

I n t e r O f f i c e
M E M O R A N D U M

TO: *Councillors*
FROM: *Director City Planning*
SUBJECT: *Addendum to Item 57 - Additional Submission received for Community Strategic Plan 2013-2032*
DATE: *9 April 2013*

The attached submission for the Community Strategic Plan 2013 - 2032 was inadvertently missed due to a technical problem with Council's email system.

Please find attached the submission received from Mr Michael Want and summary table including responses to the issues raised, as undertaken with all submissions received.

Matthew Owens
Director City Planning

Submission to Councillors and Officers of HCC re Draft Hawkesbury
Community Strategic Plan 2013-2032, (DHCSP).

14th of March 2013.

I support all submissions from the North Richmond & Districts Community Action Association (NRDCAA).

I attended the NRDCAA meeting on the 18th of February and the forum held at Windsor Library subsequently to discuss the DHCSP. Both meetings were address by Matthew Owens and others. Peter Jackson GM attended the NRDCAA's February meeting along with Councillors Bucket-Lyons, Calvert and Rasmussen. There were over fifty five persons in attendance.

All Councillors could have attended. Councillors Conolly and Creed had an invitation forwarded to attend but did not. That invitation referred to the HCSP amongst other things and invited them to address the meeting. There was an apology from Councillor Paine.

As a result of those presentations I formed the view the DHCSP should not be considered till much more detailed work was undertaken before I could support the Council's DHCSP.

Councillors should not support "their" DHCSP because details are very scant on the Directions, Strategies, Goals and Measures. They are not measureable, not detailed enough and difficult to follow. Without *much* better details within the DHCSP, Councillors, residents and ratepayers would be in the dark to what might or might not happen should Council adopt their offering.

Other Councils, like Wyong Council's draft Community Strategic Plan is an example that should be referred to that may inspire me to be more supportive of DHCSP.

The 2010-2030 Hawkesbury Community Strategic Plan (HCSP) has been a disaster for most of the engaged community. It is my view that the outcomes to date have not represented the collective vision of the entire Hawkesbury community. The interpretation by Council of the HCSP has not benefited the residents and ratepayers of the HLGA. It is opened to many outcomes.

The Council proposed DHCSP is unacceptable in its current format.

If we keep doing what we've done we will keep getting what we got.

Some Experiences with the HCSP 2010-2030.

As you know I have been engaged with the residents and ratepayer through my Community activity in particular with the NRDCAA. That engagement has led me to making an informed decision that the current HCSP with the lack of discipline, loyalty and commitment to the HCSP by Council is the precedent for my concerns.

The NRDCAA conducted ten public meetings last year. They have averaged forty members per meeting. I would respectfully suggest that the attendance at those public meetings exceeds the attendance of any of the political party meetings conducted within the HLGA.

The lack of discipline, loyalty and commitment to the HCSP by the previous Council and the current Council is reflected in decisions taken by Council and the non effect the HCSP had in Council's operations to represent the residents and ratepayers interest.

Precedents in support of the above;

HCSP 2010-2030, Looking after people and place, under Directions, have development on both sides of the river supported by appropriate physical and community infrastructure.

Shaping our future together; Measures; Community satisfaction with the delivery of services and infrastructure;

Heaps of development has occurred "west of the river" with very little physical or community infrastructure.

I have been advised by a senior Council Officer, it is difficult to address the traffic congestion in and around North Richmond till Council knows what action other levels of Governments may take on improving Bells Line of Road (BLoR) and other infrastructure. BLoR is the State Government's responsibility.

Despite that major obstacle, development and rezoning continue, in contravention of **Shaping our future together;** and the **Measures; Community satisfaction with the delivery of services and infrastructure.**

The community west of the river have advised the State Government, Mayor all Councillors and Council's senior officers of their view through a petition, **DO NOT APPROVE ANY REZONING WEST OF THE RIVER**, supported by over 4000 petitioners that;

The current infrastructure is inadequate for the existing population of North Richmond and surrounding areas. Traffic congestion is a major problem which impacts on all residents west of the river as well as residents and businesses in Richmond due to the bank up of traffic in Richmond.

North Richmond Districts Community Action Association (NRDCAA) and the Community are therefore requesting that Hawkesbury City Council does not approve any further

rezoning west of the river until the infrastructure has been upgraded significantly. The community calls for action NOW, not simply make promises for future improvements but implement actual upgrades to alleviate the existing problems. Until this time the area west of the river cannot sustain any further rezoning.

In addition, the Traffic Snarls face book page reflects residents and ratepayer frustration with traffic congestion. The recent study by RMS confirmed that some intersections and the Richmond Bridge were at capacity or near capacity.

The Member for Londonderry confirmed at a Council meeting late 2011, that you are dreaming out here if you think we are going to receive money from the Government for infrastructure , or words to that effect.

Councillor Ford Mayor of HCC regurgitated the Member for Londonderry's confirmation at the January 16th 2012 public meeting organised by the NRDCAA which I attended. The meeting minutes say this: *There is no HCC action plan for upgrading the already overburdened infrastructure west of the river in the next five years.* Councillor Ford has copy of those minutes as does Mr Jackson G.M. In addition, Mary Buckett, Margaret Smith and me met with Councillor Ford and Mr Jackson on the 27th of March 2012 to discuss the outcome. There were no changes to the minutes.

The Micromex September 2011 research also confirms at p12 that Road safety and improving services and infrastructure (generally) are a major factor in dissatisfaction with Council.

Rural landscapes or Heritage values have not been at the forefront of Council decisions.

Looking after people and place at p4 HCSP 2010-2030. Within the headings ,**directions, strategies, goals and measures**, rural landscapes and heritage values permeate, and **Shaping out future together**; see **goals**, *Work together with the community to achieve a balanced set of decisions that integrate jobs, housing infrastructure, heritage and environment.*

Council's decision to support the Windsor Bridge option 1. T

The majority of Councillors rejected the Heritage Advisory Committee endeavours to review the Council's decision to support option 1 and ignored the strong community opposition reflected in over 12,000 petitioner's support, organised by CAWB.

In addition, there was little or no support from Council to protect the heritage value and the rural landscape that is Yobarnie. This property along with Glossodia Jacaranda Ponds, on request of the developers, were entered into the Hawkesbury Residential Land Strategy (HRLS) for consideration, without reference to either the Heritage value of Yobarnie, or the

rural landscapes of both properties. The HCC made no positive contribution to the NRDCAA's endeavours to have Yobarnie listed on the Heritage Council's register that I am aware of.

Subsequently, little or no relevance of the heritage value or the picturesque rural landscape of the properties was considered by the majority of Councillors in supporting the planning proposal progressing to the Gateway process.

Further, at p12 of the HCSP 2010-2030, under **directions**; *Have transparent, accountable and respected leadership and an engaged community.*

The leadership in this submission is the Mayor, Deputy Mayor and Councillors. The Micromex research September 2011 confirmed my view that the majority of the leadership is underperforming. Residents and ratepayers expect better.

Decisions taken by Councillors in determining issues such as Windsor Bridge and Yobarnie significantly contribute to the residents and ratepayer expressing a very poor view that the leadership is not transparent, not accountable and is underperforming.

Over 4000 petitioners supported the petition; **DO NOT APPROVE ANY REZONING WEST OF THE RIVER.**

The petitions were forwarded to Ministers of the State Government, Local Members Councillors and staff with comments and questions with regards to the contents of HCSP. The majority of Councillors ignored those references and continue to do so. This is another example why the residents and ratepayers have rated the leadership so poorly.

I refer to the 2012 January 16th public meeting of the NRDCAA which I attended, with over 140 in attendance, which Councillor Ford Mayor of HCC addressed. The participants reflection of the Mayor's inability to answer the questions he had received days before, further confirms the findings of Micromex Research.

The HCSP also contained Milestone to; **Develop Master Plans for towns and villages.** These milestones were not met. Endeavours by minority of Councillors to have these Milestones delivered recently failed. Clearly most political decisions taken in Council are based on the numbers rather than merit.

Glaring examples of this are the recent Committee's decisions and the majority of Councillors not supporting the "penalty" recommended by the investigator into Councillor Porter "despicable and cowardly" attack in the Gazette on the Director of Planning. My view of that outcome reflected a caucus decision to protect a political ally and was certainly not made on merit.

There are many more precedents that could be referred to. I submit the evidence should suffice to support this submission. Should the reviewer/s of this submission require further

evidence that the HCSP directions, strategies, goals and measures could be interpreted in a number of ways, please refer to the NRDCAA's submission on Council's DHCS.

How do we move forward considering; Transparency, Accountability, respected Leadership—an Engaged Community?

The submission on the DHCS 2013-2032 from the NRDCAA prepared by Bryan and Margaret Smith along with others reflects a way forward. The submission/s was prepared after two presentations by Director of Planning Matthew Owens and others. This submission provides a stronger more definitive DHCS. The Council's plan is not acceptable. It also is not strong enough for the direction that the State Government is heading with Planning legislation.

The NRDCAA's proposal should be seriously considered, if the Mayor is serious that; **This Strategic Plan is a community plan not simply a Council plan and should represent the collective vision of the whole Hawkesbury community.**

The submission reflects a way forward that would give the residents and ratepayers the confidence that the **Directions, Strategies, Goals and Measurements (Measures) are identifiable, easily understood and outcomes measured.** The NRDCAA's proposal may at least address their concerns.

In my view the Council and the community must work together, if we are to; **Have transparent, accountable and respected leadership and an engaged community.**

I quote Councillor Ford Mayor of HCC; **This Plan belongs to the people of the Hawkesbury. We encourage you to help us to achieve your vision.(DHCS p3)**

The DCSP is not the people's plan in its current form.

Accordingly I strongly recommend that Council determine that the NRDCAA's submission and other Council's Strategic Plans be discussed in dept with interested community groups prior to Council adopting any options. A collective community outcome is NRDCAA preference and Councillor Fords' Mayor of HCC.

I am available to discuss the contents of this submission should any clarification be required.

Michael Want,

Trafalgar 47 Pine Place Grose Vale 2753.

0245722349. 14 03 2013.

Draft Hawkesbury Community Strategic Plan 2013 – 2032 – Summary of Submissions			
	Name	Summary of Submission	Response
	Michael Want, Resident	Supports all submissions from the North Richmond and Districts Community Action (NRDCAA). The NRDCAA submission provides a stronger more definitive submission to the DHCS. The NRDCAA's proposal should be seriously considered if the CSP is a community plan not simply a Council plan.	Noted. The NRDCAA's submission has been summarised and responded to in Attachment 1 of Item 57.
		Councillors should not support "their" DHCS because details are very scant on the Directions, Strategies, Goals and Measures. They are not measureable, not detailed enough and difficult to follow. Without much better detail within the DHCS, Councillors, residents and rate payers would be in the dark to what might or might not happen should Council adopt their offering. Other Councils' CSPs, e.g. Wyong Council's, should be referred to. The Council proposed DHCS is unacceptable in its current form. It is not the people's plan in its current form. It is not strong enough for the direction that the State government is heading with Planning legislation.	The CSP is a high level document. Detailed actions to achieve the Directions, Strategies and Goals will be outlined in subsequent Delivery Programs and Operational Plans. Other Council's CSP, including Wyong's, have been examined.
		Concerned about the lack of discipline, loyalty and commitment to the 2010 – 2030 HCSP by Council. The outcomes of the 2010 – 2030 HCSP have not represented the collective visions of the entire Hawkesbury community. Specific examples are: 1. Looking after people of Place - Direction – <i>have development on both sides of the river supported by appropriate physical and community infrastructure</i> Shaping our Future Together - Measure – <i>Community satisfaction with the delivery of services and infrastructure</i> Development has occurred "west of the river" with very little physical or community infrastructure. Development and rezoning continue in contravention of this measure. The community west of the river have advised State government, Mayor, all Councillors, and Council's senior officers of their view through a petition, not to approve any rezoning west of the river, supported by over 4000 petitioners. Petition advised of current inadequacies of infrastructure, in particular related to traffic congestion, and requested that Council not approve any further rezoning west of the river until the infrastructure has been upgraded significantly, with action now to alleviate existing problems.	Council is currently discussing with the RMS and relevant rezoning applicants existing traffic problems between North Richmond and Richmond and approaching Windsor Bridge. In terms of the two major residential rezonings at North Richmond and Glossodia Council staff are also discussing with these applicants the full range of physical and community infrastructure required for the proposed residential rezonings. The required infrastructure will be identified in a voluntary planning agreement which will be publically exhibited and will need to be agreed upon prior to the rezoning being approved.

Draft Hawkesbury Community Strategic Plan 2013 – 2032 – Summary of Submissions			
	Name	Summary of Submission	Response
		<p>2. Rural landscaping or heritage values have not been at the forefront of Councils decisions.</p> <p>Looking after People and Place – within Directions, Strategies, Goals and Measures rural landscapes and heritage values permeate.</p> <p>Shaping our Future Together – Goal – <i>Work together with the community to achieve a balanced set of decisions that integrate jobs, housing, infrastructure, heritage and environment.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned about Council support for Windsor Bridge option 1 given Council’s Heritage Advisory Committee view and strong community opposition reflected in over 12,000 signature petition organised by CAWB. • Little or no support from Council to protect the heritage value and rural landscape of “Yobarnie”. “Yobarnie” and Jacaranda Ponds were included into the Hawkesbury Residential Land Strategy without reference to either the heritage value or the rural landscape of both properties. Council has made no positive contribution to the NRDCAA’s endeavours to have “Yobarnie” State heritage listed. Little or no relevance of the heritage value or picturesque rural landscape of these properties was considered by the majority of Councillors and supporting the planning proposals progressing to the Gateway process. 	<p>It is noted that Council has adopted a position that is different to the Heritage Advisory Committee and the CAWB.</p> <p>During the preparation of the RLS matters such as natural environment, proximity to centres, transport services, open space and recreation, community facilities, utility infrastructure and heritage listing were considered. “Yobarnie” and Jacaranda Ponds were not heritage listed at the time. “Yobarnie” has subsequently been State heritage listed and the NSW Heritage Council endorsed a Conservation Management Plan for “Yobarnie” on 27 March 2013 and Council staff have been, and will continue to work with the NSW Heritage Council and Office and the developer to ensure the heritage significance of “Yobarnie” is appropriately considered and incorporated into the proposed development. Jacaranda Ponds is not heritage listed and there is no proposal to list it.</p>

Draft Hawkesbury Community Strategic Plan 2013 – 2032 – Summary of Submissions			
	Name	Summary of Submission	Response
		<p>3. Shaping our Future Together – Direction – <i>Have transparent, accountable and respected leadership and an engaged community.</i> The Micromex research September 2011 confirmed my view that the majority of leadership is underperforming. Decisions taken by Councillors in determining issues such as Windsor Bridge and “Yobarnie” significantly contribute to the residents and ratepayer expressing a very poor view that the leadership is not transparent, not accountable and is underperforming.</p> <p>4. HCSP – Milestone – Develop Master Plans for towns and villages. These milestones were not met. Endeavours by a minority of Councillors to have these Milestones delivered recently failed.</p>	<p>The Micromex research is a survey of the community and is not, in itself, a planning document but more an input into these documents. The research of September 2011 showed that <i>providing transparent, accountable and respected leadership</i> ranked 8th out of the top 9 largest performance gaps perceived by the community. Providing transparent, accountable and respected leadership is a key driver in determining the community’s satisfaction with Council. Due to its importance, this Direction has been retained in the 2013 – 2032 CSP.</p> <p>Milestones were only included in the previous CSP due to the transition to the Integrated Planning and Reporting regime and the absence of the Delivery Program at that time. Milestones are not considered necessary in the CSP and Immediate and Short term actions will be included in the Delivery Program and Operational Plan. Council staff are currently progressing the review of the Windsor Masterplan.</p>