP) and Development Control Plan (DCP) to give effect to the findings of the review. The final recommendations include:

- Amendments to the Cooks Hill, Hamilton South and The Hill Heritage Conservation Area boundaries
- Proposed Heritage Conservation Areas for Glebe Road Federation cottages and Hamilton Residential and additional heritage items in Parkway Avenue and Gordon Avenue Hamilton
- Amendments to the DCP and Heritage Technical Manual to include desired future character statements, contributory building maps and design guidelines.

Assessing land zonings was outside the scope of this review. A review of land zonings is a separate future project. The review itself does not make any amendments to HCA boundaries or heritage listings. Changing conservation area boundaries and heritage listings requires amendments to the LEP. A strict legal process must be followed to amend the LEP. Similarly, recommended changes to the DCP require a formal, legal process. This work will be undertaken as a separate project.
CHAPTER ONE -
INTRODUCTION
1.0 Introduction

This report presents the results of a review of five heritage conservation areas (hereafter referred to as HCAs) across the Newcastle Local Government Area, conducted between February 2014 and October 2015. The draft document was publicly exhibited for six weeks between 1 February 2016 and 14 March 2016. The final document has been refined as a result of the exhibition.

HCAs are included in Part 2, Schedule 5 of the Newcastle Local Environmental Plan 2012 (LEP) and identified in accompanying heritage maps to the LEP. They comprise:

- Cooks Hill
- Hamilton South ‘Garden Suburb’
- Hamilton Business Centre
- The Hill
- Newcastle East

The review has also assessed two potential HCAs. These are discussed in Chapter 7 of this report.

The review was prepared by staff of the Strategic Planning Unit, Newcastle City Council. The community surveys undertaken as part of this review were conducted on behalf of Strategic Planning by Newcastle City Council Communications Unit (Newcastle Voice).

A second round of community surveys was conducted through Newcastle Voice as part of the exhibition process in February and March 2016. The results of the engagement are attached in Appendix A.

The project plan comprised the following tasks:

- Review the heritage significance of HCAs in accordance with NSW Office of Environment and Heritage guidelines.
- Identify and define building styles and key elements of heritage value within each heritage conservation area.
- Undertake fieldwork to identify the contributory buildings and identify these using mapping software for publication in the Heritage Technical Manual. Give each building a contributory, neutral or non-contributory rating and define a policy for managing contributory buildings.
- Review the boundaries of the HCAs to ensure they continue to reflect the heritage significance of each and analyse the planning framework including development controls. Examine whether the areas should be managed as individual areas for development assessment purposes.
- Commission a heritage architect to develop a series of design options for the various building styles. These are to be included in the Heritage Technical Manual.
- Conduct a community survey in each HCA to determine what residents value about their particular HCA and what role Council should have in guiding development.

---

1 The City Centre HCA was recently subject to LEP and DCP amendments by the NSW Department of Planning. It was therefore determined to be outside the scope of this review.
• Consult with the architectural and building design industry on appropriate design options for the Newcastle DCP and Technical Manual.

1.1 Purpose of this report
This report brings together the findings of the conservation area review project and presents the information as a consolidated heritage review report. The report makes recommendations for managing HCAs into the future.

The draft document was reported to Council on 24 November 2015 where Council resolved to place the document on public exhibition for a minimum period of six weeks. Submissions received have been used as the basis of the final recommendations.

1.2 Newcastle 2030 Community Strategic Plan
Newcastle 2030 is a shared community vision developed as a guide to inform policies and actions throughout the city for the next twenty years. To guide the city forward, seven strategic directions have been set to guide the implementation of this vision. This project aligns with the Newcastle 2030 Community Strategic Plan (CSP) principles, and will contribute to a liveable and distinctive built environment, vibrant and activated public places and open and collaborative leadership.

Through the CSP, the Newcastle community has expressed its aspiration that moving towards 2030, local heritage will be valued, enhanced and celebrated. Overall, Council aims to ensure that the significant aspects of the City's heritage are identified, cared for, celebrated and appropriately managed on behalf of residents and visitors of Newcastle. The intention is to ensure that decisions about heritage places are made with due regard to heritage significance, and that opportunities to strengthen or better appreciate heritage significance are undertaken.
1.3 **Alignment with Newcastle Heritage Strategy 2013-2017**

The Newcastle Heritage Strategy 2013-2017 provides a framework for Council to work towards achieving the aspirations of the community articulated in the 2030 Community Strategic Plan. The Heritage Strategy is a strategic framework to guide Council's approach to the management of heritage in the Newcastle local government area. It is drawn from the principles of the Newcastle 2030 Community Strategic Plan (Revised 2013) and the Newcastle Heritage Policy 2013. The Heritage Strategy 2013-2017 provides detailed actions and an implementation framework based on the key strategic directions of the CSP and Newcastle Heritage Policy 2013.

This review delivers on the following strategies:

- **Strategy 1 - Knowing our heritage - enhancing our community's knowledge of and regard for local heritage items and places**
- **Strategy 2 - Protecting our heritage - Council will protect and conserve the City's heritage places for the benefit of everyone**
- **Strategy 3 - Supporting our heritage - Council will protect the integrity of heritage places by ensuring consistent and sympathetic uses, physical and aesthetic treatments and outstanding interpretations**
- **Strategy 4 - Promoting our heritage – Newcastle’s significant heritage places are a unique historical resource and represent an asset for the continuing educational, cultural and economic enrichment of the region.**

1.4 **What is a heritage conservation area?**

A heritage conservation area is a geographic area recognised for a range of physical characteristics that collectively have been found to have heritage significance. HCAs are usually identified through a heritage study process or comprehensive heritage assessment and will exhibit a range of heritage values that the community deems is worthy of preservation. Heritage conservation areas are typically distinguished from other places and surroundings by their history, streetscapes, landscape or other physical attributes that are deemed to have heritage value.

Heritage conservation areas are more than a collection of individual heritage items. According to the NSW Heritage Council, they are places in which the historical origins and relationships between various elements creates a sense of place that is worth keeping.  

Depending on the degree of heritage significance, heritage conservation areas may be statutorily recognised in national, state and local heritage registers. In New South Wales, there are heritage conservation areas listed on the NSW State Heritage Register subject to the provisions of the NSW Heritage Act 1977, including Braidwood and the Rocks precinct. At the local government level, HCAs may be included in the heritage schedules of LEPs. In such cases, the standard instrument heritage provisions of the NSW Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 apply and will govern the circumstances in which development is permitted.

---

A heritage conservation area is determined by examining its heritage significance and by identifying the special characteristics that make up that significance. These characteristics can include the subdivision pattern, the consistency of the building stock, or common building and construction materials. Heritage conservation areas will usually demonstrate aspects of our cultural, economic and social history, and patterns of change and development over time. These elements will provide evidence of how Australians have responded physically, emotionally, socially and architecturally to their environment; and how places have been occupied, used, ignored, refined, degraded or associated with Australian history over time.

1.5 Conservation principles

As the second oldest city in the State, Newcastle’s heritage is embodied in its history of work and industry, its historic buildings, its rich cultural landscape and working harbour. This heritage contributes to Newcastle’s identity as an important place of maritime and economic activity, and to its identity as a place which has a rich social fabric, and an interesting environment.

The approach to managing change to a HCA is derived from the Australia International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) Charter for Conservation of Places of Cultural Significance (The Burra Charter). The Burra Charter is the foundation of the heritage conservation sector in Australia and is the industry standard for managing change to heritage places. This review of heritage conservation areas is based on the following Burra Charter approaches:

- Change should be based on an understanding of heritage significance.
- Change should respect the heritage significance of the item, site, streetscape and/or area.
- Change should be managed in accordance with an appropriate conservation policy.

A key principle is that the sum of the parts is equally important as the individual features themselves and explains why the cumulative impact of change is an important consideration. This is often not well understood. Where buildings positively reinforce the character of a HCA, they will need to be retained to conserve the significance of the HCA.

1.6 How are heritage conservation areas determined?

Heritage conservation areas are determined using an objective, evidence based process established by the Burra Charter of Australia ICOMOS³. Under the methodologies contained in the Burra Charter, the significance of an area is defined and assessed, typically through a heritage study or community based heritage study, and its comparative values are established. This is achieved by applying the NSW Heritage criteria, which is defined under the NSW Heritage Act 1977.

1.7 Contributory buildings

There are three levels of contribution that buildings can make in a HCA. The contribution of any particular building to streetscape, character or heritage significance will guide the approach to development and assist in determining the degree of change that will be permitted. Each level of contribution is explained in the table below.

This review has undertaken field surveys to identify the contribution of every building in each HCA and Contributory building maps have been prepared. These maps are to be inserted into the Heritage Technical Manual, and published on Council's website. It is intended that these maps will be updated annually.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contributory buildings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contributory buildings make a significant contribution to the character of heritage conservation areas and streetscapes. Typically they will retain a high proportion of original features and alterations are generally reversible. Contributory buildings are an important resource for the interpretation and understanding of the history and development pattern of the area. Such buildings will contribute to the overall heritage value of the area. The appearance of a principal or significant frontage should be retained, with alterations and additions located at the rear of contributory buildings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neutral buildings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neutral buildings do not contribute or detract from the significant character of the heritage conservation area or streetscape. They include buildings that are associated with an area’s historic development but may have been altered, or their intactness reduced over time. Neutral buildings may also be new sympathetic development or infill that sits well within a streetscape. It is preferable to keep such buildings and restore elements to increase the contribution of the buildings to the streetscape.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non Contributory buildings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-contributory buildings are intrusive to the streetscape of a heritage conservation area owing to their inappropriate scale, bulk, setback, roof treatment, atypical garage arrangements or materials. Non-contributory buildings may detract from the heritage conservation area streetscape and are suited to redevelopment. The redevelopment of non-contributory buildings provides an opportunity for new development to reinforce the character of the area. Non-contributory buildings provide locations for appropriate infill development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.8 Methodology

The NSW Heritage criteria, defined in the NSW Heritage Act 1977, are the foundation of the NSW heritage assessment system and are enshrined in the heritage assessment guidelines of the NSW Heritage Council. This review is based on these guidelines, as the standard methodology for assessing heritage significance. The document "Heritage Conservation Areas", best practice guidelines of the NSW Heritage Council was also used.

This review has conducted a literature review of previous heritage studies relating to the heritage conservation areas, and an analysis of new information, including the results of the fieldwork, historical updates, and the community surveys.

An important element of heritage significance is social value - that is, the esteem people place on an item or HCA. In order to seek the views of each community residing in the HCAs in a robust and objective manner, the review has included a series of community surveys. These surveys were conducted on behalf of the project team by Newcastle Voice, and the results are included within each HCA chapter. The results have been treated as the baseline data to explore the social significance of each heritage conservation area.
CHAPTER TWO -
COOKS HILL
HERITAGE CONSERVATION AREA
2.1 Introduction

This report presents the findings of the review of the Cooks Hill Heritage Conservation Area. The current boundaries and location of the Cooks Hill HCA are as reproduced in Figure 2.1.

![Figure 2.1 - Cooks Hill HCA - current boundary](image-url)
2.2 Heritage Status - Cooks Hill

Cooks Hill was first listed as an Urban Conservation Area by the National Trust of Australia (NSW) on 27 April 1981. The area extended in a southerly direction from Laman Street to Bull Street, and was bounded to the east by Railway Street and to the west by Union Street.

The area was included in the heritage schedule of Newcastle Local Environmental Plan 1987 as Amendment No. 52, Government Gazette 3 July 1992 as “HCA”. The Hill and Newcastle East Heritage Conservation Areas were gazetted at the same time. Following a resolution of Council in 1996, the boundaries of the Cooks Hill Heritage Conservation Area were extended, with changes gazetted on 21 June 1996 and 19 September 1997 to include the area south of Bull Street through to Young Street, including Centennial Park.

At the time of its gazettal, Council adopted Development Control provisions for The Hill, Cooks Hill, and Newcastle East within DCP 44. Council also at that time adopted guidelines developed in 1996 by Godden Mackay Heritage Consultants, in a study to extend the heritage areas.

2.3 History

This history is drawn from a number of secondary sources including histories compiled within heritage impact assessments, heritage studies and previous Council documents. The reports are available in the Local Studies Collection of Newcastle Region Library.

Settlement in Cooks Hill was initiated in response to demand for housing for the coal miners who worked the Australian Agricultural Company’s pits east of Darby Street. The AA Company’s first mine, the A Pit, was established in 1831 near the corner of Church and Brown Streets, followed shortly after by the opening of the B Pit in 1835 at the eastern end of Pitt Street (now Queen Street). It was the B Pit, together with the C, F and Sea pits that led to the urban development of Cooks Hill. The most prolific of these pits, the Sea pit, opened in 1888 to the east of Darby Street (near Nescapark) and it operated until 1916. At its peak, the Sea pit employed 790 men under ground and 160 above. Railway lines in Brooks Street transported the coal from these pits to the harbour.

The demand for housing and the increase in population in Cooks Hill led the AA Company to start to divide up their land holdings to sell to their workers. The chief surveyor of the AA Company, George Elder Darby, was handed the task of laying out town allotments of the company’s estate. The first auction was held in April 1853 and comprised thirty-two quarter acre lots in Darby Street which sold for £30 each. Many of the purchasers were miners employed in the nearby mines.

Early residential development in Cooks Hill was situated east of Bruce Street and north of Bull Street. West of Bruce Street development was prevented by swampy land and the presence of the Newcastle Coal and Copper Company’s railway, which brought coal from mines in the Burwood estate (Merewether). Built in 1851 the railway cut a swathe through the AA Company’s lands, and was a significant catalyst in the breaking of the AA Company’s monopoly on the mining and sale of coal. Coal continued to be hauled to the port along this railway until the mid-twentieth century.
The historical and associative significance of the railway should not be underestimated. The line was the Burwood Coal and Copper Company Railway built by Sir Thomas Mitchell. The Newcastle Industrial Heritage Association helps us grasp the immense historical significance of the remnant railway line running through Cooks Hill as attested in this grab:

In 1835 Sydney doctor and businessman James Mitchell purchased about 900 acres of coastal land extending from the far side of Merewether ridge to Glenrock Lagoon. He named the property the Burwood estate, after his wife's family home in London and later extended it to 1,834 acres. In 1842 Ludwig Leichhardt visited the Burwood estate and drew up the stratigraphy of the coastline. Leichhardt may also have established the extent of the coal seams under Mitchell's property, as it was not long after Leichhardt's visit that Mitchell commissioned a tram/road tunnel through Burwood ridge (now Merewether ridge). Known as 'Mitchell's tunnel' the historical events surrounding its construction make it one of the most significant sites in NSW. It was partly due to the tunnel's construction that coal mining in Australia was opened up to independent mining, which in turn led to the Hunter's establishment as a coal-mining centre. It was also the first tunnel of its type to be constructed in Australia.

Mitchell publicly claimed construction of the tunnel was to allow access to Burwood Beach so he could build a salt works. In private, however, it appears Mitchell was planning to overturn the Australian Agricultural Company's (AACo) Government supported monopoly on coal mining. He had already approached Governor Gipps with several requests, including: that the Metallic Ores Act be repealed, allowing copper ores to enter NSW duty free; that Newcastle be made a free port so private vessels could enter the estuary without restrictions; and that he be permitted to mine and use coal from his estate as fuel for a copper smelter. Gipps agreed to the first two requests but felt he had no power to agree to the third.

Despite this set back, Mitchell continued with his tunnel project and commissioned its construction in 1846. It was constructed directly into a coal seam, located in line with present day Merewether Street. Work was carried out from both ends with the point of meeting marked by an obvious change in direction of the pickaxe marks. The roof was high enough to accommodate a horse team. Two to three thousand tons of coal were extracted, which Mitchell could do nothing with due to the AACo monopoly.

The AACo and the Government were also under a great deal of pressure from other quarters to relinquish the monopoly. A number of people operated small mines in the district in defiance of the monopoly, which the AACo mostly ignored. However, a former employee of Mitchell's mining near East Maitland, a Mr James Brown, brought the matter into the public domain when he directly undercut the AACo price to supply coal to steamships at Morpeth. He was subsequently prosecuted. The Government's legal advice after this case was that they would have to individually prosecute every other person involved in such activities. The then Governor, Fitzroy, expressed the opinion that the AACo should bear the costs of these prosecutions. In 1847 the NSW Legislative Council appointed a Select Committee to investigate the matter further. This was known as the Coal Inquiry, and both Mitchell and Brown gave evidence; Mitchell in relation to his tunnel, Brown in relation to price-cutting.

Before the committee could issue any recommendations the AACo gave in and relinquished its monopoly. Mitchell proceeded to lease out the coal rights on the Burwood estate, with five mines being quickly established by J & A Brown, Donaldson, Alexander Brown, Nott and Morgan. However, the AACo owned the land between the Burwood estate and the Port of Newcastle and refused to allow Mitchell to transport coal by rail across its land. Mitchell lobbied the Government again and in 1850 a Private Act of Parliament Mitchell's Tram Road Act (the first in NSW) was passed finally allowing him to carry coal through AACo lands. (http://www.niha.org.au/staticpages/index.php/20110830001925853/print Accessed 1/04/2016)
What is most interesting is that the AA Company’s monopoly ended with the first ever Private Act of Parliament in NSW in 1850. What also happened was a change in thrust of the company who began to hedge their bets by benefiting from land sales in hiving off parcels on Lake Macquarie Road (now Darby Street).

Still, the AA Company remained capitalised in Newcastle’s inner area until the early 20th century. The AA Company provided land and money for the building of St John’s Anglican Church in 1857, together with a rectory and a school. With the employment provided by the mines by 1861, there were 22 houses in the area, which were a mix of brick and timber miners’ cottages. Many of the streets started to be formally named after men connected to the AA Company including Darby, Dawson, Bruce, Corlette, Parry and Bull Streets. As the population continued to grow it came to be dominated by small cottages and closely built terrace houses that were said to resemble the workers’ housing of English industrial cities.

Sales brochures of the 1860s reveal insights into the cost and nature of housing in Cooks Hill. In the early 1860s, a two storey wooden cottage on Bruce Street could be bought for £250, and were marketed to the workers of the area. As is now, affordability was inextricably connected to job security and hence house styles that survive reflect broader economic shifts.

In Cooks Hill we see a diverse mix of styles and building forms as a result of economic cycles and fashions - what’s cool. The national recession of 1890, the Edwardian spurt of 1900, the Inter-war era, the post war boom and later conservation movement in the 1970s instigated by the residents of Cooks Hill (including the late Anne Von Bertouch) have all made a stylistic mark on the built form of Cooks Hill and created a citizen culture that is pervasive and enduring.

Development accelerated in the 1870s when investors began to build rental accommodation, shops, hotels and factories. By 1870, Darby Street had five hotels, a foundry, nineteen shops with adjoining residences, two surgeries with residences and numerous houses. Referred to as the “drinking man’s paradise”, at one time there were ten hotels in Cooks Hill. By the 1880s, Cooks Hill was firmly established as a thriving village and was officially named Cooks Hill in 1885 following the opening of the Cooks Hill Public School in Laman Street. The name Cooks Hill is reputed to be derived from Thomas Cook, a wealthy owner of an impressive residence that stood at the rise of land at the intersection of Auckland and Laman Streets.

In 1864, five acres of AA Company land between Melville (Union) and Bruce Streets was leased to the Newcastle Cricket Club for the establishment of a cricket ground. The first match was played in 1867. Catering to the demand for after-match drinks between opposing teams, the Cricketer’s Arms hotel was constructed in 1869 was constructed on the west side of Bruce Street just south of Bull Street (opposite the current day Cricketer’s Arms). The Oriental Hotel was also erected at this time on the corner of Bull and Bruce Streets. In 1889, the Newcastle Cricket Club voted to provide members a lawn bowling facility, with the City Bowling Club established on the southern end of the cricket ground. In 1888 the AA Company set aside 5.5 acres of land for a park as a centennial gift.
and aptly named Centennial Park. Terrace houses, a benevolent asylum and a lying-in hospital were built on the north edge of the park along Parry Street.

The presence of Centennial Park brought increased property values in its vicinity. Although Cooks Hill had evolved as an essentially working class suburb, there were many middle class residents such as William Arnott the biscuit maker, whose own family home was built on Union Street and who lived in Cooks Hill. Many fine houses were also built throughout the Cooks Hill in the 1880s and beyond.

In 1880, St Andrews Presbyterian church was built at the corner of Laman and Auckland Streets to a design by the prominent architect Frederick Menkens followed by another of Menken’s commissions in 1889 with the building of the Baptist Tabernacle.

The last of the AA Company’s mines in the area closed in 1916 and this saw many of the miners move to other coal fields in the Hunter Valley. However, the proximity of Cooks Hill to the city and services meant that it remained popular with workers. The AA Company sold the last remaining parcels of land in the early decades of the 20th century, including the cricket ground with the exception of the cricket pitch which remains to this day as a pocket park on Corlette Street.

By the end of the 1920s, Cooks Hill was a suburb of mixed fortunes. Dilapidated old houses and ‘tenements’ were often adjoined by new and more modern buildings. Many tenements were demolished after the war and many lots were re-subdivided and redeveloped.

By the 1960s, Cooks Hill was becoming a desirable place for people wanting to live close to the city centre. Demographic change led to a property boom in the 1970s, and the battle to conserve the suburb began, led by Anne von Bertouch who restored her home and art gallery on Laman Street. The earthquake of 1989 destroyed many buildings and many more were damaged. In 1992, the suburb was heritage listed by its inclusion in the Newcastle Local Environmental Plan.
2.4 Physical Description

There are a number of physical elements in Cooks Hill that date from the 19th and early 20th centuries and provide it with a distinctive historic character. These elements represent more than 160 years of residential development:

- The variety of building styles throughout Cooks Hill that date from the nineteenth and early twentieth century including attached terrace houses and semi detached cottages, Victorian period villas and early twentieth century detached bungalows in various styles
- Minimal street frontage setbacks that give the impression of a densely clustered neighbourhood
- Mature trees in gardens and streets including Council, Parry, Swan and Dawson Streets
- The former Burwood Coal and Copper Company rail line and bridge abutments under Laman Street
- Fences from the Inter-war and Federation periods and earlier
- Sandstone kerbs and gutters
- Victorian era post box on Corlette Street
- Pubs and shops on Darby and Bull Streets
• Parks, including Centennial Park, Corlette Street reserve (formerly the Newcastle Cricket Club pitch), National Park.

Cooks Hill contains comparatively dense residential development at the northern edge between Laman and Bull Streets and houses are generally aligned with the street boundary or have only a small setback from the front boundary. Smaller lots of land dominate the northern precinct whereas the southern section contains larger blocks of land where there are a higher number of free standing houses around Centennial Park and towards Young Street.

Figure 2.3 - Georgian style attached terraces on Queen Street
One of the most significant features of Cooks Hill is the evidence of the route of the Burwood Coal and Copper Company railway, which is evident in the layout of houses and the shape of streets and lanes. The route of the railway line has left an indelible impression on the suburb to the present day. Laman Street could not be constructed until after the Company built a bridge to support the extension of the road, allowing coal trains to pass underneath.

Precincts in Cooks Hill
In 1996, Council commissioned Godden Mackay Pty Ltd to assess the character and heritage significance of the area. The report found that there are five areas within Cooks Hill that have a distinctive character. The report describes these areas as precincts to the extent to which they define the character of each. However, for the purposes of development assessment, the report did not assign individual controls or design guidelines to the individual precincts the report identified. Instead, generic guidelines were developed for the whole of the conservation area which were adopted as "DCP 44 Conservation Area Guidelines" in 1996. This review finds that the controls should continue this approach because it is simple to apply and takes into account the generally eclectic nature of Cooks Hill.

The question of what controls should apply and whether these can be customised to individual streets or precincts was canvassed with the Building Design Industry Reference Group in May 2014. The consensus of the Group was that the DCP acknowledges these variations in house type and streetscape character and is an appropriate means of managing character, supporting and encouraging design innovation and creativity. The Group provided feedback that precinct based controls were unnecessary, preferring instead a series of design guidelines that could be applied depending on the situation. Consequently, it is not recommended that the controls be broken down into precinct based controls. The review finds that such an approach would burden the development assessment process with additional, unnecessary complexity.

The Residential Precinct
Cooks Hill as a whole is essentially residential in character, typified by a mixture of single storey and two storey buildings providing residential, commercial and public uses. It has a dense quality bestowed by the fact the houses are generally not set back from the street or have small front gardens. Especially distinctive are the cantilevered balconies of Victorian Regency houses and the prevalence of timber weatherboard dwellings including free standing cottages and terrace houses. Also notable are the variety of architectural treatments that survive from the late 19th and early 20th centuries in the form of parapets, pediments, classical detailing and cast iron filigree decoration. The avenues of street trees within Cooks Hill are also significant and are valued by residents and visitors to the area.

Darby Street Commercial Precinct
Buildings in the commercial strip of Darby Street tend to be modestly scaled, almost entirely one or two storeys high with some multi level buildings of more recent construction. For detailed guidelines in relation to this precinct refer to Section 6.09 of the DCP 2012.
Railway Street Residential Precinct
Railway Street has a distinctive character of two storey houses, some single storey detached houses, which address each other across a narrow north-south street. The narrowness of the thoroughfare gives it a pleasant linear quality. There are few front gardens with most houses being built to the street line. Unity is bestowed by a general harmony of scale and by the use of traditional materials, corrugated iron roofs, terrace houses and some fine examples of buildings from the 1860s are particularly notable.

Figure 2.4 - Houses on Railway Street Cooks Hill

Public Buildings Precinct
This is dominated by the St. Andrew’s Presbyterian Church, the splendid gothic landmark, and the Baptist Tabernacle. The Laman Street underpass visible with large brick buttressed retaining walls at the end of Glovers Lane and at the rear of the Signalman’s cottage, is an important physical remnant of the former coal railway.

School Precinct
The Federation period buildings of the former Cooks Hill primary school group are a strong presence in the precinct and also have landmark qualities at the slight elevation of Laman Street.

2.5 Previous Heritage Studies
The heritage value of the inner suburbs of Newcastle has been recognised since the 1960s. On 30 October 1978, the National Trust of Australia (New South Wales) resolved to classify both The Hill and Newcastle East as an "Urban Conservation Area" (see Figure 5.2). The 1978 listing boundary determined by the National Trust became the same boundary that was later gazetted into the Newcastle LEP as the statutory boundary of the Hill and Newcastle East Heritage Conservation Areas.
Soon after the National Trust listing, the area was also included on the Register of the National Estate by the Australian Heritage Commission as the "Newcastle Conservation Area", in 1979.

In 1982, Council commissioned the firm Suters Bysteed + Lester Firth to assess the character and heritage significance of Cooks Hill, The Hill and Newcastle East areas. The purpose of the study was:

- To identify and conserve the environmental heritage of the inner city of Newcastle.
- To provide rehabilitation and infill guidelines for this area, and
- To provide a draft development control plan for urban conservation, including the identification of public works.

The major emphasis of the study was to enable policies and objectives for conservation management to be incorporated in detailed development controls for the area. The area was regarded by Council as a key aspect of the city's physical identity and heritage.

The draft study was called the Newcastle Inner Areas Conservation Planning Study and was placed on public exhibition in September 1985. The study contains invaluable urban planning and heritage documentation and is available for viewing in Newcastle Region Library. The Newcastle Inner Areas Conservation Planning Study remains an invaluable baseline document for managing the heritage values of the areas.

The areas identified were eventually listed as heritage conservation areas in the Newcastle Local Environmental Plan, Amendment No 52 in 1992. In 1997, Council adopted development control guidelines in the form of DCP 44 - covering Newcastle East, The Hill and Cooks Hill. The DCP introduced principles and objectives to facilitate the protection and management of the built environment within each precinct.

In 2005, a study of proposed heritage conservation areas was commissioned by Council\(^5\). An area just outside of the east boundary of Cooks Hill was assessed as part of this study. This area was around Anzac Parade, Kitchener Parade and extended up to Bingle and High Streets in The Hill. It was a recommendation of the study that the area be formed as a heritage conservation area with the name Shepherds Hill, however the study was not reported to Council and no further work was progressed.

---

\(^5\) Ecotecture (2005), Review of Potential Heritage Items - Group 1 Final Report, prepared on behalf of Newcastle City Council
2.6 Assessment of Cultural Significance

Applying the NSW Heritage Criteria

In revising the heritage significance of the area, the NSW Heritage criteria have been applied as expressed below:

- **Criterion a - An item is important in the course, or pattern, of NSW’s cultural or natural history:**

  Cooks Hill Heritage Conservation Area represents a pattern of urban settlement that typifies the history of Newcastle’s development. Starting as a cluster of coal mines owned by the Australian Agricultural Company, the area gradually transitioned into a residential suburb from the mid-19th century onward, closely influenced by the decisions and activities of the Australian Agricultural Company. The AA Company began disposing their land holdings in the early 1850s, releasing parcels along Darby Street, Council Street and Railway Street. Examples of early residential and commercial buildings in these streets survive to the present day, representing the oldest development in the suburb of Cooks Hill. Other parts of the suburb were released later in the 19th century and into the 20th century. By the 1890s Cooks Hill was densely settled and had acquired the character of a worker’s village with services and public buildings along Darby and Bull Streets and the suburb is demonstrative of this criterion at the local level.

  The internal street network in Cooks Hill was progressively dedicated to public use by the AA Company from the 1860s to the 1880s. Private housing would usually follow this dedication and as many of the buildings in Cooks Hill are the original buildings on the land the heritage conservation area is demonstrative of these times of dedication.

- **Criterion b - An item has strong or special association with the life or works of a person, or group of persons, of importance in NSW’s cultural or natural history:**

  Cooks Hill has been the birthplace and home of significant individuals who have contributed to the political and cultural life of Australia including the nation’s first female Lord Mayor Joy Cummings, gallery owner Ann Von Bertouch, and celebrated artists John Olsen and William Dobell. Historically Cooks Hill is strongly associated with the Australian Agricultural Company.

- **Criterion c - An item is important in demonstrating aesthetic characteristics and/or a high degree of creative or technical achievement in NSW:**

  Cooks Hill is a defining visual marker of the urban geography of Newcastle, containing a collection of buildings, trees, historical features and parks that visually establish a sense of place that is aesthetically linked to its history. The avenues of street trees provide an attractive green canopy that is a unifying visual element. Starting as a cluster of coal mines from the 1830s, the area gradually transitioned into a residential suburb from the mid 19th century onward, closely influenced by the decisions and activities of the Australian Agricultural Company. Aesthetically, Cooks Hill heritage conservation area contains an important collection of elements that share aesthetic characteristics that establish a strong historical character and sense of place. These elements are:
- Buildings that represent architectural styles and construction technologies predominantly from the mid-19th century, as well as Victorian, Federation, and Inter War periods of urban development.
- Streetscapes in which there is a strong character of densely clustered buildings, with minimal setbacks and generally on small lots.
- Mature fig trees which deepen the sense of place and the historical character of Cooks Hill.
- The variety of building styles throughout Cooks Hill that date from the nineteenth and early twentieth century including attached terrace houses and semi detached cottages, Victorian period villas and early twentieth century detached bungalows in various styles
- Minimal street frontage setbacks that give the impression of a densely clustered neighbourhood
- Mature trees in gardens and streets including Council, Parry, Swan and Dawson Streets
- The former Burwood Coal and Copper Company rail line and bridge abutments under Laman Street
- Fences from the Inter-war and Federation periods and earlier
- Sandstone kerbs and gutters
- Victorian era post box on Corlette Street
- Pubs and shops on Darby and Bull Streets
- Parks, including Centennial Park, Corlette Street, National Park.

- **Criterion d - An item has strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group in NSW for social, cultural or spiritual reasons:**

  Cooks Hill is highly regarded by the community for its interesting urban character, liveable streetscapes, and the diverse range of historic buildings that unify and provide the suburb with a special character. A 2014 community survey confirms that there is an established and distinctive ‘Cooks Hill’ character which is valued by residents and visitors to Cooks Hill. Cooks Hill meets this criterion as there is a high degree of esteem held by the resident community and strong attachment to the character of the area, the streetscape, buildings and public open space. The area meets this criterion on cultural grounds at the local level.

  The conservation movement of the 1970s instigated by the residents of Cooks Hill (including the late Anne Von Bertouch) have all made a stylistic mark on the built form of Cooks Hill and created a citizen culture that is pervasive and enduring.

- **Criterion e - An item has potential to yield information that will contribute to an understanding of NSW’s cultural or natural history:**

  Given the rate of survival of key elements of the early urban settlement of Newcastle, including its ability to demonstrate elements of the early development of Newcastle as well as the system of land subdivision by the Australian Agricultural Company from the 1860s onwards, the area has the potential to yield information that will contribute to understanding aspects of Newcastle’s
cultural history. There are numerous building styles ranging from early Victorian terraces through to post war residential flat buildings. A high number of contributory buildings help to establish the streetscapes of Cooks Hill, along with the hotels, shops, churches, schools and parks.

- **Criterion f - An item possesses uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of NSW’s cultural or natural history:**

  The area has the capacity to demonstrate rare and uncommon aspects of local heritage as the first of the Australian Agricultural Company’s land holdings to be released for urban development. Some of these aspects are quite unusual including the evidence of the route of the Burwood Coal and Copper Company railway, the Signalman's cottage at Civic park, and many surviving small miners’ cottages.

- **Criterion g - An item is important in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a class of NSW’s cultural or natural places or cultural or natural environments:**

  Cooks Hill contains many surviving elements of the mid-late 19th and early 20th centuries and the processes of urbanisation including land subdivision, street layout and varying building types that reflect a long period of urbanisation. It demonstrates these characteristics in its elements including building stock setting, scale and form of buildings, street layout including laneways, and heritage items and parklands.

### 2.7 Comparative Assessment

Cooks Hill is demonstrative of the ad-hoc land release prerogatives of the Australian Agricultural Company and demonstrates through its irregular subdivision pattern this aspect of its history. As such, it is a unique example of a place reserved for coal mining that would become one of the earliest suburbs of Newcastle.

### 2.8 Threatening Processes

In terms of the processes that undermine the character of Cooks Hill, the principle threat is arising from the demolition of contributory building stock. The character and heritage significance of Cooks Hill would be lost if large numbers of contributory buildings were removed. It stands to reason that maintaining a control on demolition and building alterations is an essential tool for managing the character of the Heritage Conservation Area into the future.

### 2.9 Desired Future Character Statement

This review has gathered data on the elements of heritage value in Cooks Hill, the features that establish character and provide a sense of place, and the views of the building design industry and residents. As a result of this work, a **statement of desired future character** has been prepared. It is proposed to include the statement in the DCP as a clear guide for development assessment and design planning.
The character of the Cooks Hill Heritage conservation area is made up of a variety of building styles that date from the late 19th and early decades of the 20th century. The special character of Cooks Hill will be preserved, celebrated and maintained through the retention of contributory buildings, the existing subdivision pattern, and elements of visual interest. Elements that are to be preserved include:

- Contributory buildings constructed prior to the second world war
- Mature trees in gardens and the public domain
- The former Burwood Coal and Copper Company rail line and bridge abutments at Laman Street
- Heritage Fences
- Sandstone kerbing and guttering
- Victorian era post box on Corlette Street
- Pubs and shops on Darby, Union and Bull Streets
- Parks, including Centennial Park, Corlette Street, National Park

The eclectic character of Cooks Hill will continue to provide residents with a unique and valued sense of place into the future.

Figure 2.5 – A group of workers’ cottages on Young Street
Figure 2.6 – A bungalow on Corlette Street. The dwelling contributes in a positive manner to the streetscape

2.10 Contributory Buildings

Fieldwork was undertaken during March and April 2014 in order to establish the overall level of intactness of the HCA and to map the location of contributory buildings. For definitions of contributory buildings, refer to section 1.7.

The following images are intended to provide guidance on the three categories of building contribution in Cooks Hill HCA, starting with contributory buildings, neutral and ending with the category of non-contributory building. Finally a map of the area is provided which identifies, by colour, the category of each building within the heritage conservation area.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contributory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image2.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image3.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non Contributory$^6$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image4.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

$^6$ Non-contributory buildings are only deemed non-contributory in the context of the character of a HCA. The authors are not seeking to disparage such buildings and no offence should be taken.
2.11 Newcastle Voice Community Survey Results

As part of the Cooks Hill HCA review, a survey of local community members was conducted to gain an understanding of what residents and property owners value about the HCA. The survey was conducted in March and April 2014. A total of 197 survey responses were completed. The key findings are as follows:

- 96% were aware that Cooks Hill is a Heritage Conservation Area
- 93% agree that Cooks Hill should be a Heritage Conservation Area
- 29% had lodged a development application (DA) for a property in the CHHCA in the past 10 years
- the elements residents valued most about Cooks Hill were the streetscape and character (86%), the proximity to facilities and services (84%), and the heritage houses and building (82%).

The majority of respondents agreed that there are buildings in the area that both contribute to, and detract from, the character of the area. Over half the respondents agreed that buildings in the HCA should be allowed to be demolished where they are in poor structural condition (58%) or where the building has been altered or does not fit with the character of the area (50%). The majority of Cooks Hill residents (86%) agreed that new development, including alterations and additions, should be designed to fit the existing character of the area.
Opinion on whether HCA development guidelines should be merit based or prescriptive was divided, with 55% of respondents indicating a preference for the merit based approach and 45% preferring prescriptive standards. Cooks Hill residents were supportive of the idea of including sketches, models and concept plans for new building and alterations and additions in the development control plan (DCP) guidelines.

**NOTE:** The exhibition of the draft report included another community survey conducted by Newcastle Voice. This survey was open between 1 February 2016 and 14 March 2016 and the results are provided at Appendix A.

### 2.12 Boundaries

A review of the boundaries of HCA was undertaken. Overall the boundaries are in appropriate positions to ensure that the heritage significance of the area is retained and conserved, with two exceptions.

The Darby Street block between Tooke and Parry Streets, has been fragmented by recent development including three storey residential flat buildings and atypical development. Fieldwork also identified a large aged care complex, and large townhouse developments that are at odds with the valued character of Cooks Hill. As a recommendation of this review it is advised that the boundary of the Conservation Area at this section is adjusted to exclude these parcels from the Conservation Area. These parcels are 252, 256, 260, 266-268, 272, 274, 278, 282, and 286 Darby Street. See Figure 2.8 below.

A small section of Anzac and Kitchener Parade was assessed as part of this review. As noted, Council commissioned a heritage assessment of this area in 2005. The finding recommended that a heritage conservation area was warranted to preserve heritage significance. This review has revisited this recommendation and found that the lower part of Anzac and Kitchener Parades retains several Inter-war period bungalows that are intact and produce a streetscape that is uniform and reflects its history of construction typologies following the First World War and should be preserved, by extending the eastern boundary of Cooks Hill HCA to include it. See Figure 2.8 below.
Figure 2.8 - Proposed Boundary Changes to Cooks Hill HCA (Source: NCC GIS, 18 August 2015)
CHAPTER THREE -

HAMILTON SOUTH GARDEN SUBURB HERITAGE CONSERVATION AREA
3.1 Introduction

This chapter examines the Hamilton South 'Garden Suburb' Heritage Conservation Area. Its' cultural significance, as its name suggests, is embodied in the surviving physical elements of the 'garden suburb' movement of the early 20th century. The layout of roads such as Parkway, Gordon and Stewart Avenues, and public open space including Learmonth and National Parks, creates a distinctive character planned around large residential allotments containing single dwellings on allotments of between 520m² and 820m².

The suburb today is defined by elements that reflect the ideas of the garden suburb movement. Key visual elements include:

- California and Inter-War bungalows built as single storey detached dwellings on large lots
- Consistent front and side setbacks
- a soft 'edge' between the public domain and gardens in the private domain
- a strongly symmetrical pattern of streets supporting a grid layout
- Parkway, Gordon and Stewart Avenues as the obvious dominant feature streets, parts of which contain the street trees planted by the AA Company
- Newcastle High School
- Learmonth Park. The park contains a pair of masonry monuments that originally formed the southern gateway at the intersection of Gordon Ave and Glebe Road
- Parkway Avenue is important in demonstrating the “garden suburb” design principles.

Stewart Avenue (later to become the Pacific Highway), Gordon Avenue, and Parkway Avenue, provide the central axis to the plan. Parkway Avenue remains highly important in demonstrating the application of the Garden Suburb principles with its wide central median. It was designed as an important access corridor from Hamilton to the beach. The street plan remains relatively true to the original design, apart from road closures and the introduction of round-a-bouts on Parkway Ave, the signalisation of Gordon Avenue / Glebe Road in the 1960s and Stewart / Parkway Avenues in 2003.

Parkway Avenue is the most enduring aspect of Sulman’s plan for the area, with its wide central median that extends beyond the boundaries of the conservation area, from Denison Street at its western end, to Memorial Drive in the east. It is reflective of Sulman’s skill as a surveyor and planner that he provided a logical road connection from Hamilton to the beach and treated it as a wide grand avenue. It is strongly suggested that this avenue with its central median, is protected by its listing as a heritage item, to minimise any loss of intactness, or under regulated changes to street design, layout or form.

The street pattern gives a strong identity to the area, while houses, fences, building and street trees provide the fabric of the area that sets the character of the place.
3.2 Heritage Status - Hamilton South Garden Suburb

The current boundaries of the HCA were made as Amendment No. 110 to the Newcastle LEP 1987, dated 18 September 1998, Government Gazette No 145, page 8163. A locality specific Development Control Plan was adopted as the Hamilton South DCP No. 58 on 8 July 2003 following exhibition and workshops in 2001 and 2002. The current boundaries of the area remain as gazetted in 1998. See Figure 3.1
3.3 History

The Garden Suburb Hamilton was developed by the Australian Agricultural Company (AA Company), between 1913 and 1935, at the behest of the chief surveyor Worters Pulver.⁷ The land was part of the AA Company’s 2000 acre coal bearing land acquired from the colonial government in 1829. As the mines wound down and the pits were closed at the turn of the 20th century, the AA Company found itself with a large area of redundant land, situated between the AA Company’s townships of Hamilton and Cooks Hill.

The land was mostly flat and swampy and occupied by sand dunes. Two creek lines converged to form Cottage Creek in what was boggy ground and the drainage sink for a broader flood plain.

The challenge was to transform this land into a respectable suburb that would appeal to the growing professional and managerial classes, and move them away from the dense and industrial portside districts.⁸ The Sydney firm Sulman & Hennessey, who had been involved in the design of the Daceyville estate, were engaged to lay the suburb out in a way that would appeal to the middle class. Modelled on the Garden Suburb ideals, the plan by Sulman and Hennessey made provision for an urban green space on Stewart Avenue, and extensive parklands throughout. National Park, Learmonth Park, Wilson Place and small pocket parks were set aside in the original design. Newcastle Council was responsible for the development of these parks.

Sulman and Hennessey’s scheme was to fill in the swamps inland of Bar Beach taking the sand from the dunes that swept across what is now Empire Park, and to relocate the Chinese market gardens in the swamp land (which is now National Park) to Hexham. Emeritus Professor of History University of Newcastle, John Ramsland, notes “Under Sulman’s plan, work began to transform Hamilton South into a garden suburb that would be totally unlike Newcastle’s modest mining towns with their small timber gun-barrel shaped miners’ cottages almost opening onto the street. A middle-class suburb was thus created by filling and draining the many swamps between the Cook’s Hill precinct of Newcastle and Hamilton and leveling the main sand dunes to create a large subdivision of AA land to be sold to the highest bidder.”⁹ To provide the required fill, around 1800mm of earth was taken from the coastal hillside above Bar Beach (now Bar Beach carpark) and transported to the Garden Suburb by a temporary small-gauge railway to fill in the hollows and swamps. A massive concrete stormwater channel was also built by the Hunter Water Board, straightening natural creeks and gullies to drain the area for development.

The AA Company first advertised the Sulman and Hennessey plan in the window of Palings Music Warehouse, Hunter Street, in mid-1913 and the plan was submitted to Hamilton Council. Inspired by the Griffin’s plan for the Civic area in Canberra, the final design featured three wide avenues, each envisaged as main roads with avenue trees planted on what would become the road reserves of Gordon, Stewart and Parkway Avenues. Parkway Avenue, the widest, was intended to provide direct vehicular access to Bar Beach from Hamilton and it bisected the suburb.

⁹ Ibid. p. 24.
The area was well positioned being in close proximity to the beach and the Newcastle central business district. The first subdivision occurred on the ground at 2:30pm on 30 May 1914. Gas, electricity and sewerage were to be available. In the Creer and Berkeley auction poster, the garden suburb Hamilton was promoted as "A triumph of town planning…ample public recreation grounds. Gardens…Bathing beaches….imposing tree planted avenues." Eighty-five lots were offered in the first auction, the boundaries of which were the Newcastle (Broadmeadow) racecourse to the west and the coastline in the east. Some of the posters carried a sketch of a picturesque California bungalow nestled between trees and shrubs, all intended for middle class families.

Notwithstanding the promotional material, the subdivision of the streets occurred at a slow pace, because of external forces including the onset of war in 1914, and later the Great Depression of 1929. Sales halted completely in 1918.

It is notable that the AA Company commissioned the local architect Frank G Castelden to design a comfortable four-bedroom dwelling as a model home for the estate so that "intending home-makers would have a concrete example of how and what cost to build." The intention of the AA Company was that the estate would be a model suburb with tree-lined streetscapes and attractive California bungalows with gardens front and back on spacious blocks along the parkway (later Parkway Avenue) and Gordon Avenue.

In the original plan of the estate dated 1912, a focal point was designed around a central village green and provided for a business hub on Stewart Avenue. A rotunda for brass bands was intended to be a centre piece, but it was never built. Today, a few shops have been built and a petrol station, but the village green idea was never realised. Land for parkland was also set aside, although it was left to Newcastle Council to fill National Park and develop it as a sporting ground.

John Sulman, sought to devise the road network with Parkway Avenue as the center piece and certainly, Parkway Avenue endures as a dominant attribute of the Garden Suburb. Norfolk pines were planted along its length and on either side houses of a superior class of kiln-fired bricks (many of which remain today), together with neat and well tended lawns and gardens. Most homes were well set back on Parkway Avenue to emphasise and display the large front gardens.

Ramsland has analysed the legacy and enduring aspects of the Hamilton Garden Suburb estate. Ramsland has identified many surviving elements of the original concept - for example the majority of the dwellings - which are examples of the styles that were to define the Garden Suburb - California bungalows, Art Deco, and Spanish Mission houses of the 1920s-1930s. Ramsland says that the dwelling stock has "maintained the elaborate traditional and exotic front gardens of hedges, flowering bushes, small trees and rose gardens." Most tellingly and of most relevance to this review, Ramsland has remarked that "While the title Garden Suburb has been dropped long ago, the structure has survived better than at Daceyville, Matraville and Castlecrag combined."
Of interest to this review is that the north and south sections of the Garden Suburb were intended to be purchased by two different demographic segments of the population. The Garden Suburb was designed to allow the section roughly north of Jenner Parade to be marketed to the more wealthy buyer (the managerial and professional class of an industrial city) who would build brick houses, while the south half (roughly south of Jenner Parade) was marketed to tradesmen and shop owners who were expected to build weatherboard houses. As a part of its marketing strategy the Company built two brick display houses in Gordon Avenue in the north end, and two weatherboard display houses at the south end, presumably to drive this socio-economic vision for the area. This attempt at social stratification was not overly successful as outside events would drive a more drawn-out development timeframe than first anticipated, and lead to a more mixed blend of brick and weatherboard houses throughout. However there are some streets where there are consistent rows of brick or weatherboard houses.

3.4 Physical Description

There are a number of physical elements in Hamilton South that date from the early 20th century that give the suburb a distinctive residential character. These elements represent more than 100 years of residential development:

- Original single storey detached houses constructed between 1918 and 1940, represented by detached Inter-War bungalows in various styles and treatments.
- Generous allotment sizes, ranging from 420 – 820m² with the predominant allotment size being 520 – 620m² (Meredith Walker, 1986, p.9).
- Generous street frontage setbacks (approximately 5.9m), which is landscaped with grass, plantings and low brick or timber fences.
- A distinct difference between the north of the conservation area (predominantly brick construction with more Federation style dwellings) and the south of the conservation area (predominantly clad construction and later houses of the 1920s and 30s).
- Large and mature street trees along road verges including Gordon Avenue, Stewart Avenue, Jenner Parade and Parkway Avenue.
- The width of the carriageways of the principle streets including Parkway, Gordon and Stewart Avenues.
- National Park, Learmonth Park, Wilson Place and small pocket parks.
- Low density residential development throughout.

3.5 Previous Heritage Studies

In 1986, Council commissioned Meredith Walker & Associates to assess the character and heritage significance of the area. This report found that the area was predominantly characterised by consistent streetscapes, including the massing and scale of individual dwellings. This report provided recommended guidelines for the control of development within the area, with reference to Council’s DCP No. 14 which at the time, did not provide specific controls for the purposes of development assessment in the Garden Suburb.
Council commissioned a second report in 1996 from the same firm with the aim of providing guidance to council on appropriate boundaries for the area. That report included the area south to the original boundary of the subdivision to Glebe Road. In 1997, Council adopted a resolution to make the area a heritage conservation area as an amendment to the local planning instrument. The current boundaries were made as amendment number 110 to the Newcastle LEP 1987, dated 18 September 1998, Gazette No 145, page 8163.

Other studies undertaken by Council include a review of the heritage significance of Parkway Avenue by Colin Brady & Associates in 2002, and a heritage assessment of both Parkway Avenue and National Park, by Ecotecture in 2005. Both of these reports recommend the heritage listing of Parkway Avenue and National Parks, either as heritage items or included in either Cooks Hill Heritage Conservation Area or Hamilton South Garden Suburb HCA.

3.6 Assessment of Cultural Significance

Hamilton South “Garden Suburb” Heritage Conservation Area represents a pattern of urban settlement that is representative of the gradual urban infill of the Newcastle coal field after 1900. As such, it has the capacity to demonstrate aspects of the history of Newcastle associated with state historical themes. In revising the heritage significance of the area, the NSW State Heritage Inventory criteria has been applied to assess cultural significance, expressed in detail below:

- **Criterion a - An item is important in the course, or pattern, of NSW’s cultural or natural history:**

  The Garden Suburb is historically significant for its associations with the Australian Agricultural Company, at a time when the economy of Newcastle was shifting from coal to steel making. The opening of the BHP Steelworks created a need for a higher standard of housing for professional staff, and the garden suburb is evidence of the need to house the growing middle class that emerged as a result of the establishment of BHP. The garden suburb is also representative of the type and style of building construction and development in the years between the two world wars, with numerous examples of the work of local building firms. The area is important in the course of Newcastle’s history as its design and development represents the activities, decision making and strategies of the AA Company at the turn of the 20th century. It is also important in the course of Newcastle’s history as one of the last areas to be opened up to residential development once the AA Company divested their land holding in inner Newcastle.

  The garden suburb at Hamilton South is an important surviving example of the garden suburb movement and is representative of an approach to urban development that utilised town planning concepts from the United Kingdom and other features of the movement including well planned streets, tree lined avenues, parks and gardens. It is an important representative example of the model garden suburbs developed by the recognised architect Sir John Sulman, who was responsible for laying out the street plan for the Daceyville Garden Suburb of 1912, Matraville, and other garden suburbs in Sydney. The large parks contained within the area are representative of the AA Company’s intention to market the area to a discerning buyer who would be attracted to parkland and open space.
Chapter two - Hamilton South Heritage Conservation Area

- **Criterion b - An item has strong or special association with the life or works of a person, or group of persons, of importance in NSW’s cultural or natural history:**

  The HS Garden Suburb HCA has special associations with the A.A. Company, being part of their 2000 acre grant of land in inner Newcastle which remained undeveloped until after 1910. The land was converted from swamp and sand dunes, to level blocks of land suitable for residential occupation, and specifically designed to attract Newcastle’s emerging middle class. This occurred as a result of the strategies and decisions of the Australian Agricultural Company, and the creative influence of its contracted town planners and architects, Sir John Sulman, John Hennessey, and Frank Castelden. HS GS HCA has strong associations with the work of John Sulman and important in the course of Newcastle’s urban history as an expression of his ideas.

- **Criterion c - An item is important in demonstrating aesthetic characteristics and/or a high degree of creative or technical achievement in NSW:**

  The Hamilton South Garden Suburb HCA is important in demonstrating aesthetic characteristics that define the garden suburb town planning movement. These features include:

  1. House styles – Federation and Inter War bungalows in the popular styles of the time, Edwardian, California, Art Deco and Spanish Mission.
  2. Suburb layout and its reflection of the aspirations of the AA Company and their ambition for a high standard of residential development attractive to Newcastle’s growing middle class.
  3. Streetscapes and landscaping, especially on roads including Gordon Avenue, Stewart Avenue and Parkway Avenue, which strongly contribute to the character of the suburb with their wide carriageways and many mature street trees, particularly Parkway Avenue which is highly significant for its green open space.
  4. The overall layout of the suburb which provides evidence of the technical achievement of the firm of Sulman and Hennessey in laying out the suburb to fit an existing town grid.
  5. The areas of park and green space designed to be an integral element of the suburb’s design and appeal, including Learmonth Park, National Park and smaller pocket parks.
  6. The location of the garden suburb in close proximity to the Newcastle City Centre, is a defining visual marker of the urban geography of Newcastle.

  The Garden Suburb provides a consistent development pattern with respect to style, scale, built form and materials and is important in demonstrating the key elements of the garden suburb town planning ideals of single storey detached dwellings in a garden setting flanked by tree lined streets.

- **Criterion d - An item has strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group in NSW for social, cultural or spiritual reasons:**

  A survey of residents in 2014 revealed that the community value the character and physical elements of the Hamilton South Garden Suburb and they agree with its protection as a heritage conservation area. On the whole there is a high degree of esteem held by the resident
community and strong attachment to the character of the area, the streetscape, buildings and public open space. The area meets this criterion on cultural grounds at the local level.

- **Criterion e** - An item has potential to yield information that will contribute to an understanding of NSW’s cultural or natural history:
  
  Given the rate of survival of key elements of the garden suburb town planning movement, including its ability to demonstrate elements of the work of John Sulman as well as the behaviour and strategies of the AA Company in the early 20th century following the cessation of coal mining, the area has the potential to yield information that will contribute to understanding aspects of Newcastle’s cultural history, and more broadly to the state of NSW for the capacity to yield information about the garden suburb movement, John Sulman, and the Australian Agricultural Company.

- **Criterion f** - An item possesses uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of NSW’s cultural or natural history:
  
  The area does not demonstrate this criterion to any notable degree.

- **Criterion g** - An item is important in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a class of NSW’s:
  
  - cultural or natural places or
  - cultural or natural environments.

The Hamilton South Garden Suburb HCA contains many surviving elements of the early 20th century town planning ideals of the garden suburb movement, and demonstrates these characteristics in its key elements including garden suburb layout and town plan, single detached bungalows and houses on large lots, and street trees and open space.

### 3.7 Comparative Assessment

Fieldwork undertaken for this review has found that the area contains many surviving elements associated with the Garden Suburb town planning concept (bungalows, gardens, large lots (over 600m²), parklands and smaller pocket parks, Art Deco and Spanish Mission houses). Perhaps the most striking element is the largely unaltered road and lot layout. The finding is supported by Ramsland’s recent comparison of early 20th century model garden suburbs, where he identifies the Hamilton South Garden Suburb as the best surviving example of its class of item. He argues that Hamilton South retains a “dominant early 20th century look and feel about its entire landscape”\(^\text{14}\), compared against Daceyville, Matraville and Castlecrag.

---

3.8 Threatening Processes

Notwithstanding Ramsland's findings about the comparative significance of the Hamilton South Garden Suburb HCA, the fieldwork identified a large number of dwellings that have been altered. Of this group, a high proportion of dwellings have been compromised by the scale and form of additions that have occurred over the past 20 years. Such is the degree of change that numerous houses were deemed to be no longer contributory to the area. In most cases this was due to an addition at the first floor and/or accommodation for vehicles situated in a manner which made them appear large and out of scale with the host dwelling.

Negative impacts undermine the integrity of the heritage conservation area especially in cases where the design of large extensions is visually dominant and clutters the appearance of the original house. Although some first floor extensions are only slightly discernible (and hence have minimal effect on the scale of the host dwelling), the roofline of many houses has been altered to a significant degree. This is often the case where the extension is floor space added above the roof line necessitating the addition of multiple roofs. Some houses have five roof elements which has resulted in convoluted roof geometry. Although the degree of impact can be subjective, this review finds that these changes affect the consistency of the streetscape and threaten the area's valued character.

The Heritage Technical Manual includes provisions that deserve attention. Two sub sections provide guidelines that influence the form of development - *Alterations and Additions* and *Roof Form and Shape*. These sections aim to minimise the impact where the roof space is to be converted to additional floor space. Relevant sketch is copied below.

![Sketch of second storey addition](image)

Although this is intended to discourage second storey additions by concealing additional floor space largely inside the roof cavity, the fieldwork identified many examples where the addition was out of scale and visually dominant. Recognising that the residents were supportive of Council's efforts to manage the character of the area, it is recommended that clearer controls be formulated based on design principles that are specific and measurable. This may include numeric standards such as building envelopes, maximum number of roof elements and minimum setbacks.
This review has identified dominant first floor additions as the key threatening process to the character of the heritage conservation area and the cumulative impact over time is identified as a risk to the heritage significance of the area. Because of the high number of non-contributory dwellings where additions were carried out after the introduction of DCP controls in 2003, it is clear that there is a need to provide clearer standards on the bulk and scale of additional floor space. Stringent development controls are required to manage these threatening processes and to guide future changes to homes in the HCA.

3.9 Desired Future Character Statement

This review has gathered information about the elements of heritage value in Hamilton South, and the features that establish character and provide a sense of place that is recognisable and worth keeping. As a result of this work, a statement of desired future character has been prepared. It is proposed to include the statement in the DCP as a clear guide for development assessment and design planning.

The character of the Hamilton South ‘Garden Suburb’ Heritage conservation area is made up of a variety of building styles that date from the late 19th and early decades of the 20th century. The special character of Hamilton South Garden Suburb will be preserved and maintained through the retention of contributory buildings, open space, the existing subdivision pattern and maintenance of the ‘Garden Suburb’ layout, street trees and elements of visual interest and heritage significance such as Parkway Avenue, Learmonth Park, small pocket parks, and the vegetated edges of Cottage Creek. Elements that are to be preserved include:

- The original dwellings of the Garden Suburb which were built up to 1935
- The single storey scale of housing stock that is an original defining feature of the Garden Suburb
- The consistent front and side setbacks including retaining the offsets to side boundaries and keeping front gardens as open space
- Existing subdivision pattern and street layout as evidence of Sulman’s ‘garden suburb’ layout and town plan
- A strong symmetrical and hierarchical pattern of streets including Parkway, Gordon and Stewart Avenues
- The existing appearance, form and function of Parkway Avenue, including the road verges, street trees, bridge abutments at Cottage Creek, and the central median that splits the carriageway into two single lane roads
- Gardens, street trees and public open space including pocket parks at Wilson Place, Corona Street, and elsewhere
- The relationship of houses to their gardens and houses to each other.
3.10 Contributory Buildings

Fieldwork was undertaken during September and October 2014 to establish the overall level of intactness of the heritage conservation areas and to map the location of contributory buildings. For definitions of contributory buildings, refer to section 1.7.

Contributory buildings may be defined as those buildings that are part of the original building stock, or have historic or aesthetic significance, or make a positive contribution to the streetscape. Generally buildings in this category had not been heavily altered or where alterations were evident these were of a scale or style that retained the character of the building. Removal of contributory buildings is detrimental to the heritage conservation area because these elements establish the prevailing character and reinforce its sense of place. On the other hand, demolition of and alterations to non-contributory buildings is encouraged if the replacement design is more in character with the streetscape. The contribution of any particular building to streetscape, character or heritage significance will guide the approach to development and assist in determining the degree of change that will be permitted.

The following images are intended to provide guidance on the three categories of contribution, starting with contributory buildings, neutral and ending with the category of non-contributory building. Finally a map of the area is provided which identifies, by colour, the category of each building within the HCA.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Images</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contributory</td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributory</td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td><img src="image4.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Non Contributory

Non Contributory

Non Contributory

15 Non-contributory buildings are only deemed non-contributory in the context of the character of a HCA. The authors are not seeking to disparage such buildings and no offence should be taken.
3.11 Newcastle Voice Community Survey Results

Newcastle Voice conducted a survey of residents who reside in the Hamilton South Garden Suburb HCA. The outcomes of this survey provide an insight into what people value about the heritage conservation area (HCA), the level of awareness of the heritage area and attitudes to current and future heritage controls.

The on-line survey was conducted between 8 October - 24 October 2014 and was open to all residents across the HCA. Information sessions comprised of two drop-in sessions at Hamilton Library on the 14th and 15th October 2014. Information flyers were placed in all resident letter boxes in the heritage conservation area, inviting residents to attend the information sessions and to complete the survey on line. A total of twenty-two people attended these sessions and were provided an opportunity to talk to Council staff about the HCA and the survey. The total number of respondents to the survey was 245 out of around 800 households (30%).

A summary of the responses is provided below:

- 97% are aware that they are a resident of the HCA
- 92% agree with the Hamilton South Garden Suburb being a HCA
61% of participants within the Hamilton South Garden Suburb HCA have not lodged a Development Application with Council to make changes to property in the Hamilton South Garden Suburb HCA in the last ten years.

96% think there are buildings in the Hamilton South Garden Suburb that contribute positively to the character of the area.

57% would find it helpful if the contributory buildings were identified on a map, 29% do not.

92% think new development (alterations/ additions or new buildings) should be designed to fit the existing character of the HCA.

56% indicated that the guidelines for development in the Hamilton South Garden Suburb HCA should be merit based, with 44% supportive of a prescriptive standard.

Top three elements most valued
- 91% streetscape and character
- 88% heritage houses and buildings
- 75% proximity to facilities and services

Top three aspects to be included in development guidelines
- 77% examples of concept plans for alterations / additions
- 68% examples of architect designed sketches
- 62% guidance about fences

Circumstances where buildings may be permitted to be demolished
- 59% building has been altered and detracts from the streetscape and area's character
- 52% poor structural conditions
- 31% poor condition of building

The majority of residents agreed that there are buildings in the area that contribute positively or negatively detract from the character of the area. Over half of the residents that participated in the survey agreed that buildings should be allowed to be demolished where they are in poor structural condition (52%) or where the building has been altered or does not fit with the character of the area (59%). The majority of residents (92%) agree that new development, including alterations and additions, should be designed to fit the existing character of the area.

The survey reveals that of the residents who participated in the survey there is a high level of support for the continued protection of the area's character through the mechanism of the heritage conservation area listing, along with clear recognition of the necessity of the development control measures in the LEP and DCP. The survey also reveals that a high proportion of residents (77%) believe there is benefit in having concept plans included in development guidelines to help illustrate the types of development suitable for the HCA. Such guidelines were outside of the scope of this review but should be undertaken following its completion.
NOTE: The exhibition of the draft report included another community survey conducted by Newcastle Voice. This survey was open between 1 February 2016 and 14 March 2016 and the results are provided at Appendix A.

3.12 Boundaries

A review of the boundaries of the HCA was undertaken. In recognition of the heritage significance and existing character of Denison Street, Parkway Avenue and Ada Street, it is recommended that the north boundary of the HCA be adjusted to include properties on the north side of Denison Street (currently the boundary is in the middle of Denison Street), and properties at 302-308 Parkway Avenue and 2-10 Ada Street Hamilton East, as shown in Figure 3.3.

The draft review report recommended that the boundary of the HCA at Glebe Road be amended by removing a section between 152 and 210 Glebe Road Merewether. Following analysis of the submissions made during the public exhibition it has been determined to not proceed with this recommendation.
Figure 3.3 - Proposed boundary changes to Hamilton South HCA (Source: NCC GIS 18 August 2015)
CHAPTER FOUR -
HAMILTON BUSINESS CENTRE
HERITAGE CONSERVATION AREA
4.1 Introduction

The Hamilton Business Centre HCA is defined by the principle commercial street which may be described as a traditional shopping strip with commercial buildings of two and three storeys built to the boundary alignment on each side of the street. The side streets are mainly residential development of one and two storeys. Key visual elements include:

- A traditional commercial shopping strip comprising commercial buildings of two – three storeys built to the boundary alignment
- Active street frontages in commercial buildings at the ground level
- Parapets concealing roofs from the street
- Masonry buildings with face brick or rendered wall surfaces
- Parallel parking either side of the street
- Minimal street trees
- Sandstone kerb and guttering
- Various heritage items including the Wesley Uniting Church, Scotts Kirk, the former Masonic Hall, and several hotels
- Post 1990 infill development built after the 1989 earthquake.

Beaumont Street was heavily impacted by the Newcastle earthquake of 1989. As a consequence there are numerous examples of infill development and many buildings that date from the early 1990s. The character of Beaumont Street is reinforced by the activity at street level, rather than by a collection of intact heritage buildings. Many of the buildings that are original have been altered at both street and first floor level and there are very few that remain intact. Those that are considered to be of heritage significance are included as heritage items in Schedule 5 of the Newcastle LEP 2012.

The boundaries of the Heritage Conservation Area are shown in Figure 4.1.
4.2 Heritage Status

The area known as the Hamilton Business Centre Heritage Conservation Area was gazetted as a heritage conservation area as Amendment No. 52 to the Newcastle LEP 1987, dated 25 June 1992, Gazette No 83, page 4652. The current boundaries of the area remain as gazetted in 1992.

4.3 History

The Hamilton Business Centre HCA is situated on land that was owned by the Australian Agricultural Company (AA Company). The land was part of the AA Company’s 2000 acre coal bearing land acquired from the colonial government in 1829. Most of the area known now as the suburb of Hamilton was the Company’s coal field, opened up to mine the lucrative borehole seam The D Pit was located in Hamilton and a small township sprang up around it. It would be the genesis of the modern suburb of Hamilton.
Figure 4.2 - Land release dates in the suburb of Hamilton (Source: NCC GIS)

The area in which Beaumont Street is situated was released by the Australian Agricultural Company for commercial and residential purposes between 1900-1910. Hence, many of the buildings along the Beaumont Street corridor were built after 1910. Most were built between 1910 and 1930. The residential area to the immediate east of Beaumont Street was released earlier, with Pit Town occurring in 1870 and sections including a section called ‘Woodville’ subdivided in 1885, other sections following 1886 and 1888. The housing stock is a reflection of these dates of urban release and is typically of the late Victorian and early Federation era.

4.4 Physical Description

There are a number of physical elements in Hamilton Business Centre HCA that date from the mid-late 19th centuries and give the area a distinctly commercial character of a human scale of between one and three stories. These elements represent the commercial growth of the area after its establishment as Pit Town in the years following the opening of the Australian Agricultural Hamilton pits from 1848.

Today Beaumont Street is a north - south spine where the building stock is built to the street frontage. Side boundaries are generally based on zero lot lines with shared party walls, reflecting the commercial nature of the precinct. Many of the shops were planned around a ground floor commercial space, with residential accommodation at the first floor level accessed from a flight of stairs at the back of the shops. The majority of the building stock on Beaumont Street is derived from the period between 1890-1930, or is post-Earthquake infill.
The side streets off Beaumont Street are predominantly residential in character, and of a single storey scale, typified by detached dwellings. This establishes a sense of common uniform to many of these streets.

4.5 Assessment of Cultural Significance

Hamilton Business Centre HCA represents a pattern of urban settlement that is representative of the gradual urban infill of the Newcastle coal field during the mid-19th to early twentieth centuries. The NSW State Heritage Inventory criteria and inclusion and exclusion guidelines have been applied to assess cultural significance, expressed in detail below:

- **Criterion a - An item is important in the course, or pattern, of NSW’s cultural or natural history:**
  
  Hamilton Business Centre HCA is historically significant for its associations with the AA Company, during the mid-to late 19 century and its development is reflective of the coal mining that dominated inner Newcastle. The economic shift from coal mining to steel making around the turn of the century is also reflected in the way Beaumont Street changed over time. The area is important in the course of Newcastle’s history as a settlement that originated as a satellite village to a coal mine, to become a densely populated commercial and residential precinct.

  The extent to which the HCA represents this pattern of development is compromised by later changes and the removal of the earlier original building stock. Alterations and additions have reduced the integrity of the HCA as an area of early 20th century development.

- **Criterion b - An item has strong or special association with the life or works of a person, or group of persons, of importance in NSW’s cultural or natural history:**

  Hamilton Business Centre HCA does not demonstrate this criterion to any notable degree.

- **Criterion c - An item is important in demonstrating aesthetic characteristics and/or a high degree of creative or technical achievement in NSW:**

  Hamilton Business Centre HCA does not demonstrate this criterion to any notable degree.

- **Criterion d - An item has strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group in NSW for social, cultural or spiritual reasons:**

  Hamilton Business Centre HCA does not demonstrate this criterion to any notable degree.

- **Criterion e - An item has potential to yield information that will contribute to an understanding of NSW’s cultural or natural history:**

  The Hamilton Business Centre HCA may over time have potential to yield information about the process of re-building and reconstruction, in both a physical and economic sense following a major natural disaster.
• **Criterion f - An item possesses uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of NSW’s cultural or natural history:**

The area does not demonstrate this criterion to any notable degree.

• **Criterion g - An item is important in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a class of NSW’s:**
  - cultural or natural places, or
  - cultural or natural environments.

The area does not demonstrate this criterion to any notable degree.

In conclusion, the Hamilton Business Centre HCA has marginal heritage significance for its association with the Australian Agricultural Company, and the transition of land used originally for coal mining into commercial and residential land uses.

4.6 **Boundaries**

Fieldwork was undertaken in November 2014 to establish the overall level of intactness of the heritage conservation area and to map the location of contributory buildings.

The map shows a significant number of non-contributory and neutral buildings. Although there was a relatively high number of individually listed heritage items and a generally consistent two storey scale within Beaumont Street, the high proportion of altered buildings raises questions about the validity of maintaining the existing status quo. Away from Beaumont Street, in the side streets, there was a higher level of intactness, particularly in Bennett, William and Murray Streets with a differing residential character.

It was therefore recommended in the draft HCA report that the Hamilton Beaumont Street Heritage Conservation Area be removed from the heritage schedule of the LEP. However as a result of the analysis of the submissions made during the public exhibition this final review report has concluded that the removal of the Hamilton Business Area Heritage Conservation Area should not proceed at this time. It is further recommended that the sandstone kerb and gutters not be heritage listed.
Figure 4.3 - Hamilton Business Centre Heritage Conservation Area – contributory building map (Source: NCC GIS 18 August 2015)
CHAPTER FIVE -
THE HILL HERITAGE CONSERVATION AREA
5.1 Introduction

This section documents The Hill Heritage Conservation Area, located in the inner area of the city of Newcastle, bounded to its north by the Newcastle City Centre, west by Cooks Hill and east by the Pacific Ocean. A map of the heritage conservation area is reproduced in Figure 5.1 of this chapter. 16

![Figure 5.1 - The Hill Heritage Conservation Area - current boundary](image)

16 This section should be read in conjunction with background studies to the original statutory listing of The Hill Heritage Conservation Area in the Newcastle LEP 1987, including the Urban Conservation Area Guidelines for Inner Newcastle, 1996, by Godden Mackay Heritage Consultants (Dewey Q711.558/NEW), and the Newcastle Inner Areas Conservation Planning Study, March 1984, by Suters Busted Lester Firth (Dewey RSQ711.5/SUT).
5.2 Heritage Status - The Hill

The area known as The Hill Heritage Conservation Area was gazetted as a heritage conservation area as Amendment No. 52 to the Newcastle LEP 1987, dated 3 July 1992, Gazette No 83, page 4668. The current boundaries of the area remain as gazetted in 1992.

5.3 History

Awabakal and Worimi peoples are acknowledged as the traditional owners of the land and waters of Newcastle. For thousands of years before the arrival of the British in Newcastle, Aboriginal people lived on and around the harbour and its hinterland. Newcastle was called Muloobinba while the Hunter River was called Coquon.

Although landscape of the Hill has changed dramatically since European arrival, Newcastle and The Hill continues to hold important cultural significance to local Aboriginal communities. There are meanings and associations in the landscape that reinforce the deep and ancient history of the area and continuity of Aboriginal connection. The high cliff at South Newcastle Beach extending into King Edward Park is called Yi-ran-na-li, and in dreaming story it is a fearful place. Yi-ran-na-li must be respected by all and no one should linger or speak in its vicinity because of the danger of falling rocks. Yi-ran-na-li is interpreted today by an artwork made by members of the local community.

Natural landscape features and known sacred sites near to the Hill Heritage Conservation Area include Whibay Gamba (Nobbys). It is said that a kangaroo jumped from Tahlibihn Point, at the site now known as Fort Scratchley, to the safety of Whibay Gamba. The kangaroo remains hidden in the island’s bowels occasionally thumping its tail and making the land tremble. The thumping is said to be a reference to the region’s earthquake activity.

Paintings depicting Aboriginal people were produced after the establishment of a permanent British settlement in 1804. A large collection of artworks are important testimony of the Aboriginal ownership of the area, and a reminder of the experience of first contact between the Awabakal and Worimi tribes and the British. As such, The Hill has profound historical significance as a place of first contact between the traditional owners of the land and waters of Newcastle and the newly arrived Europeans.

In 1804, a penal settlement was established by proclamation of Governor King. The area just south of the penal settlement, on the lower slopes of the Hill, was to become the site of the church and the location of Government House and domain. In the fashion typical of the settlers, the traditional Aboriginal place names were ignored and the new area was called Church Hill, in recognition of the church established in 1817 by Commandant Wallis.

By 1822 the penal settlement was moved to Port Macquarie and Newcastle and the Hunter was declared a free settlement. The remaining convicts stayed at Newcastle to build the breakwater and the barracks within the government domain, and infrastructure and road improvements in the town. The government appointed the surveyor Henry Dangar to devise a layout for the settlement, and in 1823, his plan for the town of Newcastle was accepted. The alignment of streets in The Hill still follows this plan.
Dangar’s Plan of the Town of Newcastle

The layout created by Dangar sufficed for many years, even though it was not officially aligned. It was not until 8 August 1853, that the streets in the inner part of Newcastle were officially aligned. This covered the area bounded on the south by Church Street, on the west by Brown Street (the boundary of the AA Company's land), on the north by the harbour and on the east by Telford and Pacific Streets. Licensed Surveyor John Rogers had surveyed the plan. Subsequently, in 1854, the Colonial government spent £190/1/3/0 aligning Newcastle’s streets.

The line of Brown Street and The Terrace were altered to allow an adjustment of the boundary between the AA Company grant and the official town. A sketch plan by the Surveyor-General of April 1857 of the altered line showed the changes. By 1860, Newcastle was slowly emerging from the shackles of its penal past, growing in economic importance as a place for coal extraction and exportation. The Awabakal people were pushed out by the new system of land alienation and now lived on the outskirts. The city’s rapidly burgeoning middle class chose The Hill to build large fine houses. Many of these survive in The terrace and Cliff Street, Claremont House, Marlborough House, Jesmond House, Lee Terrace, Shalimah, Lance Villa and Woodlands among others. Working people also built houses and many modest examples survive as physical evidence of the age and historical layering that defines The Hill.

Parks and reserves in The Hill

King Edward Park was set aside in November 1856, an area of 35 acres for a Recreation Area and Reservoir. It was later dedicated on 2 July 1863. In 1897, the Upper or Horse-shoe Reserve was occupied by a bowling green and tennis court. During World War Two, King Edward Park became an important site for the defence of Newcastle and an army base was established. A series of tunnels were dug under the park and a searchlight and engine house was built at the base of the bowling club. Houses on The Terrace and High Streets were resumed by the government for occupation by the military. The shepherds Hill coast battery site of 1 acre 2 roods was set aside by 31 July 1890. The Obelisk is the site of the 1821 stone windmill, which was later rebuilt as an obelisk. Arcadia Park was originally part of the Recreation Reserve. By the late 1840s, Church Walk Park, located at the western end of Church Street, was the route of the AA Company's railways from the D Pit at Hamilton.

Cathedral Park originally formed part of the burial ground of the church. A sketch map of land at Newcastle by Henry Dangar, dated as 9 October 1832, suggests that it extended to the north-east towards the corner of King and Newcomen Streets. The actual boundary has not been verified with the modern cadastre. By the 1890s, the burial ground was replaced by the opening of the Sandgate cemetery, and the burial ground began a process of neglect. In 1966, the Christ Church Cathedral Act was gazetted and the land was transferred to the ownership of Newcastle City Council. This was extended in 1990 to include the portion on the corner of Wolfe and King Streets, previously occupied by Simon’s Kemp’s cottage Mulimbah.

Fletcher Park was reserved as public open space as early as 1860. By October 1893 Fletcher and Shortland Parks were shown on survey maps of the area. The Ocean Beach Foreshores were dedicated as 40 acres on 7 November 1906, but there were later changes to the area.
5.4 Physical Description

The Hill occupies the steep slopes on the southern shore of Newcastle harbour, with the highest point being the Obelisk and Shepherds Hill in the grassy knoll atop King Edward Park. Two major spurs run west along Tyrrell Street and north down King Street. South of the obelisk, the major ridge line continues along The Terrace to the reservoir.

Christ Church Cathedral is situated on a secondary knoll at the heart of The Hill. The Cathedral is an iconic landmark dominating the skyline of The Hill. Secondary landmarks include the Lead Light Tower at the corner of Brown and Tyrrell Streets, the Obelisk above Ordnance Street and the tower of Jesmond House in Barker Street.

The topography and the views it allows from the public domain over the harbour and ocean are an important aspect of The Hill’s urban character. Panoramic views are available from the Obelisk and Cathedral Park. Scenic views along the coastal cliffs include those from the reservoir at Shepherds Hill, King Edward Park and the end of Ordnance Street. Views of townscape interest include the view up Bolton Street, terminating with the court House and channelled street views over the harbour along Perkins and Wolfe Streets. A majority of large residences have been located to take advantage of views.

Parks and reserves are an important element of the amenity and physical character of The Hill. In fact, the Hill has a long history of public land reservation.

In summary, the physical character of The Hill is defined by a range of historically, culturally and visually significant built, natural and landscape features. These features include:

- Diversity of built form demonstrated by the diversity of building types and architectural styles - apartments, terraces and detached houses reflecting varying periods of economic prosperity and building activity, the earliest of which date from the closure of the penal settlement in 1822 (Newcomen House, the remains of the parsonage, archaeological remains from the first Christ Church).
- Original building stock of between one and three storeys, through to the post-war era.
- Buildings purpose built to accommodate a range of civic, religious and educational functions reflecting the history of the city as the second oldest urban centre outside Sydney.
- Aboriginal places and sites of cultural significance including locations of known dreaming stories and places of meaning and attachment.
- Archaeological areas and relics, known and unknown.
- A distinct topography which provides views out to the coastline, port of Newcastle and harbour mouth.
- Large and mature trees in gardens and in the public domain.
- Parks and reserves including King Edward Park, Cathedral Park, Fletcher Park, and Arcadia Park, each with their own history, significance and place in the story of Newcastle.
5.5 Previous Heritage Studies

The heritage value of the inner suburbs of Newcastle has been recognised since the 1960s. On 30 October 1978, the National Trust of Australia (New South Wales) resolved to classify both Newcastle East and The Hill as an "Urban Conservation Area" (see Figure 5.2). The 1978 listing boundary determined by the National Trust became the same boundary that would later be gazetted into the Newcastle LEP as the statutory boundary of the Hill and Newcastle East Heritage Conservation Areas.

Figure 5.2 - Newcastle Urban Conservation Area 1978 listing boundary
Soon after the National Trust listing, the area was also included on the Register of the National Estate by the Australian Heritage Commission as the "Newcastle Conservation Area", in 1979.

In 1982, Council commissioned the firm Suters Busted + Lester Firth to assess the character and heritage significance of Newcastle East and The Hill areas. The purpose of the study was:

- To identify and conserve the environmental heritage of the inner city of Newcastle
- To provide rehabilitation and infill guidelines for this area
- To provide a draft development control plan for urban conservation in Newcastle East, including the identification of public works.

The major emphasis of the study was Newcastle East and The Hill area to enable policies and objectives for conservation management to be incorporated in detailed development controls for the area. The area was regarded by Council as a key aspect of the city's physical identity and heritage.

The draft study was called the Newcastle Inner Areas Conservation Planning Study and was placed on public exhibition in September 1985. The study contains invaluable urban planning and heritage documentation and is available for viewing in Newcastle Region Library. The Newcastle Inner Areas Conservation Planning Study remains an invaluable baseline document for managing the heritage values of the areas.

The areas identified were eventually listed as heritage conservation areas in the Newcastle Local Environmental Plan, Amendment No 52 in 1992. In 1997, Council adopted development control guidelines in the form of DCP 44 - covering The Hill, Newcastle East and Cooks Hill. The DCP introduced principles and objectives to facilitate the protection and management of the built environment within each precinct.

5.6 Assessment of Cultural Significance

The Hill Heritage Conservation Area represents a pattern of urban settlement that traces its origins back to the earliest phase of the European settlement of the city of Newcastle, and beyond that, to the long tradition of indigenous settlement, the physical remains of which are contained in a rich archaeological layer and in stories and paintings of Aboriginal people set within The Hill following the arrival of the British from 1797. As such, The Hill Heritage Conservation Area has the capacity to demonstrate aspects of the history of Newcastle, in terms of its long indigenous heritage, through to colonisation and urban change. The Hill HCA is broadly representative of the urbanisation of a natural landscape.

The cultural significance of The Hill is embodied in the surviving physical elements of the area. The street layout is the most enduring aspect of Dangar's plan of inner Newcastle as it provides an orderly network of streets that provide vistas to the harbour and a strong north-south orientation. The building stock is representative of the urban history of Newcastle, covering almost all decades from the 1820s to the present. The eclectic range of buildings, as well as sandstone walls and street drainage, and the street trees give The Hill a unique and eclectic character, typified by its dominance of older buildings. Key visual elements include:
• The diversity of the building stock which reflects a long history of urban settlement
• The random house styles and varying building setbacks
• An organic street layout which reflects the steep topography of the Hill
• Stone retaining walls in the public and private domain
• Views from public areas over the coastline and harbour as these are an important aspect of the urban character of The Hill
• Open space and reserves including King Edward Park and Ordnance Reserve, Cathedral Park, Arcadia Park and Fletcher Park
• Iconic buildings and structures of significance including the Newcastle Cathedral, Newcastle Club, Claremont House, Newcastle Courthouse, the Obelisk, the Lead Light Tower and Newcastle Reservoir, the original Newcastle East Public School on Bolton Street and the newer Newcastle East Public School on Tyrrell Street.

Applying the NSW Heritage Criteria

In revising the heritage significance of the area, the NSW Heritage criteria has been applied as expressed below:

• **Criterion a - An item is important in the course, or pattern, of NSW's cultural or natural history:**

The Hill HCA is significant for its role in the course of the history of New South Wales, including being a place of documented first contact between Aboriginal people and the British. It is significant as the location of the first attempt at coal extraction in 1801. It is also important in the course of NSW's history as the site of the Colonial government's attempt to control and punish recidivist convicts, through the proclamation by Governor King of the penal settlement in 1804, which continued for an 18 year period until 1822. The penal period would create the hallmarks of the city layout and character that defines it today, including the site of the first church and burial ground (now Christ Church Cathedral and Park), the site of the parsonage (1818, corner of Church and Newcomen Street), and the gradual transition from an altered landscape to a modern city. It is also a place that is important in course of NSW's cultural history as the site of the establishment of the first private coal mining venture in Australia, the archaeological evidence of which survives in the site of the A Pit off Church Street.

The Hill HCA is important for its ongoing existence as a modern urban settlement which can demonstrate through the rich archaeological heritage the pre contact traditions and life ways of Aboriginal people, who through the ongoing connections of the Awabakal people maintain an attachment to area today. Following the arrival of the British, Awabakal associations are recorded in paintings and records of the penal period and the decades that followed.
• **Criterion b - An item has strong or special association with the life or works of a person, or group of persons, of importance in NSW’s cultural or natural history:**

The Hill HCA has special associations with the convict history of Australia, being a place of secondary punishment for reoffending convicts between 1804-1822. The first administrators of the colony and some of the first European navigators are associated with the area, including Lieutenant Shortland, Governors King and Hunter, and numerous others of importance in the history of early colonial Australia, including Commandant Wallis and Commandant Morisset. The area is also associated with the Australian Agricultural Company, being the eastern most extent of their 2000 acre grant of land in inner Newcastle. The AA Company established the first private coal mine in Australia at the A Pit, just off Church Street, in 1828. The AA Company, through its modern system of coal extraction and its coal export monopoly, made an important contribution to the origins of the Australian economy.

• **Criterion c - An item is important in demonstrating aesthetic characteristics and/or a high degree of creative or technical achievement in NSW:**

The Hill HCA is important urban cultural landscape that demonstrates aesthetic characteristics that define the evolution of an early Australian city established during the penal period. It has evolved a rich urban fabric that represents 210 years of urban development. These aesthetic features include:

1. Buildings that represent architectural styles and construction technologies from all periods of Australia's development including buildings of the Georgian, Victorian, Edwardian, Federation, Inter War and post war periods of urban development.
2. Suburb layout and its reflection of the Dangar plan of 1823, as well as the boundary of the Australian Agricultural Company's 2000 acre grant of coal bearing land in inner Newcastle.
3. Streetscapes and vistas outwards and inwards which strongly contribute to the character of the suburb.
4. The areas of park and green space designed to be an integral element of the Hill including King Edward Park, Fletcher Park, Arcadia Par and Cathedral Park.
5. The location of the Hill adjacent to the Newcastle City Centre, is a defining visual marker of the urban geography of Newcastle.

• **Criterion d - An item has strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group in NSW for social, cultural or spiritual reasons:**

A survey of residents in 2015 revealed that the residents value the character and physical elements of The Hill and they agree with its protection as a heritage conservation area. On the whole there is a high degree of esteem held by the resident community and strong attachment to the character of the area, the streetscape, buildings and public open space. The area meets this criterion on cultural grounds at the local level.
• **Criterion e - An item has potential to yield information that will contribute to an understanding of NSW’s cultural or natural history:**

Given the rate of survival of key elements of the early urban settlement of Newcastle, including its ability to demonstrate elements of the work of Henry Dangar as well as the behaviour and strategies of the system of land subdivision and crown grants following the cessation of the penal colony mining, the area has the potential to yield information that will contribute to understanding aspects of Newcastle’s cultural history, and more broadly to the state of NSW for the capacity to yield information about the cessation of a penal settlement and its evolution to a modern city.

• **Criterion f - An item possesses uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of NSW’s cultural or natural history:**

The area does not demonstrate this criterion to any notable degree.

• **Criterion g - An item is important in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a class of NSW’s:**
  - cultural or natural places, or
  - cultural or natural environments.

The Hill contains many surviving elements of the early 19th and 20th centuries and the processes of urbanisation. It demonstrates these characteristics in its key elements including street layout and the evidence of the Dangar town plan, housing stock and historic iconic elements and green space.

### 5.7 Comparative Assessment

Fieldwork undertaken for this review has found that the area contains many surviving elements associated with the gradual development of the city of Newcastle following the arrival of the invading British in 1804. Perhaps the most striking element is the steep gradients and undulating topography which has focused urban development to the determined the fairly organic subdivision layout and large number of retaining walls and split streets. The finding is supported by citations made by the Australian Heritage Commission and the National trust in their findings in the early 1980s of the value and significance of the Hill as an historic precinct.

### 5.8 Threatening Processes

This review has identified the demolition of contributory buildings as one of the key threatening processes, which over time, could undermine the valued character of the heritage conservation area. Cumulatively, this impact, if unmitigated, would compromise the heritage significance of the area.

A secondary key threatening process is the anticipated impact that future building envelopes in close proximity to the Hill will have on the views and character of the Hill HCA. These envelopes are a set of controls adopted in the Newcastle Local Environmental Plan 2012, and other planning considerations would apply. However as potential building envelopes the specific controls deserve consideration.
The Newcastle LEP 2012 at Part 7 Additional local provisions - Newcastle City Centre - includes provisions for building heights, Floor Space Ratios and building envelopes for land in the vicinity of the Hill Heritage Conservation Area. The maximum height for three particular parcels is 58.9m. If future developments were built to the maximum extent of the controls, the resulting buildings would be significantly taller than any of the existing buildings in the immediate vicinity of the Hill HCA.

Properties with the allowable larger height controls are in direct proximity to the north boundary of The Hill Heritage Conservation Area. In effect, the City Centre to the immediate north of the HCA is within the visual curtilage of The Hill HCA so any changes to the scale and form of the City Centre could affect the character, amenity and visual quality of the Hill HCA. Vistas outwards from the Hill HCA could be interrupted or obscured by any future buildings and if no mitigation measures are introduced could undermine the human scale that defines both The Hill and adjacent City Centre.

A concept plan was approved by the Hunter and Central Coast Joint Regional Planning Panel in April 2016 for the former Hunter Street mall site which limits building height to below 40m AHD. The Joint Regional Planning Panel concluded that the approved concept plan would have no unacceptable impacts on the built or natural environments including the heritage character of the locality. The LEP should be amended to reflect the concept plan approved building heights.

5.9 Desired Future Character Statement

This review has gathered information about the elements of heritage value in The Hill, and the features that establish character and provide a sense of place that is recognisable and worth keeping. As a result of this work, a statement of desired future character has been prepared. It is proposed to include the statement in the DCP as a clear guide for development assessment and design planning.

The character of the The Hill Heritage conservation area is made up of a variety of building styles that date from the late 19th and early decades of the 20th century. The special character of The Hill will be preserved and maintained through the retention of contributory buildings, open space, the existing subdivision pattern, street trees and elements of visual interest and heritage significance such as the many iconic buildings located in The Hill, parks and open space, views and vistas, the unique steep topography and street layout, and the character of the streetscapes including street trees, buildings and the relationship of built elements.

Elements that are to be preserved include:

- The range of contributory and historic buildings, particularly intact or historically significant groupings, heritage items, iconic structures, and the appearance and layout of streets
- Sandstone retaining walls, street features such as sandstone kerbing and guttering, and other features of historical interest such as coal shutes, public stairs, lanes, parks, views and vistas
- The eclectic and organic nature of the urban pattern and varying ages of the building stock that demonstrates the gradual urbanisation during the 19th and 20th century of a once indigenous landscape
• The existing appearance of the Hill, views outwards to the coastline and harbour and views into the area from the City, foreshore and Stockton which reveal a tree-lined suburb with a steep topography
• Gardens, street trees and public open space
• Existing subdivision pattern and street layout.

5.10 Contributory Buildings

Fieldwork was undertaken in May 2015 to establish the overall level of intactness of the heritage conservation areas. The location of contributory buildings has been mapped. For definitions of contributory buildings, refer to section 1.7

Contributory buildings may be defined as those buildings that are part of the original building stock, or have historic or aesthetic significance, or make a positive contribution to the streetscape. Generally buildings in this category had not been heavily altered or where alterations were evident these were of a scale or style that retained the character of the building. Removal of contributory buildings is detrimental to the heritage conservation area because these elements establish the prevailing character and reinforce its sense of place. On the other hand, demolition of and alterations to non-contributory buildings is encouraged if the replacement design is more in character with the streetscape. The contribution of any particular building to streetscape, character or heritage significance will guide the approach to development and assist in determining the degree of change that will be permitted.

The following images are intended to provide guidance on the three categories of contribution, starting with contributory buildings, neutral and ending with the category of non-contributory building. Finally a map of the area is provided which identifies, by colour, the category of each building within the heritage conservation area.
Non Contributory

Non Contributory

17 Non-contributory buildings are only deemed non-contributory in the context of the character of a HCA. The authors are not seeking to disparage such buildings and no offence should be taken.
Figure 5.3 - The Hill - Contributory Buildings map (Source: NCC GIS 18 August 2015)
5.11 Newcastle Voice Community Survey Results

The Hill HCA is an inner-urban precinct of regional and state heritage significance and the heritage values of this area are held especially dear to local residents. In order to gain an understanding of specifically what it is that residents and the general community value about the HCA, a survey was conducted in March and April 2014 by Newcastle Voice.

In total, 88 survey responses were received, with 73 of these stating that they were local residents of The Hill HCA. Some key findings from these 73 resident respondents were:

- 73% were aware that The Hill is a Heritage Conservation Area;
- 97% agreed that The Hill should be a Heritage Conservation Area;
- 16% had lodged a development application (DA) for a property within the HCA in the past 10 years; and
- The top three elements that residents valued most about The Hill were: heritage houses and buildings (92%), streetscape and character (92%) and proximity to facilities and services (88%).

All respondents (both residents and non-residents) agreed that there are buildings in the HCA that contribute to the character of the area. Almost half of the resident respondents agreed that buildings in the HCA should be allowed to be demolished where the building has been altered or does not fit with the character of the area (47%). The majority of resident respondents (92%) agreed that new development, including alterations and additions, should be designed to fit the existing character of the area.

Opinion on whether the HCA development guidelines should be merit based or prescriptive standard was divided, with 60% of resident respondents indicating a preference for the merit based approach and 40% preferring prescriptive standards. Resident respondents were supportive of the idea of including examples of concept plans for alterations / additions (77%), examples of architect designed sketches (73%) and sketches, models and concept plans for new buildings (72%) in the development control plan chapter on HCAs.

The survey results will be considered in the re-formulation of the statement of significance and desired future character statement for The Hill HCA. This re-formulation will then be considered for incorporation in the DCP.

NOTE: The exhibition of the draft report included another community survey conducted by Newcastle Voice. This survey was open between 1 February 2016 and 14 March 2016 and the results are provided at Appendix A.
5.12 Boundaries

A review of the boundaries of The Hill HCA was undertaken. Generally the boundaries are appropriate to ensure that the heritage significance of the area is retained and conserved. However, the city block between King, Church, Bolton and Newcomen Streets is included in the Newcastle Urban Renewal Strategy and has controls, zone and guidelines consistent with the Renewal Strategy. This block is also within the boundary of The Hill and hence subject to its heritage controls. The zoning of this block is R4 High Density residential and the FSRs and Height of Building map applies to it. In terms of character this block is much more reflective of the commercial nature of development in the city centre. However, the City Centre HCA has been outside the scope of this review. It is, however, recommended that this block be further investigated for possible excision from The Hill HCA as part of a future review of the City Centre HCA.

Council has in the past considered expanding the Hill HCA boundary to take in other parts of the suburb considered to be of heritage significance. In 2005, Council commissioned Ecotecture to assess a section of the Hill for protection as a heritage conservation area. The area covered was High Street, Anzac, Lemnos and Kitchener Parades (see Figure 5.4). This area was released by the Australian Agricultural Company for residential development at the end of the First World War. As a result of a previous report by Ecotecture, it was recommended that Council create a stand-alone Heritage Conservation Area on the basis of its heritage significance and character. However, this idea did not progress and no further action was taken.

As part of this review, the Ecotecture 2005 report was considered in order to determine whether a Heritage Conservation Area remained a valid option to conserve its heritage significance. It was found that in the ten years since the 2005 report, there were notable changes to the character of the potential area. However, it was also found that there are significant outstanding groups that should be conserved through their inclusion in both The Hill HCA (by extending the boundary to include all of High Street and parts of Anzac Parade) and as an extension to the Cooks Hill HCA (parts of Kitchener and Anzac Parades). Lemnos Parade, by contrast, was found to be of low intactness and has not been recommended for inclusion.

As a result of the review the following recommendations are made:

1. On the basis of the character, significance and streetscape qualities of High and Bingle Streets, as well as a small section of Anzac Parade, a boundary adjustment to The Hill HCA is proposed to extend it to include this area. Refer Figure 5.4.

2. On the basis of the character, significance and streetscape qualities of a small part of Kitchener and Anzac Parades, a boundary adjustment to the Cooks Hill HCA is proposed to extend it to include this area. Refer Figure 5.4.

---

Figure 5.4 - Proposed boundary changes to The Hill Heritage Conservation Area (Source: NCC GIS 9 October 2015)
CHAPTER SIX - NEWCASTLE EAST HERITAGE CONSERVATION AREA
6.1 Introduction

This section documents The Newcastle East Heritage Conservation Area, located in the inner area of the city of Newcastle, which is bounded by Watt Street at its west, the Pacific Ocean at its east, Pacific Park to the south and to the north by the harbour. A map of the heritage conservation area is reproduced in Figure 6.1.19

Figure 6.1 - Newcastle East Heritage Conservation Area - current boundary

6.2 Heritage Status - Newcastle East

The area known as Newcastle East Heritage Conservation Area was gazetted as a heritage conservation area as Amendment No. 52 to the Newcastle LEP 1987, dated 3 July 1992, Gazette No 83, page 4668. The current boundaries of the area remain as gazetted in 1992.

19 This section should be read in conjunction with background studies to the original statutory listing of Newcastle East Heritage Conservation Area in the Newcastle LEP 1987, including the Urban Conservation Area Guidelines for Inner Newcastle, 1996, by Godden Mackay Heritage Consultants (Dewey Q711.558/NEW), and the Newcastle Inner Areas Conservation Planning Study, March 1984, by Suters Busteed Lester Firth (Dewey RSQ711.5/SUT).
6.3 History

Awabakal and Worimi peoples are acknowledged as the traditional owners of the land and waters of Newcastle, and the original owners of the suburb now called Newcastle East. For thousands of years before the arrival of the British in Newcastle, Aboriginal people lived on and around the harbour and its hinterland. Newcastle was called Muloobinba while the Hunter River was called Coquon. Newcastle and Newcastle East continues to hold important cultural significance to local Aboriginal communities. There are meanings and associations in the landscape that reinforce the deep and ancient history of the area and continuity of Aboriginal connection.

Natural landscape features and known sacred sites near to Newcastle East Heritage Conservation Area include Whibay Gamba (Nobbys). It is said that a kangaroo jumped from Tahlbihn Point, at the site now known as Fort Scratchley, to the safety of Whibay Gamba. The kangaroo remains hidden in the island’s bowels occasionally thumping its tail and making the land tremble. The thumping is said to be a reference to the region’s earthquake activity.

Paintings depicting Aboriginal people were produced after the establishment of a permanent British settlement in 1804. The large collection of artworks are an important testimony of the Aboriginal ownership of the area, and a reminder of the experience of first contact between the Awabakal and Worimi tribes and the British. As such, Newcastle East has profound historical significance as a place of first contact between the traditional owners of the land and waters of Newcastle and the newly arrived Europeans.

Convictism was the main imperative in the earliest years of Newcastle East. Many of the important structures of that period, including the lumber yard, the convict stockade, the gaol and salt-works, were situated in what is now the Newcastle East HCA. Henry Dangar’s map of 1823, also shows a fort in this area. The massive breakwater linking Nobbys island to the mainland, is a post penal era improvement located in Newcastle East.

Following cessation of the penal settlement in 1822, many of the convicts were moved to Port Macquarie. Those that remained were employed in the building of the barracks at James Fletcher hospital, the breakwater, or employed by the AA Company in their coal mines. After 1822, the shipping industry began to develop and soon a high proportion of the population were employed in the maritime industry - pilots, lighthouse keepers, life-boat sailors, tug boat crews, wharf labourers, ship chandlers, and customs staff.

The need for improved coastal defences along Australia’s east coast was accepted by the 1890s and Fort Scratchley was built as part of a wider defence plan. It was completed by 1886, with modifications continuing up until the 1940s.
One of the early major problems with building in Newcastle East was caused by wind blown sand. Soon after the arrival of Europeans, vegetation was removed from the area now known as Pacific Park, and along the coastline, and this caused the inundation of the area by sand dunes. This issue would continue to limit the residential development of Newcastle East until the 1870s, when mitigation work was carried out on behalf of the government by the Scottish Australian Investment Company. To do this, coal mine chitter was used to stabilise the sand by limiting its movement. Subdivision and development stimulated by the growth of Newcastle in the boom period of the 1870s, then took place. By the 1880s, substantial Victorian villas began to emerge. Newcastle East, by this time, was described as the 'aristocratic end of the city'.

6.4 Physical Description

Newcastle East comprises of an area of flat land at the north east end of the Newcastle peninsula. It contains iconic sites of cultural significance to the local Aboriginal community, including Nobbys Wiby-gamba, the harbour landscape and ocean. Fort Scratchley Historic site, the Newcastle Customs House, Convict Lumber Yard, Coutts Sailors' Home, and Foreshore Park are significant heritage places that define Newcastle East.

The underlying geology tells important aspects of the Newcastle story. The coal measures outcrop at Newcastle East under Fort Scratchley. The proximity and views of the harbour and ocean are an important aspect of Newcastle East's urban character.

The current built character of Newcastle East HCA ranges from small-scale residential to intensive urban forms, from recreational to business uses. The residential buildings are mostly Victorian or Federation period. A majority of the building stock in the central section of the HCA contributes to the character of the HCA in some way. Collectively, the contributory building stock demonstrates a consistency of scale, style, or other features which together make up a consistent built form in the Newcastle East HCA. In summary, the physical character of Newcastle East can be described as a cultural landscape comprising historically significant built and natural heritage items. These features include:

- Two and three storey terrace houses, historically significant former bond stores, commercial buildings and worker's housing from the late 19th century early decades of the 20th century.
- Aboriginal places and sites of cultural significance including locations of known dreaming stories and places of meaning and cultural connection. The Convict Lumber Yard is the location of a documented Aboriginal archaeological site.
- Archaeological areas and relics, known and unknown.
- Views out to the coastline, port of Newcastle and harbour mouth.
- Foreshore Park, Nobbys, Fort Scratchley, Pacific Park and the Convict Lumber Yard, each with their own history, significance and place in the story of Newcastle.
6.5 Previous Heritage Studies

The heritage value of the inner suburbs of Newcastle has been recognised since the 1960s. On 30 October 1978, the National Trust of Australia (New South Wales) resolved to classify both The Hill and Newcastle East as an "Urban Conservation Area" (see Figure 6.2). The 1978 listing boundary determined by the National Trust became the same boundary that was later gazetted into the Newcastle LEP as the statutory boundary of the Hill and Newcastle East Heritage Conservation Areas.

Figure 6.2 - 1978 National Trust Listing Boundary of the Newcastle Urban Conservation Area
Soon after the National Trust listing, the area was also included on the Register of the National Estate by the Australian Heritage Commission as the "Newcastle Conservation Area", in 1979.

In 1982, Council commissioned the firm Suters Busted + Lester Firth to assess the character and heritage significance of The Hill and Newcastle East areas. The purpose of the study was:

- To identify and conserve the environmental heritage of the inner city of Newcastle
- To provide rehabilitation and infill guidelines for this area
- To provide a draft development control plan for urban conservation in Newcastle East, including the identification of public works.

The major emphasis of the study was to enable policies and objectives for conservation management to be incorporated in detailed development controls for the area. The area was regarded by Council as a key aspect of the city's physical identity and heritage.

The draft study was called the Newcastle Inner Areas Conservation Planning Study and was placed on public exhibition in September 1985. The study contains invaluable urban planning and heritage documentation and is available for viewing in Newcastle Region Library. The Newcastle Inner Areas Conservation Planning Study remains an invaluable baseline document for managing the heritage values of the areas.

The areas identified were eventually listed as heritage conservation areas in the Newcastle Local Environmental Plan, Amendment No 52 in 1992. In 1997, Council adopted development control guidelines in the form of DCP 44 - covering Newcastle East, Newcastle East and Cooks Hill. The DCP introduced principles and objectives to facilitate the protection and management of the built environment within each precinct.

### 6.6 Assessment of Cultural Significance

The Newcastle East Heritage Conservation Area represents a pattern of urban settlement that traces its origins back to the earliest phase of the European settlement of the city of Newcastle, and beyond that, to the long tradition of indigenous settlement, the physical remains of which are contained in a rich archaeological layer and in stories and paintings of Aboriginal people following the arrival of the British from 1797. As such, Newcastle East Heritage Conservation Area has the capacity to demonstrate aspects of the history of Newcastle, in terms of its long indigenous heritage, through to colonisation and urban change.

The cultural significance of Newcastle East is embodied in its setting - a core of heritage items and significant building groups surrounded by water on three sides. The inner part of the HCA, bounded by Scott Street and Stevenson Place, is enclosed and the physical elements within it are iconic features of Newcastle East. The building stock is representative of the urban history of Newcastle, covering almost all decades from the 1820s to the present. The historic buildings provide a series of uniform streetscapes which visually reinforce the historical character of the area.
The archaeological potential of the Newcastle East HCA cannot be overstated. The Newcastle Archaeological Management Plan 1997 and the Review 2013 confirm that the archaeological resources of this area are abundant, both Aboriginal and historical. The Coal River Precinct, listed on the NSW state Heritage Register, is an area where there is documented and predicted archaeological remains of profound research potential to the nation as the place of first contact with the local Aboriginal population and the place of the establishment of the Australian coal industry.

The architectural values of the Newcastle East HCA are to be found in the high quality of buildings, in the landscape settings of many of them, in the style, scale and detail, and in the contribution to the streetscape. The overall impression of Newcastle East is a strongly established historic precinct.

Key visual elements include:

- The narrow range of building types including terrace houses, workers' housing, government buildings, and bond stores which reflects the long history of urban settlement and various industrial themes in the city's history
- A uniform street layout which reflects the flat topography of Newcastle East and laneways which reflects the historical mechanism of sanitisations
- Views from public areas over the coastline and harbour as these are an important aspect of the urban character of Newcastle East
- Open space and reserves including Foreshore Park, Convict Lumber Yard, Newcastle Beach foreshore, Nobby's breakwater and headland, and Pacific Park
- Iconic buildings and structures of significance including Nobby's lighthouse and headland, Customs House, Fort Scratchley, the Coutts Sailors Home, the Bond stores, Tyrrell House, and Boatman's Row.

Applying the NSW Heritage Criteria

In revising the heritage significance of the area, the NSW Heritage criteria has been applied as expressed below:

- **Criterion a - An item is important in the course, or pattern, of NSW’s cultural or natural history:**

  Newcastle East HCA is significant for its role in the course of the history of New South Wales, including being a place of documented first contact between Aboriginal people and the British. It is significant as the location of the first attempt at coal extraction in 1801. It is also important in the course of NSW's history as the site of the Colonial government's attempt to control and punish recidivist convicts, through the proclamation by Governor King of the penal settlement in 1804, which continued for an 18 year period until 1822. The penal period would create the hallmarks of the city layout and character that defines it today, including the site of the Convict Lumber Yard and Coal River precinct, Flagstaff Hill (Fort Scratchley) and the gradual transition from an indigenous landscape to a residential precinct. It is also a place that is important in
course of NSW’s cultural history as the site of the establishment of the first successful coal mining in Australia at Fort Scratchley.

Newcastle East HCA is important for its ongoing existence as an urban settlement which can demonstrate through the rich archaeological heritage the pre contact traditions and life ways of Aboriginal people, who through the ongoing connections of the Awabakal people maintain an attachment to area today. Following the arrival of the British, Awabakal associations are recorded in paintings and records of the penal period and the decades that followed.

- **Criterion b - An item has strong or special association with the life or works of a person, or group of persons, of importance in NSW’s cultural or natural history:**

Newcastle East HCA has special associations with the convict history of Australia, being a place of secondary punishment for reoffending convicts between 1804-1822. The first administrators of the colony and some of the first European navigators are associated with the area, including Lieutenant Shortland, Governors King and Hunter, and numerous others of importance in the history of early colonial Australia, including Commandant Wallis and Commandant Morisset. The area is also associated with the discovery of coal and its extraction and export from Newcastle was the first in the country. The Coal River precinct is significant for its ability to demonstrate the history of coal mining, its impact on the Australian economy and how coal has shaped the Australian economy.

- **Criterion c - An item is important in demonstrating aesthetic characteristics and/or a high degree of creative or technical achievement in NSW:**

Newcastle East HCA is important urban cultural landscape in that is demonstrates aesthetic characteristics that define the evolution of an early Australian city established during the earliest phases of Australia's development into a modern nation, and that has evolved a rich urban fabric that represents 200 years of urban development. These aesthetic features include:

1. Buildings that represent architectural styles and construction technologies predominantly from the Victorian, Federation, and Inter War periods of urban development.

2. A Strongly homogenous street and lot layout, developed after the sand reclamation efforts of the 1870s and which can be said to be a reflection of the economic boom of the 1880s.

3. Streetscapes and vistas outwards and inwards which strongly contribute to the character of the suburb

4. An enclosed central precinct with a strongly historic character between King Streets, Stevenson Place, Parnell Place and Telford Streets.

5. The areas of parkland that are an integral element of Newcastle East including Foreshore Park, Pacific Park, the beaches and coastal facilities.

6. The location of Newcastle East at the end of the Newcastle peninsula, is a defining visual marker of the urban geography of Newcastle.
• **Criterion d - An item has strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group in NSW for social, cultural or spiritual reasons;**

A survey of residents in 2015 revealed that the community significantly value the character and physical elements of Newcastle East and identify with its’ protection as a heritage conservation area. On the whole there is a high degree of esteem held by the resident community and strong attachment to the character of the area, the streetscape, buildings and public open space. The area meets this criterion on cultural grounds at the local level.

• **Criterion e - An item has potential to yield information that will contribute to an understanding of NSW’s cultural or natural history;**

Given the rate of survival of key elements of the early urban settlement of Newcastle, including its ability to demonstrate elements of the early development of Newcastle as well as the system of land subdivision and crown grants following the cessation of the penal colony mining, the area has the potential to yield information that will contribute to understanding aspects of Newcastle’s cultural history, and more broadly to the State of NSW for the capacity to yield information about the cessation of a penal settlement and its evolution to a modern city.

• **Criterion f - An item possesses uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of NSW’s cultural or natural history:**

The area does not demonstrate this criterion to any notable degree.

• **Criterion g - An item is important in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a class of NSW’s:**
  - cultural or natural places or
  - cultural or natural environments.

Newcastle East contains many surviving elements of the early 19th and 20th centuries and the processes of urbanisation. It demonstrates these characteristics in its key elements including building stock and the relationship of buildings to the street and each other, street layout including laneways, along with heritage items and green space.

### 6.7 Comparative Assessment

Fieldwork undertaken for this review has found that apart from modern developments on the edges of the HCA, the area in its central core is very intact and contains many historic elements that can be placed in the late 19th century and early 20th century. The high concentration of state and nationally significant heritage items in this HCA (Fort Scratchley, Nobbys Lighthouse, Newcastle Customs House, Convict Lumber Yard, Ocean Baths and Coutts Sailors Home), make this HCA very unique. The finding is supported by citations made by the Australian Heritage Commission and the National trust in their findings in the early 1980s of the value and significance of Newcastle East as an historic precinct.
6.8 Threatening Processes

There are some issues that continue to undermine the integrity and intactness of the Newcastle East HCA. These include:

- Unsympathetic development, in particular, inappropriately scaled and designed infill development that replaces original building stock
- The R3 zoning objectives should be considered against heritage conservation objectives, and may need to be investigated in a future study
- The ‘wire scape’ created by power poles and power lines continues to detract from the amenity and character of Newcastle East
- Increased traffic movements through the Newcastle East HCA reduces the amenity of the HCA.

6.9 Desired Future Character Statement

This review has gathered information about the elements of heritage value in Newcastle East, and the features that establish character and provide a sense of place that is recognisable and worth keeping. As a result of this work, a statement of desired future character has been prepared. It is proposed to include the statement in the DCP as a clear guide for development assessment and design planning.

The character of the Newcastle East Heritage conservation area is made up of a variety of building styles that date from the late 19th and early decades of the 20th century. The special character of Newcastle East will be preserved and maintained through the retention of contributory buildings, open space, street trees and elements of visual interest and heritage significance such as the many iconic buildings located in Newcastle East, parks and open space, views and vistas, the unique steep topography and street layout, and the character of the streetscapes including street trees, buildings and the relationship of built elements. Elements that are to be preserved include:

- The range of contributory and historic buildings, particularly intact or historically significant groupings, heritage items, iconic structures, and the appearance and layout of streets
- Existing subdivision pattern and street layout, including preserving the integrity of laneways.
- Street furniture such as sandstone kerbing and guttering, and other features of historical interest such as heritage items, public stairs, lanes, parks, views and vistas.
- The regular and homogenous urban form which reflects a regular pattern of subdivision and development, and building stock from between the 1870s and 1930, demonstrating the gradual urbanisation of a once indigenous landscape.
- The existing appearance of Newcastle East, views outwards to the coastline and harbour, and views into the area from Foreshore Park and the Newcastle coastline and Ocean Baths.
- Icon heritage items including the Coal River Precinct, the Nobbys headland and breakwater, Fort Scratchley Historic Site, Convict Lumber Yard and Customs House precinct, the Newcastle Ocean baths, Joy Cummings Centre and other significant groups such as the Lahey Bond Store and Stevenson Place terraces.
- Parks and reserves, including Newcastle beach, Nobbys Beach, and Foreshore Park.
6.10 Contributory Buildings

Fieldwork was undertaken in May 2015 to establish the overall level of intactness of this area. For definitions of contributory buildings, refer to section 1.7.

Contributory buildings may be defined as those buildings that are part of the original building stock, or have historic or aesthetic significance, or make a positive contribution to the streetscape. Generally, buildings in this category had not been heavily altered or where alterations were evident these were of a scale or style that retained the character of the building. Removal of contributory buildings is detrimental to the heritage conservation area because these elements establish the prevailing character and reinforce its sense of place. On the other hand, demolition of and alterations to non-contributory buildings is encouraged if the replacement design is more in character with the streetscape. The contribution of any particular building to streetscape, character or heritage significance will guide the approach to development and assist in determining the degree of change that will be permitted.

The following images are intended to provide guidance on the three categories of contribution, starting with contributory buildings, neutral and ending with the category of non-contributory building. Finally a map of the area is provided which identifies, by colour, the category of each building within the heritage conservation area (see Figure 6.3).
20 Non-contributory buildings are only deemed non-contributory in the context of the character of a HCA. The authors are not commenting on the architectural or design merits of such buildings and no offence should be taken.
6.11 Newcastle Voice Community Survey Results

The Newcastle East HCA is an inner-urban precinct of regional and state heritage significance. Its unique features, its accessibility and its prominent location mean that the area is held dear to both local and regional residents as well as visitors. In order to gain an understanding of specifically what it is that residents and the general community value about the HCA, a survey was conducted between the 9 March and 17 April 2015 by Newcastle Voice. The purpose of this data is to assist in Council's review process of all of its HCAs. In total, 102 survey responses were received, with 71 respondents stating that they resided within the Newcastle East HCA. Some key findings from these 71 resident respondents were:

- 97% were aware that Newcastle East is a Heritage Conservation Area
- 99% agreed that Newcastle East should be a Heritage Conservation Area
- 25% had lodged a development application (DA) for a property within the HCA in the past 10 years
- The top three elements that residents valued most about the Newcastle East HCA were: heritage houses and buildings (90%), proximity to facilities and services (89%) and streetscape and character (89%).

99% of resident respondents agreed that there are buildings in the HCA that contribute to the character of the area. Almost half of the resident respondents agreed that buildings in the HCA should be allowed to be demolished where the building has been altered or does not fit with the character of the area (46%). The majority of resident respondents (85%) agreed that new development, including alterations and additions, should be designed to fit the existing character of the area.

Opinion on whether the HCA development guidelines should be merit based or prescriptive standard showed that 63% of resident respondents indicated a preference for the merit based approach and 37% preferred prescriptive standards. Resident respondents were supportive of the idea of including examples of architect designed sketches (84%) examples of concept plans for alterations / additions (83%), and guidance about improving the environmental performance of buildings (eg. solar power, rainwater tanks) (64%) in the development control plan chapter on HCAs.

**NOTE:** The exhibition of the draft report included another community survey conducted by Newcastle Voice. This survey was open between 1 February 2016 and 14 March 2016 and the results are provided at Appendix A.

### 6.12 Boundaries

A review of the boundaries of Newcastle East HCA was undertaken. Overall the boundaries are in appropriate positions to ensure that the heritage significance of the area is retained and conserved. The boundary also coincides with the Coal River State Heritage precinct.

The Newcastle East HCA boundary was assessed as appropriately positioned to ensure the conservation of the most significant parts of the Newcastle East area.
CHAPTER SEVEN - PROPOSED HERITAGE CONSERVATION AREAS
7.1 Introduction
During the course of the review it became apparent that two small areas in close proximity to the Hamilton Business Centre Heritage Conservation Area and the Hamilton South Heritage Conservation Areas possessed a distinctive character and had potential heritage significance. Fieldwork was undertaken to examine the extent of contributory buildings and research into the history and heritage significance of these places was undertaken, in accordance with the guidelines for assessing heritage significance. The areas are discussed separately below.

7.2 Hamilton Residential Precinct Heritage Conservation Area
A relatively compact pocket of residential development located between Donald Street, Murray Street, Devon Street, Gordon Avenue and Tudor Street Hamilton was examined (See Figure 7.2). It was determined that as a representative example of residential development, this area, to the immediate east of the Hamilton Beaumont Street HCA is a highly intact residential area and strongly representative of the late 19th and early 20th century. An assessment of heritage significance was undertaken following the standard Heritage Assessment Guidelines and the NSW state heritage criteria. As a result of the assessment, it is recommended that the area be protected through the mechanism of a statutory heritage conservation area, and referred to as the Hamilton Residential Precinct Heritage Conservation Area, in a future LEP amendment.

In addition to the proposed heritage conservation area, this review identified three potential heritage items - 18, 32 and 34 Gordon Avenue. These items were developed after the land releases in 1885 and 1886, and are excellent representative examples of Edwardian homes with high levels of intactness. These properties are assessed as having local heritage significance and should be considered for inclusion in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the NLEP 2012, as local heritage items.
7.3 History

Figure 7.1 - Subdivision history (Source: NCC GIS)

7.4 Physical Description

The Hamilton Residential precinct HCA is a low scale, residential area typified by small lot housing of generally one and two storeys. The age of most of the building stock is late Victorian, Federation or Inter-war. In this sense, the character of the area and its streetscapes is representative of the late Victorian, Federation and pre-war periods of Australian urban development. These features include:

1. The style of housing – late Victorian terraces and cottages, Federation cottages and bungalows in the popular styles of the time, Italianate, Queen Anne, Edwardian, and California and Spanish mission influences.

2. The large number of detached terrace houses, which is unusual for terrace housing, indicating that, although the terrace house was still a favoured building form, purchasers' were moving away from party walls in building construction, which was associated with workers' housing.

3. The predominant age of houses indicates a boom around 1897, when Hamilton railway station was completed. Coupled with this is the observation that streetscapes are generally comprised of small lot housing, with a traditional street grid nestled adjacent to Hamilton railway station,
suggesting the emergence of a commuter culture within Newcastle. The area was also well serviced by the abundant network of trams in the city.

4. The small lot layout reflects the residential market with the suburb being popular with miners and nearby waterside industries.

5. The general absence of space for vehicle accommodation is important evidence that the suburb was developed in an age prior to the advent and take up of the motor car.

Examples of the range of housing styles found in this precinct is provided in the following images.
7.5 Previous Heritage Studies

The heritage value of Hamilton residential precinct was recognised in the Newcastle City Wide Heritage Study of 1997. The heritage study recognized it as an area of historic character, based around a traditional village centre.

7.6 Assessment of Cultural Significance

The Hamilton residential precinct represents a pattern of urban settlement that is representative of the gradual urban infill of the Newcastle coal field as mining moved out to the Hunter valley from 1880s until the turn of the 20th century. The urban development in the suburb reflects the gradual release of land by the AA Company, with some houses built as early as 1870. Most of the suburb was released in 1885-1886, and 1900-1920. As such this area has the capacity to demonstrate aspects of the history of Newcastle associated with state historical themes. Cultural significance has been assessed using the NSW State Heritage Inventory criteria and inclusion and exclusion guidelines, as follows:

- Criterion a - An item is important in the course, or pattern, of NSW's cultural or natural history:

  The residential precinct referred to as the Hamilton Residential Precinct Heritage Conservation Area is important in the course of Newcastle's cultural history, as it demonstrates key aspects of the urban development of land formerly owned by the Australian Agricultural Company, from the
1870s until the 1900s. The Australian Agricultural Company, who donated the land in which the township would develop, were instrumental in the growth of the area, operating the coal mines and establishing a local settlement around the pits of the borehole seam. The company donated a large parcel of land on which to base the commercial part of Hamilton, as well as Gregson Park and the surrounding areas. As the coal reserves were exhausted the Company developed their redundant coal land for residential uses. More than any other suburb of Newcastle, Hamilton exemplifies the changes that were happening to the economy and social character of Newcastle at the end of the 19th century. Hamilton exemplifies the population growth that occurred as a result of coal mining, and the boom in the local economy. Between 1880 and 1890, the population increased from 2000 to over 5000. But by the late 1890s the main mine, the Borehole pit, was in decline resulting in its closure in 1901, and the position of the town as a mining village ended.

Hamilton’s development between 1880 and 1900 reflects a period of intensive infrastructure investment by the state government, comprising the opening of the railway and train station in 1887. This attracted people to the suburb from the city centre and the style and age of much of the housing stocks reflects this period of growth and development.

- **Criterion b - An item has strong or special association with the life or works of a person, or group of persons, of importance in NSW’s cultural or natural history:**

The Hamilton Residential precinct HCA has special associations with the Australian Agricultural Company, being part of their 2000 acre grant of land in inner Newcastle. The township developed around the lucrative borehole pit, and was named “Pit Town”, with operations at the No 1 pit, No 2 pit, the Hamilton pit and the lucrative D pit on Cameron Hill, all of which were opened up in the late 1840s and 1850s. The enduring legacy of the AA Company is still reflected in the contemporary names of streets, including Lindsay, Denison, Cleary, Everton and Skelton Streets. The smaller lot layout of the present day residential area of Hamilton can be attributed to the manner in which the AA Company released land for sale, the main purchasers being miners and company employees, and also reflects an era of urban development before the widespread use of the motor car, with little provision made for car parking.

- **Criterion c - An item is important in demonstrating aesthetic characteristics and/or a high degree of creative or technical achievement in NSW:**

The Hamilton Residential precinct HCA is important in demonstrating aesthetic characteristics that define the late Victorian and Federation periods in Australian urban development. These features include:

1. The style of housing – late Victorian terraces and cottages, Federation cottages and bungalows in the popular styles of the time, Italianate, Queen Anne, Edwardian, California and Spanish mission influences.
2. The large number of detached terrace houses, which is an irregular modification to the usual ‘attached’ form of terrace housing. This pattern provides evidence of a move away from the construction of terrace houses, to detached terrace housing. This indicates that although
the terrace house was still a favoured building form, party walls in building construction were not the favoured form of construction in this area.

3. The predominant age of houses indicates a boom around 1897, when Hamilton railway station was completed. Related to this is that streetscapes are generally comprised of small lot housing, with a traditional street grid nestled adjacent to Hamilton railway station, suggesting the emergence of a commuter culture within Newcastle. The area was also well serviced by the abundant network of trams in the city.

4. The small lot layout also reflects the demography of the real estate market with the suburb being popular with miners and waterside workers.

5. The general absence of space for vehicle accommodation is important evidence that the suburb was developed in an age prior to the widespread use of the motor vehicle.

- **Criterion d - An item has strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group in NSW for social, cultural or spiritual reasons:**
  
The area does not demonstrate this criterion to any notable degree.

- **Criterion e - An item has potential to yield information that will contribute to an understanding of NSW’s cultural or natural history:**
  
The area does not demonstrate this criterion to any notable degree.

- **Criterion f - An item possesses uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of NSW’s cultural or natural history:**
  
The area does not demonstrate this criterion to any notable degree.

- **Criterion g - An item is important in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a class of NSW’s:**
  - cultural or natural places, or
  - cultural or natural environments.
  
The area does not demonstrate this criterion to any notable degree.

### 7.7 Comparative Assessment

Fieldwork undertaken for this review has found that there is very little contemporary development in this precinct, and it is considered highly intact on a comparative level. In relative terms, this area is more intact than the nearby Hamilton Business Centre HCA, and is locally rare for its number of intact two-storey free standing terrace houses and a range of distinctive houses of the late Victorian and Edwardian periods.
7.8 Desired Future Character Statement

This review has gathered information about the elements of heritage value in this precinct, and the features that establish character and provide a sense of place that is recognisable and worth keeping. As a result of this work, a statement of desired future character has been prepared. If the area is subject to the regulation of a heritage conservation area, the following statement of desired future character would apply:

*The character of the proposed Hamilton residential Heritage conservation area is made up of a variety of building styles that date from the late 19th and early decades of the 20th century. The special character of Hamilton residential precinct will be preserved and maintained through the retention of contributory buildings, street trees and elements of visual interest and heritage significance. Elements that are to be preserved include:*

- The range of contributory and historic buildings, particularly intact or historically significant groupings, heritage items, iconic structures, and the appearance and layout of streets.
- Street furniture such as sandstone kerbing and guttering, and other features of historical interest.
- The urban form which reflects a regular pattern of subdivision and development that dates from the 1890s to the 1930s, and building stock from this period.
- Prevailing absence of garages and on-site car parking accommodation
- Sandstone kerb and gutters and traditional road layout
- Items of heritage significance individually listed as heritage items in Schedule 5 of the Newcastle LEP.

7.9 Contributory Buildings

Fieldwork was undertaken in early 2015 to establish the overall level of intactness of this area. The location of contributory buildings has been mapped, see Figure 7.2.

Contributory buildings may be defined as those buildings that are part of the original building stock, or have historic or aesthetic significance, or make a positive contribution to the streetscape. Generally buildings in this category had not been heavily altered or where alterations were evident these were of a scale or style that retained the character of the building. Removal of contributory buildings is detrimental to the heritage conservation area because these elements establish the prevailing character and reinforce its sense of place. On the other hand, demolition of and alterations to non-contributory buildings is encouraged if the replacement design is more in character with the streetscape. The contribution of any particular building to streetscape, character or heritage significance will guide the approach to development and assist in determining the degree of change that will be permitted.
The following images are intended to provide guidance on the three categories of contribution, starting with contributory buildings, neutral and ending with the category of non-contributory building. Finally a map of the area is provided which identifies, by colour, the category of each building within the heritage conservation area.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

 Contributory
Non-contributory buildings are only deemed non-contributory in the context of the character of a HCA. The authors are not seeking to disparage such buildings and no offence should be taken.
7.10 Proposed The Junction Federation Cottages Heritage Conservation Area

A section of Glebe Road in The Junction business area was examined. The area contains a highly intact group of Federation period dwellings, at street addresses 55 and 75 Glebe Road. See Figure 7.4.

The heritage investigation has now been undertaken by council staff and it is recommended that a Heritage Conservation Area be proposed in recognition of the heritage significance of this group of Federation era cottages. It is proposed that this area is called the “Glebe Road Federation cottages Heritage Conservation Area”. It is suggested that locality specific development controls are devised to retain the single storey scale of the group, including prescribing stringent envelope and heights controls imposed by the LEP. An amendment to the heritage schedule should be undertaken as this will create the necessary statutory controls to preserve the group.

The zoning on the north side of Glebe Road is B2 Local Centre, recognizing the commercial and shopping function. The south side of Glebe Road is zoned R3 Medium Density. It is acknowledged that the difference in zoning recognises a distinct change in the character from one side of Glebe Road to the other, from commercial to residential. The road is the boundary.

7.11 History

The cottages were constructed in rapid succession following the release of the land for residential development by the Australian Agricultural Company, in 1908. As a result, the cottages share similar characteristics and represent Federation style housing. The cottages are in fact at the southern-most edge of the AA Company's estate, so their release was coincident with the releases of other parts of the AA Company's land holding, including sections of Gordon Avenue north in Hamilton. Glebe Road itself is an important marker of the physical boundary of the AA Company's land holding, and the large Merewether Estate to the south.
7.12 Physical Description

The character of the south side of Glebe Road is defined by single storey detached weatherboard dwellings set close to Glebe Road, and set off side boundaries. It is noted that none have attached or built in garage structures with their associated garage doors facing the street. Access for vehicles is provided at the side of the dwelling and provision for parking occurs at the side or at the rear. The lack of obvious garaging is considered a distinctive feature of the group, and is evidence of the age of the dwellings. The uniformity of the group in terms of age, height, setbacks and materials contributes to defining the character.

The fieldwork confirms that most of the houses in the group have undergone renovation and restoration that retains and enhances the intact one storey weatherboard with hipped and gabled roof character.
7.13 Previous Heritage Studies

In 2004, Hunter History Consultants Pty Ltd did a brief historical analysis of the group in 2004 to accompany a development proposal. This history has been used as the basis of this assessment of cultural significance.

In 2005, the Land and Environment Court handed down a judgment that supported refusal of a development application for demolition of a dwelling. The reason was partly attributed to the observation that the area had potential heritage significance as a group of intact Federation houses. In refusing the appeal, the judgement concluded:

"There is real evidence that there is heritage significance in the streetscape, and cultural significance in the early origins of the subdivision, and the row of houses, and there is particular reference to the cultural significance of the existing house on No. 55 Glebe Road. The council is in the process of examining that."

The court also found that because the houses are relatively intact they could be considered fine representative examples of the era of construction - ie. between 1909 and 1915. The court noted:

"The reasons the streetscape is valuable also relates to heritage matters the respondent said. In this aspect:

(1) The land on which the row of houses stand was the first residential subdivision by the pioneering AA Company at The Junction.

(2) The consistency, aesthetic form, scale, detail, alignment and remnant external finishes of the row of houses are intact and demonstrate the early Federation cottage form of detached working persons' houses. Each house in the row had contributory significance for the whole row."

The court also noted that one of the dwellings, No 55 Glebe Road, was shown to have important historical associations with RJ Kilgour, a past mayor of Merewether, and whose son was the first to enlist locally in 1915 for the First World War. The judgement states "...there is a strong association with a prominent person of the locality and WWI. There was cultural heritage value in the existing house itself."

7.14 Assessment of Cultural Significance

This review has taken these principles further and applied an assessment of cultural significance based on the NSW State heritage inventory criteria. As a result of this, it is recommended that a formalised heritage conservation area be made in Schedule 5 of the Newcastle LEP. This recommendation should be reported to council after July 2015, and based on the boundaries as shown in Figure 7.4 below.

---

22 Hunter History Consultants Pty Ltd for Jackson Teece Architects, October 2004
Cultural significance has been assessed using the NSW State Heritage Inventory criteria and inclusion and exclusion guidelines, as follows:

- **Criterion a - An item is important in the course, or pattern, of NSW’s cultural or natural history:**
  The proposed Glebe Road Federation Cottages Heritage Conservation Area is important in the course of Newcastle’s cultural history, as it demonstrates key aspects of the urban development of the city of Newcastle, including the gradual urban infill of land held by coal companies, including in this case, land owned by the Australian Agricultural Company. Released by the Australian Agricultural Company for auction in 1909, the group is important in the course of The Junction's cultural history as it represents the transition of this area from undeveloped mining land at the southern extremity of the AA Company's estate, to a residential area dating from the turn of the 20th century.

- **Criterion b - An item has strong or special association with the life or works of a person, or group of persons, of importance in NSW’s cultural or natural history:**
  The house at 55 Glebe Road has associative significance with a prominent individual, being the home of RJ Kilgour who was one of the first mayors of the amalgamated City of Greater Newcastle. The group of houses itself has associational significance with the Australian Agricultural Company, and the south east boundary line abuts the easement of the former Burwood Coal and Copper Company railway line, which was the Merewether estate's coal haulage line.

- **Criterion c - An item is important in demonstrating aesthetic characteristics and/or a high degree of creative or technical achievement in NSW:**
  The proposed Glebe Road Federation Cottages Heritage Conservation Area is important in demonstrating aesthetic characteristics that define the Federation period and the style of housing of that period. These features include:
  1. Detached Federation cottages, with a detached single storey weatherboard cottage flanked by a driveway to one side, consistent 4 metre front setback and rear garden zones.
  2. The consistency in the scale, form, massing, style, and construction of houses and allotment layout. This is aesthetically significant while also being representative of residential construction across Newcastle up until 1915 when the last house was built.

- **Criterion d - An item has strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group in NSW for social, cultural or spiritual reasons:**
  The area does not demonstrate this criterion to any notable degree.

- **Criterion e - An item has potential to yield information that will contribute to an understanding of NSW’s cultural or natural history:**
  The area does not demonstrate this criterion to any notable degree.
• **Criterion f - An item possesses uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of NSW’s cultural or natural history:**

The area does not demonstrate this criterion to any notable degree.

• **Criterion g - An item is important in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a class of NSW’s:**
  - cultural or natural places, or
  - cultural or natural environments.

The proposed Glebe Road Federation Cottages Heritage Conservation Area is important at the local level in demonstrating the principal characteristics of the Federation period and the nature of residential building construction in Newcastle between 1909 and 1915. The narrow window of time in which the precinct developed is significant in providing evidence of the key features of the Federation period including construction and building technologies, fashions and key elements of the Federation style, including the single storey scale of these modest dwellings, a symmetrical street frontage, open verandah, pyramidal roof form, hip and gable roofs, bearer and joist construction with lightweight cladding material (weatherboard), and the absence of garaging.

### 7.15 Desired Future Character Statement

This review has gathered information about the elements of heritage value in the Glebe road precinct, and the features that establish character and provide a sense of place that is recognisable and worth keeping. As a result of this work, a statement of desired future character has been prepared. If the area is subject to the regulation of a heritage conservation area, the following statement of desired future character would apply:

*The character of the proposed The Junction Federation cottages Heritage conservation area is made up of the single storey Federation cottages that were built between 1909-1920. The homogenous character of this precinct will be preserved and maintained through the retention of all contributory buildings, elements of visual interest and heritage significance. Elements that are to be preserved include:*

  • The building group at 55 to 75 Glebe Road, The Junction, is a fine representative example of a group of intact Federation era cottages which have high contributory value to the streetscape.

  • The urban form which reflects a regular pattern of subdivision and development that dates from the 1900-1920.

  • Side driveways with access to garages and on-site car parking accommodation at the rear of the house group.

  • Items of heritage significance recommended for individual listing as heritage items in Schedule 5 of the Newcastle LEP.*
7.16 Contributory Buildings

Fieldwork was undertaken in 2015 to establish the overall level of intactness of this area. The location of contributory buildings has been mapped, see Figure 7.4.

Contributory buildings may be defined as those buildings that are part of the original building stock, or have historic or aesthetic significance, or make a positive contribution to the streetscape. Generally buildings in this category had not been heavily altered or where alterations were evident these were of a scale or style that retained the character of the building. Removal of contributory buildings is detrimental to the heritage conservation area because these elements establish the prevailing character and reinforce its sense of place. On the other hand, demolition of and alterations to non-contributory buildings is encouraged if the replacement design is more in character with the streetscape. The contribution of any particular building to streetscape, character or heritage significance will guide the approach to development and assist in determining the degree of change that will be permitted.

Figure 7.4 - Proposed Glebe Road Heritage Conservation Area - contributory buildings map (Source: NCC GIS 18 August 2015)
Selected images of these houses are provided below:
7.17 Development standards and controls

The land to be incorporated into the proposed “The Junction HCA” currently has a maximum building height of 10m and an FSR of 0.9, which is inconsistent with the current built form on the land and would conflict with the conservation objectives that this review proposes.

Council does not currently apply numeric building height or FSR controls to its HCAs given these controls do not adequately dictate the desired building envelope outcomes, nor would they necessarily result in a built form that respects the character and significance of the existing building stock. Hence, it is recommended that consideration should be given to amending the LEP height of building and FSR maps to remove such controls from the subject land.

Detailed design guidelines should also be developed and included in the Heritage Technical Manual to ensure the heritage significance and character of this area is protected.

7.18 Community Survey 1 February 2016 - 14 March 2016

The results of the community survey are at Appendix A. The results of the questions posed to the community in the survey are summarised below:

**Issue 1: The proposed Hamilton residential area should be included in the Newcastle LEP as a Heritage Conservation Area**

62% of this group were in support with this proposal, while 31% indicated disagreement.

**Issue 2: The heritage significance of properties at 32, 34 & 18 Gordon Avenue Hamilton should be assessed to determine if they should be listed as heritage items in the Newcastle LEP**

62% agreed this this proposal (agree or strongly agree), while 17% disagreed with it. A further 17% were neutral towards this proposed changed and 3% were unsure/ not applicable.
Issue 3: A new heritage conservation area should be established to include all of the properties 55 to 75 Glebe Road, The Junction
The majority (14 of 17 people) were in agreement with this proposed change.

Issue 4: A locality specific set of development guidelines should be prepared to protect the single storey character of the potential new Glebe Road The Junction HCA
The majority (14 of 17 people) were in agreement with this proposed change.

Accordingly, this report recommends that Council proceed with the next stage to make these two areas heritage conservation areas, and to proceed with the listing of the houses at 18, 32 and 34 Gordon Avenue Hamilton. It is noted also that there is an existing heritage item at 36 Gordon Avenue Hamilton.
CHAPTER EIGHT -
PLANNING FRAMEWORK
8.1 Introduction

This chapter sets out the planning context in which Council regulates and manages the heritage conservation areas listed in the Newcastle LEP 2012.

In New South Wales, the responsibility for managing heritage is split between the State and Local Governments. The NSW Heritage Council, assisted by the NSW Office of Environment and Heritage, has responsibility for items of State heritage significance listed on the State Heritage Register and for relics of State and Local significance. Local Government has responsibility for local heritage, through Local Environmental Plans and Development Control Plans.

The State Heritage Register lists items and areas that have significance to the people of New South Wales, while nationally significant places are listed on the National Heritage List administered by the Commonwealth Department of Environment, Water, Sustainability Population, and Communities.

The three legal instruments that regulate cultural heritage in New South Wales are:
1. **NSW Heritage Act 1977**
2. **Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, 1979**

Identifying and listing items and places of heritage significance are the first steps in protecting and managing those places deemed to be of heritage significance. Listing heritage places on statutory heritage registers provides a legal framework for managing the approval of major changes so that heritage significance is retained and not diminished.

The legal framework in which Council's heritage listings are made is through the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 which enables the listing of heritage items and places through the local environmental plan (LEP) and the provisions for regulating heritage that are contained in the standard instrument LEP. This is the mechanism in which heritage items, heritage conservation areas and archaeological sites are recognised and managed.

8.2 Local Environmental Plan

The standard instrument provisions contained in the Newcastle Local Environmental 2012 (LEP) establish the consent requirements for development in heritage conservation areas and provide the assessment framework for Council to follow when assessing a development application within a HCA.

The provisions at Part 5 of the LEP set out the matters that Council must consider in its assessment of a development application within a heritage conservation area. Generally, the majority of development activities within HCAs will need the consent of Council, with the exception of some types of exempt development.
Under Part 5.10 of the Newcastle LEP 2012, Council must assess the impact of a proposed development on the heritage significance of the heritage conservation area concerned. Most types of development in a heritage conservation area, unless exempt, will require development consent via a development application or complying development certificate. An applicant must demonstrate that there is no heritage impact or that it is minimal and measures to manage impacts are in place.

The heritage clauses at Part 5 of the NLEP are mandatory clauses set by the NSW Department of Planning and Environment. Council has no discretion to alter or amend these provisions. The LEP is however supported by the Newcastle DCP, to clarify and provide direction on the types of alterations permissible in a heritage conservation area. This is further explained below.

Heritage Conservation Areas are listed in Schedule 5 of the LEP. Any changes to boundaries, the removal of a heritage conservation area or creating HCA or heritage item requires an amendment to the LEP.

8.3 Development Control Plan

A development control plan is a guideline document that supports the LEP with more detailed planning and design guidelines. The Newcastle Development Control Plan 2012 contains controls for heritage conservation areas in Section 5.07, and brings together separate DCP chapters including DCP 44 (The Hill, Cooks Hill and Newcastle East), DCP 57 (part of The Hill), and DCP 58 (Hamilton South Garden Suburb) into the one section.

The DCP enables merit assessment of development applications because it contains relevant aims, objectives and controls on future development. The Council can implement the DCP in a discretionary capacity, and in this way, flexibility in the controls supports design without prescribing the means of achieving it. Applicants can demonstrate that the objectives for the area have been met but can decide on the design options in meeting these objectives. In this sense, the DCP is a non-restrictive planning tool. This approach takes into account the principle that there is no one-size-fits-all that will be suitable within the heritage conservation area, that technology and fashions change and therefore provided that the objectives are met Council does not prescribe the actual means of achieving it.

This review has found that minor changes could be made to the DCP to strengthen it. Firstly, the Statement of Desired Future Character introduced throughout this review for each of the HCAs should be included in the DCP. Secondly, Section 5.07 should be moved to the locality specific provisions in Section 6, so that the relationship between desired future character and development outcomes is better emphasised. Section 5.07 is currently included in Section 5 of the DCP which focusses on environmental protection provisions.
The DCP is supported by the Heritage Technical Manual, effectively an instruction manual for development in heritage areas containing detailed design guidelines. During the early stages of this review, an architect was engaged to prepare design concepts for the Cooks Hill Heritage Conservation Area. A package of design concepts was prepared for each building type including terrace houses, bungalows and cottages. A package was prepared and workshopped with an industry liaison group who provided feedback to refine the designs. As a result of this work, the Heritage Technical Manual was amended and 3D design concepts modelling height, bulk, scale and siting were introduced into the Manual. These design concepts illustrate a range of best practice options for changing buildings in the Cooks Hill HCA.

These designs should now be applied to the Newcastle East and the Hill Heritage Conservation Areas. They should not be applied to the Hamilton South Garden Suburb HCA as further detailed guidelines will need to be prepared specifically to retain the single storey bungalow character of the Garden Suburb HCA. The two proposed HCAs identified in Chapter 7 of this report will also need development guidelines similar to the Hamilton South Garden Suburb HCA, as the building typologies and character are similar.

8.4 Land Use Zones

Zoning is the division of land into categories. The categories determine the types of activities and development allowed in the area they cover. Zoning is guided by the standard instrument provisions in the LEP, and is identified in maps and relevant land use tables.

The standard Instrument LEP contains 34 zoning categories including various residential zones. For each zone it identifies certain mandatory objectives and mandatory land uses that are permitted with consent or permitted without consent. It also includes a range of land uses which are prohibited in each zone.

During the course of this review, Council adopted a Local Planning Strategy23 to guide future land use and development for the Newcastle LGA. Two of the relevant strategic directions are:

- Ensure development controls and zoning protect the heritage significance of items and conservation areas.
- Evaluate the extent of R3 Medium Density zone within heritage conservation areas where identified desired character is inconsistent with zone directions.

It was not within the scope of this review to examine land use zones. This work will be undertaken in a future review.

---

23 The Local Planning Strategy was adopted on 28 July 2015.
CHAPTER NINE - FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS
9.1 Introduction

The final recommendations made in this report are a result of the analysis of the submissions made by the community, agencies, and the survey results conducted by Newcastle Voice, during the exhibition period (1 February - 14 March 2016).

The final recommendations for managing the Heritage Conservation Areas, are as follows:

1. Cooks Hill - it is recommended that the east boundary is extended to include the lower portion of Kitchener and Anzac Parades, and reduced at Darby Street to exclude the section of Darby Street as identified in the report.

2. Hamilton South 'Garden Suburb' - it is recommended that the north boundary of the HCA is extended to include the north side of Denison Street and Ada Street. It is recommended that the Glebe Road boundary proposal (to exclude a small section), does not proceed.

3. The Hill - It is recommended that the boundary adjustment to include High Street, and parts of Anzac and Kitchener Parades, proceed as recommended in the report. The city block between King, Church, Bolton and Newcomen be further investigated for possible excision from The Hill HCA as part of a future review of the City Centre HCA.

4. Hamilton Business Area Heritage Conservation Area - it is recommended that the removal of the Hamilton Business Area Heritage Conservation Area not proceed. It is not recommended that the sandstone kerb and gutters not be heritage listed at this time.

5. Proposed Heritage Conservation Areas for Glebe Road Federation cottages and Hamilton Residential - it is recommended that the proposed making of two additional heritage conservation areas proceed.

6. Newcastle DCP amendments - It is recommended that the DCP is amended to include the statements of desired future character and revised statements of heritage significance as contained in the report.

7. Heritage Technical Manual - It is recommended that the Technical Manual is updated to include the contributory maps. It is also recommended that the Cooks Hill design guideline also apply to the Hill, Newcastle East and the proposed Hamilton Residential heritage conservation area.

8. Potential heritage items - Parkway Avenue as a landscape heritage item and 18, 32 and 34 Gordon Avenue Hamilton - it is recommended that the proposed heritage listing of these four items proceed. Parkway Avenue is to include the entire length from its commencement at Tudor Street through its terminus at Memorial Drive Bar Beach.

9. New design guidelines - it is recommended that locality specific design guidelines be prepared for Hamilton South Garden Suburb, and Glebe Road cottage heritage conservation area respectively. These are to be included in the technical manual.

10. It is recommended that DCP section for HCAs be moved from Environmental Controls to Locality Specific controls.

11. It was not within the scope of this review to examine land use zones. However, it is recommended that the zoning in all HCAs be examined at a future date.
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Executive Summary

The exhibition looked into the following Heritage Conservation Areas (HCA); Cooks Hill, Hamilton South Garden Suburb, Hamilton Business Centre, The Hill, Proposed Hamilton resident area, Proposed Glebe Road cottages and Newcastle East. Participants were asked to provide feedback on the HCA proposals.

- The survey received a total of 195 people participants.
- 3x information sessions received 108 attendees in total.

Cooks Hill

- A total of 35 people made comment on the proposals for Cooks Hill.
- Majority of participants in survey were property owners and residents.
- 72% agreed that The Cooks Hill HCA should be extended to include portions of Anzac and Kitchener Parades.
- 46% agreed that Darby Street, between Parry and Tooke Street, should be removed from the heritage conservation area.

Hamilton South Garden Suburb

- A total of 132 people made comment on the proposals for Hamilton South Garden Suburb.
- Majority of participants in survey were property owners and residents.
- 48% did not support the proposal to remove part of Glebe Road from the boundary of Hamilton South Garden Suburb HCA.
- 72% agreed with the inclusion of a part of Denison Street and Ada Street in Hamilton East in the Hamilton South Garden Suburb.
- 83% agreed that Parkway Avenue should be included as a landscape heritage item in Schedule 5 of the Newcastle LEP.
- 66% agreed that specific guidelines for alterations and additions to be prepared and included in the Heritage Technical Manual.

Hamilton Business Centre Heritage Conservation Area

- Just 12 people made comment on the proposed changes to the Hamilton Business Centre HCA.
- Majority of participants were many those with interest in the area.
- Seven out of 12 participants disagreed that Hamilton Beaumont Street should be -delisted as a HCA.
- Six out of 12 agreed that the sandstone kerb and gutters in Beaumont Street should be heritage listed.
The Hill

- A total of 27 people made comment on the proposals for The Hill HCA.
- 67% of participants were owners and residents.
- 63% agreed with the proposal to extend the boundary of The Hill HCA to include parts of Kitchener Parade, Anzac, Bingle and High Streets.

Proposed Hamilton Residential Area

- A total of 29 people made comment on the proposals for Hamilton Residential HCA.
- 59% of participants were owners and residents.
- 62% agreed with the proposal for Hamilton residential area to be included in the Newcastle LEP as a Heritage Conservation Area.
- 62% agreed that the heritage significance of properties at 32, 34 and 18 Gordon Avenue Hamilton should be assessed to determine if they should be listed as heritage items in the Newcastle LEP.

Proposed Glebe Road - The Junction cottages

- Just 17 people made comment on the proposed changes to the Glebe Road - The Junction cottages.
- Majority of participants were many those with interest in the area.
- 14 out of 17 agreed with the proposal for a new heritage conservation area to be established to include all of the properties 55 to 75 Glebe Road, The Junction.
- 14 out of 17 agreed with the proposal for a locality specific set of development guidelines to be prepared to protect the single storey character of the potential new HCA.

Newcastle East

- Just 17 people made comment on the proposed changes to the Newcastle East HCA.
- Comments were received about recommendation to update the Heritage Technical Manual to revise statement of significance and new contributory buildings map.

All areas

Zoning was not within the scope of this review, however Council recognises the need to analyse the zones in HCAs.

- 60% of participants agreed that Council should examine the applicable land use zones and zone objectives in each HCA.
- 58% agreed that analysis of the zones should be high priority.
**Introduction**

In 2014, a process was begun to review all of the Heritage Conservation Areas (HCAs) within the Newcastle Local Government Area, including Cooks Hill, Hamilton South ‘Garden Suburb’, The Hill, Newcastle East and the Newcastle City Centre HCAs.

As part of the initial review, it was deemed as crucial that local community members should be consulted through information sessions and a survey. The objectives of these HCA review and consultation processes are to:

- ensure that as the city moves towards 2030, an attractive and distinctive built environment, focussed around people reinforces Newcastle’s unique sense of identity and built environment and is aligned with objective 5.1 of the 2030 Newcastle Community Strategic Plan.
- produce development controls that are consistent with the principles of the Newcastle Heritage Policy, are easy to use and are unambiguous.
- produce development controls that are supported by a clear character statement that shapes the desired future character of each area.
- ensure that Council’s role in regulating development in heritage areas is supported by a framework of heritage planning best practice, as defined by the NSW Heritage Council.
- incorporate input from property owners, residents and industry stakeholders on how the development controls can be better structured and designed.
- The data captured was considered in the re-formulation of the statement of significance and desired future character statements. Elements addressed were considered and were applicable incorporated into the Development Control Plan (DCP). The results from study were reported to Council as part of the HCA review as background data.
Objectives

The Heritage Conservation Area review report (draft) examines the heritage significance, character, boundaries and planning context of five heritage conservation areas (HCAs). It includes the results of community surveys of residents in four of the HCAs, which occurred in 2014 and 2015.

The draft document presents a range of findings that may or may not result in future changes to the LEP.

Should changes to the LEP occur at a future time, there may be impacts on the residents in these areas. Feedback on the findings of the HCA report is required in order to create a priority action plan and finalise the report for adoption by Council.

On 24 November 2015, Council resolved:

- to place the draft Review of Heritage Conservation Areas Report on public exhibition for six weeks
- Commence community consultation process with residents to notify residents about the content and recommendations in the report and receive a report back with the outcomes.

Public Exhibition objectives:

- build community awareness of exhibition period for draft Review of HCA
- awareness that feedback on the draft is invited and will help to prioritise actions for future heritage management and direction
- provide opportunities for feedback on the draft report
- gain an understanding for the levels of support for new areas of Heritage Conservation Areas and the expanded HCAs
- focus on feedback from property owners

Engagement framework

Community participation refers to the degree to which the community is involved in planning and decision making. Council recognises and abides by best practice principles developed by the International Association for Public Participation (IAP2). The IAP2 Public Participation Spectrum, outlined in figure 1, is a useful tool to help identify and select the appropriate level of public participation, from informing the community through to empowering the community to make decisions that will be implemented by Council. This study falls under INFORM and CONSULT in the IAP2's Public Participation Spectrum.
Methodology

The HCA survey was open from 1 February 2016 and 14 March 2016.

Survey was promoted through Information Sessions, Council's website, Facebook, Media release, Newcastle Voice newsletter, and direct email to those that had participated in previous surveys. In addition to this, 4972 brochures promoting the survey were mailed to affected property owners.

Three information sessions were held during the exhibition period;

- Monday 8 February 2016 6-7pm Glebe Road Uniting Church Merewether - Church hall (good disability access)
- Tuesday 9 February 2016 - 6-7pm The “Yoga” Room, 21 Gordon Ave Hamilton (U3A building) (no disability access)
- Wednesday 10 February - 6-7pm The Benson Library - Newcastle East Public School (good disability access)

Information sessions were facilitated by Council's community engagement officer and a presentation was undertaken by Council's heritage strategist. Notes taken at session are included in Appendix III.
Data Collection
Formal written submissions were collected by Strategic Planning. The Newcastle Voice survey was a structured questionnaire with a total of 12 questions about the proposed changes. A copy of the survey is included in Appendix I.

Data handling
All data was analysed by NCC Community Engagement staff using Sparq panel management and survey software.

Respondents
A total of 195 people participated in the survey.

Participants were invited to provide feedback on proposals across a number of areas. Each participant could nominate any number of areas of interest to them. Figure 2 below shows the number of participants providing comment on proposals in each area.

Figure 2: Participation by area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of interest</th>
<th>Number of people commenting</th>
<th>% of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cooks Hill</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton South Garden Suburb</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton Business Centre</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Hill</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Hamilton resident area</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Glebe Road cottages</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle East</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of participants made comment on one area only (83%); however, almost 1 in 10 (9%) made comment on two areas and some made comment on a total of 3, 4, 6 or 7 areas, as shown in Figure 3.
Figure 3: Percentage providing feedback on one or more areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage commenting on multiple areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 areas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4 below shows the overlap in areas being commented on:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooks Hill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSGS</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBC</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Hill</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop. HRA</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop. GRC</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey Findings

Cooks Hill

Profile

A total of 35 people made comment on the proposals for Cooks Hill. This is a small sample size so care should be taken when reviewing the data for this group.

Of those responding to plans for the Cooks Hill area, the majority (74%) were Owners, none were Renters (0%); and the remainder were 'Others'. 'Others' included an LGA ratepayer, a Parkway Avenue resident, a 'user', someone interested in the area, someone with housing provided and 3 others.

The majority were Residents (71%); none were Business Owners although one person indicated they were both a resident and business owner.

Figure 5: Profile of Cooks Hill Respondents

![Cooks Hill Respondent Profile]

The issues

Those commenting on the Cooks Hill area were asked to indicate the strength of their agreement with two issues:
**Issue 1: The Cooks Hill HCA should be extended to include portions of Anzac and Kitchener Parades**

The majority (72%) agreed, or strongly agreed, with this statement, while 14% disagreed (disagree or strongly disagree).

Further comments made on this issue are shown in Figure 7.

**Figure 7: Further comments made on Cooks Hills proposal 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response to Issue 1</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>the inclusion of this area will only cause unnecessary restriction and more paper work to complete renovations or repairs to my properties. It will also risk a reduction in the value of my properties with no consequent benefit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>I believe that the northern side of Nesca Pde between Brooks St and Kitchener Pde should also be included. This strip of the street until very recently was a strip of significant character - weatherboard and brick bungalows from the early 20th century. It was an attractive streetscape with real heritage appeal and interest. In the last two years two properties have been demolished and very modern houses that have been designed with no consideration for the existing streetscape have been built. It is important that this trend does not continue in the street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree (and strongly agree to issue 2)</td>
<td>As a resident of parkway Ave for the past 16 years I value the quiet nature of the area. The last thing I want is increased traffic flow along the street this will impact our lifestyle and property values.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Issue 2: Darby Street, between Parry and Tooke Street, should be removed from the heritage conservation area**

Sentiment for the second statement explored was more divided, with 46% agreeing (agree or strongly agree) and 34% disagreeing (disagree or strongly disagree). 20% were neutral (no answer or neither).

Further comments made on this issue are shown in Figure 8 below.

**Figure 8: Further comments made on Cooks Hills proposal 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response to Issue 2</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>No. No heritage area should be reduced. That just plays into the hands of the unscrupulous.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Any future proposals for development of the area on Darby Street between Parry and Tooke Street should fit in with the heritage conservation area. One has to question how these developments were approved with the Cooks Hill Conservation Area in place!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>The HCA between Centennial park and Darby St was in reasonable shape before the Soviet era inspired concrete bomb shelter was recently erected behind 139-143 Dawson st. Either pull it down or cover it with something like vertical gardens to make it conform to the HCA that it was supposed to be subject to. If these are not options then : 1 Someone’s nuts should be on the line for permitting the travesty of a future slum nucleus to be built the way it was 2 Excise the Dawson st lots whose heritage values have been seriously degraded by that development from the HCA, as well as the Darby St section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>the surrounding cooks hill area has ample HCA, agree with the decision to remove the main street CA and let businesses adapt to modern trends and growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>I think in the case of the Darby St/area, with the exclusion of St John’s Church etc is developed with no particular advantage to the conservation area any more. I do think that the Anzac Pde and Kitchener Pde should be included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree (also strongly agreed to issue 1)</td>
<td>As a resident of parkway ave for the past 16 years I value the quiet nature of the area. The last thing I want is increased traffic flow along the street this will impact our lifestyle and property values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>The developments approved on Darby Street compromise the HCA by their bulk and their impact on on street parking in the vicinity. In my view changes at the edge of HCAs contribute to the erosion of streetscape values and add pressure on Council to enable changes within the HCA itself.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hamilton South Garden Suburb

Profile

A total of 132 people made comment on the proposals for Hamilton South Garden Suburb. The majority of this group (89%) were Owners, just 1% were Renters; and the remainder were 'Others'. The majority were Residents (92%); none were Business Owners and the remainder (8%) selected 'Other'.

![Figure 9: Profile of Hamilton South Garden Suburb Respondents](image)

The issues

Those commenting on the Hamilton South Garden Suburb area were asked to indicate the strength of their agreement with four issues. The results can be seen below in figure 10.
Figure 10: Extent of agreement with proposed changes to Hamilton South Garden Suburb HCA

**Extent of agreement with proposed changes to Hamilton South Garden Suburb HCA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Percentage Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Issue 1: Removal from HCA area</td>
<td>8% Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue 2: Expand HCA area</td>
<td>9% Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue 3: Change to LEP</td>
<td>2% Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue 4: Update to Heritage technical manual</td>
<td>15% Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Issue 1: Removal of part of Glebe Road from the boundary of Hamilton South Garden Suburb HCA**

A greater proportion was against this proposal (48%) than supported it (38%). 21% took a neutral stance.

**Issue 2: Inclusion of a part of Denison Street and Ada Street in Hamilton East in the Hamilton South Garden Suburb**

The majority (72%) agreed, or strongly agreed, with this proposal. In contrast 9% disagreed (disagree or strongly disagree).

**Issue 3: Parkway Avenue should be included as a landscape heritage item in Schedule 5 of the Newcastle LEP**

Support for this proposal was very strong, with 83% of respondents indicating strong agreement and a further 5% recording agreement. 7% disagreed (disagree or strongly disagree).

**Issue 4: Specific guidelines for alterations and additions to be prepared and included in the Heritage Technical Manual**

Support for this proposal was also strong, with 66% of respondents recording agreement (agree or strongly agree). In contrast, 7% disagreed (disagree or strongly disagree). It is worth noting that 15% responded with “not sure/ not applicable” and a further 11% were neutral on the matter.
**Figure 11: Further comments made on Hamilton South Garden Suburbs proposals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue 1</th>
<th>Issue 2</th>
<th>Issue 3</th>
<th>Issue 4</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>This area looks run down, assuming the HCA is removed, this area could be revitalised by residents and council. The affected residents campaigned very hard recently to limit the development 65-67 Denison St because it did not fit in with the design of the area and a number of other issues whereby it did not comply with area requirements. Now this development has been approved and houses have been demolished to make way for modern residential and business development, that council has now decided to make it a heritage area that would have prevented this development from occurring. This is crazy and smacks of hypocrisy. The timing is impeccable! I will suspect the affected residents that are affected will again campaign very hard to prevent this ludicrous rezoning from occurring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Strong guidelines that Council will enforce and support is crucial to ensure no further erosion of properties in the area to non contributory status.in the past Council has entertained such development proposals and surrounding residents have needed to campaign against such undesirable development applications. Bottom line Council must actively promote and support its own heritage guidelines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>The removal of the boundary directly impacts my property in that I live at 566 National Park St. The removal means that my property becomes the edge of the boundary. I am concerned about this change as it means that medium/high density housing could be built on my fence line overshadowing my property. I am already surrounded by 3 x 2 storey properties that overlook and overshadow my property. My recommendation is that a transitional boundary (buffer zone) be proposed which limits what can be built around the edges of boundaries. This would address the issue of having a 5 storey apartment complex next to a single storey heritage house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Under no circumstances should the Glebe road boundary be altered. This includes a church and church hall used by the community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HCA: Public Exhibition Report
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the area on Glebe road was to be removed and high density accommodation built on the site I am concerned about stormwater drainage from those properties to those within the Heritage area, shading of dwellings in Cram Street, increased traffic and noise to dwellings in Cram Street, and the impact on the character and setting of the streetscape looking towards the south side of Cram Street. There is also concern that any new buildings on the Glebe road site would not be in keeping with the building form, scale, roof scale, and in keeping with other notable features of the area.

Parkway Avenues grassed median and pine trees are a unique residential feature of genuine heritage conservation significance to the entire City of Newcastle. This architecturally designed promenade was a key component in the landscape planning of the Hamilton South Garden Suburb. Originally including lovely flowerbeds (we lived here at the time) the significance of the term 'Garden Suburb' is closely linked to features such as this. With constant pressure from traffic and building construction it is incumbent upon us as historical custodians to take measures to protect. This Avenue of aesthetically pleasing lines and greenery and acknowledge prominent role it plays in the City. The Novocastrians Parkway Avenue is synonymous with beautiful tree lined street.

There are very few areas in Newcastle that are as unique as parkway avenue for the architecture of the homes and the central garden and pine trees. It would be tragic if this was not conserved for future generations. I would trust that the council and local government would have the foresight to ensure this occurs.

The streetscape of Parkway Ave should remain as is and protected from any alterations under the Newcastle LEP. It is an important part of the original Garden Suburb.

Removal of the part on Glebe Road would allow for multi-storey buildings to be built along this section. This would impact on the streetscape of Cram Street significantly, which would mean that views from the street on Cram Street would no longer be in keeping with the Heritage Conservation Area requirements.

Former Town Planner Brent Knowles advised me personally that he had personally sought through detailed analysis that the grassed verged separating Parkway Avenue and the Norfolk Island Tree species had been gazetted by the NSW Government. Furthermore, this area should and does fall within the BURRA charter. The trees and the linear form of Parkway Avenue were designed to provide clear linear indicators to other significant landmarks including the city’s Obelisk and provide directions to visitors/tourists to the CBD and the harbour foreshore area. It is also a significant part of the historical drive that leads to our beach areas. It is interesting to note that a Heritage Architect is to be commissioned to aid Council in the decision making process, critically relevant to that should be a parallel commission of a reputable Heritage Landscape Architect that Council deemed important enough to ask me as principal designer for Newcastle Christ Church Cathedral to seek such expert (Heritage Landscape Architect) to determine our DA and CC application for the
The area is classed as a ‘Garden Suburb’ the issues relating to Landscape and existing hardscape/softscapes plantings trees and Heritage impact DO NOT fall within the ambit of a General Heritage Architect - that is why there is two separate disciplines in Architecture. Please involve the appropriate expert for Heritage Garden issues that incorporate the important protection of this highly heritage significant grassed/tree verge separating Parkway Avenue Hamilton South.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Parkway Avenue should be included in the LEP within the HSCA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>LEAVE THE MEDIAN STRIP IN PARKWAY AVE AS IS, WE NEED SOME GREEN SPACE, AS FAR AS TRAFFIC SIDE GOES, THE STEWART AVE LIGHTS NEED TO BE ON LONGER FOR RIGHT HAND TURNS EACH WAY, THE BANK UP OF TRAFFIC ONLY LAST TILL SCHOOL STUDENTS ARRIVE AT S.F.C. GOING EAST TO GRAMMER SCHOOL AND TOWN THERE IS MORE TRAVELLING THAT WAY. ANY CHANGES TO THESE BOUNDARY’S WE NEED TO BE GIVEN PLENTY OF NOTICE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>parkway ave is one of the grand boulevard of newcastle and should be protected especially those green median strips and norfolk island pines ... it is an iconic street of Newcastle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>The RMS proposal to increase traffic flow on Parkway Ave would greatly diminish the heritage value of the Hamilton South area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>There is a suggestion that RMS wish to narrow the Parkway Ave median strip to allow for more traffic flow along Parkway Ave.I strongly oppose this &amp; I believe that Council should oppose this too.Such a development would greatly diminish the landscape heritage value of the Hamilton South Garden Suburb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>We live on Parkway Avenue. We have a young family and walk to and from Hamilton South Public School every day. Parkway Avenue, including its pedestrian friendly wide central median, is an important feature of the Hamilton South garden Suburb and should be reflected by inclusion in the LEP as an item of significant value to Heritage Conservation Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>The verge and trees must be protected in Parkway Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>The entire length of Parkway Avenue has historic relevance. As one of the suburbs main streets it is visually pleasing, creating a sense of space and a park-like feeling. Its central strip of Norfolk Island Pines is environmentally important contributing to air quality (helping balance the increasing traffic pollution) and supporting a variety of bird life. Parkway Avenue and Hamilton garden Suburb, as they exist today, should be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Included in the LEP and as such would remain true to the designers original aspirations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I strongly believe that Parkway Avenue should be left as is, no change should be made to the current size of the median strip</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkway avenue is an iconic feature of Newcastle and should retain its heritage features.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have too many to enumerate here. Suffice to say since the introduction of the various HCAs there have been many non complying developments approved on the boundaries and within the areas themselves by either clever words or deceit. It would seem that there is one rule for the residents and one for the developers. Why is it that compliance is only for those who cannot afford the costly legal challenges, which when they come from developers Council just caves in. Prime example is the disgusting Bimet development which really did not satisfy the HCA requirements of being on a boundary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Glebe road area which it would seem may be excised from the HS HCA - why? Was there an application to remove this area. If so who applied? A person or entity?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The area should NOT be removed as it will only create a precedent for peripheral areas along the HCAs (as with Bimet - but that fell under SEPP which of course is an out for Council)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As for Parkway Avenue it is time that this area properly protected by heritage conservation laws as this is the last intact and thus significant area by the fact that it intact; designed by Sir John Sulman.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The amenity of this area has been destroyed by the huge volumes of traffic, some of which should not even be in the area (GVM&gt;Strongly agreeT)and the excessive speed at which it travels.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ideals of the HCA are certainly not being adhered to by any save for the residents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkway Avenue is a residential street and not any sort of heavy vehicular traffic road. It is supposedly a Collector Road which in theory gathers traffic from the local roads and feeds it to the arterial roadway system. It is not for through traffic both heavy and too fast for a residential area. It would seem that these issues are overlooked for the sake of Council and the RMS not wishing to improve the surrounding arterial road system.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By the way we are not the only residents who think this way. Should you wish further discussion please feel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Since Parkway was an original avenue in the setup of the Garden Suburb concept it should always be retained / conserved for its absolute heritage value.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Parkway Avenue is a vitally important feature of Hamilton South Garden Suburb and this should be reflected by inclusion in the LEP as an item of huge significant value to Heritage Conservation Plan. This should not be altered in any way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Not only should Parkway avenue be included in the Newcastle LEP, it should also be brought back to how it was in its early years with the inclusion of gardens on the central median strip. After all, it is classified as the 'Garden Suburb' of Newcastle. Lets show the world what can be done. Maybe this can be done with the NCC working close with the property owners, and possibly getting them involved in some of the streetscape/garden upkeep. The Avenue also has the potential to become one of Newcastle’s premier Christmas attraction by installing lighting in the Norfolk Island pines from Hamilton to Bar Beach. Imagine the 'sea of lights' as you drive down Parkway Avenue at Christmas. Again this could be done by the NCC, with the help of the residents of the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Its vital Parkway Ave remains an important feature of the Hamilton South Garden Suburb and this must be reflected by the inclusion in the LEP as an item of significant value to Heritage conservation plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Please Parkway Avenue must be included in the LEP as an item of huge and immense importance to the heritage conservation plan the value is priceless to this area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>This Heritage conservation plan will only benefit by Parkway Avenue being included in the LEP Parkway Avenue is a huge important and historical part of Hamilton South and it must remain that way including the majestic Norfolk Pines that line this street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Parkway Avenue is a vital and important part of the Hamilton South Garden Suburb, it has been forever the Norfolk Pines are majestic and the native birds such as cockatoos on this strip are a daily morning and afternoon occurrence please keep parkway Ave in the LEP for historical and environmental and heritage significant No not change this</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Strongly disagree | Agree             | Strongly agree | Agree | Parkway Ave with its green and wooded divide is a unique feature of area part of Newcastle. If there are plans to widen the thoroughfare, consideration must be given to the fact that there are two large
schools on this road with many students having vehicles these days. The confusion and congestion before and after school times is already quite dangerous, and this would be exacerbated by increased traffic flows and speed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parkway is an important feature of the Hamilton East area and should be reflected by inclusion in the LEP as an item of significant value to heritage conservation in the area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I don't want to see Parkway avenue altered in any way. Reducing the size of the median strip would spoil the beauty of the avenue and rob the area of its distinctive character. I can’t believe that this would even be considered as it is such a long-standing and beloved part of Hamilton South and surrounds.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>parkway ave is a significant land mark in Newcastle and should be protected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parkway avenue has one of the most enduring features of suburban Newcastle in the long median strip and the Norfolk pine trees. It is a heritage of grand planning dating back to post WW1 and the early 1920’s. There are 3 schools along its length and it has many years of efforts to calm traffic in what is already a neighbourhood zone. It was a travesty when the traffic lights were so poorly constructed at Stewart avenue causing traffic chaos on a regular basis. The streets were never meant to be feeder roads and never designed to be the next main road parallel to Glebe and King streets. There should be less traffic not more, if anything add a proper ‘cycles only’ cycle path instead.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly oppose removal of part of Glebe Road from boundary of Hamilton South HCA.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Isn’t the Ada St section where they’ve just knocked down 4 houses???

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Removal of the boundary in Glebe road from the Hamilton south Garden suburb HCA would be catastrophic for the existing residences of the surrounding area. The only person who would benefit from this is the person who brought the property on glebe road where Merewether smash repairs previously was. My property boarders this property and I would be the most disadvantaged in the area. Having renovated our home within the guidelines of the heritage area and at great expense we should be protected by inappropriate/unsympathetic developments. The impact on traffic, parking, noise, loss of value of our property</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and the destruction of our lifestyle would be unthinkable. Council planning dept has been lacking by its own admission and has already allowed inappropriate development/renovations in the heritage area but this must stop. This could open the flood gates for potential high density development of up to 4 storeys. Common sense should prevail and this MUST NOT GO AHEAD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The proposed removal from the Garden Suburb HCA of properties on Glebe Road between National Park and Smith Streets due to the buildings in this area being deemed of non-contributory to HCA is of great concern. The heritage significance of these particular properties is not relevant - it is the impact on the surrounding area that a change in the HCA boundary may have. That is, the removal of the HCA in effect makes way for the potential high density development which this area is currently protected from. The building mass, population density and inherent traffic issues from potential over-development will adversely affect the liveability of all surrounding residents who purchased in this area for the very benefits the Garden Suburb HCA currently provides. There is absolutely no good reason to remove this portion of Glebe Road from the HCA. Any future development of this portion of Glebe Road needs to be consistent with existing HCA of Hamilton South Garden Suburb.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NA</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A once beautiful Newcastle icon is being transformed into a high density raceway. Modern urban design thinking strongly suggests the car is not the future and yet we continue to cater to this. Time to think back to what is beauty and how to increase it or at least maintain what we have.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parkway Avenue is an amazing street that should be protected from development. It is well known by visitors from all over the area, enjoyed by the residents for its style and the median strip wonderful for minimising the noise of traffic.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Grass Median in Parkway Avenue must be maintained in order to preserve the original plan for the Garden Suburb. Council should also abide by the concept of a 'Garden Suburb' and disallow the removal of trees which provide shade and a healthy environment. Council should not allow the area to become a concrete jungle with out of proportion areas of concrete which do not allow for drainage or absorption. Considering the rates which residents pay, the Council should not allow the Garden Suburb environment to be destroyed. It is a fitting entry path to the beaches and coastline and a city which will hopefully rise again!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do not alter Parkway Ave or its median strip at all. We are under strict rules about what alterations, extensions, fences and even garage doors that we can have in this heritage area so under NO circumstances can the heritage streetscape of Parkway Ave be altered as it is the main feature of this heritage area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parkway Ave must be included in the Ncle LEP to preserve the median strip for it's heritage significance, and keep the area as it is meant to be.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkway Avenue is an important feature of the Hamilton South Garden Suburb and this be reflected by inclusion in the LEP as an item of significant value to the Heritage Conservation Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NA</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parkway Ave is and must remain as a landscape heritage item in the LEP it holds the Hamilton South Garden Suburb together and establishes this area with beauty and must remain for all citizens of Newcastle and surrounds. The key importance is the Norfolk pines, the wide grassed strip to define and attracts the wildlife (cockatoos) historically garden beds were also along the Avenue as well providing extra beauty to this garden strip. Without Parkway Avenue remaining as is there would be no defined Hamilton South Garden Surburb heritage Area. please preserve this wonderful avenue as it has historically been intended.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NA</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parkway Ave is and must remain as a landscape heritage item in the LEP it holds the Hamilton South Garden Suburb together and establishes this area with beauty and must remain for all citizens of Newcastle and surrounds. The key importance is the Norfolk pines and the wide grassed strip to define this lovely garden strip. Without Parkway Avenue remaining as is there would be no defined Hamilton South Garden Surburb heritage Area. please preserve this wonderful avenue as it has historically been intended it holds such significant value to the Heratage Conservation Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protect our heritage and beauty of the area and especially Park way ave .. No more traffic should be funnelled down it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residents in the Hamilton South Garden Suburb HCA have made significant investment in restoration and maintenance of their homes in keeping with the provisions of the heritage conservation plan for the suburb. Any change to the perimeter of the HCA will erode this process as well as impacting on the privacy and amenity of residents who have planned the back yard areas of their properties to highlight family and social recreation. A rezoning along Glebe Road raises the prospect of these areas being overlooked. The removal of Glebe Road properties from the HCA has the potential to seriously impact on the character, safety and facility of the residents of Cram and National Park Streets. Any intensification of development on Glebe Road will also impact on the drainage to Cram Street which has experienced serious flooding issues in the past. Cram Street takes storm drainage from Glebe Road and Turnbull Street. A significant increase in building coverage and hard surface on the Glebe Road properties would greatly increase flooding potential in Cram Street. Parking restrictions on Glebe Road already cause increased parking on Cram Street. This would be increased by any change in development density on Glebe Road. My survey of properties from 152 Glebe Road to 214 Glebe Road shows that the majority of households in that area have kept their housing within the concepts of the HCA.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From Smith Street to National Park Street six original houses have been restored in keeping with the HCA and one left unrestored. Three new houses have been built outside the concepts of the HCA. In the Glebe Road section beyond National Park Street four houses retain the fabric and concept of the HCA and one has been redeveloped out of sympathy with the HCA.

The Glebe Road frontage forms an integral part of the HCA and should be left intact.

Five properties abutting the corner of Smith and National Park Street form a neighbourhood commercial precinct. Any redevelopment of the commercial premises should be constrained to the current footprint to retain its neighbourhood focus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Parkway Avenue is a major feature of Hamilton South, with its greenscape and Norfolk Island Pines being a significant value to the Heritage Conservation Plan. It also gives the area a sense of space within an area that is becoming densely populated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The Hamilton South Garden Suburb HCA is highly valued and strongly supported by residents within the area. This is reflected in the excellent condition of the properties within the HCA and the high resale value when properties are sold.

The heritage classification has given owners, and potential owners greater certainty that the heritage character of the area will be respected and preserved and that unsympathetic development will not be permissible. This confidence is reflected in the quality of property maintenance and in the respectful way that the character of the dwellings, their surrounds and the streetscape has been honoured during maintenance, renovations, restorations and additions on the housing stock within the HCA.

I strongly object to the removal of part of Glebe Road from the Hamilton South Garden Suburb HCA. The majority of the houses in this section of Glebe Road are still intact as originally constructed and still reflect the character and streetscape of the HCA.

If this area of Glebe Road is rezoned the current properties and land in Glebe Road will be subject to redevelopment. Existing properties and open space will be destroyed and replaced by buildings of much greater height and density and a totally different character to that of the HCA.

These changes will degrade the quality and amenity of the properties behind them in Cram Street and National Park Street. Privacy will be destroyed by much taller properties overlooking both the curtilage and rooms at the rear of the existing dwellings in Cram and National Park Streets.

I have seen these detrimental effects caused by a Glebe Road redevelopment which looms over a neighbour's home in Cram Street. The pool, backyard and rear rooms in the neighbour's property are totally overlooked by this unsympathetic two storey development on the boundary fence thus reducing the amenity for the home owners and the resale potential of the affected property. This redevelopment happened prior to the
It is important for council to consider that residents within the HCA purchased their homes and have invested heavily in quality maintenance, restorations, renovations & additions which respected the heritage character of the area. Owners did so in the belief that they had the certainty of protection against detrimental redevelopment in their designated Heritage Conservation Area. Now it is proposed to change the rules. This will adversely impact on the capital asset of the property owners and the amenity of the affected residents.

Long standing drainage & flooding issues in Cram Street will be exacerbated by the increasing density & coverage of open space in Glebe Road which will occur with the proposed rezoning. Glebe Road is higher than Cram Street which has a long history of acting as a drainage detention basin for Glebe Road.

Parking will become much more of a problem due to increased numbers of occupants from higher density redevelopment in Glebe Road. Overflow parking will occur in Cram & National Parks Streets. As our existing area has revitalised with younger families moving into the area there is much more on street parking in Cram & National Park Streets due to increasing levels of vehicle ownership. Because more family members have personal or work vehicles they need to park on the street.

Higher density will increase traffic management & safety issues as residents & visitors at the new dwellings will need to enter & exit onto the very busy Glebe Road.

The adverse impacts associated with the proposed removal of part of Glebe Road from the boundary of the Hamilton South Garden Suburb HCA have not been adequately considered by Council. The proposed rezoning & resulting redevelopment along Glebe Road will degrade the character of the HCA & over time lead to attrition in the HCA. There will be a decline in amenity for affected residents & the quality & value of the affected homes in Cram Street & National Park Street will be downgraded because property owners will not have the same commitment to living in & maintaining these properties. The HCA will be undermined by attrition.

Additional comments: I have lived in our family home since January 1980. The Uniting Church properties, the Vet (with attached original house), the Smash Repair business (now closed) at the National Park end of Glebe Road and the Automotive business (with its adjacent home in Smith Street) at the Smith Street end of Glebe Road have been long established. These commercial properties & the Church properties have been an accepted part of the local character of the Hamilton South Garden Suburb.

The three commercial properties on Glebe Road west of National Park Street are more recent additions in the Glebe Road streetscape. When we moved into our home in 1980 there was an original two story brick building with Chemist shop on the ground floor, & a dwelling above, on the corner of Glebe Road & National Park Street. Adjacent to this were the small Take Away hot food shop & a butcher shop. The Chemist shop building which was built in the style and character of the area was demolished due to earthquake damage. The other two shops were demolished & replaced by very unsympathetic commercial buildings prior to the declaration of the HCA.
Church property has encroached on Robinson Place Reserve for many years. Apparently this encroachment includes the old wooden building which was moved onto the site many years ago. When the Church congregation was more active with younger members, the Church claimed exclusive use of the tennis court on Robinson Place Reserve & neighbouring residents were excluded from usage. As the congregation aged the tennis courts have fallen into disrepair & Council has not rectified this situation.

Robinson Place Reserve has been used by local children, (including our own children & grandchildren) over the years. The mowing of the Reserve has been shared by the Church or Council over the years. Local residents have planted many of the trees & shrubs in Robinson Place Reserve & these provide a very pleasant backdrop for local residents and a bird habitat in the Reserve.

For unexplained reasons Council has removed the Robinson Place Reserve signage. Hopefully this does not signal Council’s intent to reclassify the Reserve to allow residential development on this land (& on any surplus property owned by the Church). Although that may be a popular direction for developers it will not be so with local residents who value the open space & tree cover in Robinson Place Reserve and have contributed to improvements by tree planting in the Reserve.

It is also worth noting that local residents have, and continue to pay very high rates while the Church would have been be exempt from rates. The encroachment of Church property onto Robinson Place Reserve has been either at no cost, or for a peppercorn rent. Apparently the Lease expired many years ago.

Any rezoning of Robinson Place Reserve to allow residential development would lead to the destruction of the Reserve. Any development on the Reserve would have detrimental impacts on the surrounding homes. Part of the value of these homes has been based on the attractive open space, recreation space & tree cover in the Reserve. Development would destroy the amenity & property values for the adjoining residents (in ways as outlined previously in this submission).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parkinson Avenue in its current form (wide median and substantial/aged pine trees) provides significant landscaped heritage qualities. From Hamilton South to Bar Beach the avenue should be protected and included in the LEP.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parkway Avenue is the last remaining intact boulevard in the original Garden Suburb plan by the famous Architect and Planner, Sir John Sulman. Its impressive streetscape, and relatively unspoiled architectural development makes it a unique and imposing icon, well worthy of preservation and listing on the State Heritage register. Whilst residents have previously stated their strong desire to preserve the form of Parkway Ave, RMS are currently planning to encroach on the central median to allow more more traffic to flow through the Heritage Area. Construction work would certainly endanger the root systems of the magnificent Norfolk Island pines, and allow the diesel and petrol exhaust fumes emanating from trucks to discharge directly into the tree canopies causing distress and likely permanent damage.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RMS should be more concerned with the safety aspects of encouraging more traffic past the three large schools, and resident amenity and access to their properties, and taking measures to divert traffic away from Parkway Avenue. There appears to be little communication between RMS and Council in this matter.

The recent and sudden demolition of all of the remaining properties in Denison St appears highly coincidental and worthy of investigation.

Newcastle has so few beautiful avenues, why destroy one now. Its a wonderful access area to some of Newcastle’s prime attractions such as the beach, the ANZAC memorial walk and King Edward Park.

Re: Parkway Avenue

It absolutely should be included as a landscape heritage item in Schedule Strongly agree of the Newcastle LEP.

NCC's draft report supports this view with numerous references to it being "...the most enduring aspect...of the area..."

Previous heritage studies "...recommend the heritage listing of Parkway Avenue...as (a) heritage item...

""Elements that are to be preserved include the existing appearance, form and function of Parkway Avenue, including the road verges, street trees....and the central median that splits the carriageway into two single lane roads".

Based on the above quote from NCC's own reports, I fail to see any viable option other than including Parkway Avenue as a landscape heritage item in Schedule Strongly agree of the Newcastle LEP.

NCC / RMS (whoever is responsible) are currently complicit in eroding the heritage significance of this thoroughfare. It is a collector road, not a sub-arterial road. The signalisation of the junction with Stewart Avenue accelerated this process and NCC / RMS continue to ignore residents concerns. Vehicle weight limits are never enforced, the traffic calming measures (speed humps / Agree0km/h zone, redirection of traffic flow along Smith St) never materialised with no feedback from NCC. The median strip continues to be damaged by illegally parked cars during winter weekends.

If NCC are serious about protecting THE most enduring aspect of the Hamilton South Garden Suburb HCA, they MUST act now and enforce the rules.

Re proposed new area for Ada St and Denison St:

- Zoning was changed from Residential to Mixed Use Medium Density in 2012, no residents were aware of change, therefore there was no effective public consultation

- First we knew of zoning change was when the current Denison St development was proposed; there were
over 50 submissions from the public against it - most feeling it was out of character

- Following the earthquake houses had to be rebuilt in residential style sympathetic to heritage, why change this attitude?
- Re the block between Ada and Parkway; 7 of 8 houses are owner occupied; Neither houses were built for the Australian Agricultural Company circa 1890 and all are well maintained (the area is older than Hamilton St; I have a photo from 1910 showing Parkway did not exist as a road);
- Many residents have spent a lot upgrading properties sympathetic to heritage concerns
- There are many fine heritage properties in Denison St as well, as well as the nearby Ambulance Station and TAFE, which are both heritage listed
- The character of the area is at a tipping point due to decision to change to medium density mixed use, and the subsequent development in Denison St, which is completely out of character. This needs to be overturned, else the heritage character of this area, which is far older than Hamilton South, will be lost.
- In my view, the houses on Denison St between Ada St and Parry St should be added as well. All the properties are residential style and many are pre 1930. E.G. The house on corner of Ada and Denison is also circa 1890

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All building approval should adhere to strict heritage building guidelines in order to preserve heritage areas. The beautiful streetscape of Parkway Avenue should be preserved as it is one aspect of Newcastle Heritage that defines Newcastle as the city that it is.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With the current push for major developments in this area (such as the current 3 storey mixed commercial residential building comprising of 4 medical suites and 10 units) it is incredibly important that we look to protect the heritage homes and landscape that we have left. This also includes the iconic Parkway avenue landscape and median strip.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The landscape of Parkway Ave must be preserved as a gateway to the beach and should be protected as a heritage item.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Essential to maintain landscape heritage of Parkway Ave. (Traffic control needed ++)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parkway Avenue is a unique streetscape in the city of Newcastle and has considerable environmental and aesthetic importance to all Novocastrians. Heritage and Conservation is not only about buildings but also about preserving our environment from the ever increasing construction of hard surfaces which place greater stress on our trees and grassed areas. Over time both Stewart and Gordon Avenues have lost their medians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon Avenue no longer safely links with the current road system and so attracts very little traffic. Case in point: That median should never have been removed. Parkway Avenue should be protected from the same fate and priority listed without further alteration to the LEP.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re inclusion of Parkway Avenue as a heritage item, I am particularly interested in ensuring there is no loss of median area or trees due to road widening or addition of turn pockets etc. I also quote the draft report p.40: &quot;The existing appearance, form and function of Parkway Avenue, including the road verges, street trees, bridge abutments at Cottage Creek, and the central median that splits the carriageway into two single lane roads&quot; I have a concern that Parkway Avenue westbound between National Park and Stewart has become a de facto two lane road. Please take action to return this section of Parkway to a single lane of traffic.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkway Avenue is a Newcastle landmark and I strongly support the proposal to have it listed as a landscape heritage item to protect this wonderful thoroughfare.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am very please and supportive that the Council is adopting a positive and proactive to heritage planning and guidelines.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I agree with the Review of Heritage Conservation Areas Draft Report in that Parkway Avenue should be listed as a heritage item in Newcastle LEP 2012 because it is a fundamental surviving element of Sulman’s Garden Suburb design. The Avenue with its generous median and plantings of Norfolk pines are central to the suburb’s street pattern and should be protected from potential changes to street design and functionality. Parkway Avenue is the highest in the order of streets in Hamilton South and should be left intact to protect the visible evidence of Newcastle’s efforts to grow out of its coal mining town beginnings into the diverse City it is today. The Garden Suburb principles that the Avenue exemplifies, contributes to the City’s prosperity and generosity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every city must have an identity and an integral part of its identity shows a blend of valued heritage areas and the need to be progressive. A progressive approach is to preserve the integrity of heritage areas and manage the somewhat &quot;sneaky&quot; erosion of valuable heritage areas. As a community we need to ensure the proposed boundaries of heritage areas are managed sensitively.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I live in the Hamilton South Garden Suburb precinct and find the lack of traffic control to be a major concern to the integrity and amenity of this highly regarded residential area.
I recently hosted a visitor from Minnesota USA who remarked about the attractiveness of the Norfolk Pine lined Parkway Avenue.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AS a resident of the Garden Suburb my whole life, I feel it would be detrimental to reduce the size of the median strip in Parkway Avenue. Having grown up in Parkway Avenue and having now bought in Hebburn street, part of the appeal to this area was the trees and parks, not seen like this anywhere else in Newcastle.

I don't believe that the fact that inappropriate development has occurred in Glebe road is a reason to move the boundary. This would place at risk what we see from our back yard. (3 Cram st). Leaving it as is maintains a logical boundary at one side Glebe road and may lead to future sympathetic development. I also think it's a backward step to water down the rules that have been in place for 20 years.

I haven't commented on the heritage technical manual but do think that any clarification between "guidelines" and rules is probably a good thing. We were able to do what I believe was a suitable extension without issue.

I would be very happy to discuss my views further if required. Thanks you

I have lived in Parkway Avenue for over 50 years and throughout that time it has been a beautiful avenue in the true sense of the word forming a centerpiece for what is now the garden suburb. Even though the council no longer maintains the many garden beds which are now buried under grass or full of dying hibiscus it still forms a graceful corridor from the centre of town to the beach. This tree-lined avenue and its maintenance in its current form (single lane carriageway) is vital if this area is to reflect its name as the Garden Suburb. Beyond this it is a unique and beautiful feature within the city, one we should care for and protect in its current form.

I wish Parkway Avenue Hamilton changed in any manner whatsoever. The median strip is a delightful and essential part of Hamilton and surrounds.

I do not wish to see Parkway Avenue Hamilton changed in any manner whatsoever. The median strip is a delightful and essential part of Hamilton and surrounds.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>I have been a resident of this area for the past NA years. This is a stunning original area of Hamilton with houses dating back well over 100 years. The loss of several houses of this era has recently occurred in Dennison which saw well over 10 objections to this loss occur. This demonstrates the communities love of our area and its heritage value. Our block in particular is one of the last remaining intact historic blocks of Parkway Ave. Our houses have histories with the beginning of the AA Company in this area. Preserving this history only adds to the history of our community as a whole.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attention Sarah Cameron.

My objection to the proposed boundary changes are as follows.

1. The proposed boundary changes will lead to rezoning and redevelopment in Glebe Road which will allow buildings of much greater height and density. This will be totally out of character with the existing homes in the HCA.
2. High buildings will overview out homes and outdoor areas, this will lead to a loss of privacy in the rear of our homes.
3. The streetscape as seen from the street and homes in Cram Street and National Park Street will be adversely impacted by increased heights and densities.
4. Increased densities will lead to drainage and flooding problems in Cram Street. Glebe Road and Turnbull Street drain into Cram Street due to their higher elevation. Cram Street has a very long history of flooding in heavy rain.
5. Parking will be increased in Cram Street due to increased densities. Parking is restricted in Glebe Road so excess parking from new residents and visitors will overflow into Cram Street and National Park Street.
6. The above detrimental effects will make this area much less appealing to home owners. Downgrading of our amenity and homes will impact on the integrity of this part of the HCA. This will flow on to other parts of the HCA over time.

Neither | Strongly agree | Strongly agree | Strongly agree | the area of Denison and Ada St complement the area already heritage listed. Beautiful buildings along Denison and the block of Ada and Parkway being the oldest in the area. Consideration should also be given to Denison st between Parkway and Parry St it has a high degree of continuity, with 11 of the 13 houses on the north side original and the sth side showing how medical suits had to be built in keeping with the street scape following the earthquake, which is now part of the Newcastle |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>heritage</strong> Denison once was a grand street and with some love this could be returned.</td>
<td>I strongly oppose any change to the median in Parkway Ave. Parkway Avenue has been the main town-planning feature of this area since my family first moved here in 1947. Most of the houses are in close-to-original prospect from what I can remember as a child way back then. The main part of this is the very wide gorgeous green median that runs the full length which even looks better without the oleandras that were there in the 1940s. Any reduction in the size of the median for things like turning lanes at Stewart/Parkway lights can be done just as well by re-routing the bicycle route to quieter streets like Jenner Parade to cross Stewart Ave at the pedestrian lights at Alexander St and thereby have a full 2 lanes of traffic at the Stewart/Parkway lights (we live on that corner). The cycleway can then follow Alexander and Beaumont to the Racecourse and Dumaresq St. Any proposal for light rail along Parkway is crazy - if trams come south they should go to The Junction (servicing Bar Beach) and on to Merewether or Dixon Park Beaches and then back along Gordon Avenue and Denison St to Wickham.</td>
<td>As a resident of Parkway Avenue I strongly object to any changes that would bring additional traffic to this street or reduce the aesthetic of the current width of the medium strip and the beauty of existing trees. In fact I would promote additional streetscaping involving additional tree plantings and gardens to enhance this avenue towards its original design - as a generous green corridor. Turning it into a busier road would have a significant and detrimental impacts on residents incuding increased noise levels, loss of aesthetic, negative impact on heritage areas either side of Parkway Ave, higher risk of road accidents (car and pedestrian) and a downgrade in the sense of community as residents would be less likely to spend time in their front yards/verges if it were a busy road. These negatives would also reduce property values which is significant to me as I moved here Agree years ago to take advantage of the current environment and streetscape. I would therefore be disadvantaged be losing these advantages and losing property value. I strongly object to making Parkway Ave a busier street and support it being listed on the LEP.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hamilton Business Centre Heritage Conservation Areas

Just 12 people made comment on the proposed changes to the Hamilton Business Centre HCA. This is a very small sample size and care must be taken when reviewing this data. For this reason the data is reported in terms of numbers of people rather than as percentages.

Just 2 of the 12 were owners, and 2 of the 12 were residents. None were renters and none were Business Owners.

Figure 12: Profile of Hamilton Business Centre HCA Respondents

The issues

Those commenting on the Hamilton Business Centre HCA area were asked to indicate the strength of their agreement with two issues. The results can be seen below in figure 13.
Issue 1: Hamilton Beaumont Street should be -delisted as a HCA

Disagreement with this proposal was greater than agreement with it, with 7 people disagreeing and 4 people agreeing.

Issue 2: The sandstone kerb and gutters in Beaumont Street should be heritage listed.

Six of the twelve responders indicated agreement with this proposal. 4 disagreed and the remaining 2 voted either neutral or unsure/not applicable.

Figure 14: Further comments made on Hamilton Business Centre proposals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response to Issue 1</th>
<th>Response to Issue 2</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>I think the Hamilton Business centre has struggled over the past decade to grow as a top income earner for the city. Removing the HCA from the businesses centre will give and residents and business owners more ownership to transform the heart of Hamilton.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>I think Beaumont Street business precinct is looking untidy at present, with a few premises unoccupied. The Islington end is looking far better, so I have no objections to the precinct having the opportunity to be smartened up by removing the Heritage category.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Future development in the street should reflect the scale of the existing streetscape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>The street scape is unique to this strip. However there should be proper cleaning of the street/footpath and maintenance. There are to many Asian food Shops/ eatery in this Area it should be more available to/for Southern Europe cuisine as is the history of this strip and it's ethnic influence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>I do not see that these features really contribute greatly to the streetscape. I would rather see modern kerbs and gutters that suit the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Hill

Profile

A total of 27 people made comment on the proposals for The Hill HCA. This is a small sample size and care should be taken when reviewing the data.

Approximately two-thirds of this group were Owners (67%) and two-thirds were Residents (67%) - note that not all owners were also residents. No Renters and No Business Owners participated.

Figure 15: Profile of The Hill HCA Respondents
The issues

Those commenting on the The Hill HCA area were asked to indicate the strength of their agreement with one issue. The results can be seen below in figure 8.

**Issue 1: The boundary of The Hill HCA should be extended to include parts of Kitchener Parade, Anzac, Bingle and High Streets**

Agreement with this proposal was greater than disagreement, with approximately two-thirds (63%) agreeing (agree or strongly agree) and one-third (37%) people disagreeing (disagree or strongly disagree).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response to Issue 1</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>this area needs to be included urgently to prevent the redevelopment in an inconsistent way with the neighborhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Obviously in this area there will be a tendency towards developments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. designed to maximise revenue-gathering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. obsessed with size and grandeur at the expense of aesthetics and impact on neighbours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. unsympathetic to the gracious character of the area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Therefore we are keen to see our area included in the heritage conservation zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Although there are some 'out of character' buildings here there are quite a few houses worthy of conservation protection. Listing this area will prevent redevelopment and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Reconstruction of unsympathetic buildings on the fringe of an existing conservation area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Yes I strongly agree. However I believe that the whole of the eastern side of Lemnos Pde should be included in the extended HCA zone. According to me reading of the criteria, the following houses in that eastern side of Lemnos Pde would be classified as follows. No 1 - a modern architecturally designed house with features sympathetic to the streets heritage styles - e.g pitched roof. No 1A as above No 3 neutral / contributory No 5 contributory No 7 neutral contributory (pitched roof) No 9 contributory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>I strongly agree with the boundary extension but R3 (medium density) development should not be permitted in a Heritage Conservation area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>I am very pleased to endorse this addition to The Hill Conservation Heritage Area. I would now like to encourage our Council to ensure that these heritage areas are not over-crowded by medium density development ((R3) as has happened in other parts of Newcastle and NSW. These heritage areas should be left to demonstrate to all Novocastrians and to tourists visiting our City our pride in our history. They should be available to future generations and not drowned by adjacent high rise development. We have a very special heritage to proclaim.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Ensure that all property owners are consulted on the potential change and its implication for property maintenance and improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>This action would decrease the house values in the proposed area and although I value heritage and my home is approx 100 years old and beautifully restored, I feel it unfair that I should lose value by councils actions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>The approval of developments not consistent with existing building stock over many years by NCC, particularly on the northern side of High Street, has created a hodgepodge of conflicting building styles and densities which makes it a case of &quot;try and spot the heritage houses.&quot; The inclusion of buildings at 11A and 30 High Street as contributing to the heritage values of 19th century and inter-war houses makes me wonder what the consultants were thinking. Presumably this means that the future development of modern style houses such as No. 11A will be OK if the boundary adjustment is approved. The issue of including High Street in the existing HCA has been examined extensively in the past and no compelling reasons were found for its inclusion. Council should only include new areas in HCAs where there has been a low level of attrition and degradation of the housing stock to be protected and not where the streetscape has already been significantly altered by inappropriate development. The area is also progressively being turned into a parking lot due to the failure of NCC to provide adequate parking in the CBD which is hardly consistent with HCA values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>This will restrict my ability to renovate and repair my property that I have lived in for nearly 50 years. There is no obvious benefit to owners and a risk of de-valuing my property if I chose to sell.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Council already has substantial regulations and another level of regulations is not required or wanted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Strongly disagree

These changes will make it difficult for owners to make updates to their properties as required. Having to get approval for this constantly will be a real problem.

I agree with Council’s endeavours to promote conservation through efforts like identifying potential heritage, raising community awareness about heritage, and establishing and managing conservation zones. However, the proposal to extend the existing area would significantly deteriorate the fabric that constitutes a true heritage conservation area.

In simple terms, a conservation area is one that is historic in character and is special or attractive enough to warrant protection to maintain the traditional, special and individual character of a place. The Terrace and other areas within the existing Conservation Zone in my view meet this criteria. However, the extension of the zone as proposed will achieve nothing but to fossilise the proposed extension area and not allow it to evolve with the modern world that Newcastle City is becoming. My home for example was constructed in 1998 and a large percentage of other homes were also built around the same time. They have no heritage significance or character and they add nothing to making the existing Conservation Zone any “more special.” I do however consider the terrace homes on the northern eastern side of Bingle Street would be the only properties worthy of inclusion in any proposed extension of the conservation zone.

I also recognise the counter argument that whilst conservation area status does lead to additional planning constraints and considerations for the land owner, the purpose of conservation is not about preventing all change but about managing it in a way which preserves its special interest. The extension area proposed has no areas of special interest. While the benefits of owning a property in a conservation zone tend to be intangible in nature and flow from the pleasure or enjoyment associated with owning a historic or unique house of conservation value, the costs are more real and visible. These include the cost of ensuring alterations and extensions to the house are sympathetic to homes of historic value and the owner is burdened by the opportunity cost of forgoing land development opportunities which are available to homes outside conservation zones.

There are also costs the Council bears in regulating land use in conservation zones and Council is dropping the ball when it comes to regulating the existing Conservation zone on The Hill. The significant property at 12 The Terrace for example standouts. It has been transformed into an illegal boarding house and the front downstairs verandah has a staircase constructed to connect it to the upstairs verandah! The conservation value, appeal, and aesthetics of the area is impacted because Council is unable to meet its regulatory and conservation demands. If Council cannot meet its current obligations it will be unable to meet them under and extended conservation zone.

Strongly disagree

I believe each property in this area should be individually assessed and reviewed by Council should the Owner want to redevelop the property.

Whilst I appreciate keeping our history intact there are properties within this boundary which have absolutely no heritage value at all. They were built at a time when financial hardship meant the design and materials used were of a low standard and quality.

The city is experiencing a revitalization and most developers (not talking about big developers but just ordinary people wanting to buy and live in the city) are sympathetic to the property's character and try to build or redevelop with that in mind. It would be a shame to see properties remain in disrepair because a person is not able to remodel in the modern accepted styles of today.

Afterall, if we were to use this philosophy we would all still be living with dirt floors and architects would be redundant.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I don't feel that the housing merits the extension of the HCA. The housing is not heritage, in the same way that the terrace is. There is a very high number of non-heritage housing and brick flat buildings. The mix of housing in High Street is typical of many streets in Newcastle that are not listed as HCA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am surprised to see my house listed as a contributing to the HCA as it is a 1950's brick building, which was rendered and painted baby blue in the 1990's!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The eco texture report supports extending the HCA to High Street in 2005, and this same report is then questioned as to whether it is a valid opinion due to the age. The report then simply states that “This review has re-assessed the area and finds certain streets are considered worthy of statutory listing as a HCA” can we have more information as to why the High Street extension is proposed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the 2015 public voice responses included extending the HCA to include High Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It should be noted that Council previously approved the demolition of my house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have spoken to many neighbours about this extension of the HCA and none have understood or been supportive of it. I hope that they have been able to take the time to raise their objections. I should also note that those that I have spoken to did not receive notification of the 2015 survey in the mail, myself included.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposed Hamilton Residential Area

Profile

A total of 29 people made comment on the proposals for Hamilton Residential HCA. This is a small sample size and care should be taken when reviewing the data.

The majority of this group were Owners (59%), with just 3% renting. An equivalent proportion (59%) were residents, with 3% Business Owners.

Figure 18: Profile of Hamilton Residential HCA Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Owner</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The issues

Those commenting on the proposed changes to the Hamilton Residential HCA were asked to indicate the strength of their agreement with two issues. The results can be seen below in figure 19.

**Figure 19: Extent of agreement with proposed changes to Hamilton Residential HCA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent of agreement with proposed changes for Hamilton Residential area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Issue 1: Expend the HCA area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue 2: Consideration of potential new heritage items in the Newcastle LEP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Issue 1: The proposed Hamilton residential area should be included in the Newcastle LEP as a Heritage Conservation Area**

62% of this group were in support with this proposal, while 31% indicated disagreement.

**Issue 2: The heritage significance of properties at 32, 34 and 18 Gordon Avenue Hamilton should be assessed to determine if they should be listed as heritage items in the Newcastle LEP**

62% agreed this this proposal (agree or strongly agree), while 17% disagreed with it. A further 17% were neutral towards this proposed changed and 3% were unsure/ not applicable.
### Figure 20: Further comments made on the proposed Hamilton residential area HCA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response to Issue 1</th>
<th>Response to Issue 2</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>I am not clear on the implications this would have on the processes for renovating our property. I expect it means that applications for approval for any renovation will need to be submitted (with additional fees). I also expect that there will be design limits or constraints imposed. For eg. Another house in our street is already listed and the owners were only permitted to restore not renovate. I am not clear on the implications for property value but I would suspect that it would not increase and is more likely to decrease the value as the costs and trades associated with maintaining or restoring may be unattractive to buyers. I don’t understand the impact this will have on our rates. Will there be an additional fee or tax added to already escalating rates? There are many homes within the proposed area that are certainly not of heritage significance and I am left scratching my head over the motivations council have for wasting time and public money on such an unnecessary proposal. I can’t see on any advantages or benefits for the home owner in this proposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>The proposed Heritage Conservation Area for the Hamilton Residential Precinct is not supported given the mixed demographic the precinct attracts. The concept of a HCA means that the current proportion of contributory dwellings will tend to naturally limit who can take up residence within the precinct: - Those with sufficient funds to maintain such dwellings, which becomes more expensive than modern designed and constructed dwellings; - Those with sufficient funds to live within such dwellings, which again is generally more expensive due to greater requirements for unnatural heating, cooling, and lighting. Currently, the village atmosphere exists because of the diversity in demographic: this may be put at risk, for example, students may not be able to afford even greater amounts of rent as living in heritage style housing becomes even more expensive; or relatively lower income families despite abilities to save, may not be able to afford to live there, as the greater living expense may be used up in the capital acquisition in a form of debt paydown. In the long term, this may sterilise the village like atmosphere enjoyed in the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>I doubt the historical significance of this area is particularly valuable. I believe the more valuable HCA should be Veda street and surrounds as this was where the first Mine SUperintendents were housed in the early days of the &quot;Bog Hole&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>I am delighted that the Council is considering this precinct as Heritage Conservation. Too many houses have been demolished and rebuilt with cement &quot;boxes&quot;or in many cases not maintained to an appropriate standard.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I imagine there are some owners who buy properties as investments in this area and just let them out without doing any running repairs or improving gardens etc. So I am delighted that owners may be encouraged to take more pride in their houses.

Also, I was pleased to hear at the meeting last night that reclassification is likely to include streetscape improvements like street trees, traffic calming devices on corners etc. I would love to see a community garden established within the precinct somewhere, maybe the library or some other appropriate spot in the way it has been done on the corner of Bull and Darby Sts Cooks Hill - I think it would add a point of interest and a community gathering point as well as providing a practical asset to the community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Making areas Heritage compliant places greater financial burden on property owners. Rates are increasing and it will not be possible to undertake reasonable repairs or changes to my home if heritage guidelines are imposed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strongly disagree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The make up of the building in this area are too diverse in nature and age to constitute any particular style or type of building to make any unique heritage style. Some examples: 21 Cameron street is circa 1905 whereas 25 Cameron St is less than 10 years old. The same is for 22 Cameron and the property two doors further down. 16 James street is circa 1991 and also 12 James street is also a "new property". This is also the case for the property two doors East as well as the duplex next door. Cnr. Lindsay and Cameron is also a "New house" again with no "Heritage value."

These are only a few examples within a small radius of 61 Lawson St, the house I own. Without going further this is typical of this suggested area.

I know that several of these dwellings were replaced because of damage ie. termite infestations making any repair impossible and because of the small size and shape of the blocks these owners were left with optimising their finances to construct feasible non-heritage dwellings.

Also, what kind of dwelling style would be suitable for this area as the current buildings range from wooden miner's to freestanding terraces, older apartments like the corner of James and Lawson to buildings exhibiting ethnic heritage styles and many houses built over the last 40 years?

That there is no particular heritage style to be preserved makes the idea silly.

Strongly agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I think the heritage significance should include 32, 34, 36, 38 and also 5 James Street.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strongly agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The property we own at 3 Murray st is included with which we agree. It is a 1900 house, which had separate kitchen and outside toilets. We have removed them and made the back modern. However, the front half is as it was when built except the front verandah which was demolished. We rebuilt it to look like the original. We think that the frontages should be heritage, but not the back.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposed Glebe Road - The Junction cottages

Profile

Just 17 people made comment on the proposed changes to the Glebe Road The Junction cottages. This is a very small sample size and care must be taken when reviewing this data. For this reason the data is reported in terms of numbers of people rather than as percentages.

Just 3 of the 17 were owners, and 3 of the 17 were residents; one owner was a resident and two were landlords. None were renters and none were Business Owners.

Figure 21: Profile of those responding to proposed changes to Glebe Road/ The Junction cottages
The issues

Those commenting on the proposed changes to the Glebe Road The Junction cottages were asked to indicate the strength of their agreement with two issues. The results can be seen below in figure 22.

Figure 22: Extent of agreement with proposed changes to Glebe Road/ The Junction cottages

![Bar chart showing the extent of agreement with proposed changes to Glebe Road, The Junction cottages.]

**Issue 1: A new heritage conservation area should be established to include all of the properties 55 to 75 Glebe Road, The Junction**

The majority (14 of 17 people) were in agreement with this proposed change.

**Issue 2: A locality specific set of development guidelines should be prepared to protect the single storey character of the potential new HCA**

The majority (14 of 17 people) were in agreement with this proposed change.

Figure 23: Further comments made on the proposed Glebe Road The Junction cottages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response to Issue 1</th>
<th>Response to Issue 2</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>The heritage nature of this area has already been compromised by the construction of a 2nd (modern) dwelling at the rear of 2 of the 10 or 11 properties that would be affected by this proposed conservation area. The proposed area is also quite small &amp; isolated, in that it is essentially enclosed on Neither sides by The Junction's existing retail &amp; commercial development. This development already detracts from the overall visual appeal of the current streetscape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Approximately 5 years ago an appeal was denied for a development plan for 55 Glebe Rd by the Minister for Planning and Inviroment. The court considered that the facades of the cottages 55 to 75 were mostly unchanged and should be maintained as an example of the original village architecture still in tact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Junction Village is a rather unique 'village' style shopping precinct. It is bounded by residential properties some of which have valuable heritage character. e.g in Corlette St and in Glebe Rd. For the 'village' character to be maintained there must be a clear boundary between commercial and residential and having residential right up close to shops etc helps retain this character. The strip of single storey character houses on the south side of Glebe road provides and interesting neat boundary to the 'village'. Glebe Rd is an entry thoroughfare to inner beachside Newcastle and as such its character needs to be preserved where possible.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>These are an outstanding group of well maintained garden cottages that add to the character of The Junction. Ensure that all owners are fully aware of the proposal and its implications for maintenance and renovation before declaring the heritage area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>These properties warrant a heritage classification under a new HCA. With one exception, the character of the cottages between Robinsons Real Estate &amp; Arrivederci Restaurant is intact. The owners have respected the character &amp; streetscape of these cottages &amp; have kept them in a very well maintained state. Previously the residents strongly supported the retention of these homes &amp; opposed the proposed demolition of one of the cottages for redevelopment. Council's decision to reject the proposed demolition &amp; redevelopment &amp; to preserve the character of this small group of cottages was supported by an external judgement by a Heritage Consultant. It may be possible to sympathetically build into the existing roof structures, set back from the streetscape as has happened with some dwellings in the Hamilton South Garden Suburb HCA. As long as the single story character is preserved with adequate set back within the roof line to preserve the heritage character of the homes then it may be suitable. Similarly it may be possible for garage roof structures to be extended to allow extra development within the roof space if the change is sympathetic to the character of the street. Such possibilities would need proper study &amp; consideration so that the heritage character would not be adversely impacted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lovely group of old cottages most of which are still in good condition if not exactly in an original state. Worthy of protection in the inner city.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Newcastle East

Profile

Just 17 people made comment on the proposed changes to the Newcastle East HCA. This is a very small sample size and care must be taken when reviewing this data. For this reason the data is reported in terms of numbers of people rather than as percentages.

Six of the 17 were owners, and these 6 were also residents. None were renters and none were Business Owners.

Figure 24: Profile of those responding to proposed changes to Newcastle East HCA.

The issues

Participants were asked to comment on one issue:

*Update to Heritage technical manual: The Heritage Technical Manual to be amended with revised statement of significance and new contributory buildings map.*

Figure 25: Comments made on the Newcastle East proposal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle station should be included and protected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many of the buildings do not have heritage value. I question the value of grouping buildings by area. The cost/inconvenience of compliance can be prohibitive to real development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I support the amendment of the Heritage Technical Manual to include a revised statement of significance and new contributory buildings map for the Newcastle East Heritage Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Newcastle East is becoming and vibrant and character filled part of the city. The streetscapes are looking great and I notice that more and more buildings are being done up and restored and adding to the heritage value and interest of the precinct.

See previous comments

Should include Newcastle Station area, Watt St bothsides up to James Flether Hospital Area, Fletcher park out to Nobbys Headland

For all of the Areas

Zoning was not within the scope of this review, however Council recognises the need to analyse the zones in HCAs. With this in mind, all participants were asked to indicate the extent of their agreement with a further two issues:

Figure 26: Extent of agreement zoning proposals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue 1: Council should examine the applicable land use zones and zone objectives in each HCA</th>
<th>13%</th>
<th>10%</th>
<th>6%</th>
<th>11%</th>
<th>31%</th>
<th>29%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Issue 2: Analysis of the zones should be a high priority</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Issue 1: That Council should examine the applicable land use zones and zone objectives in each HCA**

60% of participants agreed (agree or strongly agree) that Council should examine the applicable land use zones and zone objectives in each HCA. 16% indicated their disagreement with this proposal.

**Issue 2: That analysis of the zones should be high priority.**

58% of participants agreed (agree or strongly agree) that the analysis of the zones should be a high priority. 17% disagreed with this proposal.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response to Issue 1</th>
<th>Response to Issue 2</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Quite possibly, but I'm not sure. Certainly the lot sizes may require a refactoring of types of dwellings and changes to dwellings that can take place, as well, advances in construction and contemporary technologies that can overcome previously difficult to solve problems should be considered as part of this (eg. noise attenuation/dampening, insulation, construction materials allowing more glass for natural light etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>The zones have been reviewed in recent years and reflect a high density area. They also comply with the SAFE criteria. The objective of the r3 zone reflects cooks hills high density nature. Outside of the city centre it is one of the LGAs highest density suburbs. See housing paper to LPS. If design, in particular height, is an issue that is a design issue- not a zone issue. Hence why heights and fsr now stay alone in the LEP. They should be captured via design controls. Cooks Hill reflects a true r3 zone. Should be be anything less it would mean that the zones are not being applied consistently and cause much confusion. If height is the issue then height should be addressed. I agree that the character of a HCA should be retained but this is not the correct planning mechanism. Perhaps advice from the department should be sort on using the zones that way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>There seems to be a contradiction between having a HCA and then it is zoned for medium density. They do not work together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>the above response is provided that the reviews of zones are consistent with protecting heritage value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>I believe that most of the land is zoned residential, why change?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Zoning is of vital importance if the heritage significance of the character and streetscape of the heritage conservation areas is to be maintained. Zoning should reflect the existing built environment within the Heritage Conservation Areas. The northern length of Denison Street Hamilton is a good example of the way in which inappropriate zoning has ruined the ambience and amenity of a once-popular residential area with high quality housing stock, so discouraging inner-city living. This will be the eventual fate of all Heritage Conservation Areas if zonings do not reflect the existing character.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Let's not ruin historic end of Newcastle with too much high rise and boxing in of open spaces. This does not align with the history and gentrification of Newcastle and Newcastle East particularly. Short term gain. Let's</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
More and more residential dwellings are being purchased within HCAs and converted into businesses such as specialist medical practitioner rooms even though there are ample vacant buildings in commercially zoned Hunter Street. The problem with this is that they often remove grass and gardens and replace with concrete carparks. Having on-site parking is a major contributing factor in the choice of an inner city residentially zoned dwelling over a commercially zoned one where parking limitations and ease of access are less attractive to patients.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>The zoning should be maintained as residential with single residential properties. Multi storey apartments should be not allowed in the heritage areas, even dual occupancy on a single block as has been allowed in the past.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Residential and commercial zones should be kept separate and multi-storey developments have no place within a HCA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>So long as Council abides by the significant heritage areas that are identified by such examinations and strongly protect the heritage fabric and integrity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>Not sure what this question means? however had to answer to move on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>There is a definite conflict between the intention of the Hamilton South Garden Suburb area and the change in zoning that occurred. There should be NO medium residential zoning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>This must be addressed now before the RMS comes in and builds another arterial route ruining our heritage in that area for ever</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>R3 (medium density) development is not appropriate in a Heritage Conservation area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>If zoning was to be reviewed and any changes proposed would such changes be presented to residents for comment?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>No changes to current zoning in HCA areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>See previous comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There needs to be regular contact between Council and the residents of HCAs to ensure that they are aware of the design principles and physical characteristics that contribute to the heritage status of their suburb or location. Unless this is done there will continue to be development proposals that conflict with the goals of maintaining the heritage fabric of the HCAs. In the case of Hamilton South HCA the intrusion of some second floor rooflines into the streetscape has impacted on the heritage quality of the location. There is a need for all Council Officers and any professional involved in planning approvals to be aware and involved in upholding the planning provisions underpinning the HVAs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Each Heritage Conservation Area has its own individual characteristics which is not covered by a one size fits all approach. The above survey points should be high priority to protect the heritage fabric in each different zone and to provide guidance &amp; certainty for individual owners, prospective owners, Council and the wider community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is imperative that the low density zoning in the conservation area be retained. Demolition in all the inner suburbs surrounding the Hamilton South Heritage Area is proceeding at an alarming rate. Replacement buildings of blue board and cocked hat flat roofs is destroying the character of the original suburbs. This trend makes the preservation of the Hamilton South Heritage Conservation Area even more critical in retaining the ambience of the inner city.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NA</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If more out of character developments are allowed the heritage character of the whole area will be lost. Considering the closeness to Tudor and Parry St and the St Francis Xavier high school and TAFE, more over or poor development in this area may well lead to the creation of an inner city ghetto, losing the current feeling of a well kept and connected community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do Pull Down or removal Cave should be Placed on all Items in the HCA area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whatever outcome of the zoning examination it is extremely important to maintain and even extend (where possible) the open space availability. The health outcomes of residents is enhanced by the availability of open space. Once open space is lost it will never be replaced. Cities throughout the world are often recommended to visitors because of the open spaces that are available.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction in Newcastle was &quot;fast tracked&quot; by the previous Council and seemingly at the expense of future sustainable town planning. Its time to take a good look at just how many apartments Newcastle can reasonably accommodate and prevent this sprawl from impinging on neighbouring residential zones.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I would potentially agree but I would need to understand the implications of this proposal. What are the land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>Neither</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additional comments

At the close of the survey, participants were asked if there were any further comments they would like to make. All comments are shown in Appendix II.

Where to from here

- Identify areas where this feedback can be incorporated into the final document.
Appendix I - questionnaire
Heritage Survey: Public Exhibition

The Heritage Conservation Area report presents the findings of a review of five heritage conservation areas (hereafter referred to as HCAs) across the Newcastle Local Government Area.

The purpose of the review was to;

- define the current heritage significance of each area,
- produce desired future character statements,
- assess the appropriateness of boundaries,
- examine the development control framework and the relevant planning context,
- identify what items contribute to or detract from each area,
- understand what the community values about these areas.
- investigate the potential for new HCAs or extensions to existing HCAs.

The draft report is currently on public exhibition to gain community feedback. This survey looks at the particular proposals for each HCA. Your feedback will be considered in the development of the final draft which will go to Council for review and then put on public exhibition.

Here are a few terms to keep in mind while leaving your feedback...

**Contributory:** a building or feature that positively reinforces or reflects the character or the heritage significance of the HCA

**Non-contributory:** a building or feature that detracts from the character or the heritage significance of the HCA

**LEP:** Local Environmental Plan - the statutory landuse planning instrument


**HCA:** Heritage Conservation Area
Your details will be used for nothing further than ensuring that the survey is not compromised with multiple completions. All data provided will be sorted by heritage conservation area.

Name:

Address:

☐ Prefer not to disclose

Which areas do you wish to make comment on? (*multiple response permitted*)

☐ Cooks Hill
☐ Hamilton South Garden Suburb
☐ Hamilton Beaumont Street
☐ The Hill
☐ Newcastle East
☐ Proposed Hamilton residential area
☐ Proposed Glebe Road cottages

The survey is divided into sections for each of the above 7 areas to allow comment to be made per area.

Please complete only the sections corresponding to those you have selected above.

Finally there is a section for all survey participants - please completed this section in addition to the area-specific sections.

THANK YOU
Cooks Hill

For more information please refer to Chapter Two of the Review of Heritage Conservation Areas draft report.

Do you own or rent property in the Cooks Hill HCA?

☐ Own
☐ Rent
☐ Other:

Property type

Select all that apply.

☐ Resident
☐ Business owner
☐ Other:

Proposed changes to Cooks Hill Heritage Conservation Area:

- **Expand the HCA area:** The HCA review has assessed an area to the east of the current Cooks Hill boundaries (around Anzac Parade, Bingle and High Streets) and found this area to have heritage significance.

- **Removal from the HCA area:** The review found a part of Darby Street between Parry and Tooke Streets to be so compromised it should be excluded from the HCA.
To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Not sure/not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Cooks Hill HCA should be extended to include portions of Anzac and Kitchener Parades.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darby Street, between Parry and Tooke Street, should be removed from the heritage conservation area.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you have any further comments to make about these recommendations?
Hamilton South Garden Suburb

For more information please refer to Chapter three of the Review of Heritage Conservation Areas draft report.

Do you own or rent property in the Hamilton South Garden Suburb HCA?

☐ Own
☐ Rent
☐ Other:

Property type

Select all that apply.

☐ Resident
☐ Business owner
☐ Other:

Proposed changes to Hamilton South Garden Suburb Heritage Conservation Area:

- **Removal from the HCA area**: Change the boundary at Glebe Road - Heritage significance is compromised by inappropriate development in some sections of Glebe Road.

- **Expand the HCA area**: There is merit in extending the boundary of the HCA to include parts of Denison Street, Parkway Avenue and Ada Street. These streets have been identified to have local heritage significance on historic and aesthetic grounds, with a number of contributory items identified.

- **Change to LEP**: Consideration of listing Parkway Avenue as a heritage item in the LEP. This is proposed to protect the significant physical and visual presence of Parkway Avenue to minimise any loss of intactness or erosion of this landscape and roadway feature.

- **Update to Heritage technical manual**: Resources should be obtained to produce specific updated guidelines, including enforceable envelope controls, for inclusion in the Heritage Technical Manual. This aims to prevent undesirable trends that could erode the significance of the HCA if no action is taken to address the issue.
To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Not sure/not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The removal of part of Glebe Road from the boundary of Hamilton South Garden Suburb HCA</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The inclusion of a part of Denison Street and Ada Street in Hamilton East in the Hamilton South Garden Suburb</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkway Avenue should be included as a landscape heritage item in Schedule 5 of the Newcastle LEP</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific guidelines for alterations and additions to be prepared and included in the Heritage Technical Manual</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you have any further comments to make about these recommendations?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hamilton Business Centre Heritage Conservation Areas

For more information please refer to Chapter four of the Review of Heritage Conservation Areas draft report.

Do you own or rent property in the Hamilton Business Centre HCA?

☐ Own
☐ Rent
☐ Other:

Property type

Select all that apply.

☐ Resident
☐ Business owner
☐ Other:

Proposed changes to Hamilton Business Centre Heritage Conservation Area:

- Heritage significance is compromised in this HCA by infill development and loss of intactness overall.
- Consideration of potential new heritage items in the Newcastle LEP: Undertake heritage assessment of sandstone kerb and gutters in Beaumont Street for possible consideration as a heritage item of local significance.
To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Not sure/not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton Beaumont Street should be delisted as a HCA</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The sandstone kerb and gutters in Beaumont Street should be heritage listed.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you have any further comments to make about these recommendations?


The Hill

For more information please refer to Chapter five of the Review of Heritage Conservation Areas draft report.

Do you own or rent property in The Hill HCA?

- Own
- Rent
- Other:

Property type

Select all that apply.

- Resident
- Business owner
- Other:

Proposed changes to The Hill Heritage Conservation Area:

- **Expand the HCA area**: The HCA review has assessed an area of Federation and Inter War houses at Anzac/ Kitchener Parade, Bingle and High Streets. This review has re-assessed the area and finds certain streets are considered worthy of statutory listing as HCA.
To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The boundary of The Hill HCA should be extended to include parts of Kitchener Parade, Anzac, Bingle and High Streets.</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Not sure/not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you have any further comments to make about these recommendations?
Proposed Hamilton Residential Area

For more information please refer to Chapter seven of the Review of Heritage Conservation Areas draft report.

Do you own or rent property in the Proposed Hamilton Residential Area HCA?

- Own
- Rent
- Other:

Property type

Select all that apply.

- Resident
- Business owner
- Other:

Proposed changes to the Hamilton Residential Heritage Conservation Area:

- **Expand the HCA area**: The residential precinct immediately east of the Beaumont St Business Area HCA is an intact precinct of Victorian and early Federation period houses. This review identified numerous contributory buildings and street trees of heritage value and has assessed this area as being of local heritage significance.

- **Consideration of potential new heritage items in the Newcastle LEP**: Undertake heritage assessment of properties 32, 34 and 18 Gordon Avenue Hamilton as heritage items of local significance.
To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The proposed Hamilton residential area should be included in the Newcastle LEP as a Heritage Conservation Area</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Not sure/not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The heritage significance of properties at 32, 34 and 18 Gordon Avenue Hamilton should be assessed to determine if they should be listed as heritage items in the Newcastle LEP.</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Not sure/not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you have any further comments to make about these recommendations?
Proposed Glebe Road The Junction cottages
For more information please refer to Chapter seven of the Review of Heritage Conservation Areas draft report.

Do you own or rent property in the Proposed Glebe Road The Junction cottages HCA?

☐ Own
☐ Rent
☐ Other:

Property type
Select all that apply.

☐ Resident
☐ Business owner
☐ Other:

Proposed changes to the Glebe Road The Junction Cottages Heritage Conservation Area:
- **Create a new HCA for the area:** Glebe Road group (55-75 Glebe Road) has sufficient heritage significance to justify conservation. This would involve the making of a heritage conservation area.
- **Updates:** Locality specific development controls would need to be produced to facilitate the preservation of the dwellings in this area.
To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Not sure/not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A new heritage conservation area should be established to include all of the properties 55 to 75 Glebe Road, The Junction.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A locality specific set of development guidelines should be prepared to protect the single storey character of the potential new HCA.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you have any further comments to make about these recommendations?
Newcastle East

Do you own or rent property in the Newcastle East HCA?

☐ Own
☐ Rent
☐ Other:

Property type

Select all that apply.

☐ Resident
☐ Business owner
☐ Other:

Proposed Updates:

Do you have any further comments to make about these recommendations?
For all of the Areas

Proposals:

- **Further review**: Zoning was not within the scope of this review, however the need to analyse the zones in HCAs is recognised.

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Not sure/not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>That Council should examine the applicable land use zones and zone objectives in each HCA</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That analysis of the zones should be high priority.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you have any further comments to make about these recommendations?


Do you have any additional comments?


Appendix II - Verbatim comments
Property_type_Other:. Do you own or rent property in the Cooks Hill Heritage Conservation Area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbatim Responses</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing provided</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am interested in this area</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGA ratepayer and resident</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neither</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non resident</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkway Ave resident</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>user</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Property_type_2_Other:. Are you a resident or business owner?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbatim Responses</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am interested in this area</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landlord</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGA ratepayer and resident</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neither</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>own rental property</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>visitor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OE_recommendations. Do you have any further comments to make about these recommendations?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbatim Responses</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Any future proposals for development of the area on Darby Street between Parry and Tooke Street should fit in with the heritage conservation area. One has to question how these developments were</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
approved with the Cooks Hill Conservation Area in place!!

As a resident of parkway ave for the past 16 years I value the quiet nature of the area. The last thing I want is increased traffic flow along the street this will impact our lifestyle and property values.

I believe that the northern side of Nesca Pde between Brooks St and Kitchener Pde should also be included. This strip of the street until very recently was a strip of significant character - weatherboard and brick bungalows from the early 20th century. It was an attractive streetscape with real heritage appeal and interest. In the last two years two properties have been demolished and very modern houses that have been designed with no consideration for the existing streetscape have been built. It is important that this trend does not continue in the street.

I think in the case of the Darby St/area , with the exclusion of St John's Church etc is developed with no particular advantage to the conservation area any more. I do think that the Anzac Pde and Kitchener Pde should be included.

Nil

No. No heritage area should be reduced. That just plays into the hands of the unscrupulous.

The developments approved on Darby Street compromise the HCA by their bulk and their impact on on street parking in the vicinity. In my view changes at the edge of HCAs contribute to the erosion of streetscape values and add pressure on Council to enable changes within the HCA itself.

The HCA between Centennial park and Darby St was in reasonable shape before the Soviet era inspired concrete bomb shelter was recently erected behind 139-143 Dawson st. Either pull it down or cover it with something like vertical gardens to make it conform to the HCA that it was supposed to be subject to. If these are not options then:

1 Someone’s nuts should be on the line for permitting the travesty of a future slum nucleus to be built the way it was
2 Excise the Dawson st lots whose heritage values have been seriously degraded by that development from the HCA, as well as the Darby St section.

the inclusion of this area will only cause unnecessay restriction and more paper work to complete renovations or repairs to my properties.

it will also risk a reduction in the value of my properties with no consequent benefit

the surrounding cooks hill area has ample HCA, agree with the decision to remove the main street CA and let businesses adapt to modern trends and growth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HS_Property_type_Other:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you own or rent property in the Hamilton South Garden Suburb Heritage Conservation Area?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbatim Responses</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Own property On Parkway ave</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>considering owning</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS_Property_type_2_Other: Are you a resident or business owner?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Verbatim Responses</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>considering residing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am interested in the area</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invested party</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landlord</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGA resident and ratepayer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>local resident</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neither</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reside the junction</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resident</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OE_recommendationsCopy1. Do you have any further comments to make about these recommendations?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbatim Responses</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEAVE THE MEDIAN STRIP IN PARKWAY AVE AS IS, WE NEED SOME GREEN SPACE, AS FAR AS TRAFFIC SIDE GOES, THE STEWART AVE LIGHTS NEED TO BE ON LONGER FOR RIGHT HAND TURNS EACH WAY, THE BANK UP OF TRAFFIC ONLY LAST TILL SCHOOL STUDENTS ARRIVE AT S.F.C. GOING EAST TO GRAMMER SCHOOL AND TOWN THERE IS MORE TRAVELLING THAT WAY. ANY CHANGES TO THESE BOUNDARY’S WE NEED TO BE GIVEN PLENTY OF NOTICE.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A once beautiful Newcastle icon is being transformed into a high density raceway. Modern urban design thinking strongly suggests the car is not the future and yet we continue to cater to this. Time to think back to what is beauty and how to increase it or at least maintain what we have. After listening to the presentation from council, I still cant understand why an area with contributing houses would be removed. My concerns are as follows Parking, Storm water, flooding, Traffic management and the effect on Cram street, street scape. I am strongly against removing the Glebe rd area from the heritage area. All building approval should adhere to strict heritage building guidelines in order to preserve heritage areas. The beautiful streetscape of Parkway Avenue should be preserved as it is one aspect of Newcastle Heritage that defines Newcastle as the city that it is. As a resident of Parkway Avenue I strongly object to any changes that would bring additional traffic to this street or reduce the asthetic of the current width of the medium strip and the beauty of existing trees. In fact I would promote additional streetscaping involving additional tree plantings and gardens to enhance this avenue towards its original design - as a generous green corridor. Turning it into a busier road would have a significant and detrimental impacts on residents incuding increased noise levels,loss of asthetic, negative impact on heritage areas either side of Parkway Ave, higher risk of road accidents (car and pedestrian) and a downgrade in the sense of community as residents would be less likely to spend time in their front yards/verges if it were a busy road. These negatives would also reduce property values which is significant to me as I moved here 4 years ago to take advantage of the current environment and streetscape. I would therefore be disadvantaged be losing these advantages and losing property value. I strongly object to making Parkway Ave a busier street and support it being listed on the LEP. AS a resident of the Garden Suburb my whole life, I feel it would be detrimental to reduce the size of the median strip in Parkway Avenue. Having grown up in Parkway Avenue and having now bought in Hebburn street, part of the appeal to this area was the trees and parks, not seen like this anywhere else in Newcastle. My objection to the proposed boundary changes are as follows.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. The proposed boundary changes will lead to rezoning and redevelopment in Glebe Road which will allow buildings of much greater height and density. This will be totally out of character with the existing homes in the HCA.

2. High buildings will overview out homes and outdoor areas, this will lead to a loss of privacy in the rear of our homes.

3. The streetscape as seen from the street and homes in Cram Street and National Park Street will be adversely impacted by increased heights and densities.

4. Increased densities will lead to drainage and flooding problems in Cram Street. Glebe Road and Turnbull Street drain into Cram Street due to their higher elevation. Cram Street has a very long history of flooding in heavy rain.

5. Parking will be increased in Cram Street due to increased densities. Parking is restricted in Glebe Road so excess parking from new residents and visitors will overflow into Cram Street and National Park Street.

6. The above detrimental effects will make this area much less appealing to home owners. Downgrading of our amenity and homes will impact on the integrity of this part of the HCA. This will flow on to other parts of the HCA over time.

Do not alter Parkway Ave or its median strip at all. We are under strict rules about what alterations, extensions, fences and even garage doors that we can have in this heritage area so under NO circumstances can the heritage streetscape of Parkway Ave be altered as it is the main feature of this heritage area.

Do not widen Parkway Avenue. I live in Parkway Ave, have young children and do not want any more traffic along this road. I bought here because it is not a major road and changing this will impact on our enjoyment of living here and would negatively impact property values.

Do not wish to see Parkway Avenue Hamilton changed in any manner whatsoever. The median strip is a delightful and essential part of Hamilton and surrounds.

Essential to maintain landscape heritage of Parkway Ave. (Traffic control needed ++)

Every city must have an identity and an integral part of its identity shows a blend of valued heritage areas and the need to be progressive. A progressive approach is to preserve the integrity of heritage areas and manage the somewhat"sneaky" erosion of valuable heritage areas.
As a community we need to ensure the proposed boundaries of heritage areas are managed sensitively.

I live in the Hamilton South Garden Suburb precinct and find the lack of traffic control to be a major concern to the integrity and amenity of this highly regarded residential area.

I recently hosted a visitor from Minnesota USA who remarked about the attractiveness of the Norfolk Pine lined Parkway Avenue.

Former Town Planner advised me personally that he had personally sought through detailed analysis that the grassed verged separating Parkway Avenue and the Norfolk Island Tree species had been gazetted by the NSW Government.

Furthermore, this area should and does fall within the BURRA charter. The trees and the lineal form of Parkway Avenue were designed to provide clear lineal indicators to other significant landmarks including the city's Obelisk and provide directions to visitors/tourists to the CBD and the harbour foreshore area. It is also a significant part of the historical drive that leads to our beach areas.

It is interesting to note that a Heritage Architect is to be commissioned to aid Council in the decision making process, critically relevant to that should be a parallel commission of a reputable Heritage Landscape Architect that Council deemed important enough to ask me as principal designer for Newcastle Christ Church Cathedral to seek such expert (Heritage Landscape Architect) to determine our DA and CC application for the cathedral.

The area is classed as a 'Garden Suburb' the issues relating to Landscape and existing hardscape/softscapes plantings trees and Heritage impact DO NOT fall within the ambit of a General Heritage Architect - that is why there is two separate disciplines in Architecture. Please involve the appropriate expert for Heritage Garden issues that incorporate the important protection of this highly heritage significant grassed/tree verge separating Parkway Avenue Hamilton South.

I agree with the Review of Heritage Conservation Areas Draft Report in that Parkway Avenue should be listed as a heritage item in Newcastle LEP 2012 because it is a fundamental surviving element of Sulman’s Garden Suburb design. The Avenue with its generous median and plantings of Norfolk pines are central to the suburb’s street pattern and should be protected from potential changes to street design and functionality. Parkway Avenue is the highest in the order of streets in Hamilton South and should be left intact to protect the visible evidence of Newcastle’s efforts to grow out of its coal mining town beginnings into the diverse City it is today. The Garden Suburb principles that the Avenue exemplifies, contributes to the City’s prosperity and generosity.

I am very please and supportive that the Council is adopting a positive and proactive to heritage planning and guidelines.

I don't believe that the fact that inappropriate development has occurred in Glebe road is a reason to move the boundary. This would place at risk what we see from our back yard. (3 Cram st). Leaving it as is maintains a logical boundary at one side Glebe road and may lead to future sympathetic development. I also think it's a backward step to water down the rules that have been in place for 20 years.
I haven't commented on the heritage technical manual but do think that any clarification between "guidelines" and rules is probably a good thing. We were able to do what I believe was a suitable extension without issue.

I would be very happy to discuss my views further if required. Thanks you.

I don't want to see Parkway avenue altered in any way. Reducing the size of the median strip would spoil the beauty of the avenue and rob the area of its distinctive character. I can't believe that this would even be considered as it is such a long-standing and beloved part of Hamilton South and surrounds.

I have been a resident of this area for the past 6 years. This is a stunning original area of Hamilton with houses dating back well over 100 years. The loss of several houses of this era has recently occurred in Dennison which saw well over 50 objections to this loss occur. This demonstrates the communities love of our area and its heritage value. Our block in particular is one of the last remaining intact historic blocks of Parkway Ave. Our houses have histories with the beginning of the AA Company in this area. Preserving this history only adds to the history of our community as a whole.

I have lived in Parkway Avenue for over 50 years and throughout that time it has been a beautiful avenue in the true sense of the word forming a centerpiece for what is now the garden suburb. Even though the council no longer maintains the many garden beds which are now buried under grass or full of dying hibiscus it still forms a graceful corridor from the centre of town to the beach. This tree-lined avenue and its maintenance in its current form (single lane carriageway) is vital if this area is to reflect its name as the Garden Suburb. Beyond this it is a unique and beautiful feature within the city, one we should care for and protect in its current form.

I strongly appose any change to the median in Parkway Ave. Parkway Avenue has been the main town-planning feature of this area since my family first moved here in 1957. Most of the houses are in close-to-original prospect from what I can remember as a child way back then. The main part of this is the very wide gorgeous green median that runs the full length which even looks better without the oleandads that were there in the 1950s. Any reduction in the size of the median for things like turning lanes at Stewart/Parkway lights can be done just as well by re-routing the bicycle route to quieter streets like Jenner Parade to cross Stewart Ave at the pedestrian lights at Alexander St and thereby have a full 2 lanes of traffic at the Stewart/Parkway lights (we live on that corner). The cycleway can then follow Alexander and Beaumont to the Racecourse and Dumaresq St. Any proposal for light rail along Parkway is crazy - if trams come south they should go to The Junction (servicing Bar Beach) and on to Merewether or Dixon Park Beaches and then back along Gordon Avenue and Denison St to Wickham.

I strongly believe that Parkway Avenue should be left as is, no change should be made to the current size of the median strip.

If the area on Glebe road was to be removed and high density accommodation built on the site I am concerned about Stormwater drainage from those properties to those within the Heritage area, shading of dwellings in Cram Street, increased traffic and noise to dwellings in Cram Street, and the impact on the character and setting of the streetscape looking towards the south side of Cram Street. There is also concern that any new buildings on the Glebe road site would not be in keeping.
with the building form, scale, roof scale, and in keeping with other notable features of the area.

In these areas the existing streetscape ought to be maintained. There are other, more appropriate, areas suitable for development.

Isn't the Ada St section where they've just knocked down 4 houses???

Its vital Parkway Ave remains an important feature of the Hamilton South Garden Suburb and this must be reflected by the inclusion in the LEP as an item of significant value to Heritage conservation plan.

Just that I think it is important to protect the heritage value of the area and reduce the impact of extensions.

Newcastle has so few beautiful avenues, why destroy one now. It's a wonderful access area to some of Newcastle's prime attractions such as the beach, the ANZAC memorial walk and King Edward Park.

Not only should Parkway Avenue be included in the Newcastle LEP, it should also be brought back to how it was in its early years with the inclusion of gardens on the central median strip. After all, it is classified as the 'Garden Suburb' of Newcastle. Let's show the world what can be done. Maybe this can be done with the NCC working close with the property owners, and possibly getting them involved in some of the streetscape/garden upkeep.

The Avenue also has the potential to become one of Newcastle's premier Christmas attraction by installing lighting in the Norfolk Island pines from Hamilton to Bar Beach. Imagine the 'sea of lights' as you drive down Parkway Avenue at Christmas. Again this could be done by the NCC, with the help of the residents of the area.

Parkway Ave is one of the grand boulevards of Newcastle and should be protected.

Parkway Ave is and must remain as a landscape heritage item in the LEP it holds the Hamilton South Garden Suburb together and establishes this area with beauty and must remain for all citizens of Newcastle and surrounds. The key importance is the Norfolk pines and the wide grassed strip to define this lovely garden strip. Without Parkway Avenue remaining as is there would be no defined Hamilton South Garden Suburb heritage Area. please preserve this wonderful avenue as it has historically been intended it holds such significant value to the Heritage Conservation Plan.

Parkway Ave is and must remain as a landscape heritage item in the LEP it holds the Hamilton South Garden Suburb together and establishes this area with beauty and must remain for all citizens of Newcastle and surrounds. The key importance is the Norfolk pines, the wide grassed strip to define and attracts the wildlife (cockatoos) historically garden beds were also along the Avenue as well providing extra beauty to the garden strip. Without Parkway Avenue remaining as is there would be no defined Hamilton South Garden Suburb heritage Area. please preserve this wonderful avenue as it has historically been intended.

Parkway Ave is one of the grand boulevards of Newcastle and should be protected especially those green median strips and norfolk island pines … it is an iconic street of Newcastle.

Parkway Ave is the last of the wide avenues with mature trees providing a pleasant vista to drive down. I wish to protect this picturesque avenue as far as possible.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thanks</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parkway Ave must be included in the Ncle LEP to preserve the median strip for it's heritage significance, and keep the area as it is meant to be.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkway Ave with its green and wooded divide is a unique feature of area part of Newcastle. If there are plans to widen the thoroughfare, consideration must be given to the fact that there are two large schools on this road with many students having vehicles these days. The confusion and congestion before and after school times is already quite dangerous, and this would be exacerbated by increased traffic flows and speed.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkway avenue has one of the most enduring features of suburban Newcastle in the long median strip and the Norfolk pine trees. It is a heritage of grand planning dating back to post WW1 and the early 1920's. There are 3 schools along its length and it has many years of efforts to calm traffic in what is already a neighbourhood zone. It was a travesty when the traffic lights were so poorly constructed at Stewart avenue causing traffic chaos on a regular basis. The streets were never meant to be feeder roads and never designed to be the next main road parallel to Glebe and King streets. There should be less traffic not more, if anything add a proper 'cycles only' cycle path instead.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkway Avenue in its current form (wide median and substantial/aged pine trees) provides significant landscaped heritage qualities. From Hamilton South to Bar Beach the avenue should be protected and included in the LEP.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkway Avenue is a major feature of Hamilton South, with its greenscape and Norfolk Island Pines being a significant value to the Heritage Conservation Plan. It also gives the area a sense of space within an area that is becoming densely populated.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkway Avenue is a Newcastle landmark and I strongly support the proposal to have it listed as a landscape heritage item to protect this wonderful thoroughfare.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkway Avenue is a unique streetscape in the city of Newcastle and has considerable environmental and aesthetic importance to all Novocastrians. Heritage and Conservation is not only about buildings but also about preserving our environment from the ever increasing construction of hard surfaces which place greater stress on our trees and grassed areas. Over time both Stewart and Gordon Avenues have lost their medians to vehicular traffilis priority. Due to poor road planning Gordon Avenue no longer safely links with the current road system and so attracts very little traffic. Case in point: That median should never have been removed. Parkway Avenue should be protected from the same fate and priority listed without further alteration to the LEP.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkway Avenue is a vital and important part of the Hamilton South Garden Suburb, it has been forever the Norfolk Pines are majestic and the native birds such as cockatoos on this strip are a daily morning and afternoon occurrence please keep parkway Ave in the LEP for historical and environmental and heritage significant No not change this</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkway Avenue is a vitally important feature of Hamilton South Garden Suburb and this should be reflected by inclusion in the LEP as an item of huge significant value to Heritage Conservation Plan. This should not be altered in any way.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Parkway Avenue is an amazing street that should be protected from development. It is well known by visitors from all over the area, enjoyed by the residents for its style and the median strip wonderful for minimising the noise of traffic.

Parkway Avenue is an iconic feature of Newcastle and should retain its heritage features.

Parkway Avenue is an important feature of the Hamilton South Garden Suburb and this be reflected by inclusion in the LEP as an item of significant value to the Heritage Conservation Plan.

Parkway Avenue is the last remaining intact boulevard in the original Garden Suburb plan. Its impressive streetscape, and relatively unspoiled architectural development makes it a unique and imposing icon, well worthy of preservation and listing on the State Heritage register.

Whilst residents have previously stated their strong desire to preserve the form of Parkway Ave, RMS are currently planning to encroach on the central median to allow more more traffic to flow through the Heritage Area. Construction work would certainly endanger the root systems of the magnificent Norfolk Island pines, and allow the diesel and petrol exhaust fumes emanating from trucks to discharge directly into the tree canopies causing distress and likely permanent damage. RMS should be more concerned with the safety aspects of encouraging more traffic past the three large schools, and resident amenity and access to their properties. and taking measures to divert traffic away from Parkway Avenue. There appears to be little communication between RMS and Council in this matter.

The recent and sudden demolition of all of the remaining properties in Denison St appears highly coincidental and worthy of investigation.

Parkway Avenue should be included in the LEP within the HSCA.

Parkway Avenues grassed median and Pine trees are a unique residential feature of genuine heritage conservation significance to the entire City of Newcastle. This architecturally designed promenade was a key component in the landscape planning of the Hamilton South Garden Suburb. Originally Including lovely flowerbeds (we lived here at the time) the significance of the term Garden Suburb' is closely linked to features such as this. With constant pressure from traffic and building construction it is encumbered upon us as Historical custodians to take measures to protect This Avenue of aesthetically pleasing lines and greenery and acknowledge prominent role it plays in the City. The Novocastrians Parkway Avenue is synonymous with beautiful tree lined street.

Parkway is an important feature of the Hamilton East area and should be reflected by inclusion in the LEP as an item of significant value to heritage conservation in the area.

Please Parkway Avenue must be included in the LEP as an item of huge and immense importance to the heritage conservation plan the value is priceless to this area.

Protect our heritage and beauty of the area and especially Park way ave .. No more traffic should be funnelled down it.

Re inclusion of Parkway Avenue as a heritage item, I am particularly interested in ensuring there is no loss of median area or trees due to road widening or addition of turn pockets etc.
I also quote the draft report p.40: “The existing appearance, form and function of Parkway Avenue, including the road verges, street trees, bridge abutments at Cottage Creek, and the central median that splits the carriageway into two single lane roads”.

I have a concern that Parkway Avenue westbound between National Park and Stewart has become a de facto two lane road. Please take action to return this section of Parkway to a single lane of traffic.

Re proposed new area for Ada St and Denison St:
- Zoning was changed from Residential to Mixed Use Medium Density in 2012, no residents were aware of change, therefore there was no effective public consultation
- First we knew of zoning change was when the current Denison St development was proposed; there were over 50 submissions from the public against it - most feeling it was out of character
- Following the earthquake houses had to be rebuilt in residential style sympathetic to heritage, why change this attitude?
- Re the block between Ada and Parkway; 7 of 8 houses are owner occupied; 3 houses were built for the Australian Agricultural Company circa 1890 and all are well maintained (the area is older than Hamilton Sth, I have a photo from 1910 showing Parkway did not exist as a road);
- Many residents have spent a lot upgrading properties sympathetic to heritage concerns
- There are many fine heritage properties in Denison St as well, as well as the nearby Ambulance Station and TAFE, which are both heritage listed
- The character of the area is at a tipping point due to decision to change to medium density mixed use, and the subsequent development in Denison St, which is completely out of character. This needs to be overturned, else the heritage character of this area, which is far older than Hamilton South, will be lost.
- In my view, the houses on Denison St between Ada St and Parry St should be added as well. All the properties are residential style and many are pre 1930. E.G. The house on corner of Ada and Denison is also circa 1890

Re: Parkway Avenue
It absolutely should be included as a landscape heritage item in Schedule 5 of the Newcastle LEP. NCC’s draft report supports this view with numerous references to it being “...the most enduring aspect...of the area...”

Previous heritage studies “…recommend the heritage listing of Parkway Avenue...as (a) heritage item...”

“Elements that are to be preserved include the existing appearance, form and function of Parkway Avenue, including the road verges, street trees....and the central median that splits the carriageway into two single lane roads”.

Based on the above quote from NCC's own reports, I fail to see any viable option other than including Parkway Avenue as a landscape heritage item in Schedule 5 of the Newcastle LEP.

NCC / RMS (whoever is responsible) are currently complicit in eroding the heritage significance of this thoroughfare. It is a collector road, not a sub-arterial road. The signalisation of the junction with
Stewart Avenue accelerated this process and NCC / RMS continue to ignore residents concerns. Vehicle weight limits are never enforced, the traffic calming measures (speed humps / 40km/h zone, redirection of traffic flow along Smith St) never materialised with no feedback from NCC. The median strip continues to be damaged by illegally parked cars during winter weekends.

If NCC are serious about protecting THE most enduring aspect of the Hamilton South Garden Suburb HCA, they MUST act now and enforce the rules.

Removal of the foundry in Glebe road from the hamilton south Garden suburb HCA would be catastrophic for the existing residences of the surrounding area. The only person who would benefit from this is the person who brought the property on glebe road where Merewether smash repairs previously was. My property boarders this property and I would be the most disadvantaged in the area. Having renovated our home within the guidelines of the heritage area and at great expense we should be protected by inappropriate/unsympathetic developments. The impact on traffic, parking, noise, loss of value of our property and the destruction of our lifestyle would be unthinkable. Council planning dept has been lacking by its own admission and has already allowed inappropriate development/renovations in the heritage area but this must stop. This could open the flood gates for potential high density development of up to 4 storeys. Common sence should prevail and this MUST NOT GO AHEAD.

Removal of the part on Glebe Road would allow for multi-storey buildings to be built along this section. This would impact on the streetscape of Cram Street significantly, which would mean that views from the street on Cram Street would no longer be in keeping with the Heritage Conservation Area requirements.

Residents in the Hamilton South Garden Suburb HCA have made significant investment in restoration and maintenance of their homes in keeping with the provisions of the heritage conservation plan for the suburb. Any change to the perimeter of the HCA will erode this process as well as impacting on the privacy and amenity of residents who have planned the back yard areas of their properties to highlight family and social recreation. A rezoning along Glebe Road raises the prospect of these areas being overlooked.

The removal of Glebe Road properties from the HCA has the potential to seriously impact on the character, safety and facility of the residents of Cram and National Park Streets. Any intensification of development on Glebe Road will also impact on the drainage to Cram Street which has experienced serious flooding issues in the past. Cram Street takes storm drainage from Glebe Road and Turnbull Street. A significant increase in building coverage and hard surface on the Glebe Road properties would greatly increase flooding potential in Cram Street. Parking restrictions on Glebe Road already cause increased parking on Cram Street. This would be increased by any change in development density on Glebe Road.

My survey of properties shows that the majority of households in that area have kept their housing within the concepts of the HCA. From Smith Street to National Park Street six original houses have been restored in keeping with the HCA and one left unrestored. Three new houses have been built outside the concepts of the HCA. In the Glebe Road section beyond National Park Street four houses retain the fabric and
The concept of the HCA and one has been redeveloped out of sympathy with The HCA. The Glebe Road frontage forms an integral part of the HCA and should be left intact. Five properties abutting the corner of Smith and National Park Street form a neighbourhood commercial precinct. Any redevelopment of the commercial premises should be constrained to the current footprint to retain its neighbourhood focus.

Since Parkway was an original avenue in the setup of the Garden Suburb concept it should always be retained / conserved for its absolute heritage value.

Strong guidelines that Council will enforce and support is crucial to ensure no further erosion of properties in the area to non contributory status. In the past Council has entertained such development proposals and surrounding residents have needed to campaign against such undesirable development applications. Bottom line Council must actively promote and support its own heritage guidelines.

Strongly oppose removal of part of Glebe Road from boundary of Hamilton South HCA.

The affected residents campaigned very hard recently to limit the development on Denison St because it did not fit in with the design of the area and a number of other issues whereby it did not comply with area requirements. Now this development has been approved and houses have been demolished to make way for modern residential and business development, that council has now decided to make it a heritage area that would have prevented this development from occurring. This is crazy and smacks of hypocrisy. The timing is impeccable! I will suspect the affected residents that are affected will again campaign very hard to prevent this ludicrous rezoning from occurring.

The area of Denison and Ada St complement the area already heritage listed. Beautiful buildings along Denison and the block of Ada and Parkway being the oldest in the area.

Consideration should also be given to Denison St between Parkway and Parry St as it has a high degree of continuity, with 11 of the 13 houses on the north side original. And the south side showing how medical suits had to be built in keeping with the street scene following the earthquake. Which is now part of the Newcastle heritage.

Denison once was a grand street and with some love this could be returned.

The entire length of Parkway Avenue has historic relevance. As one of the suburbs main streets it is visually pleasing, creating a sense of space and a park-like feeling. Its central strip of Norfolk Island Pines is environmentally important contributing to air quality (helping balance the increasing traffic pollution) and supporting a variety of bird life. Parkway Avenue and Hamilton garden suburb, as they exist today, should be included in the LEP and as such would remain true to the designers original aspirations.

The Grass Median in Parkway Avenue must be maintained in order to preserve the original plan for the Garden Suburb. Council should also abide by the concept of a ‘Garden Suburb’ and disallow the removal of trees which provide shade and a healthy environment. Council should not allow the area to become a concrete jungle with out of proportion areas of concrete which do not allow for drainage or absorption. Considering the rates which residents pay, the Council should not allow the Garden Suburb environment to be destroyed. It is a fitting entry path to the beaches and coastline and a city
The Hamilton South Garden Suburb HCA is highly valued & strongly supported by residents within the area. This is reflected in the excellent condition of the properties within the HCA and the high resale value when properties are sold.

The heritage classification has given owners, & potential owners greater certainty that the heritage character of the area will be respected & preserved and that unsympathetic development will not be permissible. This confidence is reflected in the quality of property maintenance & in the respectful way that the character of the dwellings, their surrounds & the streetscape has been honoured during maintenance, renovations, restorations and additions on the housing stock within the HCA.

I strongly object to the removal of part of Glebe Road from the Hamilton South Garden Suburb HCA. The majority of the houses in this section of Glebe Road are still intact as originally constructed and still reflect the character & streetscape of the HCA.

If this area of Glebe Road is rezoned the current properties & land in Glebe Road will be subject to redevelopment. Existing properties & open space will be destroyed & replaced by buildings of much greater height & density & a totally different character to that of the HCA.

These changes will degrade the quality & amenity of the properties behind them in Cram Street & National Park Street. Privacy will be destroyed by much taller properties overlooking both the curtilage & rooms at the rear of the existing dwellings in Cram & National Park Streets.

I have seen these detrimental effects caused by a Glebe Road redevelopment which looms over a neighbour's home in Cram Street. The pool, backyard & rear rooms in the neighbours property are totally overlooked by this unsympathetic two story development on the boundary fence thus reducing the amenity for the home owners & the resale potential of the affected property. This redevelopment happened prior to the declaration of the Hamilton South Garden Suburb HCA.

It is important for council to consider that residents within the HCA purchased their homes and have invested heavily in quality maintenance, restorations, renovations & additions which respected the heritage character of the area. Owners did so in the belief that they had the certainty of protection against detrimental redevelopment in their designated Heritage Conservation Area. Now it is proposed to change the rules. This will adversely impact on the capital asset of the property owners and the amenity of the affected residents.

Long standing drainage & flooding issues in Cram Street will be exacerbated by the increasing density & coverage of open space in Glebe Road which will occur with the proposed rezoning. Glebe Road is higher than Cram Street which has a long history of acting as a drainage detention basin for Glebe Road.

Parking will become much more of a problem due to increased numbers of occupants from higher density redevelopment in Glebe Road. Overflow parking will occur in Cram & National Parks Streets.
As our existing area has revitalised with younger families moving into the area there is much more on street parking in Cram & National Park Streets due to increasing levels of vehicle ownership. Because more family members have personal or work vehicles they need to park on the street.

Higher density will increase traffic management & safety issues as residents & visitors at the new dwellings will need to enter & exit onto

The landscape of Parkway Ave must be preserved as a gateway to the beach and should be protected as a heritage item.

The proposed removal from the Garden Suburb HCA of properties on Glebe Road between National Park and Smith Streets due to the buildings in this area being deemed of non-contributory to HCA is of great concern. The heritage significance of these particular properties is not relevant - it is the impact on the surrounding area that a change in the HCA boundary may have. That is, the removal of the HCA in effect makes way for the potential high density development which this area is currently protected from. The building mass, population density and inherent traffic issues from potential over-development will adversely affect the liveability of all surrounding residents who purchased in this area for the very benefits the Garden Suburb HCA currently provides. There is absolutely no good reason to remove this portion of Glebe Road from the HCA. Any future development of this portion of Glebe Road needs to be consistent with existing HCA of Hamilton South Garden Suburb.

The removal of the boundary directly impacts my property in that I live at [redacted]. The removal means that my property becomes the edge of the boundary. I am concerned about this change as it means that medium/high density housing could be built on my fence line overshadowing my property. I am already surrounded by 3 x 2 storey properties that overlook and overshadow my property. My recommendation is that a transitionary boundary (buffer zone) be proposed which limits what can be built around the edges of boundaries. This would address the issue of having a 5 storey apartment complex next to a single storey heritage house.

The RMS proposal to increase traffic flow along Parkway Ave by means of reduction of the size of the Parkway Ave median strip would greatly diminish the heritage value of the Hamilton South Garden Suburb.

The RMS proposal to increase traffic flow on Parkway Ave would greatly diminish the heritage value of the Hamilton South area.

The streetscape of Parkway Ave should remain as is and protected from any alterations under the Newcastle LEP. It is an important part of the original Garden Suburb.

The verge and trees must be protected in Parkway Ave.

There are very few areas in Newcastle that are as unique as parkway avenue for the architecture of the homes and the central garden and pine trees. It would be tragic if this was not conserved for future generations. I would trust that the council and local government would have the foresight to ensure this occurs.

There is a suggestion that RMS wish to narrow the Parkway Ave median strip to allow for more traffic flow along Parkway Ave. I strongly oppose this & I believe that Council should oppose this too. Such a development would greatly diminish the landscape heritage value of the Hamilton South
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Garden Suburb.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This area looks run down, assuming the HCA is removed, this area could be</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>revitalised by residents and council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This Heritage conservation plan will only benefit by Parkway Avenue</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>being included in the LEP. Parkway Avenue is a huge important and historical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>part of Hamilton South and it must remain that way including the majestic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk Pines that line this street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under no circumstances should the amenity of Parkway Ave be reduced to</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accommodate additional traffic. It is a residential area - not a major</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thoroughfare.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under no circumstances should the Glebe road boundary be altered. This</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>includes a church and church hall used by the community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have too many to enumerate here. Suffice to say since the introduction</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of the various HCAs there have been many non complying developments approved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on the boundaries and within the areas themselves by either clever words or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deceit. It would seem that there is one rule for the residents and one for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the developers. Why is it that compliance is only for those who cannot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>afford the costly legal challenges, which when they come from developers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council just caves in. Prime example is the disgusting Bimet development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>which really did not satisfy the HCA requirements of being on a boundary.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Glebe road area which it would seem may be excised from the HS HCA -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>why? Was there an application to remove this area. If so who applied? A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>person or entity?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The area should NOT be removed as it will only create a precedent for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peripheral areas along the HCAs (as with Bimet - but that fell under SEPP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>which of course is an out for Council)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As for Parkway Avenue it is time that this area properly protected</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>protected by heritage conservation laws as this</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The amenity of this area has been destroyed by the huge volumes of traffic,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>some of which should not even be in the area (GVM&gt;5T)and the excessive speed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at which it travels.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ideals of the HCA are certainly not being adhered to by any save for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the residents.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkway Avenue is a residential street and not any sort of heavy vehicular</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>traffic road. It is supposedly a Collector Road which in theory gathers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>traffic from the local roads and feeds it to the arterial roadway system. It</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is not for through traffic both heavy and too fast for a residential area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It would seem that these issues are overlooked for the sake of Council and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the RMS not wishing to improve the surrounding arterial road system.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By the way we are not the only residents who think this way.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should you wish further discussion please feel free to contact me.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We live on Parkway Avenue. We have a young family and walk to and from Hamilton South Public School every day. Parkway Avenue, including its pedestrian friendly wide central median, is an important feature of the Hamilton South garden Suburb and should be reflected by inclusion in the LEP as an item of significant value to Heritage Conservation Plan.

With the current push for major developments in this area (such as the current 3 storey mixed commercial residential building comprising of 4 medical suites and 10 units) it is incredibly important that we look to protect the heritage homes and landscape that we have left. This also includes the iconic Parkway avenue landscape and median strip.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbatim Responses</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>na</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen of Newcastle</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>considering owning</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am interested in this area</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGA resident &amp; ratepayer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>live nearby</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>local resident</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neither</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non resident</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbatim Responses</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen of Newcastle</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>considering residing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am interested in this area</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OE_recommendationsCopy2. Do you have any further comments to make about these recommendations?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbatim Responses</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Future development in the street should reflect the scale of the existing streetscape.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not see that these features really contribute greatly to the streetscape. I would rather see modern kerbs and gutters that suit the commercial development of the area, and the sandstone material could be used elsewhere where heritage significant areas are being upgraded or restored.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think Beaumont Street business precinct is looking untidy at present, with a few premises unoccupied. The Islington end is looking far better, so I have no objections to the precinct having the opportunity to be smartened up by removing the Heritage category.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think the Hamilton Business centre has struggled over the past decade to grow as a top income earner for the city. Removing the HCA from the businesses centre will give and residents and business owners more ownership to transform the heart of Hamilton.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would be concerned if lifting the heritage listing what would be the LEP be.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I could understand developing it more, but not to make it a second Kotara.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The street scape is unique to this strip. However there should be proper cleaning of the street/footpath and maintenance. There are to many Asian food Shops/ eatery in this Area it should be more available to/for Southern Europe cuisine as is the history of this strip and it's ethnic influence.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The_hill_Property_typeCopy2_Other:. Do you own or rent property in The Hill Heritage Conservation Area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbatim Responses</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Citizen of Newcastle</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>considering owning</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGA resident and ratepayer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>na</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbatim Responses</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No but can see The Hill from my lounge room.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No just interested in heritage features</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One street from heritage area</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xx</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The_Hill_Property_type_2Copy2_Other. Are you a resident or business owner?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbatim Responses</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Citizen of Newcastle</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>considering residing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landlord</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGA resident and ratepayer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>na</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No but I can see The Hill from my loungeroon.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental property</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xx</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OE_recommendationsCopy3. Do you have any further comments to make about these recommendations?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbatim Responses</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Although there are some 'out of character' buildings here there are quite a few houses worthy of conservation protection. Listing this area will prevent redevelopment and reconstruction of unsympathetic buildings on the fringe of an existing conservation area.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure that all property owners are consulted on the potential change and its implication for property maintenance and improvements.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I agree with Council's endeavours to promote conservation through efforts like identifying potential heritage, raising community awareness about heritage, and establishing and managing conservation zones. However, the proposal to extend the existing area would significantly deteriorate the fabric that constitutes a true heritage conservation area.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In simple terms, a conservation area is one that is historic in character and is special or attractive enough to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
warrant protection to maintain the traditional, special and individual character of a place. The Terrace and other areas within the existing Conservation Zone in my view meet this criteria. However, the extension of the zone as proposed will achieve nothing but to fossilise the proposed extension area and not allow it to evolve with the modern world that Newcastle City is becoming. My home for example was constructed in 1998 and a large percentage of other homes were also built around the same time. They have no heritage significance or character and they add nothing to making the existing Conservation Zone any "more special."

"I do however consider the terrace homes on the northern eastern side of Bingle Street would be the only properties worthy of inclusion in any proposed extension of the conservation zone."

I also recognise the counter argument that whilst conservation area status does lead to additional planning constraints and considerations for the land owner, the purpose of conservation is not about preventing all change but about managing it in a way which preserves its special interest. The extension area proposed has no areas of special interest. While the benefits of owning a property in a conservation zone tend to be intangible in nature and flow from the pleasure or enjoyment associated with owning a historic or unique house of conservation value, the costs are more real and visible. These include the cost of ensuring alterations and extensions to the house are sympathetic to homes of historic value and the owner is burdened by the opportunity cost of forgoing land development opportunities which are available to homes outside conservation zones.

There are also costs the Council bears in regulating land use in conservation zones and Council is dropping the ball when it comes to regulating the existing Conservation zone on The Hill. The significant property at 12 The Terrace for example standouts. It has been transformed into an illegal boarding house and the front downstairs verandah has a staircase constructed to connect it to the upstairs verandah! The conservation value, appeal, and aesthetics of the area is impacted because Council is unable to meet its regulatory and conservation demands. If Council cannot meet its current obligations it will be unable to meet them under and extended conservation zone.

I am very pleased to endorse this addition to The Hill Conservation Heritage Area. I would now like to encourage our Council to ensure that these heritage areas are not over-crowded by medium density development ((R3) as has happened in other parts of Newcastle and NSW. These heritage areas should be left to demonstrate to all Novocastrians and to tourists visiting our City our pride in our history. They should be available to future generations and not drowned by adjacent high rise development. We have a very special heritage to proclaim.

I believe each property in this area should be individually assessed and reviewed by Council should the Owner want to redevelop the property.

Whilst I appreciate keeping our history intact there are properties within this boundary which have absolutely no heritage value at all. They were built at a time when financial hardship meant the design and materials used were of a low standard and quality.

The city is experiencing a revitalization and most developers (not talking about big developers but just ordinary people wanting to buy and live in the city) are sympathetic to the property's character and try to build or rebuild with that in mind. It would be a shame to see properties remain in disrepair because a person is not able to remodel in the modern accepted styles of today.

Afterall, if we were to use this philosophy we would all still be living with dirt floors and architects would be redundant.
I don't feel that the housing merits the extension of the HCA. The housing is not heritage, in the same way that the terrace is. There is a very high number of non-heritage housing and brick flat buildings. The mix of housing in High Street is typical of many streets in Newcastle that are not listed as HCA.

I am surprised to see my house listed as a contributing to the HCA as it is a 1950's brick building, which was rendered and painted baby blue in the 1990's!

The eco texture report supports extending the HCA to High Street in 2005, and this same report is then questioned as to whether it is a valid opinion due to the age. The report then simply states that "This review has re-assessed the area and finds certain streets are considered worthy of statutory listing as a HCA" can we have more information as to why the High Street extension is proposed?

None of the 2015 public voice responses included extending the HCA to include High Street.

It should be noted that Council previously approved the demolition of my house.

I have spoken to many neighbours about this extension of the HCA and none have understood or been supportive of it. I hope that they have been able to take the time to raise their objections. I should also note that those that I have spoken to did not receive notification of the 2015 survey in the mail, myself included.

I strongly agree with the boundary extension but R3 (medium density) development should not be permitted in a Heritage Conservation area.

Obviously in this area there will be a tendency towards developments:
1. designed to maximise revenue-gathering
2. obsessed with size and grandeur at the expense of aesthetics and impact on neighbours
3. unsympathetic to the gracious character of the area
Therefore we are keen to see our area included in the heritage conservation zone.

The approval of developments not consistent with existing building stock over many years by NCC, particularly on the northern side of High Street, has created a hodge podge of conflicting building styles and densities which makes it a case of "try and spot the heritage houses." The inclusion of buildings at 11A and 30 High Street as contributing to the heritage values of 19th century and inter-war houses makes me wonder what the consultants were thinking. Presumably this means that the future development of modern style houses such as No. 11A will be OK if the boundary adjustment is approved. The issue of including High Street in the existing HCA has been examined extensively in the past and no compelling reasons were found for its inclusion. Council should only include new areas in HCAs where there has been a low level of attrition and degradation of the housing stock to be protected and not where the streetscape has already been significantly altered by inappropriate development. The area is also progressively being turned into a parking lot due to the failure of NCC to provide adequate parking in the CBD which is hardly consistent with HCA values.

These changes will make it difficult for owners to make updates to their properties as required. Having to get approval for this constantly will be a real problem.

This action would decrease the house values in the proposed area and although I value heritage and my home is approx 100 years old and beautifully restored, I feel it unfair that I should lose value by councils.
Actions

This area needs to be included urgently to prevent the redevelopment in an inconsistent way with the neighborhood. 1

This will restrict my ability to renovate and repair my property that I have lived in for nearly 50 years. There is no obvious benefit to owners and a risk of de-valuing my property if I chose to sell. Council already has substantial regulations and another level of regulations is not required or wanted. 1

Yes I strongly agree.

However I believe that the whole of the eastern side of Lemnos Pde should be included in the extended HCA zone. According to me reading of the criteria, the following houses in that eastern side of Lemnos Pde would be classified as follows.

No 1 - a modern architecturally designed house with features sympathetic to the streets heritage styles - e.g. pitched roof.

No 1A as above

No 3 neutral / contributory

No 5 contributory

No 7 neutral contributory (pitched roof)

No 9 contributory

**Verbatim Responses**

| Citizen of Newcastle | 1 |
| considering buying | 1 |
| hamilton south | 1 |
| I am interested in the area | 1 |
| LGA resident and ratepayer | 1 |
| Live nearby | 1 |
| na | 1 |
| Neither | 1 |
| Non resident | 1 |
Own properties adjacent to this proposed area | 1
Visitor | 1

HR_Property_type_2Copy3_Other: Are you a resident or business owner?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbatim Responses</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Citizen of Newcastle</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>considering residing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am interested in the area</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGA resident and ratepayer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live nearby</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>na</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non resident</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own property and rent it</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See above</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OE_recommendationsCopy4: Do you have any further comments to make about these recommendations?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbatim Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am delighted that the Council is considering this precinct as Heritage Conservation. Too many houses have been demolished and rebuilt with cement &quot;boxes&quot;or in many cases not maintained to an appropriate standard. I imagine there are some owners who buy properties as investments in this area and just let them out without doing any running repairs or improving gardens etc. So I am delighted that owners may be encouraged to take more pride in their houses. Also, I was pleased to hear at the meeting last night that reclassification is likely to include streetscape improvements like street trees, traffic calming devices on corners etc. I would love to see a community garden established within the precinct somewhere, maybe the library or some other appropriate spot in the way it has been done on the corner of Bull and Darby Sts Cooks Hill -I think it would add a point of interest and a community gathering point as well as providing a practical asset to the community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I am not clear on the implications this would have on the processes for renovating our property. I expect it | 1 |
means that applications for approval for any renovation will need to be submitted (with additional fees). I also expect that there will be design limits or constraints imposed. For eg. Another house in our street is already listed and the owners were only permitted to restore not renovate. I am not clear on the implications for property value but I would suspect that it would not increase and is more likely to decrease the value as the costs and trades associated with maintaining or restoring may be unattractive to buyers. I don't understand the impact this will have on our rates. Will there be an additional fee or tax added to already escalating rates? There are many homes within the proposed area that are certainly not of heritage significance and I am left scratching my head over the motivations council have for wasting time and public money on such an unnecessary proposal. I can't see on any advantages or benefits for the home owner in this proposal.

I doubt the historical significance of this area is particularly valuable. I believe the more valuable HCA should be Veda street and surrounds as this was where the first Mine Superintendents were housed in the early days of the "Bog Hole".

I think the heritage significance should include... 1

Making areas Heritage compliant places greater financial burden on property owners. Rates are increasing and it will not be possible to undertake reasonable repairs or changes to my home if heritage guidelines are imposed. 1

The Catholic Diocese of Maitland - Newcastle owns significant property interests to the East of the proposed Heritage Conservation Area. The properties owned and operated by the Diocese are at and...

The Diocese is currently in the process of drafting a Master Plan for the sites mentioned above including the any additional sites affronting Selma Street. Given the Master Planning process is well underway the Diocese would like to understand the impact (if any)of the proposed Hamilton Residential Heritage Conservation Area on the Diocese's proposed draft Master Plan. 1

The heritage area should be extended to include Dumaresq Street West of Gordon Avenue. 1

The make up of the building in this area are too diverse in nature and age to constitute any particular style or type of building to make any unique heritage style, Cameron street is circa 1905 whereas... The same is for and the property two doors further down. James street is circa 1991 and also James street is also a "new property". This is also the case for the property two doors East as well as the duplex next door. Cnr. Lindsay and Cameron is also a "New house" again with no "Heritage value. These are only a few examples within a small radius of. Without going further this is typical of this suggested area. I know that several of these dwellings were replaced because of damage ie. termite infestations making any repair impossible and because of the small size and shape of the blocks these owners were left with optimising their finances to construct feasible- non heritage dwellings.

Also, what kind of dwelling style would be suitable for this area as the current buildings range from wooden miner's to freestanding terraces, older apartments like the corner of James and Lawson to buildings exhibiting ethnic heritage styles and many houses built over the last 40 years? That there is no particular heritage style to be preserved makes the idea silly.
The property we own at 3 Murray st is included with which we agree. It is a 1900 house, which had separate kitchen and outside toilets. We have removed them and made the back modern. However, the front half is as it was when built except the front verandah which was demolished. We rebuilt it to look like the original. We think that the frontages should be heritage, but not the back.

The proposed Heritage Conservation Area for the Hamilton Residential Precinct is not supported given the mixed demographic the precinct attracts.

The concept of a HCA means that the current proportion of contributory dwellings will tend to naturally limit who can take up residence within the precinct:
- Those with sufficient funds to maintain such dwellings, which becomes more expensive than modern designed and constructed dwellings;
- Those with sufficient funds to live within such dwellings, which again is generally more expensive due to greater requirements for unnatural heating, cooling, and lighting.

Currently, the village atmosphere exists because of the diversity in demographic: this may be put at risk, for example, students may not be able to afford even greater amounts of rent as living in heritage style housing becomes even more expensive; or relatively lower income families despite abilities to save, may not be able to afford to live there, as the greater living expense may be used up in the capital acquisition in a form of debt paydown. In the long term, this may sterilise the village like atmosphere enjoyed in the area.

Their should be consideration of long term owner/occupier needs ie knock down rebuild in view of aging issues and living in a more suitable home for ageing owners.

As Govt; wants the elderly to stay in there home and for many like myself I have been planning this for 20 years. To stay on my property site. and should not be disadvantage re the proposed new changes (perhaps there should be a clause re this issue added to any change). Additionally, re streetscape I would like to see traffic calming/restriction (greened kerbs) restrictions to oversize vehicles/caravans etc being parked on street obstructing the non-owners property to streetscape view/light/security/safety and the overall enjoyment of environment/surrounds ( some areas are becoming a caravan/ truck storage area ).

James street is the only entry point from Gordon Ave; and has become a noisy thoroughfare 24/7 consideration to making this entry a Cul-de-sac/other ?

This is a very significant collection of diverse housing styles and I support its addition to the HCAs. It is most important to gain the approval of the residents/owners of the housing within the area and build their awareness of the plan and its strictures in regard to development and renovation before declaring the new HCA. All efforts should be made to link the HCA smoothly to the Beaumont Street precinct by way of signage, street furniture and vegetation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbatim Responses</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen of Newcastle</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>considering buying</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am interested in this area</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGA resident and ratepayer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>live nearby</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>na</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No but I live in the area and value the character of the area.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non resident</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkway Ave resident and frequent user of Junction Precinct</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>use this area daily</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**GR_Property_type_2Copy2_Other:** Are you a resident or business owner?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbatim Responses</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>na</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen of Newcastle</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>considering residing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am interested in this area</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landlord</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGA resident &amp; ratepayer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>live nearby</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neighbour</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non resident</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental property</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**OE_recommendationsCopy5.** Do you have any further comments to make about these recommendations?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbatim Responses</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approximately 5 years ago an appeal was denied for a development plan for Glebe Rd by the Minister for Planning and Inviroment. The court considered that the facades of the cottages were mostly unchanged and should be maintained as an example of the original village architecture still in tact.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lovely group of old cottages most of which are still in good condition if not exactly in an original state. Worthy of protection in the inner city.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The heritage nature of this area has already been compromised by the construction of a 2nd (modern) dwelling at the rear of 2 of the 10 or 11 properties that would be affected by this proposed conservation area. The proposed area is also quite small &amp; isolated, in that it is essentially enclosed on 3 sides by The Junction's existing retail &amp; commercial development. This development already detracts from the overall visual appeal of the current streetscape.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Junction Village is a rather unique ‘village’ style shopping precinct. It is bounded by residential properties some of which have valuable heritage character. e.g in Corlette St and in Glebe Rd. For the ‘village’ character to be maintained there must be a clear boundary between commercial and residential and having residential right up close to shops etc helps retain this character. The strip of single storey character houses on the south side of Glebe road provides and interesting neat boundary to the ‘village’. Glebe Rd is an entry thoroughfare to inner beachside Newcastle and as such its character needs to be preserved where possible.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>These are an outstanding group of well maintained garden cottages that add to the character of The Junction. Ensure that all owners are fully aware of the proposal and its implications for maintenence and renovation before declaring the heritage area</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>These properties warrant a heritage classification under a new HCA. With one exception, the character of the cottages between Robinsons Real Estate &amp; Arrivederci Restaurant is intact. The owners have respected the character &amp; streetscape of these cottages &amp; have kept them in a very well maintained state. Previously the residents strongly supported the retention of these homes &amp; opposed the proposed demolition of one of the cottages for redevelopment. Council's decision to reject the proposed demolition &amp; redevelopment &amp; to preserve the character of this small group of cottages was supported by an external judgement by a Heritage Consultant.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It may be possible to sympathetically build into the existing roof structures, set back from the streetscape as has happened with some dwellings in the Hamilton South Garden Suburb HCA. As long as the single story character is preserved with adequate set back within the roof line to preserve the heritage character of the homes then it may be suitable. Similarly it may be possible for garage roof structures to be extended to allow extra development within the roof space if the change is sympathetic to the character of the street. Such possibilities would need proper study &amp; consideration so that the heritage character would not be adversely impacted.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you own or rent property in the Newcastle East Heritage Conservation Area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbatim Responses</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen of Newcastle</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>considering buying</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequent visitor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am interested in this area</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGA resident and ratepayer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>live nearby</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Hill</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>visited area almost daily</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Are you a resident or business owner?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbatim Responses</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>na</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen of Newcastle</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>considering residing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequent visitor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am interested in this area</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGA resident &amp; ratepayer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neighbour</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resident nearby</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Hill</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OE_recommendationsCopy6. Do you have any further comments to make about the recommendation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbatim Responses</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I support the amendment of the Heritage Technical Manual to include a revised statement of significance and new contributory buildings map for the Newcastle East Heritage Conservation Area.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many of the buildings do not have heritage value. I question the value of grouping buildings by area. The cost/inconvenience of compliance can be prohibitive to real development</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle East is becoming and vibrant and character filled part of the city. The streetscapes are looking great and I notice that more and more buildings are being done up and restored and adding to the heritage value and interest of the precinct.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle station should be included and protected</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See previous comments</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should include Newcastle Station area, Watt St bothsides up to James Flether Hospital Area, Fletcher park out to Nobbys Headland</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OE_recommendationsCopy7. Do you have any further comments to make about these recommendations?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbatim Responses</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As a resident of parkway ave for the past 16 years I value the quiet nature of our street. The last thing I want is increased traffic flow along parkway ave as it will decrease our property value and change our lifestyle</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask residents what they want, not commuters. We are the ones who would have to put up with greater traffic noise and a fall in property values.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearly all such requirements ought to be subject to periodic review to establish if they still meet the needs of the affected community. It is imperative, however, that advice of any such review is widely disseminated in the affected community and that it is conducted openly.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction in Newcastle was ‘fast tracked’ by the previous Council and seemingly at the expense of future sustainable town planning. Its time to take a good look at just how many apartments Newcastle can reasonably accommodate and prevent this sprawl from impinging on neighbouring residential zones.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council should be mindful of maintaining the integrity of HCA which IT has created.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do Pull Down or removal Cavet should be Placed on all Items in the HCA area</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each Heritage Conservation Area has its own individual characteristics which is not covered by a one size fits all approach. The above survey points should be high priority to protect the heritage fabric in each different zone and to provide guidance &amp; certainty for individual owners, prospective owners, Council and the wider community.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe that most of the land is zoned residential, why change?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not want Parkway Avenue Hamilton changed in any way and especially no change to the median strip.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't believe zoning has been an issue in our area / experience but i do now understand after attending the info session how this could muddy the waters in some inner CBD applications.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would potentially agree but I would need to understand the implications of this proposal. What are the land uses that need to be removed and which ones need to be added?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If more out of character developments are allowed the heritage character of the whole area will be lost. Considering the closeness to Tudor and Parry St and the St Francis Xavier high school and TAFE, more over or poor development in this area may well lead to the creation of an inner city ghetto, losing the current feeling of a well kept and connected community.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If zoning was to be reviewed and any changes proposed would such changes be presented to residents for comment?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is imperative that the low density zoning in the conservation area be retained. Demolition in all the inner suburbs surrounding the Hamilton South Heritage Area is proceeding at an alarming rate. Replacement buildings of blue board and cocked hat flat roofs is destroying the character of the original suburbs. This trend makes the preservation of the Hamilton South Heritage Conservation Area even more critical in retaining the ambience of the inner city.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is possible to extend a house without changing its character (the extensions done to our home by a previous owner are a good example) - it just takes a bit more money to get a decent architect to do it properly, and the benefits to house value will be more than the cost.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Let's not ruin historic end of Newcastle with too much high rise and boxing in of open spaces. This does not align with the history and gentrification of Newcastle and Newcastle East particularly. Short term gain. Let's play the longer game for the future of the city.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium/ high density housing and commercial development should be prohibited in these areas.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More and more residential dwellings are being purchased within HCAs and converted into businesses such as specialist medical practitioner rooms even though there are ample vacant buildings in commercially zoned Hunter Street. The problem with this is that they often remove grass and gardens and replace with concrete carparks. Having on-site parking is a major contributing factor in the choice of an inner city residentially zoned dwelling over a commercially zoned one where parking limitations and ease of access are less attractive to patients. More information needed. What do you want to change?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No changes to current zoning in HCA areas.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No changes to current zoning in HCA areas. Not sure what this question means? however had to answer to move on.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite possibly, but I'm not sure. Certainly the lot sizes may require a refactoring of types of dwellings</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and changes to dwellings that can take place, as well, advances in construction and contemporary technologies that can overcome previously difficult to solve problems should be considered as part of this (eg. noise attenuation/dampening, insulation, construction materials allowing more glass for natural light etc.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R3 (medium density) development is not appropriate in a Heritage Conservation area</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential and commercial zones should be kept separate and multi-storey developments have no place within a HCA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See previous comments</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So long as Council abides by the significant heritage areas that are identified by such examinations and strongly protect the heritage fabric and integrity</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the above response is provided that the reviews of zones are consistent with protecting heritage value</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The zones have been reviewed in recent years and reflect a high density area. They also comply with the SAFE criteria. The objective of the r3 zone reflects coops hills high density nature. Outside of the city centre it is one of the LGAs highest density suburbs. See housing paper to LPS. If design, in particular height, is an issue that is a design issue- not a zone issue. Hence why heights and fsr now stay alone in the LEP. They should be captured via design controls. Cooks Hill reflects a true r3 zone. Should be be anything less it would mean that the zones are not being applied consistently and cause much confusion. If height is the issue then height should be addressed. I agree that the character of a HCA should be retained but this is not the correct planning mechanism. Perhaps advice from the department should be sort on using the zones that way.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The zoning should be maintained as residential with single residential properties. Multi storey apartments should be not allowed in the heritage areas, even dual occupancy on a single block as has been allowed in the past.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a definite conflict between the intention of the Hamilton South Garden Suburb area and the change in zoning that occurred. There should be NO medium residential zoning.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There needs to be regular contact between Council and the residents of HCAs to ensure that they are aware of the design principles and physical characteristics that contribute to the heritage status of their suburb or location. Unless this is done there will continue to be development proposals that conflict with the goals of maintaining the heritage fabric of the HCAs. In the case of Hamilton South HCA the intrusion of some second floor rooftops into the streetscape has impacted on the heritage quality of the location. There is a need for all Council Officers and any professional involved in planning approvals to be aware and involved in upholding the planning provisions underpinning the HVAs.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There seems to be a contradiction between having a HCA and then it is zoned for medium density. They do not work together.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This must be addressed now before the RMS comings in and buils another arterial route ruining our hertigate in that area for ever</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whatever outcome of the zoning examination it is extremely important to maintain and even extend (where possible) the open space availability. The health outcomes of residents is enhanced by the</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
availability of open space. Once open space is lost it will never be replaced. Cities throughout the world are often recommended to visitors because of the open spaces that are available.

Zoning is of vital importance if the heritage significance of the character and streetscape of the heritage conservation areas is to be maintained. Zoning should reflect the existing built environment within the Heritage Conservation Areas. The northern length of Denison Street Hamilton is a good example of the way in which inappropriate zoning has ruined the ambience and amenity of a once-popular residential area with high quality housing stock, so discouraging inner-city living. This will be the eventual fate of all Heritage Conservation Areas if zonings do not reflect the existing character.

Additional_comments. Do you have any additional comments regarding the Heritage conservation area review?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbatim Responses</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- While we residents understand the need for medium density areas, there are plenty of nearby areas with no heritage building or community feeling (e.g. Denison St on the opposite side of Parry Street). Medium density should be focused in these areas, and our area returned to the residents.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Please address this additional area as a high priority, else it maybe too late</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any proposed change to an existing streetscape must be disseminated to the affected community well before its proposed implementation in a manner that clearly sets out what the real changes are.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a resident of parkway ave for the past 16 years I strongly disagree with any additional traffic along parkway ave as it will decrease our property value and change our lifestyle</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a resident of Parkway Ave I have notice a significant increase in traffic carriage over the last 12 months on this street.Any further changes which increase traffic flow will be detrimental to the residential area.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooks Hill adds a unique character to the inner city. Many of the terraces housed miner and stevedores since early days. It is similar to the Rocks area which we know is tourist attraction in Sydney. We could have guided walking tours when cruise ships dock in Newcastle.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council is already finding financial management difficult. If further impositions are placed on home owners then they too will be placed under greater financial duress.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not allow any more high density housing in the area. People live in this area because of the quiet lifestyle the area affords. Changing the character of the area will result in many residents being unhappy. Leave Parkway Avenue as it is. Do not widen it.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not alter Parkway Ave or its median strips at all if it's to remain a heritage area as previously stated.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not reduce any area for the reason of non-contributory buildings. If the area at Glebe Road is removed, whatever development it is replaced with will surely not comply with with the requirements of developments adjacent to HCA's; such as the Bimet Lodge Development.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Don't change Parkway Avenue.
Make sure the light rail services as much of the attractions along the coast as it can, that way it can help cut
the traffic in the area.

Following visual inspections of land parcels within the area any property that has had illegal extensions or
additions within the area should be prosecuted. This would include the building of inappropriate fences,
rendering of fences or houses without approval. Action should also be taken against the trades people if
possible for building the structures etc without sighting the council approval.

Hamilton is quite unique, should be enhanced and believe it should be supported in someway without
dis advantaging long term owner/occupiers (as myself)
Happy to have further consultation with NCC.
Please do not let some area/ streets become caravan/ truck parks !!

Has the review been funded by a developer? I am concerned that there is a two stage process occurring,
whereby stage one is alteration of the boundaries to make way for stage 2, which would include rezoning of
areas removed from the HCA.

I am concerned that the areas can be considered for removal from the HCA when the contain contributory
buildings within that area.

Heritage listed areas should be changed to R2

thank you for surveying the public openly to make these changes, wish this had happened when changes
where made in 2012 LEP

I believe it is important that not only the street heritage areas are maintained but the density of development
in and adjacent to the area is limited to low density development so as not to overwhelm the importance of
the areas

I believe that heritage conservation areas are important and believe that medium density development does
not seem appropriate in a Heritage Conservation area.

I strongly object to Council agreeing to any RMS proposal to modify Parkway Avenue to allow it to have
increased traffic volumes. Council should list Parkway Ave on the LEP to provide it with a higher degree of
protection from current or future RMS plans and to maintain it in its current state.

I think it is a wonderful document that is well composed and easy to read. It will assist or guide future
development. I like the categories and any design advice for future renovations/ Alts and ads was much
needed. The character statements are great too. In my opinion in needs to address design issues rather
than zoning. I don't believe a zone change would have any impact in future development is development
respects design guidelines and applications are assessed by planners with heritage focus / knowledge.

I think that local people have been making decisions about their properties for over 100 years & our suburb
has evolved accordingly. That gives the suburb its uniqueness in its own right. Do we need another layer of
beauracracy to tell us how the next 100 years will turn out.

I think that the council have done, in the main, an excellent job maintaining the existing conservation areas.
These areas are very important to Newcastle and help Newcastle maintain it charm and amenity. Remember
that the whole of the Cook's Hill area was zoned high rise more than 40 years ago and the Cook's Hill
Community Group was able to convince the then Aldermen that the permission to do so would have been a very retrograde step. The conservation officer deserves credit for this.

I think that there should be a public meeting for residents of the respective HCAs for Council to address the anomalies which occur from time to time and in particular the median of Parkway Avenue which should remain intact in its entirety.

Heavy traffic in this area also needs to be addressed as it detracts from the amenity and the heritage values of the area.

I think the council would want to be very careful watering down any restrictions that are currently in place. I think previous surveys have demonstrated how highly people within current areas value the protections offered. Since some of the rules have been in place 20 years, they should not be a surprise to anyone. A relaxing of restrictions will favour a few developers but probably anger a large number of nearby residents. My experience has been that people have been allowed to increase the size of their property without ruining the streetscape which is a great result and has probably increased a sense of community rather than disputes.

I would prefer that controls not be imposed on the population in the proposed area. Heritage impositions limit the application of eco-design and eco-technologies.

Whilst the content of the draft report seeks to justify the Australian Agricultural Company and Pit Town to qualifying Criteria A and B for Culural Significance Assessment, to the vast population of people residing in the precinct, if questioned they would lack any knowledge of this, and neither would they care. Whilst it is certainly fascinating, it lacks any legitimacy to genuinely supporting Criteria A and B. Criterion C remains true, but it is questionable if this by itself is enough to justify the imposition of HCA limitation to future changes within the precinct, particularly the risk to the village atmosphere this is likely to realise.

I would strongly urge council not to rezone or remove any areas from the HCA as in doing so, may damage the aesthetics and heritage feel which is so important to this area. In addition it may affect resale value of property in the HCA should any of the above changes take place.

I would remind council that any current HCA have previously been established by Newcastle City council in a bid to preserve our local history and cultural identity. Please leave it as is.

Is there any further information about how you can change your 'yellow' house to a green one? What plans are afoot to address the removal of 'red' houses?

It is essential that Council honours the intent of the Heritage Conservation Areas. Home owners and the wider community need guidance and certainty. Council needs to provide an adequate budget to allow for community education about HCA’s and to allow Council to properly monitor compliance with the requirements of the HCA’s. Rate notices, Council News mailouts and local free Newspapers are easy ways to spread information about the HCA’s & to gain public support.

It is important to respect the current heritage buildings and conditions in place

It is not broken. Leave as is

It should be carried out as a matter of priority.

It would be interesting to know why the demolition of some lovely houses in Denison Street which has an
attractive streetscape was approved and some ugly townhouses approved with extremely limited parking approved in an area where parking is already at a premium. This suggests that much of this 'conservation' and 'heritage' bandied around Hamilton East is really not in Council's interest as there were many objections to this demolition and the fact that these houses could have been easily restored/renovated for families not necessarily wanting townhouses with their limitations.

Leave Parkway Avenue median strip at its current width. Do not use Parkway Avenue to funnel more traffic, the trees must remain with the grass median strip.

More and more residential dwellings are being purchased within HCAs and converted into businesses such as specialist medical practitioner rooms even though there are ample vacant buildings in commercially zoned Hunter Street. The problem with this is that they often remove grass and gardens and replace with concrete carparks. Having on-site parking is a major contributing factor in the choice of an inner city residentially zoned dwelling over a commercially zoned one where parking limitations and ease of access are less attractive to patients.

no obvious benefit to owners has been put forward. There is no improvement to services, no reduction in rates and only further restrictions on the use of my property.

Over the years it has been a puzzle to me how a hit and miss Council has been in its application of rules within all of these preservation zones. If there's one thing that can't be replaced if it isn't protected and that is Parkway Avenue.

Please don't make any alterations to Parkway Avenue Hamilton.

Please keep Parkway Avenue as it is.

Please leave Parkway Avenue alone, this street should not be touched in anyway shape or form.

Please listen to the community. There have been too many recent instances where NCC have paid lip service with their community engagement process.

Example 1 - rates increase. The majority of community feedback was for accepting a mid-range rise. Yet NCC chose to ignore the feedback.

Example 2 - show holiday. The majority of community feedback was against the application for a show holiday. Yet NCC chose to ignore the feedback.

Having read the community responses from the previous Newcastle Voice survey, there is overwhelming support from the local community to increase protection regarding heritage conservation.

Listen to the community and act in accordance with their feedback.

Protect Newcastle if you wantan attractive city and tourism and lifestyle for god sake.. Look around.. See other cities and be smart.. Please

removal of remaining garden beds which are planted with hibiscus which require constant pruning and removal time which would better spent under lopping pines .a true AVENUE is a roadway with trees planted on both sides this magical avenue starts at denison street (ambulance station)thru to jenner parade (s/w drain) for further history on parkway avenue please ring
Residents have purchased homes in the heritage conservation because they wish to live this lifestyle and were aware of the guidelines required for extensions etc. We do not want rules changed and our neighbourhood to change. Particularly no changes to the road in parkway ie no cutting into the grassed medium strip, this should be maintained as is!

So much has already been lost. The need to protect what is left is crucial.

Newcastle has a serious heritage history in the fabric and development of Australia as an identity. Newcastle has can lay claim to many "Firsts".

Most of them are in the area of consideration but need widening.

The area should be widened to include the other areas like all of Nobbys Headland, James Fletcher and the Newcastle railway area.

Watt Street was the first street in the first settlement of Newcastle and has a very significant heritage significance. Hunter or Blane Street has the same significance and both show the development of Newcastle over time.

Newcastle is unique and as the opportunity to attract people as a specific and amazing tourist destination. Our convict roots have never been given the recognition that is well deserved. Let's get it right this time, it's a last chance and hold development responsible to protect and preserve with accountability to us the public who ultimately pay the price. There is so much we can do.

Speaking for Hamilton Garden Suburb only - I would be dismayed if any major changes were made to this beautiful suburb that is close to the CBD and the beach. We are very fortunate to have such a pleasing residential and school area, with its sporting facilities and parkland, and I would hate for any of this to change without careful consideration as to the consequences.

Thank you for looking at these heritage areas and working to protect them.

Thanks for the opportunity to comment on this review. Can I suggest that if there are to be future community consultations that more notice including all the appropriate documentation be provided and more time be made available for your letter box drops to allow owners and residents to have sufficient notice to attend the meeting, many families need to arrange baby sitting, or postpone other commitments etc.

Let's hope the next meeting will be in cooler weather because the Yoga Room at the Community Centre in Gordon Avenue was extremely hot, one fan was insufficient! However, I appreciate the effort your staff made to answer all the questions at the meeting.

The change of zoning to medium density of some of the HCA in the north east corner i.e., around Skelton and Heburn streets is in total conflict with the whole principle of the HCA concept.

The detailed review has taken considerable time and resources to complete and once feedback is received, Council needs to act quickly to formalise any changes. Considerable ‘damage’ could be done to these areas in the meantime by current owners who wish to make changes to properties in advance of new guidelines.
The extra traffic in the area was not covered. Why is park land being used as a busy street? That is Smith St between Dumaresque St and Parry St.

The Heritage Conservation Area review should highlight the fact that one of the reasons places such as Cooks Hill, Hamilton East and The Hill are so popular is that they are defined by their built heritage. This is in contrast to the brashness and artificiality of much modern building stock and architectural design.

The poor administration of planning applications has resulted in the loss of some of the beautiful houses in the heritage areas. I hope that this does not continue.

The review has been very professionally prepared, the important issues addressed, with good and appropriate recommendations. Congratulations to all involved.

The whole review is a very comprehensive study of the existing and proposed Heritage Conservation Areas. It is important to balance sympathetic development opportunities with heritage conservation. Could I ask to receive a short response to why my property at [redacted] is included as a neutral building and not a contributing building please by [redacted] The facade of the property has an interwar addition but it is mostly in tact. The recent additions made around 2005 are well hidden at the rear of the dwelling.

There Must be another public forum for the Hamilton South Garden Suburb area as the flyer notifying the residents of the public meeting was not distributed to the area until 24 hours after the meeting. This is totally unacceptable and whether it was the council or their contractors which were negligent in this matter is irrelevant. It is the council's responsibility to give adequate notice. This matter is too important.

There should be street trees planted in the area Hamilton is now an area that you cannot walk in the summer.

The pavement is not keeping with a heritage area.

The traffic in the proposed area particularly turning from Gordon to James St. A heritage area should be quieter and not a through traffic area for peaceful existence.

This review has come a little too late for some of the residents in the Hamilton East area who just last year fought strongly to oppose a 3 story mixed commercial residential development which sits within the block that you are proposing to now include in the heritage conservation area. I hope that the 50+ submissions that were put forward in opposition of such developments, in order to maintain our heritage landscape, are considered. Many of these people I'm sure are a little disillusioned as a result of council voting to approve the development [redacted] Dennison St Hamilton East and as a result may not participate in this survey.

Wake up Jeff!
Yeah, I know it's too late, but I believe this is another example of the damage done by him and his cronies whilst on the council.

We have lost two of the three avenues that were critical to the original Garden Suburb worldwide strategy envisaged by [redacted]
The key Garden Suburb entry stones have been removed to Learmonth Park and should be relocated to indicate the original Garden Suburb precinct and the arrival to such area.

The two areas lost are Gordon Avenue and Stewart Avenue, the remaining intact Avenue known as Parkway Avenue must be maintained in its original and current form without further alteration.

| We have only recently purchased in this area and would not have purchased a property in a heritage conservation area because of the restrictions. | 1 |
| We need to protect the character of these areas. | 1 |
| Why remove only this part of Glebe road will this give developers the chance to go ahead with big townhouse construction in place of the homes already there we know some houses have already been given the OK to go we strongly object | 1 |
| Yes need to look at how ‘outside’ agencies such as Ausgrid, Telstra etc seem to be able to build / change infrastructure that distracts from heritage buildings / streetscape - seems they can do this without abiding / consulting Council. Heritage conservation is a key attraction to inner suburb Newcastle and is part of a key attraction to this city and needs to be preserved as much as possible | 1 |
Appendix III - Information session notes

Heritage Information Session 1

Questions

- A lot of development occurring - particularly second floor developments - all need to be aware of steps taken in HCAs.
- Concerned - any development changed - could impact drainage - particularly, Cram St.
- Removing HCA could open up to development in pocket park - Robertson Reserve.
- Concern that Ausgrid does not appear to need development consent to erect large poles in the front yards of houses in the heritage conservation area.
- What does the changing of density from med to low mean for Cooks Hill?
- Depressed when he looks around the street because of unpainted fascia spoils the area and lack of maintenance to properties.
- People aren't doing the right thing to preserve the HCA.
- Want more engagement from Council. What they can and can't do.
- HCA residents need to know what their responsibilities are.
- The integrity of the areas are being compromised.
- Can you explain to the people of southern side of Cram St - What can be developed there? What scales etc.
- Does that mean you can build something like the Bimet Lodge - that was allowed - does that mean that it opens us up to that.
- Unsolicited 2 storey blocks went ahead - put in objection. - HCA - Why did they allow lego house - concerned don't want to end up with buildings out of heritage scope.
- Changes on Glebe Rd now - disagrees removing and changing to medium density - will degrade the amenity of these areas.
- You will be under pressure by developers- streets are already changing - lack of on-street parking - increasing density - need to consider flow on effects including parking.
- Glebe Rd - fighting to keep amenity.
- Collin Green report - residents very strongly want to keep findings.
- Boundaries are hard when one side of the street are in the areas - creates confusion - make it whole areas.
- What is the advantage of taking away the areas - good for developers but seems like a step back.
- Change occurring where people are in bigger houses - with fewer people in them.
- Beaumont St - fully agree with removal. Do we still need to leave a submission if we agree with change.
- Parkway Avenue - wants to know about the right hand turn lane.
- Can any other Governments override the decisions made?

Information Session 2

- Majority of participants received invites this week.
- 3 attendees didn’t receive invite at all.

Questions
- Who makes the decisions?
- Why can’t the community make the decision?
- How binding are the results?
- What’s the benefit of being in a zone and what are the negatives?
- Has the DCP been implemented and changed yet?
- Need to get the clarification right for Cooks Hill - worried that yellow will be removed - contributory.
- The DCP is pretty weak - how does the Heritage manual fall?
- Are you going to have a separate DCP for each area? - So they are targeted.
- You see developments getting put through that don’t fit the character- how does this happen?
- Who makes the decision that something is contributory?
- Will council make the decision for me? I want to have a say whether my home is contributory or not. I have a retirement plan.
- Confusion about Garden South boundary- community member wants to make it clear that this area absorbs into Hamilton East.
- Sections of Carona St - implications for single story domestic dwellings - council needs to look at the applicable zoning and whether medium density R3 is impacting heritage.
- Bimet Lodge consequences, if you remove heritage areas.
- Can we expect any improvements in street scape - trees - traffic calming footpaths?
- If you live in proposed area - what if I wanted to knock it down?
- How does it impact lanes at the back?
- What are the confines of the submission - does it apply to other areas?
- Carona St - Catholic School owned land - Graffitti - removal - store paints worried it will be developed.
- DA - council workers should attend (mentioned to Ashlee)
Heritage Information Session 3

Questions

- Are there contributory maps in review?
- How do you go to the page on Council page?
- Zoning- R3 in Hamilton East, We will end up with a Bimet Lodge.
- Private Certifier risk - no requirement to go to Council - DA Team.
- Tree choice - asked Sarah to talk about the tree choices in HCA.
- Tree trimmings - lost trees - strategic tree plantings required.
- Bruce St - Trees - figs removed from Cooks Hill -want replacements.
- Disappointed no contributory for new proposed areas.
- How can it be declared a heritage area (High St) with so many ugly buildings? How can they become heritage?
- Frustrating - that this is a result of poor council planning.
- Confusion about the maps.
- Carona St garden beds have been improved
- Residence - contributory - what does it mean if you are next a non-contributory?
- Impact of HCA will you make us have contributory enforced.
APPENDIX B -

SUMMARY OF FORMAL WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS MADE DURING EXHIBITION PERIOD
The consultation process has been extensive including a six-week exhibition period. Feedback has been collected in two forms including formal written submissions and a community survey conducted by Newcastle Voice.

A total of 87 formal submissions were received including submissions from the Heritage Division of the NSW Office of Environment and Heritage, the NSW Roads and Maritime Services, the National Trust Hunter Region Committee, and the Cooks Hill Community Group Inc.

Of these submissions, forty five were presented as a form letter expressing opposition to the proposed removal of part of the Hamilton South Garden Suburb HCA.

The majority of the concerns raised in the submissions (over 50) focussed on the proposed removal of part of the Hamilton South Garden Suburb Area at Glebe Road. Residents have expressed the view that removal would potentially compromise the HCA by enabling medium density development along Glebe Road. The view was also strongly expressed that the community is in favour of making Parkway Avenue a heritage item in Schedule 5 of the Newcastle LEP. The final recommendation is that Council proceed with the listing of Parkway Avenue as a heritage item in the LEP but not proceed with the removal of the Glebe Road section of the HCA.

Concerns were raised regarding the removal of the Hamilton Business Centre HCA as a view was expressed that doing so would undermine the efforts of Hamilton businesses and community members to acknowledge and recognise the cultural and social importance of the area. The team concurs with this view and is therefore recommending that the removal of the HCA not proceed at this time in view of these comments.

There was general agreement in the written submissions to the proposed extension of the Hamilton South Garden Suburb to include the north side of Denison Street and Ada Street.

Several submissions suggested that Council reactivate a local heritage grant scheme. Such an initiative is supported but needs to be considered in the Management Plan. One submission commented that council demonstrates support for heritage areas through such schemes.

The extension to the Hill HCA is generally supported and the majority of written submissions and the Newcastle Voice survey results are in support of this proposal. There were two submissions made expressing the view that the extension is not justified on heritage grounds however the large majority are comfortable with the proposal and it is recommended to proceed.
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6.02 Heritage Conservation Areas

Amendment history

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Version Number</th>
<th>Date Adopted by Council</th>
<th>Commencement Date</th>
<th>Amendment Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Savings provisions

Any development application lodged but not determined prior to this section coming into effect will be determined taking into consideration the provisions of this section.

Land to which this section applies

This section applies to land shown as Heritage Conservation Area on the Heritage Map of Newcastle Local Environmental Plan (LEP) 2012 and described in Schedule 5 of Newcastle LEP 2012.

Development (type/s) to which this section applies

This section applies to all development.

Applicable environmental planning instruments

The provisions of the following listed environmental planning instruments also apply to development applications to which this section applies:

- Newcastle Local Environmental Plan 2012
- State Environmental Planning Policy 64 – Advertising Signage.

In the event of any inconsistency between this section and the above listed environmental planning instruments, the environmental planning instrument will prevail to the extent of the inconsistency.

Note 1: Additional environmental planning instruments may also apply in addition to those listed above.

Note 2: Section 74E (3) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 enables an environmental planning instrument to exclude or modify the application of this DCP in whole or part.

Related sections

The following sections of this DCP may also apply to development to which this section applies:

- 5.04 Aboriginal Heritage
- 5.05 Heritage Items
- 5.06 Archaeological Management.
Associated technical manual/s
This section should be read in conjunction with the:


Additional information

▪ Burra Charter of Australia ICOMOS, Australia ICOMOS, 1999, A.C.T.
▪ Conservation Areas, 1996, Heritage Office and Department of Urban Affairs & Planning.
▪ Design in Context; Guidelines for Infill Development in the Historic Environment, 2005, Heritage Office & RAIA NSW Chapter.
▪ Federation Architecture Guidelines, 1982, Trevor Howells for Heritage Council of NSW.
  Commercial Limewashes
  Repointing Lime Mortar Joints — some important points
  Treating Biological Growths on Historic Masonry
  Cracking of buildings due to shrink/swell in clay soils
  Drought Related Cracking of buildings

Definitions

A word or expression used in this development control plan has the same meaning as it has in Newcastle Local Environmental Plan 2012, unless it is otherwise defined in this development control plan.

Other words and expressions referred to within this section are defined within Part 9.00 - Glossary, of this plan, and include:

▪ Building elements – doors, windows, gutters, downpipes, chimneys, walls, shopfronts, roofs, stairs.
▪ Building envelope - the volume of the building on its site.
- **Bulk** – the total effect of the arrangement, volume, size, and shape of the building.
- **Character** – the combination of the individual characteristics or qualities of a neighbourhood, precinct or street.
- **Conservation** - all of the processes of conserving a place to retain heritage significance.
- **Contributory building** – a building that is associated with a significant historical period, substantially intact; and a building associated with a significant historical period, altered yet readily identifiable.
- **Curtilage** – the area of land surrounding a heritage item that is essential in retaining the heritage significance of the item.
- **Demolition** – in whole or in part, the damaging, defacing, destruction, removal, pulling down of the heritage item, building or work, in whole or in part.
- **Desired Future Character Statement for Cooks Hill Heritage Conservation Area** – The character of the Cooks Hill Heritage Conservation Area is made up of a variety of building styles that date from the late 19th and early decades of the 20th century. The special character of Cooks Hill will be preserved, celebrated and maintained through the retention of contributory buildings, the existing subdivision pattern, and elements of visual interest. Elements that are to be preserved include:
  - Contributory buildings constructed prior to the second world war;
  - Mature trees in gardens and the public domain;
  - The former Burwood Coal and Copper Company rail line and bridge abutments at Laman Street;
  - Heritage Fences;
  - Sandstone kerbing and guttering;
  - Victorian era post box on Corlette Street;
  - Pubs and shops on Darby, Union and Bull Streets; and
  - Parks, including Centennial Park, Corlette Street, National Park.

The eclectic character of Cooks Hill will continue to provide residents with a unique and valued sense of place into the future.

- **Desired Future Character Statement for Glebe Road Federation Cottages Heritage Conservation Area** – The character of the Glebe Road Federation Cottages Heritage Conservation Area is made up of the single storey Federation cottages that were built between 1909-1920. The homogenous character of this precinct will be preserved and maintained through the retention of all contributory buildings, elements of visual interest and heritage significance. Elements that are to be preserved include:
  - The building group at 55 to 75 Glebe Road, The Junction, is a fine representative example of a group of intact Federation era cottages which have high contributory value to the streetscape.
  - The urban form which reflects a regular pattern of subdivision and development that dates from the 1900-1920.
  - Side driveways with access to garages and on-site car parking accommodation at the rear of the house group.
  - Items of heritage significance recommended for individual listing as heritage items in Schedule 5 of the Newcastle LEP.
• Desired Future Character Statement for Hamilton South "Garden Suburb" Heritage Conservation Area – The character of the Hamilton South 'Garden Suburb' Heritage Conservation Area is made up of a variety of building styles that date from the late 19th and early decades of the 20th century. The special character of Hamilton South Garden Suburb will be preserved and maintained through the retention of contributory buildings, open space, the existing subdivision pattern and maintenance of the 'Garden Suburb' layout, street trees and elements of visual interest and heritage significance such as Parkway Avenue, Learmonth Park, small pocket parks, and the vegetated edges of Cottage Creek. Elements that are to be preserved include:
  ▪ The original dwellings of the Garden Suburb which were built up to 1935;
  ▪ The single storey scale of housing stock that is an original defining feature of the Garden Suburb;
  ▪ The consistent front and side setbacks including retaining the offsets to side boundaries and keeping front gardens as open space;
  ▪ Existing subdivision pattern and street layout as evidence of Sulman's 'garden suburb' layout and town plan;
  ▪ A strong symmetrical and hierarchical pattern of streets including Parkway, Gordon and Stewart Avenues;
  ▪ The existing appearance, form and function of Parkway Avenue, including the road verges, street trees, bridge abutments at Cottage Creek, and the central median that splits the carriageway into two single lane roads;
  ▪ Gardens, street trees and public open space including pocket parks at Wilson Place, Corona Street, and elsewhere; and
  ▪ The relationship of houses to their gardens and houses to each other.

• Desired Future Character Statement for Newcastle East Heritage Conservation Area – The character of the Newcastle East Heritage Conservation Area is made up of a variety of building styles that date from the late 19th and early decades of the 20th century. The special character of Newcastle East will be preserved and maintained through the retention of contributory buildings, open space, street trees and elements of visual interest and heritage significance such as the many iconic buildings located in Newcastle East, parks and open space, views and vistas, the unique steep topography and street layout, and the character of the streetscapes including street trees, buildings and the relationship of built elements. Elements that are to be preserved include:
  ▪ The range of contributory and historic buildings, particularly intact or historically significant groupings, heritage items, iconic structures, and the appearance and layout of streets;
  ▪ Existing subdivision pattern and street layout, including preserving the integrity of laneways;
  ▪ Street furniture such as sandstone kerbing and guttering, and other features of historical interest such as heritage items, public stairs, lanes, parks, views and vistas;
  ▪ The regular and homogenous urban form which reflects a regular pattern of subdivision and development, and building stock from between the 1870s and 1930, demonstrating the gradual urbanisation of a once indigenous landscape;
  ▪ The existing appearance of Newcastle East, views outwards to the coastline and harbour, and views into the area from Foreshore Park and the Newcastle coastline and Ocean Baths;
  ▪ Icon heritage items including the Coal River Precinct, the Nobbys headland and breakwater, Fort Scratchley Historic Site, Convict Lumber Yard and Customs House precinct, the Newcastle Ocean baths, Joy Cummings Centre and other significant groups such as the Lahey Bond Store and Stevenson Place terraces; and
  ▪ Parks and reserves, including Newcastle beach, Nobbys Beach, and Foreshore Park.
**Desired Future Character Statement for the Hill Heritage Conservation Area** – The character of the Hill Heritage Conservation Area is made up of a variety of building styles that date from the late 19th and early decades of the 20th century. The special character of The Hill will be preserved and maintained through the retention of contributory buildings, open space, the existing subdivision pattern, street trees and elements of visual interest and heritage significance such as the many iconic buildings located in The Hill, parks and open space, views and vistas, the unique steep topography and street layout, and the character of the streetscapes including street trees, buildings and the relationship of built elements. Elements that are to be preserved include:

- The range of contributory and historic buildings, particularly intact or historically significant groupings, heritage items, iconic structures, and the appearance and layout of streets;
- Sandstone retaining walls, street features such as sandstone kerbing and guttering, and other features of historical interest such as coal shutes, public stairs, lanes, parks, views and vistas;
- The eclectic and organic nature of the urban pattern and varying ages of the building stock that demonstrates the gradual urbanisation during the 19th and 20th century of a once indigenous landscape;
- The existing appearance of the Hill, views outwards to the coastline and harbour and views into the area from the City, foreshore and Stockton which reveal a tree-lined suburb with a steep topography;
- Gardens, street trees and public open space; and
- Existing subdivision pattern and street layout.

**Fabric** – the physical material of the place (including the building, site or area).

**Form** – the overall shape and parts of the building.

**Heritage buildings, sites and elements** – heritage items (including landscape and archaeological items, and building elements), buildings, works, relics, trees and sites within heritage conservation area and heritage streetscapes.

**Heritage Impact Statement** – also includes “Statements of Heritage Impact” – a document that conforms to the standards contained in the NSW Heritage Branch publication “Statements of Heritage Impact”, current version.

**Heritage Significance** - historical, social, aesthetic, cultural, social, archaeological, architectural, scientific or natural significance.

**Host building** – the existing building on the land that is the subject of an alteration or addition.

**In the vicinity** – the surrounding context, environment or setting of a heritage item.

**Infill development** – a new building in an established neighbourhood or precinct.

**Intactness** – the degree of original elements, or elements from a significant period of development, which demonstrate the heritage significance of the building or group of buildings.

**Internal fabric** – the interior fittings such as fireplaces, ceilings, joinery, walls, lifts, galleries, stairs, hardware and moveable items.

**Intrusive building** – a building that has a negative effect on the character or heritage significance of a heritage conservation area.

**Maintenance** – the ongoing protective care of the existing fabric, finish, appearance or setting of a heritage item or a building, work, tree, or place within a heritage conservation area or streetscape within a heritage conservation area. It does not involve the introduction of new materials or technologies.
- **Massing** – the size and volume of a building.
- **Scale** – the size of a building in relation to its surroundings.
- **Setbacks** – the horizontal distance from the building to a boundary or the building line in the case of houses in a street.
- **Setting** – the context within which a building or structure is situated in relation to the surroundings. For example, buildings, roof scapes, chimneys, valleys, ridges, view corridors, trees, parks, gardens, view corridors, vantage points and landmarks may contribute to the setting of a building.

**Summary Statement of Heritage Significance for Cooks Hill Heritage Conservation Area** – Cooks Hill Heritage Conservation Area is significant on a number of levels. As a residential and commercial precinct it is regarded for its special historical character, liveable streetscapes, diverse range of historic buildings and tree lined streets. Its age relative to other parts of Newcastle is readily apparent.

It has a significant visual character comprising all architectural building styles ranging from early Victorian terraces through to post war era residential flat buildings and detached single storey bungalows. A critical mass of contributory buildings, traditional streetscapes, significant trees, sandstone kerb and gutters, artefacts, heritage listed hotels, shops and parklands, gives the suburb a strong sense of place and a distinctive historic identity valued by local residents and visitors.

**Summary Statement of Heritage Significance for Glebe Road Federation Cottages Heritage Conservation Area** – The Glebe Road Federation Cottages Heritage Conservation Area is important at the local level in demonstrating the principal characteristics of the Federation period and the nature of residential building construction in Newcastle between 1909 and 1915. The narrow window of time in which the precinct developed is significant in providing evidence of the key features of the Federation period including construction and building technologies, fashions and key elements of the Federation style, including the single storey scale of these modest dwellings, a symmetrical street frontage, open verandah, pyramidal roof form, hip and gable roofs, bearer and joist construction with lightweight cladding material (weatherboard), and the absence of garaging.

The house at 55 Glebe Road has associative significance with a prominent individual, being the home of RJ Kilgour who was one of the first mayors of the amalgamated City of Greater Newcastle. The group of houses itself has associational significance with the Australian Agricultural Company, and the south east boundary line abuts the easement of the former Burwood Coal and Copper Company railway line, which was the Merewether estate's coal haulage line.

**Summary Statement of Heritage Significance for The Hill Heritage Conservation Area** – The Hill Heritage Conservation Area is of outstanding heritage significance to the City of Newcastle on many levels. It is a significant historic landscape containing numerous heritage items, significant trees, views of the ocean and the harbour, and steeply sloping land and roads that gives it a distinctive character. Its history is multi-dimensional as one of the oldest settled areas of Newcastle.

Early paintings by colonial artists such as Joseph Lycett depict the Awabakal clan living in the area. Views towards The Hill from the city, foreshore, Newcastle east and Stockton provide. The first iron railway in Australia was located at the AA Coy's A Pit, just off Church Street and the flat bench created for the mine is still visible and is a significant artefact of the AA Company. The Boltons heritage group now sits over the site.

The heritage conservation area is significant historically for its three AA Coy coal pits, the three earliest private coal mines in Australia, the A Pit, off Church Street, the B Pit, off Swan Street, the C Pit, off Bingle Street, and their remains including the winding house at No 18 Bingle Street (see Item No. 2173981). These sites are of high heritage significance.
Cathedral and its burial ground have the potential to reveal through their archaeology, information about the convict settlement, and despite the repositioning of the graves, the human remains survive in their original resting places.

The Hill Heritage Conservation area has a strong sense of place and contains many intact streetscapes. The contributory buildings that are of heritage significance include houses, terraces, residential flat buildings and villas dating from the mid 19th Century through to the late 20th century. There are several residences which date as far back as the 1850s and these are of particular importance. The sandstone retaining walls are an important historical element in The Hill along with mature trees, gardens, and early roads formations.

- **Summary Statement of Heritage Significance for Newcastle East Conservation Area** – The Newcastle East Heritage Conservation Area is highly significant as a historic landscape that provides a record of the interaction between the natural environment, including the harbour and the sea, and human settlement. It contains important evidence of Aboriginal life in Newcastle East, uncovered during excavations at the Convict Lumber Yard (CLY) and historical archaeological sites. This evidence allows archaeologist to understand the human and environmental history of the precinct.

  Throughout its European history the area has been shaped by different activities including being the second penal settlement on the mainland after Sydney (from 1801), the site of the processing and shipping of cedar and coal (CLY), having an important coastal defence installation (Fort Scratchley Historic site), the Nobbys lighthouse and breakwater important to the story of shipping, through to the generation of electricity. The residential area is significant for its consistent streetscapes of two and three storey terrace housing dating from the mid-19th through to early 20th centuries and its housing for workers. There are also examples of single storey detached houses.

  The social history of Newcastle East is derived from it being the site of early conservation battles in the 1970s, between developers and conservationist and there are rows of public housing that make this place a community and home for many. It is also an important place of recreation at facilities like the Ocean Baths, Nobbys Beach, and Foreshore Park.

- **Summary Statement of Heritage Significance for Newcastle City Centre Conservation Area** – The Newcastle City Centre Heritage Conservation Area is significant on many levels. The mix of commercial, retail and civic buildings is a powerful reminder of the city's past, its economic and social history. Historic buildings provide the backdrop to a city of dramatic topography on the edge of sea and the mouth of a harbour.

  The pre-1840s buildings in the city are of state significance (Rose Cottage, c1830, Newcomen Club, 1830, parts of James Fletcher Hospital) and share associations with the city's convict origins. Newcastle has a rich archaeological record of national significance, with the potential to yield information about the early convict settlement and early industrial activities. The city area is known to have been a place of contact between colonists and the indigenous population. This evidence is available in historical accounts and in the archaeological record surviving beneath the modern city.

  The high numbers of commercial and civic buildings of the 19thc and 20th centuries gives the city a rich historic character which is notable and allows an understanding of the importance of the city as a place of commerce, governance and city building. The historical foundation of the city was the discovery and exploitation of coal with good shipping access via a safe and navigable harbour. The town's layout by Surveyor General Henry Dangar in 1828 is still visible in the city's streets, and is an element of historical value, particularly in the vicinity of Thorn, Keightley, Hunter and Market Streets.
Summary Statement of Heritage Significance for Hamilton South "Garden Suburb" Heritage Conservation Area – The Hamilton South “Garden Suburb” Heritage Conservation Area is significant to the local community for the surviving evidence of an early twentieth century subdivision pattern made up on single dwellings on large “suburban” style allotments generally over 600 square metres. The precinct has associational significance with the eminent Australian architect and planner Sir John Sulman and as such, its original form is important evidence of his work and ideas. The suburb is one of Newcastle’s earliest and largest examples of a planned garden suburb and as such is historically important. The evidence of Sulman’s original design is reflected in the road layout, allotment shape and pattern, and form of housing – single storey detached bungalow and cottage style houses, with a consistent palette of face brick and painted weatherboard houses.

Summary Statement of Heritage Significance for Hamilton (Beaumont Street) Heritage Conservation Area – Hamilton (Beaumont Street) Heritage Conservation Area is of heritage significance for its role in the economic and social life of the local Hamilton community. It contains many examples of two storey shops and commercial premises that serve to reflect the various periods of economic growth and social history. The area is representative of the waves of immigration during the 20th century and the eastern European immigrants who came to Newcastle established businesses in the street. Newcastle’s earliest examples of Italian and Greek eateries opened on Beaumont Street during the 1950s. The Newcastle Earthquake of 28 December 1989 dramatically changed Beaumont Street. There was widespread damage and loss of life and major social dislocation. However, in terms of the buildings that survived, they were revitalised and many of the two storey shopfronts were saved by judicious planning and urban design. Beaumont Street is now a thriving urban centre with a cosmopolitan character. Many of the buildings have been compromised by unsympathetic signage however, the two storey scale is important in defining the character of the street.

Aims of this section

1. To provide a framework for the conservation of the special qualities within each of Newcastle’s Heritage Conservation Areas - Beaumont Street, Cooks Hill, Glebe Road Federation Cottages, Hamilton South “Garden Suburb”, Newcastle City Centre, Newcastle East, and The Hill.

2. To define the importance, in heritage terms, of each heritage conservation area by providing a Statement of Heritage Significance and a Desired Future Character Statement that shall be the basis of design development.

3. To ensure that development activity within each heritage conservation area is commensurate with heritage significance and produces good design and liveable streetscapes.

4. To ensure that all development has a positive effect on the character of heritage conservation areas.

5. To provide clarity on the types of alterations and additions acceptable in each heritage conservation area.

6. To ensure that proponents of development refer to the Heritage Technical Manual in the design of development proposals.

7. To identify when the adaptive re-use of existing buildings is suitable.

8. To integrate the principles of ecologically sustainable development with best practice heritage management.
6.02.01 Alterations and additions

Objectives

1. Contributory buildings are retained, recycled and adaptively reused.
2. The architectural style of the host building(s) is reflected in the design of the additions and alterations.
3. Alterations and additions contribute positively to the streetscape and the setting of the host building.
4. Additions are designed to minimise the impact on the special qualities of the streetscape and the architectural style of the host building.
5. Additions are in proportion to the host building and conserve the scale of the building and the street.
6. Additions are not visible from the public domain unless the addition is architecturally outstanding.

Controls

Note 3: These controls should be read in conjunction with the guidelines provided in the Heritage Technical Manual, Updated September 2014, Newcastle City Council.

1. Additions respect the host building, preserving the significant aspects such as scale, roofscape, building form, external materials, details, and bulk.
2. Roof conversions occur where the host roof is a high pitch and can accommodate rooms largely within the roof volume. Depending on the significance and the style of the building, dormer roof windows to provide light and ventilation are permitted.
3. Wing additions occur at the rear. Roof pitch matches that of the host building with additions constructed in a manner that reflects the detailing of the host building.
4. Pavilion additions and rear additions are the preferred method of extending a building. A contemporary or contrasting form may be used where such additions are not visible from street or other public areas.
5. Two storey pavilions occur where there is no negative impact on the dwelling when viewed as an element in the streetscape; and, where it can be demonstrated that there is no negative affect on adjoining properties.
6. Sloping sites accommodate additions that follow the slope of the land. Such additions should be located at the rear.
7. Additional storey additions that alter the scale of the host building are permitted where an existing single storey building:

(a) is not a listed heritage item
(b) is surrounded by two to three storey buildings
(c) does not negatively affect the building in its streetscape setting
(d) does not result in a building of more than two storeys in total height.

8. In semi detached houses and contiguous groups of terrace houses, additions and alterations are only considered if the symmetry of the host building will be maintained.

9. Solar panels are permitted on roof planes facing the street where the host building is not a listed heritage item and where the panels are not visually intrusive.

6.02.02 Materials and details in heritage conservation areas

Objectives

1. Maximise the reuse of existing material on site.
2. Ensure selection of new materials and details compliment the local character.

Controls

1. A high proportion of the construction material from the host building are recycled and incorporated in the new additions.
2. The proposal builds on the materials, colours and detail seen throughout the area and which reflect the character of local precincts.
3. The materials palette proposed in an alteration and addition reflects the original design and appearance of the host building.
4. Traditional building elements including windows, doors, hardware, chimneys, verandahs, wall surfaces and other characteristic features of the building, are retained and repaired.
5. Sandblasting is not an acceptable method for cleaning unpainted brickwork or remove paint from brick or stone.
6. Lime mortars are replaced by mortars of similar consistency. Expert advice should be obtained for re-pointing and repair work.
7. External colour schemes are complimentary to the heritage conservation area, are based on research, and have regard of the setting.
8. Exposed brickwork, stone, tiles and shingles are not painted or rendered.
9. Repair and replace joinery in profiles matching the original detailing.
10. Where a face brick structure is proposed, this matches the brick colour and texture of the associated dwelling.
6.02.03 Accommodating vehicles in heritage conservation areas

**Objectives**

1. Minimise the visual intervention of new structures that accommodate vehicles.
2. Maintain the relationship of buildings to the street and to their settings.
3. Maintain the setbacks associated with the heritage conservation area.
4. Produce liveable streetscapes underpinned by the historical character of the conservation area.

**Controls**

1. Garages and carports are sited at the rear or behind the building line of the existing house.
2. Additional vehicle crossings in heritage conservation areas are not supported unless the vehicle crossing is to a rear laneway.
3. Where a property has access to a rear lane, vehicle accommodation is located adjacent to the laneway, providing vehicle access from the laneway.
4. Where access to the rear or side of the site is not available, single garages and carports are permitted where demonstrated that the impact on the streetscape or host building is acceptable.
5. Where double garages are proposed at the rear of sites, they are designed with two doors and a pier between them to reduce the horizontal effect of the opening.
6. Car parking where permitted in front of a building, is uncovered.
7. Sandstone kerbing is not to be disturbed.
8. Driveways are designed as concrete or brick strips with grass or gravel in between.
9. Paving materials are terminated inside the property boundary and are not extended into the public domain, unless of a matching colour and treatment.
10. New driveway crossings are to be designed in consultation with Council. All crossings are to be designed to match the colour palette of the site and the neighbouring footway, subject to advice from council staff. Generally plain concrete with a charcoal oxide and trowel finish is to be used where bitumen paving is the predominant paving material.
6.02.04  Fences in heritage conservation areas

Objectives

1. Preserve and protect fences, stone and brick retaining walls and garden settings.
2. Ensure fences within the public domain contribute to the streetscape.
3. Retain and repair surviving original fences.
4. Ensure new fences in the public domain match the details and materials of the adjoining contributory fences or matches the original fence in the case of rebuilding projects.

Controls

1. Reconstruct missing fences to their previous design based on photographic evidence.
2. Retain, repair and re-instate original and traditional fences and retaining walls.
3. Use traditional materials and designs on front or side boundaries where visible to the street.
4. Retain later fences where they reflect the traditional fence design.
5. Front fences are between 700-1200mm high, to a maximum height of 1500mm, measured from ground level.
6. Front fences extend across the whole of the front boundary of the property, and should incorporate gates where there is a driveway present.

6.02.05  Gardens in heritage conservation areas

Objectives

1. Ensure front gardens are a part of the streetscape.
2. Ensure appropriate landscaping is provided.
3. Retain surviving original garden elements such as lych gates, paths, edging tiles etc.
4. Promote use of traditionally designed gardens that enhance the appearance of historic houses and the streetscape.

Controls

1. Trees and shrubs are planted within the property boundaries and not on the front verge which forms part of the public domain.
2. The selection of street trees is undertaken by Council.
6.02.06 Subdividing or amalgamating land in a heritage conservation area

Objectives

1. Ensure that subdivision and amalgamation of land in a heritage conservation area is commensurate with the heritage significance of the area, and conserves the important characteristics of the subdivision pattern and allotment layout, streetscape character and notable features of the precinct.

2. Allow for the interpretation of the original pattern of the subdivision pattern in any development proposal.

Controls

1. Lot boundary changes are not proposed where the development pattern or early subdivision is integral to the heritage significance of the heritage conservation area.

2. Lot boundary changes within heritage conservation areas retains significant features such as buildings, archaeological sites, trees, gardens, and outbuildings associated with the pattern of development of that area.

3. Lot boundary changes to large allotments enables the continuation of the significant or early subdivision pattern of development in the area.

4. Amalgamation of sites in heritage conservation areas provides for the conservation of the fine grain pattern of development associated with the area, where applicable.

6.02.07 Infill development in a heritage conservation area

Note 4: These controls should be read in conjunction with the guidelines provided in the Heritage Technical Manual, Updated September 2014, Newcastle City Council.

All new development in the conservation area should be treated as 'infill', that is, it should respect the design of its neighbours and the character of the area generally. Similar principles are applied to infill development as are applied to alterations and additions, and must begin with an understanding of the design and heritage significance of the buildings to which it relates.

Infill development should not copy or replicate its neighbouring traditional buildings. Rather, it is appropriate to interpret the features of the neighbouring buildings and design them in a way that reflects and respects them.

Where a development application is submitted for infill development, appropriate design advice from an architect or accredited building designer should be obtained. A brief design statement should be written by the design professional to explain the form and style of the proposal and explain how it relates to the heritage conservation area.
Objectives

1. Infill development respects the design of its neighbours and the character of the heritage conservation area.

2. Infill development achieves a harmony of character; sympathy of scale; appropriateness of form; appropriate orientation and setback, and sympathetic materials and details within heritage conservation areas.

3. Infill development demonstrates a good fit within its setting that respects the neighbouring buildings and the character of the heritage conservation area.

Controls

Character

1. The character or style of new buildings relates to the overall character of the area. The design of new buildings should be influenced by the style of buildings within the street and the neighbouring buildings.

2. The character of an infill building harmonises with the style of its neighbours. In particular, the proposed building should avoid becoming a dominant element within the streetscape or being deliberately modern.

Scale

3. Infill buildings must reflect the general scale of streetscapes within the heritage conservation area. In particular, infill buildings should respect and be similar to the scale of neighbouring contributory buildings in the vicinity.

4. The predominant height of contributory buildings in the street should be used as the starting point for the scale of infill buildings, rather than the highest building in the street (especially where the highest building is non-contributory or intrusive).

5. Consideration must be given to the relative scale of the components of a building. Infill development must be designed with elements that reflect the scale of building elements in contributory buildings. For example, window proportions and the height of major elements such as parapets and eaves lines relative to neighbouring buildings, balustrades and roof lines.

Form

6. The form of new buildings (i.e. massing and overall bulk) is consistent with the prevailing form of contributory buildings within the heritage conservation area.

7. New development relates to the massing of neighbouring contributory buildings.

8. The roof form, slope and pitch of new development reflects and is respectful of the typical forms of contributory buildings in the heritage conservation area.
Setbacks and orientation

9. Infill development is setback consistent with the prevailing setbacks in the heritage conservation area. For example, zero lot lines to front boundaries is a development pattern that should be repeated where relevant to the streetscape.

Materials and details

10. The materials and details of new development are compatible with, but not directly copy, those of contributory buildings in the streetscape.

Vehicle accommodation

11. Garages and carports are sited at the rear or behind the building line.

12. Where a property has access to a rear lane, vehicle accommodation is located adjacent to the laneway, providing vehicle access from the laneway.

13. Additional vehicular crossings in heritage conservation areas are not supported unless the proposed car-parking is provided at the rear of the site.

14. Where access to the rear or side of the site is not available, single garages and carports are permitted where demonstrated that the impact on the streetscape is acceptable.

15. Where double garages are proposed it is at the rear and does not impact the public domain or appreciation of the character of the heritage conservation area.

16. Sandstone kerbing is not impacted.

17. Paving materials are terminated inside the property boundary and are not extended into the public domain.
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