Engagement outcomes report

Drafts of Council's key strategic documents including:

* IWC Revised Delivery Program 18/22 and combined Operational Plan 2020/21 and Budget 20/21
* IWC Fees and Charges 20/21
* IWC Updated Long-Term Financial Plan 2018-28

# Summary

Councils are required to draft key strategic documents in the Integrated Planning and Reporting framework under the Local Government Act 1993 and Local Government (General) Regulation 2005.

The prior deadline for these documents to be adopted was the 30 June 2020 but due to the Covid-19 pandemic, the Minister for Local Government made modifications to the statutory requirements as outlined in Circular 20-12/ 17 April 2020/ A696830.

Council’s Draft versions of the Revised Delivery Program 18/22 and combined Operational Plan 2020/21 and Budget 20/21, Fees and Charges 20/21 and Updated Long-Term Financial Plan 2018-28 were publicly exhibited for 28 days from 10 June to 7 July 2020.

Twenty-two (22) submissions were received, with feedback considered before finalisation of the draft documents.

# Background

In line with Council’s Community Engagement Framework, the goal of this engagement was to consult the public by seeking feedback on the documents prior to finalisation and adoption.

## Engagement Methods

The methods of engagement were:

* Online via Your Say Inner West at [yoursay.innerwest.nsw.gov.au/council-strategic-documents-2020-2030](https://yoursay.innerwest.nsw.gov.au/council-strategic-documents-2020-2030)

# Promotion

* Social media
* Council’s website

# Engagement outcomes

Who did we hear from?

During the engagement period there were 706 visits to the project page.

* 598 participants viewed at least one item on the project page.
* 252 participants downloaded at least one document
* 22 participants provided feedback

What did they say?

We have received 20 submissions directly through Your Say Inner West.

The comments received from the Your Say Inner West are summarised in the table below. Some comments were beyond the scope of this engagement.

| **Response to** | **Comment** | **Response** | **Amendment required?** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Fees & Charges  | The cost of submitting an application to prune or remove a tree is inhibitive to the community actually following the correct protocols. | In February 2020, Council adopted a new Tree Management Development Control Plan (DCP) to establish a coordinated approach to the assessment and management of trees in the Local Government Area which ensures that the cost burden of meeting tree canopy targets does not fall unreasonably on property owners. The fee for a tree application is based on 1-3 trees but often does not account for full cost recovery of the time required for Council’s qualified arborist to inspect the tree and provide a determination. Additionally, the new Tree Management DCP has increased the number of applications that can now be lodged under a Minor Works Application, which is free to lodge. | No |
| DPOP | Cycleways are underfunded despite being a healthy and sustainable transport method. | There is $6m in the 2020/2021 budget for cycleway projects. This is substantially more than previous financial years. | No |
| LTFP | The budget for cycleways should increase not decrease especially when neighbouring Councils are following Austroads best practice of introducing 30km/hr zones (AP -R612-20) and investing in additional protected cycling lanes and paths.  | There is $6m in the 2020/2021 budget for cycleway projects. This is substantially more than previous financial years. | No |
| DPOP | Lack of focus on strategic heritage investigations in areas in Inner West Council. In the former Marrickville LGA the investigations focussed on areas south of the railway meaning some places have not had adequate heritage inspections in 15-20 years and therefore there is a low density of heritage conservation areas as compared to Ashfield and Leichhardt. In Dulwich Hill for example, there are buildings at risk or redevelopment as they do not have protection such as two historic homes at The Boulevarde at Dulwich Hill, which were later heritage listed after being given interim emergency protection. | Council is in the process of reviewing existing and potential heritage items and heritage conservation areas across the Local Government Area including Dulwich Hill as part of Inner West Local Environmental Plan Phase 2 Project. Community consultation will be undertaken as part of this project. The project is anticipated to be finalised in 2021. | No |
| Lack of funding to upgrade the area around Dulwich Hill station despite a public domain study and a council report from August 2019 stating that the council had set aside $1.6 million of the $7.5 million total cost. No evidence of the project in the forward “planned capital projects” list in the capital budget overview. The area around the station needs updating for aesthetic and safety reasons, the Wardell Road crossing is dangerous. In addition, the Marrickville Rd Dulwich Hill town centre looks rundown and the footpaths need fixing.  | There was $140k in the 2019/2020 budget, $1.47m in the 2020/2021 budget and $130k in the 2021/20222 budget for Dulwich Hill upgrade works near the station. | No |
| Long Term Financial Plan (LTFP) | Council’s proposed reduction in capital spending from 20/21 ($95.4m) to 23/24 ($47.5m) is of concern and it is recommended that the proposed long-term financial option of a higher rate of asset renewal be considered. | The 2020/2021 capital works budget is artificially high as a number of large projects are underway including the Ashfield Aquatic Centre, Dawn Fraser Baths, Greenway and Urban Amenity Improvement Program. The last two projects have substantial grant funding. The total capital budget reduces from 2021/2022 to better reflects Council's "normal" capital works program, considering capacity to resource and deliver. | No |
| All | Marrickville shopping village pavements require updating to draw in out of area traffic to contribute to local businesses.  | There is $1.2m in the 2020/2021 budget for Alex Trevallion Plaza upgrade works, including the pavers. This project has been delayed due to sourcing pavers from China during COVID. | No |
| Delivery Program and Operational Plan (DPOP) | The public footpaths along Marrickville Road in Dulwich Hill Village require repair due to being damaged by electrical and water works. Trip hazards need fixing and possibly some planter boxes could make the area more appealing to visitors. | Utility companies may undertake works in the road and footpath without the consent of Council. Council has a four year capital works program, which prioritises expenditure. The requests for upgrade works on Marrickville Road, at Dulwich Hill Village can be considered in future capital works programs. | No |
| DPOP | Querying if the Camdenville Park St Peters upgrades will be put back on track for completion after being postponed from 2005 to 2014 and again due to WestConnex.  | There is $1m in the 2023/2024 and $3m in the 2024/2025 budget for the Camdenville Park upgrade. Unfortunately, the works in this park have had to be put on hold pending the completion of the WestConnex and Transgrid works, including use of the park as a worksite. | No |
| Question regarding the upgrade in Alexandria to the Transgrid cable.  | Not a Council Project, no response required.  | No |
| How much money in contributions from development projects in St Peters has been collected by council over the past 4 years and what portion of that has been budgeted to spend in the St Peters area? | Council can only provide holistic figures for developer contributions at this point in time. Council is working with the State Government on improving legislative requirements that will provide more transparency regarding developer contributions in the future. | No |
| DPOP | Question regarding the funding for the synthetic field at Leichhardt 2 oval. (received from twelve (12) respondents through Your Say and via other channels | The Council resolution was (28 May 2019):THAT Council:1. Endorse Tempe Reserve as the preferred site for synthetic sports surface upgrade and proceed to community engagement and detailed design in 2018-2019 and construction in Summer 2020-2021;2. Proceed with concept designs and costings for a synthetic sports surface at Leichhardt Oval #2 suitable for future grant funding applications and community engagement as part of the Draft Plan of Management for Leichhardt Park;3. Staff review priorities for the other shortlisted sites together with the Recreation Needs Strategy sports field renewal program preparation in 2019-2020; and4. Continues to explore opportunities for partnerships with schools and private development for synthetic surface recreation facilities provision. As per the Council resolution, the synthetic field at Tempe has been funded; however, the proposed synthetic field at Leichhardt #2 has not been funded at this time. Council will continue to explore funding opportunities. | No |
|  |  |  |  |

**Comments received from organisations/groups/stakeholders**

A submission was received from the Urban Development Institute of Australia regarding the Draft Fees and Charges 2020-21 referring to the proposed increase from 0.2% to 0.25% for the Compliance and Enforcement Levy for works over $100,000. It was requested that Council remove the levy and return to charging the maximum Development Application fee permitted under the Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation.

The response to this is:

“The Compliance Levy was adopted and introduced by Council in FY19/20. The levy is proposed to be rolled over with no increase in FY20/21. Council like several other NSW councils offset the costs of performing their compliance and enforcement functions through this specific levy. The rate of the levy is consistent with the rate charged by numerous other NSW councils and is consistent with the provisions of Section 608 of the Local Government Act.

Private building certification in NSW has increased the financial burden on Council to perform its development compliance activities. Particularly during the Covid-19 pandemic the amount of compliance complaints received by Council has significantly increased. This levy facilitates Council to effectively respond to community concerns/complaints and deliver the following compliance and enforcement activities including:

• Development compliance

• Environmental health

• Fire safety

Whilst there are other avenues for cost recovery of compliance activities. The income from the levy also allows Council to implement and improve education programs for residents and businesses on council’s compliance and enforcement functions. The levy also allows Council to focus on business improvements and governance that other cost recovery avenues do not.”

**Other responses from individuals**

Two other response were received that related to the funding of synthetic field at Leichhardt 2 oval. See the last response in the above table.

# Conclusion

There are no changes to the key strategic documents as a result of submissions received.

It is therefore recommended that the Report go to Council with mention of minor grammatical rewording and correction of spelling mistakes.