

## Neighbourhood Forum 5

## Wollongong's Heartland



Coniston, Figtree,  
Gwynneville, Keiraville,  
Mangerton, Mount  
Keira, Mount St  
Thomas, North  
Wollongong, West  
Wollongong,  
Wollongong City.

### Agenda for e-meeting on Wed 2<sup>nd</sup> June 2021 by email

- 1 Presentation None possible
- 2 Apologies None necessary
- 3 Minutes of meeting of 5<sup>th</sup> May and matters arising; see pp. 15-18
- 4 Comments If you wish to object or comment on any of the recommendations in this agenda, please respond before the meeting date.
  
- 5 Responses
  - 5.1 Community Survey: see p. 2;
  - 5.2 Access to Northern Breakwater: see p, 2;
  - 5.3 Connecting Neighbours: see p. 2;
  - 5.4 Outstanding responses: see p, 2;
- 6 Reports
  - 6.1 Council 2021 budget etc plans: see pp. 2 & 11-14;
  - 6.2 Smith Street Cycleway: see p.2;
  - 6.3 Slow speed roads: see p.2 & **rec p.3**;
  - 6.4 Stuart Park and Foreshore parking: see p.3 & **rec p.4**;
  - 6.5 North Wollongong Surf Club restaurant DA see p.4;
  - 6.6 Draft DCP Telecommunications: see p.4;
  - 6.7 Draft Community Engagement Policy: **see rec p.4**;
  - 6.8 Appreciative letter from KRAG: see p.4;
  - 6.9 NF 5 boundaries: see p.5;
  - 6.10 Harry Graham Park Bikeway: **see rec p.5**;
  - 6.11 Draft City Centre Heritage Study: see p,5 & **rec p.6**;
  - 6.12 Draft Child Safe Policy: **see rec p.6**.
  - 6.13 Synthetic Playing Fields: see p.6 and **see rec p.7**
  
- 7 Priorities 7.1 – 7.3 See p.8
- 8 Planning
  - 8.1 DAs: **see rec p.8**
  - 8.2 DA determinations: see pp.8 & 9.
- 9 General Business
- 10 Snippets see p.10

**Next Meeting/Agenda: on Wed. 7<sup>th</sup> July 2021.**

---

**Current active membership of Neighbourhood Forum 5 : 397 households**

---

## **5 Responses 5.1 Community Satisfactory Survey**

Council have responded by saying the Wellbeing Survey should cover the situation. However, this is a formal audit of Council's performance on progress on the 10 year Community Strategic Plan whereas the two-yearly Satisfaction Surveys since the 1990's are statistically reliable and provide valuable measures of the communities' perception of Council's services, performance, comparisons and trends over time. whilst the survey is a representative sample of the of their performance. Therefore it is critical that both surveys are considered at the same time. Ward Councillors have been contacted.

### **5.2 Access to Northern Breakwater**

Paul Scully, MP is still pestering ministers on this for us.

### **5.3 Connecting Neighbours**

We asked to be advised of the successful bids in our area for Verge Garden grants. They are: Heaslip Grove, Coniston; Bellevue Road, Figtree; Gilmore Green, West Wollongong.

#### Recommendation

That the Verge Garden winners be congratulated.

### **5.4 Outstanding responses**

Privatisation of public land;  
City centre movement study;  
Synthetic playing fields.  
Development Application Appeals protocol;  
DCP Character Statements.

## **6 Reports 6.1 WCC draft Operational Plan 2021/2022**

#### Recommendation

That the submission (attachment pages 9-12 ) be endorsed.)

### **6.2 Smith Street Cycleway:**

Council have responded positively on the difficulty of accommodating Waste Removal trucks and discussions are continuing including improvements to community information provided by council.

### **6.3 Slow speed roads:**

Low-speed streets are about much more than road safety and increasing fine revenue. By building safer streets, governments and cities around the world are creating more liveable cities. The benefits include low crime levels, more physically active citizens, greater social connectedness, increased spending in local businesses and less pollution.

Research shows 30km/h speed limits on local residential streets could reduce the Australian road death toll by 13%. The economic benefit would be about A\$3.5 billion every year. The chance of survival jumps from just 10% at 50km/h to 90% at 30km/h.

Speed is the most common contributor to road trauma – more common than alcohol, drugs and fatigue. To reduce serious injury risk, 40km/h speed limits aren't low enough. The chance of survival when hit by a car improves from 60% at 40km/h to 90% at 30km/h. Reducing speed limits to 30km/h in urban areas such as high pedestrian zones, school zones and local traffic areas is urgently needed to reduce deaths and severe injuries.

NF 5 has long requested Council to reduce speed limits in the City Centre area to 40 km/h. and it is understood Council staff support this – at least in principle. For example, Smith Street has been narrowed to one way as an interim safety improvement, the speed limit should be reduced.. This could be monitored and, in the light of recent research speed limits in Smith Street and other City Centre streets reduced to 30mkph where appropriate.

#### Recommendation

That Council liaise with Transport New South Wales to reduce speed limits in selected streets of the City Centre area to 30 km/h within the context of an hierarchy of an overall street framework.

#### **6.4 Stuart Park and Foreshore parking:**

For many years residents have raised concerns that unrestricted on-street and carpark spaces along the Blue Mile, nearby streets and Stuart Park are being occupied all day on weekdays, often by workers who then walk or use the free bus for CBD access. Four-hour limits during weekdays apply for foreshore parking at south beach, but not elsewhere. Council's Blue Mile Masterplan includes a multi-deck public carpark at Northbeach, but the 13 year old Masterplan still has not been reviewed despite frequent community requests. Over three years ago Council engaged consultants to develop a Foreshore Parking Strategy, with a focus on the Blue Mile and Stuart Park. Since then Council has been requested to expedite and advise on its status, but without success.

On 4 Nov 2020 NF5 agreed to request Council to advise how and when the community can be involved in discussing options for providing adequate parking for residents and visitors in the Blue Mile, Stuart Park and nearby residential areas. Also to advise the process for the long overdue review of the 2008 Blue Mile Masterplan, so that collaborative community engagement is achieved, in accordance with Council's Policy. But this has not progressed.

On 26 October 2020 Council's resolution on the Foreshore Parking Strategy included: Staff review this impending strategy and advise whether there are any pop-up parking opportunities or alternatives that could be brought forward to alleviate pressure on the foreshore precincts of the city over Summer 2020/21, noting the particularly high traffic volume areas of Austinmer, Bulli, Thirroul, Stanwell Park, Port Kembla and the city precinct comprising Stuart Park, North Wollongong Beach, City Beach and Wollongong Harbour. It is not known what has happened re this, nor when a draft Foreshore Parking Strategy will be publicly released for community input.

As reported to NF5 meeting 5 May, Council's 365 pages of exhibited budget documents included that Foreshore Parking Strategy implications are not funded. But the documents say that surplus Available Funds can be used for projects to take advantage of opportunities that may arise. A meeting with Council's Manager Infrastructure Strategy & Planning is being arranged re implementation of the Keiraville Gwynneville Access and Movement Strategy.

#### Recommendation

That Council again be requested to:

- i advise how and when the community can be involved in discussing options for providing adequate parking for residents and visitors in the Blue Mile, Stuart Park and nearby residential areas;
- ii advise the process for the long overdue review of the 2008 Blue Mile Masterplan, so that collaborative community engagement is achieved in accordance with Council's Policy; and
- iii allocate adequate finds in FY2021/22 to implement Foreshore Parking Strategy implications

#### **6.5 North Wollongong Surf Club restaurant DA;**

NF5 made a submission in accordance with relevant criteria in s4.15 of the Environmental Assessment and Protection Act, and it is understood the WLPP will consider a report by Council's planners and determine this DA. However the club are seeking further discussion with us.

#### **6.6 Draft DCP Telecommunications;**

16<sup>th</sup> June

This is primarily a re-jig of the policy to incorporate the latest legislative changes.

#### **6.7 Draft Community Engagement Policy;**

11<sup>th</sup> June

The Policy on exhibition has been revised from time to time since it was introduced in 2005. It a relatively short over-arching document that relies on reference to 12 other documents which include engagement processes.

For example, reference to where public notification and advertising procedures are set out for development applications can be found in the Community Participation Plan.

The Policy includes goals, commitment and method of engagement which respond to the four levels of – Inform, Consult, Involve and ultimately Collaborate. Unfortunately Council staff’s implementation of the Policy is mainly limited to the lower two levels of Inform and Consult. Whereas the community needs to be Involved and where appropriate to Collaborate. It is hoped this will change following previous representations. A positive is that Neighbourhood Forums are now listed as included in the top level of Collaborate.

**Recommendation**

The Policy be noted

**6.8 Appreciative letter from KRAG**

KRAG have written to thank us for action regarding the proposed development at Cosgrove Avenue. This included the endorsement of the resolutions of their recent public meeting, which was much appreciated.

**6.9 NF 5 boundaries**

There has been some confusion of late about the northern boundary of the Forum area. Council have now confirmed that the boundary is that of the suburbs as defined by Council and North Wollongong extends to include the University Campus East and includes the UoW Health and Well being Precinct for which a Dais under consideration.

**6.10 Harry Graham Park Trial Bike Track**

14<sup>th</sup> June

Council have built a temporary Trial Bike Track in this park (top) and are now seeking comments on whether it should be made permanent, transferred to the area on the corner of Uralba St & Langston Ave (bottom) or somewhere else.

It is not clear whether this is to be a purely local park, as its size suggests, or serving the suburb, where are no other such parks, as Council description suggests.

The top site is remote from houses, adjoins Lindsay Park primary school but has no vehicular access or parking nearby. As such it would be suitable as a very local facility.



The bottom site is nearer to houses but has good access and parking and excellent informal surveillance. It could serve both the local area and the suburb. However, if this site is strongly opposed by nearby residents a compromise might be Figtree Park.



#### Recommendation

Subject to feedback from members by 13<sup>th</sup> June, Council be advised:

- 1 of support to make permanent the existing temporary site for the Bike Track in Harry Graham Park provided this is proposed to be a very local facility and others will be built throughout the city;
- 2 that if it is not intended to provide similar facilities throughout the city then the Forum would support moving the track to Langston Park Reserve provided there is local support;
- 3 that if there is not support then a site in Figtree Park be investigated.

#### 6.11 Draft City Centre Heritage Study

This is a proposal is the first step towards adding 19 items to the Heritage Schedule in the Local Environmental Plan. They are:

- i Archaeological Site of Wollongong Gaol\* 84, 86, 88 Cliff Road and 2, 4 and 6 Robertson Street, Wollongong. (\* = archaeological item).
- ii Archaeological Remains of The Cricketers Arms Hotel\*, Corrimal Street Road Reserve - corner of Crown Street adjacent to 26-28 Burelli Street, Wollongong.
- iii “Bank Chambers” (Front of building to 6m), 127-131 Crown Street, Wollongong.
- iv “Caldwell’s Building”, 280-282 Crown Street, Wollongong.
- v Commercial Buildings (Front of building to 6m), 135, 137-139 Crown Street, Wollongong.
- vi Group of Commercial Buildings including the “Taylor Building” (Front of building to 6m), 98-102 Crown Street, Wollongong.
- vii Group of Commercial Buildings on Crown Street (Front of building to 6m), 98-102 Crown Street, Wollongong.
- viii “Kawarra Chambers”, 118-124 Crown Street, Wollongong.
- ix Queens Hotel Archaeological Site\*, 24 Crown Street, Wollongong.
- x Former “Berlei Building”, 43-47 Denison Street, Wollongong.
- xi Federation House, 3 Hercules Street, Wollongong.
- xii Interwar House, 11 Hercules Street, Wollongong.
- xiii Group of Commercial Buildings on Keira Street, 100-120 Keira Street, Wollongong.
- xiv “Gloucester House”, 67 Kembla Street, Wollongong.
- xv “Marlborough Court”, 4 Market Place, Wollongong.
- xvi “Braemar Flats”, 29 Smith Street, Wollongong.
- xvii “Kingston House”, 27A Smith Street, Wollongong.
- xviii “Pious Society of St Charles Sacred Heart Church”, 28 Stewart Street, Wollongong.
- ixx Seventh Day Adventist Church, 30 Victoria Street, Wollongong

At the same time there is a separate proposal to add 14 Acacia Avenue Gwynneville to the Schedule.

Recommendation

That the proposed additions to the Heritage Schedule be supported.

**6.12 Draft Child Safe Policy**

This is a quite straightforward Policy basically of an administrative nature outlining Council's commitment to be a child safe organisation.

Recommendation

That the proposed Draft Child Safe Policy be supported.

**6.13 Synthetic Playing Fields**

In April NF5 noted NSW Planning (DPIE) is investigating sustainable alternatives to synthetic grass due to increasing concerns about its environmental and health impacts, It was agreed to request Council to review any current proposals to construct synthetic playing fields, including in Keiraville, and hold off any new proposals. A response is pending.

On 25 May NF5 was represented at DPIE's online Open Space and Synthetic Turf Community Workshop to discuss the social, environmental, and economic benefits and impacts of using synthetic turf as alternative surface type material. Issues raised include:

Social: Synthetic Turf (ST) enables increased usage, but best practice Natural Grass (NG) provides comparable usage. Social disbenefits for increased usage with either ST or NG occur if fields are located too close to residential areas, including problems with traffic, parking, noise and lighting. The high cost of ST means higher fees for users, reduced affordability and adverse social impacts. The suitability of ST is limited to various sports, and ST needs fencing, alienating access and informal random uses by residents.

Environmental: There was agreement that ST creates significant disadvantages, including pollution of waterways from microplastic and rubber, harmful chemicals, high field temperatures and reduces biodiversity.

Economic: Studies comparing estimated ST and best practice NG lifecycle costs per hectare for construction & maintenance show ST costs are 4 times higher than for NG. Moreover, for carrying capacity ST costs are almost 4 times higher than for NG. Also end-of-life ST presents significant environmental and disposal costs. Most existing NG fields can have poor drainage, soils, grass types and/or maintenance, which can contribute for calls to replace with ST. Whereas best practice NG is preferable socially, environmentally and economically.

Recommendation

Council again be urged to review the use of synthetic playing fields.

## 7 Priorities

### 7.1 Liveability for our Suburbs

A meeting with Council's Manager Infrastructure Strategy & Planning is being arranged re implementation of the Keiraville Gwynneville Access and Movement Strategy.

### 7.2 City Centre Planning & Development

See reports 2,3 and 11.

### 7.3 Stormwater Management – nothing more

## 8 Planning

8.1 Please note that whilst this review, and the recommendation based on it has been prepared with all due care and objectivity, no legal responsibility is accepted for errors, omissions or inadvertent misrepresentations, nor for any outcomes which might result from the assessments. As this review has only been made with the information available, members are encouraged to make their own submissions with any additional comments to the Secretary of NF5 before the closing date.

### 8.2 DA 2021/459 3 units at 30 Keira Street, Wollongong

28<sup>th</sup> May

This is an anomalous proposal for three dwellings to convert an approved dual occupancy, to which we objected, and for which foundations have been constructed, on a narrow site with no prospect of amalgamation. The change has little further environmental impact but sets a precedent for unit development on sites almost half the minimum width.



#### Recommendation

That the submission of objection be endorsed.

### 8.3 DA determinations

DA no. 20/...	Suburb	Address	Proposal	Forum Rec	Result Authority
19/874	Keiraville	6, Bulwarra St	4 town houses	Object	Approved Court.
19/1008	W'gong	1 Smith St	8 storey flats	Object	Refused Panel
Re- zoning	Figtree	Terrie Ave	Subdivision	Object	Withdrawn

15/1242	W'gong	16-18 Market Pl	4 storey units	Object	Refused Panel
20/645	W.W'gong	39 Rosemount St	Dual Occupancy	Support	Approved Delegated
20/339	Figtree	103 Murray Pk rd	Dual Occupancy	Object	Approved Delegated
19/748	W'gong	264-268 Keira St & 23 Kenny Street	Mixed develop 15 stories	Object	Refused Regional P.
19/980	W'gong	82A Cliff Road	4 Storey Dual Occupancy	Object	Refused Panel
20/241	W'gong	93-95 Kembla St	7 storey residential	Object	Approved Panel
20/632	Gwynneville	14-16 Acacia Ave	8 townhouses	Object	Refused Panel
20/860	Figtree	6 Mallangong Close	Dual Occupancy	Support	Approved Delegated
20/4	Keiraville	14 Cosgrove Ave	Subdivision 47 dwellings	Object	Refused Regional P.
19/1356	W'gong	9-11 Park St	8 storey residential	Object	Approved Panel
20/913	West W'gong	11 Alkera Cc	Dual Occupancy	Support	Approved Panel
20/528	W'gong	359 Crown St	Storey hotel	Support concept Object details	Approved Regional P.
20/307	Figtree	5-7 Truscott Pl	Multi dwelling housing	Object	Refused Panel
20/1098	Keiraville	147 Gipps Road	Dual occupancy		Approved Delegated
20/62o	W'gong	JJ Kelly Park	Major events	Support	Approved Panel
20/622	W'gong	102/3 Springhill Rd	Major events	Support	Approved Panel

## 9 General Business

## 10 Snippets

### Green Infrastructure

Given how much we now know about the vital benefits of green infrastructure – including its contributions to health, urban cooling, reduction of air pollution and flood mitigation – why isn't more money invested in it? There are many interrelated answers to this question, but an important factor is the way that financial accounting systems operate. For instance, the financial value of the benefits that green infrastructure creates does not usually appear on balance sheets, whereas the cost of maintaining it does. As a consequence, from the point of view of financial directors, green infrastructure tends to look like a waste of money rather than a valuable asset that any prudent organisation would pay to maintain. Carefully planned investments in natural capital, targeted at the best locations, will deliver significant value for money and generate large economic returns.

### Street Art



**Neighbourhood  
Forum 5**

**Wollongong's  
Heartland**



**Coniston, Figtree,  
Gwynneville,  
Keiraville, Mangerton,  
Mount Keira, Mount  
St Thomas, North  
Wollongong, West  
Wollongong,  
Wollongong City.**

Wednesday 19th May 2021

The General Manager  
Wollongong City Council

Dear Sir

**2021-22 Budget, Delivery and Operational Plans Submission**

**Summary for Council to:**

- 1 review the organisation's Values, including taking into account transparency and accountability;
- 2 bring forward the Community Survey in the program so that the results are available before the September election;
- 3 bring forward amendments to the DCP Desired Future Character Statements to 2021-2022.
- 4 review the capitalised & distributed employee costs of over 13%.
- 5 provide adequate funding in FY 2021-22 for Foreshore Parking Strategy implications and Implementation of Leading the Way program.
- 6 provide adequate funds to ensure the draft Integrated Transport Strategy is exhibited by mid 2022.
- 7 provide adequate funds in 2021/22 to review comprehensively the Blue Mile Masterplan in conjunction with the community, at least at level 3 in the CE Policy, ie Involve, and preferably level 4 Collaborate.
- 8 provide adequate funds in the 2021/22 budget and beyond for the implementation of the Botanic Gardens Masterplan/Asset Management Plan
- 9 provide adequate funds in the 2021/22 and /23 budgets to review the City Wide LEP, including extensive and effective community engagement processes;
- 10 restore estimated costs per project in the IDP to provide an annual reconciliation of estimated and actual costs to ensure transparency and accountability;
- 11 engage the community in the Design stage of projects, where appropriate, by using the CE Policy's higher levels, ie L3 Involve and in relevant cases ultimately L4 Collaborate.
- 12 review their adopted Place Management approach and provide adequate resources to ensure Place Managers in key areas are effective
- 13 urgently correct the apparent gross relative underfunding for Stormwater Services.

**Submissions in detail**

These submissions are in response to Council's exhibited 365 page 2021/22 Financial Year (FY) plans, including (A) the draft Delivery Program, (B) Operational Plan, (C) Budget, (D) Infrastructure Delivery Program, (E) Revenue Policy, (F) Fees & Charges and (G) Financial Strategy Policy. They cover items A to D, but not E to G.

**(A) Delivery Program**

This document includes Council's six Goals, which NF5 supports. The many Objectives, Strategies, Delivery Program and Operational plans seem reasonable. The organisation's Values do not include "transparency & accountability" and also seem to lack a Value that applied from the early 1990's for many years until dropped some time in the 2000's, ie "to be an open and accessible organisation"

**Submission 1**

That Council review the organisation's Values, including taking into account transparency and accountability.

**(B) Operational Plan**

This plan includes public participation and planning issues.

The timing of the community survey of perceptions of Councils performance must be considered at the same time as Council's factual audit of their "end of term" performance.

**Submission 2**

That the Community Survey be brought forward in the program so that the results are available before the September election;

There is significant community concern about the impact of inappropriate development in low density areas, particularly those approved under State legislation without neighbours knowing until construction starts.  
amendments to Council's.

**Submission 3**

That amendments to the Development Control Plan to amend the Desired Future Character Statements be brought forward to 2021-2022.

**(C) Budget**

This is a comprehensive document that indicates Council is in a sound financial position for which Council is commended.

It is noted that Employee salaries & wages are ~\$143mpa in 2021/22 which continues to appear to be an excessive percentage when compared with other similar Councils.

**Submission 4**

That Council review the capitalised & distributed employee costs of over 13%.

The budget states the Available Funds are used as a buffer against unanticipated future costs and/or can be used to provide flexibility to take advantage of opportunities that may arise. However a list of potential initiatives or programs that have not been fully included in the financial estimates at this stage include two critically important ones, ie Foreshore Parking Strategy implications, and Implementation of Leading the Way program (said to be focussed on optimising performance through more effective, efficient and innovative service delivery).

**Submission 5**

That Council provide adequate funding in FY 2021-22 for Foreshore Parking Strategy implications and Implementation of Leading the Way program.

The Development of an Integrated Transport Strategy is obviously urgently needed. The Cycling Strategy 2030 & Implementation Plan that Council adopted in 2020 lists the ITS as high priority, estimated cost \$200,000, to be done in the Short term (ie immediately or within 2 years). The budget documents show no funds in 2020/21 and only \$50,000 per year for 2021/22 and /23.

**Submission 6**

That Council provide adequate funds to ensure the draft Integrated Transport Strategy is exhibited by mid 2022.

The Blue Mile Masterplan adopted by Council more than 13 years ago in late 2007 (ie just before the administrators started), was stated to cost about \$44 million and take 5 years. There are many outstanding works, some unscheduled projects have been funded, and it is estimated that if all planned works are completed the final cost could be around \$150 million and take up to 20 years. For many years community requests to review the Masterplan have been ignored and the budget documents show only \$46,000 in 2021/22 to update it.

**Submission 7**

That Council provide adequate funds in 2021/22 to comprehensively review the Blue Mile Masterplan in conjunction with the community, at least at level 3 in the CE Policy, ie Involve, and preferably level 4 Collaborate.

The Botanic Gardens Masterplan/Asset Management Plan is listed for \$11,000 in the current 2020/21 budget, but no funding can be found beyond then for Implementation.

**Submission 8**

That Council provide adequate funds in the 2021/22 budget and beyond for implementation of the Botanic Gardens Masterplan/Asset Management Plan

The budget shows \$100,000 in each of 2022/23 and /24 for the City Wide LEP Review, but this needs more urgent action.

**Submission 9**

That Council provide adequate funds in the 2021/22 and /23 budgets to

review the City Wide LEP, including extensive and effective community engagement processes

**(D) Infrastructure Delivery Program (IDP)**

Unfortunately estimated costs per project are not shown in the IDP, since being eliminated in early 2019, during the term of a previous acting Director (who left in late 2020). As a result it is not possible for the community to suggest alternative projects which they consider to be higher priority than others, and remain within the total budget allocation. Also it is not possible to compare actual and estimated costs of projects because this is not publicly available.

**Submission10**

That the estimated costs per project in the IDP be restored to provide an annual reconciliation of estimated and actual costs to ensure to ensure transparency and accountability.

Council has provided a list of IDP projects proposed for NF5 area, which should at least alert the community on which year is scheduled for various stages of projects, ie Design and Construction.

**Submission 11**

That in the Design stage of projects, where appropriate, Council engage the community by using the CE Policy's higher levels, ie L3 Involve and in relevant cases ultimately L4 Collaborate.

A related issue, but not found in the budget documents, is the need for effective Place Managers, the approach that Council adopted in August 2013 as a framework for management of projects and community issues. This has been used successfully in other Councils, but seems to have lapsed here. Its invigoration would assist in communications with residents particularly in the early stages of considering project options and throughout for funded works

**Submission 12**

That Council review their adopted Place Management approach and provide adequate resources to ensure Place Managers in key areas are effective.

The IDP Summary shows Stormwater Services Capital expenditure is 6.5% of total, and Maintenance & Operations is 2.5% of total, whereas other data shows the Replacement cost of Stormwater Assets is 27% of Council's total (excluding non-infrastructure & non-depreciable assets).

**Submission13**

That Council urgently correct the apparent gross relative underfunding for Stormwater Services.

Yours faithfully  
David Winterbottom, Secretary

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Neighbourhood Forum 5</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Wollongong's Heartland</b></p>		<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Coniston, Figtree, Gwynneville, Keiraville, Mangerton, Mount Keira, Mount St Thomas, North Wollongong, West Wollongong, Wollongong City.</b></p>
--	--	--

**Minutes of e-meeting on Wed 5<sup>th</sup> May 2021 by email**

- 1 Presentation None possible
- 2 Apologies It was noted that Lord Mayor would have liked to come to the meeting.
- 3 Minutes of meeting of 7<sup>th</sup> April were adopted with no matters arising;
- 4 Comments received on a Development Application are noted in 8 below.
- 5 Responses **5.1 Community Survey**

In March we requested Council to conduct and report on the budgeted two yearly Community Satisfaction Survey (CSS) by at least a month before Council elections on 4 Sep 2021. The most recent response from a Director is that it is not intended to advance the CSS, but a Wellbeing Survey is being conducted and its results will be included in the End of Term Report, which the Office of Local Government requires to be submitted at the last meeting of the existing Council (due early August). CSS reports have been conducted by IRIS for almost 30 years and results were presented to open Council during and before the end of its term. But this long-term practice has changed.

The Wellbeing Surveys were introduced by OLG several years ago as Community Strategic Plan indicators (some being beyond Council's control), for inclusion on the glossy selective End of Term report. The CSS report is essential to this to provide statistically reliable information on performance and trends, and is particularly valuable for councillors, management & staff to help identify, plan and implement improvements to services.

It was agreed that the General Manager again be requested to conduct and report on the community satisfaction survey for transparency and accountability to inform the next Local Government election.

---

**Current active membership of Neighbourhood Forum 5 : 398 households**

---

**6.1 WCC Operational Plan 2021-22**

It was agreed:

- i members advise NF5 Secretary by Monday 17 May the details of any changes they suggest for inclusion in the NF5 submission on Council's Plans and documents for FY 2021-22:
- ii NF5 Executive be authorised to make a submission to Council.

**6.2 Access to northern breakwater**

It was agreed:

- i that Paul Scully be thanked for his action to date and requested to seek that the responsible Minister direct NSW Ports and their lessee PKCT to restore conditional safe public access for fishers to the Port Kembla northern breakwater, prior to construction starting on the new LNG terminal, during its construction, and post construction;
- ii that Council be requested to take appropriate action to achieve this outcome.

**6.3 Smith Street Cycleway**

Further to Item 6.3 in NF5 Agenda, concerns have been raised advised including about extra travel time due to the one way street, and the potential for traffic delays when Waste trucks are collecting kerbside bins. Also commented is the need for more parking for Stuart Park users, for which representations have previously been made to Council requesting advice on their Foreshore parking strategy and its implementation.

It is recognised that some travel times will inevitably increase and it is understood Council will be monitoring the situation. Re traffic delays due to Waste collections, on 4 May an inspection of the cycleway was carried out from 6.30am, by which time most of the 3 types of bins (red, yellow and green lid) had been collected on the south and north sides of Smith St. It is understood that delays had been relatively short and Council's waste management section have been requested to advise the arrangements agreed with the collection contractor. A separate issue of scattered empty bins on the northern side has been taken up with staff, who are investigating improvements and will advise

**6.4 Bluescope Steel Liaison meeting:** noted

**6.5 Community Land Management Plans;** noted

**6.6 Train Service**

It was agreed that Paul Scully MP be thanked for his efforts in trying to secure the release of the McNaughton report, and requesting that he convey to the Minister for Transport our interest in speeding up our train services, and whether this will include replacing slow speed points at Waterfall by high speed points, as part of the work now underway near this station.

- 6.7 Destination Wollongong:** noted
- 7      Priorities      **7.1 Liveability for our Suburbs**  
 It was noted that in addition to the problems emerging from the Cosgrove Avenue proposal, there is nothing in the Council Delivery Program to introduce measures to address inappropriate development in the Low Density Residential Zones, which we have been promoting for at least the last 10 years. Matters are now much worse because of the State imposed as-of-right developments.
- It was agreed that:
- i      Council be requested to urgently develop appropriate protocols for appeals on DA determinations that ensure Council’s involvement in the Land and Environment Court’s conciliation and court process is transparent including all additional documentation submitted by the developer;
  - ii     Council provide for appropriate engagement of residents concerned about the DA
  - iii    the resolutions of the KRAG public meeting be endorsed;
  - iv     Council at the very least to amend the Development Control Plan in 2021-2022 to provide meaningful “Desired Future Character Statements” for suburbs as these are the only measures currently available to curb the worst excesses, with more detailed measures following as soon as the Housing Strategy has been adopted;
  - v      Ward Councillors be approached for support.
- 7.2 City Centre Planning & Development:** noted
- 7.3 Stormwater Management:** noted
- 8      Planning      **8.2 DA/2021/344, 4 Townhouses, 328 Gipps Rd Keiraville.**  
 The submission of objection was endorsed.
- 8.3 DA 2020/169 N. Wollongong Surf Club Restaurant**  
 It was agreed to endorse the submission of objection,
- 8.4 DA determinations:** noted

9      General Business **9.1 Privatisation of Public Land**

On 5 May an article in the SMH started with: “The NSW government will urge the private sector to come up with new development ideas for its extensive public property portfolio as part of a new 20- year plan for housing across the state”. Moreover: “The government will also run a pilot program with Wollongong Council to investigate the use of vacant buildings and land in the Wollongong area”.

On 5 May at a DPIE webinar the government-appointed Crown Land Commissioner spoke about delayed progress on a State Strategic Plan for Crown Land required by the 2016 Act. Apparently the #1 priority in the Plan is to use public land for public and private economic benefits. However, a report on community consultations states there were concerns this would predominantly benefit short-term private interests rather than long-term community benefits.

Unfortunately the government has been facilitating the privatisation of public land since at least 2016, after they dismissed hundreds of community submissions, ignored the Auditor General’s scathing report on the mis-management of sale & lease of Crown Land, scrapped the 1989 Crown Lands Act, and pushed through by a one vote margin the Crown Land Management Bill (now the CLM Act 2016). Therefore Wollongong’s prime public lands appear to be under threat of random privatisation,

It was agreed that the General Manager be requested to advise the purpose and details of the proposed pilot program for public land and the process involved, including community engagement carried out so far and proposed.

10      Snippets      noted

**Next Meeting/Agenda: on Wed. 2nd June 2021.**