
ATTACHMENTS DISTRIBUTED UNDER SEPARATE COVER

**CCL 28/09/2021 – ADOPTION OF WICKHAM MASTERPLAN 2021
UPDATE**

ITEM-92 Attachment B: Summary of submissions

DISTRIBUTED UNDER SEPARATE COVER

Summary of submissions

The table below provides a summary of the matters raised within the 61 written submissions received by City of Newcastle (CN) received during the public exhibition of draft Wickham Masterplan 2021 Update, (WMP 2021), which was held from 2 August to 30 August 2021. Furthermore, it provides a response, including any recommended outcome for Council to consider together with the report.

The table identifies who submissions are from but does not provide the names and addresses of individuals, in accordance with the information provided under the heading of 'Protecting your privacy' on the public exhibition 'Have Your Say' webpage. However, to provide Council with an understanding of how many submissions raised a particular issue a tally of the total is provided (where greater than one) together with a subtotal that identifies 'Submission from' being:

- made by or on behalf of members of a group/club/association include the **group name**
- made by a consultancy firm on behalf of their client (landowner) include the **company name** of the firm and the site name
- made by an individual who are a landowner/resident/business within the Wickham masterplan area are identified as being **from Wickham**
- made by an individual identified as being from outside the Wickham masterplan area (and not a landowner) are identified as being **from other** but only where not raised by one of the above; otherwise, the subtotal of submissions 'from other' is not provided.

Theme	Submission from	Issues raised	CN response/recommendation
Mine subsidence	Property Council	Request a review of the advice from Subsidence Advisory NSW (SANSW) regarding Wickham with consideration to optimising development while working within the parameters deemed acceptable by SANSW Bulk grouting should be fast tracked to help unlock the development potential of the area and the ability to meet the density targets set.	Comment noted. Subsidence Advisory NSW (SANSW) is a State Government Agency, provided legislative approval powers for any development within a declared Mine Subsidence District. It is open to the UDIA to challenge the advice provided with respect to redevelopment within Wickham directly with SANSW or their Minister.
Mine subsidence – density loss	Property Council	The density lost within WMP area due to mine subsidence or other planning decisions should be accommodated elsewhere within the WMP 2021, we question the value in offsetting the density loss in other precincts that have either met their density targets or do not meet the same strategic criteria for development as Wickham.	Comment not supported. The WMP 2017 determined the appropriate density for each part of Wickham based on several interrelated factors including site capacity, traffic, impact on amenity and character. It is not as straightforward as increasing density in one area based on the loss of potential density of another. This may be done once existing areas have reached capacity however CN does not believe this is necessary given the known capacity across the City Centre and there is several decades of redevelopment potential left to realise.
Local Area Traffic Management (LATM) & Carparking:	Property Council	With the longevity of the WMP, the loss of density should be considered in the LATM to ensure there are no adverse impacts to development in key development sites, related to traffic or parking.	Comment not supported. The LATM was based on traffic studies and modelling that envisaged various density scenarios and the measures required when certain thresholds of population are reached. If yields are less than these thresholds, the related measures would not be implemented. This does not require a full review to continue implementation until 2032.

The submissions received from individuals included 26 signed copies of a 'form letter' (15 being resident /landowners to Wickham, and 11 were individuals from outside of the suburb). Other individual submissions also included some of the issues raised by the form letter within their own submission. The 7 issues raised in the form letter are preceded by two asterisks (**) and raise the following matters:

- support for Village hub extension
- greater consideration for interface between new development and existing dwellings
- support for permissibility of single dwelling on small lots
- concern of HOB for 41-47 Throsby Street proposal given mine subsidence risk
- Advocating safety and amenity of local footpaths
- advocating safety for cycleway and traffic plans
- support for opening access to Wickham Park.

Within the table the Wickham Master Plan 2017 has been abbreviated to 'WMP 2017' and the draft Wickham Masterplan 2021 Update to 'WMP 2021'.

Theme	Submission from	Issues raised	CN response/recommendation
Areas proposed for development incentive	Property Council	<p>The WMP 2021 outlines the new densities and heights of key development areas identified. There is a much smaller development footprint when compared to WMP and this needs to be considered.</p> <p>Minimum site area requirements should be labelled as more of a guide to allow for merit-based discussions on sites just under the minimum area requirements, this will ensure no additional densities are lost in what is left of key development sites across the precinct.</p>	<p>Comment not supported.</p> <p>Incentives are based on redevelopment capacity and the provision of community infrastructure that CN seeks to deliver.</p> <p>These were tested having regard for current land ownership. CN has based the minimum site areas on design considerations (setbacks, parking, and other controls) and economic testing.</p> <p>CN intends to implement the proposed incentives as prescriptive provisions to provide transparency and certainty of what densities may occur and that CN does not support an overdevelopment of individual sites.</p>
WMP overall	Urban Development Institute of Australia (UDIA)	<p>Pleased to see CN's review of the WMP seeks to address the development potential and the feasibility of sites in Wickham. This is an important part of achieving the development potential of the area.</p>	Support noted.
Mine subsidence	UDIA	<p>UDIA is disappointed with the extent to which mine subsidence issues appear to be limiting the development potential of Wickham. UDIA accepts and supports the important role played by Subsidence Advisory (SA) in the development of areas affected by underground mine workings. UDIA is concerned that the approach taken by SA is overly conservative. UDIA submits that Council would be assisted by an independent review of the issues and the potential solutions.</p> <p>UDIA would like to see more funding applied to addressing issues associated with potential mine subsidence and supports the use of the Newcastle Mine Grouting Fund to deliver a precinct-wide approach to rectifying, issues associated with mine subsidence to restore some of the development potential that appears to have been lost because of the mine subsidence issues.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The Mine Grouting Fund is administered by HCCDC not SANSW. CN will continue to liaise with both State agencies. The UDIA may also take this matter up directly with HCCDC or the Minister of Planning.</p>
Mine subsidence	UDIA	<p>Work with the NSW Government to utilise the Newcastle Mine Grouting Fund to deliver a precinct wide approach to rectify mine subsidence issues in Wickham to restore development potential.</p>	As above.
CII policy	UDIA	<p>Reconsider the community infrastructure incentive policy as per UDIA's May 2021 submission.</p>	CN has considered and reported the UDIA submission to this Policy to Council. This matter is now resolved.
Development target	UDIA	<p>Given the mine subsidence constraint appears to have curtailed the development potential of Wickham, UDIA would support efforts by Council to replace the lost density in other appropriate areas of the inner-city.</p>	<p>Comment not supported.</p> <p>CN's studies show that there is sufficient capacity within the City Centre to adequately accommodate development.</p>
WMP overall	Port of Newcastle	<p>The vision presented in the WMP 2021 is positive and progressive, identifying issues and actions to continue the locality's transition into an adaptive, innovative inner-city precinct offering housing, employment, and recreational opportunities.</p>	Support noted
Importance of PoN	Port of Newcastle	<p>The Port functions on a 24-hour basis and may impact on residential development in its immediate catchment (e.g. noise). To increase awareness of this issue, it is requested that the WMP 2021 include comments acknowledging this and recommends that consideration is given to potential impacts during the design phase of new buildings in the locality.</p>	<p>Comment supported.</p> <p>CN acknowledges the potential impact that a working harbour has on residential amenity due to noise, light, and other impacts. This can be managed under the existing building standards given noise and vibration from roads and rail are also contributing factors to consider within inner city developments.</p>

Theme	Submission from	Issues raised	CN response/recommendation
Request to engage with CN	Port of Newcastle	<p>In respect to the Harbour Edge precinct, it is requested that comments are included in the WMP 2021 recommending engagement with PON when exploring development opportunities in this location</p> <p>To bring greater awareness of the importance of navigation aids in this locality to the safe and efficient operation of the Port, it is requested that comments are included in the WMP 2021 when considering future development options/applications.</p>	<p>Comment supported.</p> <p>To address this submission additional wording has been included under the heading 'Future Character' of the Harbour Edge within the Vision, for future uses "to respect the operational function of the Port of Newcastle."</p> <p>Furthermore, under the heading 'Ensure built environment is functional, responsive and resilient' an additional Principle is included:</p> <p>"5. Consideration of impacts on new residents from transport and employment generating uses of a working port and vibrant city are addressed in new development." and an additional Action:</p> <p>"6. Include a notation within Newcastle DCP 2012 for applicants of land in the Harbour Edge precinct to engage with Port of Newcastle prior to lodgement regarding the location and requirements for maintaining navigation aids in this locality to ensure the safe and efficient operation of the Port."</p>
Building height and density	GYDE consultancy firm on behalf of the Dangar Street Wickham Pty Ltd (landowner)	<p>Requests Wickham Masterplan be amended to allow increased density on the site (known as the approved Bowline DA) consistent with the submitted planning proposal requesting an increase in building height from 45m to 105m and increase in FSR from 5:1 /6:1 to 8.5:1.</p> <p>Submission states the planning proposal could be amended to reduce the increase in building height to 90m and increase in FSR to 8:1.</p> <p>Request is justified based on the public benefits the increased height and density will enable as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Investigation into improved connections across Hannell St 2. Investigation into public domain improvements to Dangar Street to facilitate a Share Zone 3. Investigations to improve Public Space next to the Interchange 4. Provision of a cycleway link from Station St via Charles and Dangar St to Hannell St 	<p>The request to increase the building height limit from 45m to 105m is not supported.</p> <p>The incentive building height for this site is 60m, which has been identified after careful consideration of appropriate land use, building scale and density in Wickham in 2017. Unlike most of Wickham, which is zoned B4 Mixed Use, this site is zone B3 Commercial Core and has zone objectives focussed on providing office, retail, commercial and other employment generating uses. The proposal has not demonstrated a strategic need for additional commercial/residential floor space above what has already been identified in the Wickham Masterplan.</p> <p>The provision of public benefits will be in accordance with CN's adopted Community Infrastructure Incentives Policy and conditions on any development consent.</p>
Building height and density	GYDE	<p>Request is further justified based on the following strategic principles:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The site is adjacent to the interchange and within the emerging CBD 2. Additional density will enable public benefits (listed above) 3. Proposed density in Wickham Masterplan to transport initiatives since 2012 (light rail and proposed ferry wharf) 4. Density and public benefits will connect the interchange to the foreshore and future ferry wharf 5. Keeps residential capacity and public benefit within Wickham 6. Theoretical commercial and dwelling capacity on the B3 zone are overstated 7. Commercial development in CBD is well below permissible FSR 8. Density in a city centre, next to transport is consistent with local, metropolitan, and regional plans <p>The site performs a transitional role between West End, Rail edge and Village Hub</p>	<p>Comment not supported.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the site is well located.</p> <p>The provision of public benefits is not a material consideration in determining the strategic merit of the proposal. Public domain improvements adjoining the development site could be provided as part of current development applications.</p> <p>The site is zoned B3 Commercial Core and the objectives of this zone are to provide employment opportunities in accessible locations rather than residential development. CN has an adopted Employment Lands Strategy (2019) prepared by SGS Economics and Planning, which is guiding our strategy in relation to the provision of employment lands.) The Newcastle Housing Needs Evidence Report undertaken for the Housing Strategy found that there is sufficient land zoned for residential development and housing is being supplied at a sufficient rate to meet implied demand to 2026.</p>

Theme	Submission from	Issues raised	CN response/recommendation
Village hub	SLR consultancy firm on behalf of Gemini Interchange Pty Ltd (landowner)	<p>The submission is made in relation to the land located at the western extremity of the extended Village Hub Precinct fronting three roads: Railway, Lindus and Bishopsgate Streets. The site is a significant landholding with an approximate area of 2,641m² and contains a disused service station and an old industrial building, currently accommodating several tenants, as well as an extensive hardstand area fronting Railway Street and Lindus Street used for vehicle manoeuvring.</p> <p>The submission identifies that the site is not consistent with the character of the Village Hub, which consists smaller lots with fragmented land ownership and contains a mix of lower scale residential building typologies.</p> <p>Instead, the site reflects the characteristics of the Emerging Industry Quarter being larger sites that accommodate a range of remnant light industrial buildings along the eastern side of Railway Street.</p> <p>The landowner requests Council to amend the exhibited WMP 2021 for their site to reflect the original intent for the land as adopted by the WMP 2017. That is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> reinstatement the Emerging Industry Quarter Precinct on this site (remove the extended Village Hub Precinct from this site) reinstatement provisions to enable the land to redevelop at the previously adopted increase in HOB from current 14m to 35m and FSR from current 1.5 to 2.5:1 enable the identified community infrastructure on the land (i.e. open space area fronting Lindus Street) being realised. <p>The implications for the site being within the Village Hub Precinct are, that implementation of development incentives identified on Map 10 for Area B (including the site) consistent with WMP 2017 will not apply to land within the Village Hub Precinct. Thereby not providing incentive for delivering the envisaged community infrastructure.</p>	<p>Comment supported.</p> <p>The Village Hub was extended along Bishopsgate Street, as part of Council's resolution to exhibit the WMP 2021. CN understands that this was based on the existing narrow width along parts of the street, characterised by smaller lots and existing lower scale residential building types.</p> <p>WMP 2021 propose - Parts identified for road widening in Bishopsgate Street</p> <p>Development of the site will require access from Railway Street with adequate setback controls to deliver development predominantly to the north-western area of the site.</p> <p>Given the existing HOB on the land is 14m, which allows development of a scale greater than envisaged within the Village Hub Precinct, an additional Action (8) is included to "Amend DCP 2012 to include an additional control for upper-level setbacks for any development on land that adjoins the Village Hub Precinct, to require any part of the development above HOB 12m to be setback a minimum 6m from all street fronting boundaries and 6m to all side or rear boundaries that adjoin land within the Village Hub Precinct."</p>
Building Height and Density	SLR	<p>The submission identifies that Council's inclusion of the subject site into the Village Hub Precinct is contrary to achieving Council's intention to gradually transitioning down from the higher scale development identified on surrounding sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> on the southern side of Bishopsgate Street, redevelopment densities within the Rail Edge Precinct will allow building heights of 45m and a FSR of 4:1 (comprising State owned land managed by compass housing and identified by Council as 'likely' to be redeveloped). to the west of the subject site, redevelopment potential includes a maximum height of 45m and a FSR of 4:1 (identified by Council as 'likely' to be redeveloped); and To the north of the subject site, redevelopment potential includes a maximum height of 35m and a FSR of 2.5:1 (identified by Council as 'likely' to be redeveloped). <p>The subject site presents an unconstrained development opportunity that will assist in providing a gradual 'step down' approach.</p>	<p>Comment supported.</p> <p>The identified site is an anomaly to the Village Hub character given the site area and existing industrial uses that may readily be redeveloped (under existing LEP standards) to support development of a scale greater than proposed for the Village Hub Precinct.</p>

Theme	Submission from	Issues raised	CN response/recommendation
Development incentives	SLR	<p>The landowner's intension for the land was for redevelopment consistent with the principles of the WMP 2017 given the site is located approximately 350m to the Newcastle Transport Interchange, consists of a single large holding that is not impacted by flooding or mine subsidence.</p> <p>Commercially, redevelopment of the subject site of a scale suitable for the planning controls of the Village Hub is not viable and would inevitably result in the existing light industrial development remaining within the heart of the Wickham Masterplan area indefinitely.</p> <p>The WMP Update, not only does not achieve the intention to provide opportunity and incentives for unconstrained sites to facilitate urban renewal it inhibits redevelopment of the subject site from achieving its full potential as originally proposed in the WMP 2017. A key development site, 350m from interchange and city centre with planned vision for a greater urban renewal outcome.</p>	CN supports the submission and recommends the site and other adjoining land (with a current building height of 14m in NLEP2012) be excluded from the extended Village Hub Precinct and be reinstated and shown as Emerging Industry Quarter within Map 3.
WMP in general - mine subsidence	Open Newcastle	Incorrect calculations about anticipated yields due to constraints arising from potential subsidence impacts should lead to a more comprehensive review of the WMP, and a significant downward adjustment on the proposed number of additional dwellings for this precious heritage-rich suburb.	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The loss of dwellings is based on CN calculation of loss of potential FSR (based on reasonable development scenarios). The loss accounted for is an approximation.</p>
WMP – dwelling targets	Open Newcastle	Notes that the Local Planning Strategy (2015), which was based on careful planning and demographic analysis, proposed 284 new dwellings for Wickham by 2031. This is concerning in light of the proposal for 1200 new dwellings in the WMP, which is not properly supported by related infrastructure planning and will have a negative impact on the character of the suburb and the lived experience of residents.	<p>Comment not supported.</p> <p>The role and context of Wickham has changed considerably since 2015. The densities identified within the WMP and the WMP 2021 were determined using an evidence-based approach.</p>
Heritage – Village hub	Open Newcastle	We support the WMP's commitment to active transport and recognition of heritage, but we argue that the development outcomes should be revisited to deliver a more human-scaled outcome for Wickham, and a stronger presence for the Village Hub Precinct through a rejection of vertical sprawl.	Support noted.
Croatian Wickham Club – access through Wickham Park	Open Newcastle	The proposal to establish a New One-Way Roadway through Wickham Park is not supported. This area is used by the Croatian Wickham Sports club and would reduce the amenity of this important community-owned resource.	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Map 5 Traffic and Transport of the WMP 2021 is consistent with WMP 2017 in identifying a one-way vehicle path that follows the existing vehicle path (currently two-way traffic) into Wickham Park that services the land occupied by the club and to Passmore Oval. The map formalises the existing vehicle access that extends between the playing field and the fenced off playground to the north to the cul-de-sac that provides access from Albert Street to the badminton club and Good Life Church. There is currently a gate that is opened on game days to allow for carparking.</p> <p>Map 5 Street profiles identifies this as an accessway.</p> <p>This accessway was identified in WMP 2017 to both formalise the existing vehicle access into the park and being a one way given the short sightlines for vehicles currently exiting on the inside of a corner onto Albert Street. Reducing the existing roadway to a one-way vehicle flow, also provide opportunity for providing parallel car parking in the redundant lane.</p>

Theme	Submission from	Issues raised	CN response/recommendation
Community Infrastructure incentives	Open Newcastle	The benefits of an assumed trade-off between increased density in Wickham and the delivery of “identified community infrastructure” have not been articulated. It appears that the trade-offs that are proposed (through manipulating height and density controls and the boundaries of the Village Hub Precinct) are essentially an attempt to maximise yields within subsidence constraints and should have been considered as part of the initial planning process.	Comment not supported The WMP 2021 reflects the method adopted by the Community infrastructure incentive policy. That is, it identifies all the potential increases in density based on planning grounds, as well as all the community infrastructure projects identified for the area. The value (cost) of providing this community infrastructure is divided by the increase in floor area to determine the 'incentive rate' increasing the gross density within Wickham would result in a lower rate, not more funding as is claimed. Furthermore, the Village Hub boundary has been reduced where the land is unable to increase in density due to subsidence and extended in the part of Wickham where higher densities had previously been identified. Hence reducing the overall level of potential density.
Building heights – Park Edge and Village Hub precincts	Open Newcastle	The Park Edge Precinct should be mid-rise. The Park and the Village Hub both need to be protected from outsized development. These precincts should not be dwarfed and diminished by increased HOBs or FSRs under any circumstances. A five-storey limit would support the community’s desired future character of the suburb and relate more appropriately to the Village Hub Precinct and Wickham Park.	Comment noted. Where not restricted by subsidence, density within the park edge is consistent with adopted WMP 2017, which was based on testing and modelling of densities to consider such factors as solar access and overshadowing. CN does not recommend any change within WMP 2021
Building heights	Open Newcastle	Council to reconsider the approach and be a leader in the provision of sustainable development with support for mid-rise development of no more than five storeys. Mid-scale development is more adaptable and more sustainable and inherently better suited to meeting the environmental challenges presented by climate change.	Comment noted. CN is not aware of any proven correlation between development at a five-storey scale and improved sustainability outcomes including for climate change. CN notes this comment but does not recommend changes to the WMP 2021.
Height and FSR – impact on Wickham Park	5 submitters (3 from Wickham and two community groups – Open Newcastle Inc and Friends of King Edward Park)	The proposed increases in HOB and FSR near the Park Edge and the Village Hub Precincts should not be permitted, with or without payment of development incentives. Objection to potential development incentives for provision of community infrastructure and additional FSR and building heights in Wickham.	Comment noted. Where not restricted by subsidence, density within the Park Edge is consistent with adopted WMP 2017. Village Hub Precinct is proposed to be expanded to 29 Bishopsgate Street. CN does not recommend any change within draft Update
Building heights / FSR – development incentives	4 submitters (1 from Wickham and two community groups - Open Newcastle and Friends of King Edward Park)	Objects to proposed increases to already generous HOB and FSRs with the application of incentives. The application of incentives will ultimately deliver additional profit to an elite few at the expense of liveability for the many	Comment noted. Wickham is a part of the city centre and adjacent to a multimodal public transport interchange. This is the ideal place and consistent with the planning vision for city centre strategies to increase density to provide additional dwellings and employment floor space.

Theme	Submission from	Issues raised	CN response/recommendation
Building heights	4 submitters (1 from Wickham)	<p>The increasing number of apartments is creating darkened streets and wind tunnels that are devoid of people.</p> <p>Additional high rise in such a small area will be detrimental to over-shadowing, potentially create wind tunnels and contribute to excessive traffic flow. believes that narrow residential streets, such as Bishopsgate Street have reached their capacity for motor vehicles, especially on the context of the footpaths needing repair.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The current towers identified are all within the Rail Edge precinct. This scale of built form is not proposed within other parts of Wickham under WMP2017, or the WMP 2021.</p> <p>Where increased height is proposed within other precincts, the DCP requirements will provide for both landscaped setbacks and/or building types that pose a lower scale at street level with additional height provided for at an upper-level setback, thereby reducing the scale perceived from the public domain through increased openness and opportunity for solar access.</p> <p>It is proposed to be achieved by inclusion of an additional Action (8) to "Amend DCP 2012 to include an additional control for upper-level setbacks for any development on land that adjoins the Village Hub Precinct, to require any part of the development above HOB 12m to be setback a minimum 6m from all street fronting boundaries and 6m to all side or rear boundaries that adjoin land within the Village Hub Precinct."</p>
Village hub	48 submitters (24 from Wickham, and two from community groups – Open Newcastle and Friends of King Edward Park)	**Consider the local village character along Church Street and the east end of Bishopsgate Street to ensure there is an interface with the existing cottages that exemplify the village character.	<p>Comment supported.</p> <p>Both Church and Bishopsgate Streets have been included together with Throsby and Lindus Streets in identifying that where there is a change of character precinct proposed mid-block along the listed east-west running streets from Village Hub to Emerging Industry that the scale is maintained within the lower levels of new development along the streetscape, with any additional height provided at an upper-level setback from the street.</p> <p>This matter will also be implemented through the existing upper-level setback controls within the current Newcastle DCP 2012</p>
Traffic	3 submitters (2 from Wickham)	<p>Detailed submissions on traffic including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic issues in Throsby Street • Call for traffic study to improve access to Hannell Street • Support for two-way traffic in Holland St • Calls for speed limits to be reduced in line with CN cycling plan 2021 • Comment about operational matter – roundabout Albert St Wickham • Traffic issue – access into Wickham and Union Streets • Supports proposed change in traffic direction along Furlong Lane, west of Union Street. • Support for two-way traffic on Furlong Lane between Hannell and Union Streets • Requests consideration of traffic directions and LATM measures. • Suggestion for proposed road at the southern edge of Wickham Park to be a two-way road 	Noted for consideration in LATM review and forwarded to relevant section of CN.
Building heights	4 from Wickham	Townhouses on the Western end of Bishopsgate Street would be a much more accepted approach and keep more in line with the character of Wickham	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Newcastle LEP 2012 already allows development of HOB 14m on the northern side of the western end of Bishopsgate Street and HOB 24m along the southern side for the extent of Bishopsgate Street.</p> <p>CN has addressed the existing HOB being greater than those envisaged within the Village hub by recommending a new Action 7 under the heading ' Ensure built environment is functional, responsive and resilient' to amend DCP 2012 to include controls for upper-level setbacks for development within the Village Hub Precinct where the existing HOB within the LEP exceeds 10m, that the part of the development above HOB 10m be setback a minimum 6m from all street fronting boundaries.</p>

Theme	Submission from	Issues raised	CN response/recommendation
Village hub	39 submitters (30 from Wickham)	**Extend the Village Hub in the Masterplan to include the remaining stretch west on Bishopsgate Street Village Hub.	Noted but not supported. The exhibited draft Update did include the Village Hub along Bishopsgate Street, as per Council's resolution of the 25 May 2021. However, as the LEP already allows for development of a greater scale than that identified for the Village Hub, and provision has been made to widen the western end of Bishopsgate Street, CN recommends that the larger parcels of land along Railway Street remain within the Rail Edge Precinct and return to the Emerging Industry Quarter Precinct and reflect the character envisaged by WMP 2017.
Active transport	36 submitters (23 from Wickham)	**Address the range of safety and amenity issues associated with footpaths including addressing dangerous sections of sand and lack of pram/wheelchair ramps.	Comment noted and provided to CN's Asset and Projects section for consideration in preparing the public domain plan for Wickham
41 – 47 Throsby Street	33 submitters (20 from Wickham)	**Reconsider the existing plans for 41-47 Throsby Street. We believe this building should not be approved for a height increase due to recent mine subsidence and risk investigations.	Comment noted. The proposed building height and density associated with 41 & 47 Throsby Street Wickham are the subject of a separate Planning Proposal that will be publicly exhibited and considered separate to the draft Update. CN notes the submissions but does not recommend any change to the WMP 2021.
Wickham Park	33 submitters (20 from Wickham)	**Wickham Park must be openly accessible to pedestrians from Maitland Road through Railway Street. This should occur in the very near future.	Comment noted – this is already being implemented by CN
Active transport	22 submitters (13 from Wickham)	**Cycleways must be functional and safe for commuters, citizens, and residents through improvement of traffic plans.	Comment noted and provided to CN's traffic and compliance section for consideration as part of implementing future cycleways
WMP in general - compliance	2 from Wickham	It is disappointing to see recent developments that do not respond to the DCP's or Wickham Master Plan. The CN Planners have identified this in the WMP Update 2021 with actions to investigate measures to remedy. The investigations should happen quickly, so more opportunities are not lost.	Comment noted. The issues identified within the draft Update were a result of development proposals that were lodged after the adoption of the WMP but within the transition to the new development controls being implemented. CN will continue to monitor and improve both the controls applied and the assessment process within its authority.
Building heights	3 from Wickham	Opposed to increased density along Bishopsgate Street as there is sufficient land for high rise development along the rail corridor & park edge as well as north of Lindus Street (for addition densities from WMP).	Comment not supported. WMP 2017 took an evidence-based approach to determining the potential development densities, based on several interrelated factors including site capacity, traffic, impact on amenity and character. Therefore, it is not as straightforward as moving density from one area to another, as suggested. The area north of Bishopsgate Street was determined as suitable for increased density within WMP based on amalgamation of land parcels and widening of Bishopsgate Street. However, the draft Update reduced these densities along Bishopsgate Street in response to concerns on the impact on the existing residences along Bishopsgate Street.
LEP permissible uses	28 submitters (18 from Wickham)	**Change the planning permission in the LEP to permit the building of new single storey residential dwellings on small land lots, which will improve the overall structure of Wickham Village.	Support noted This was included within the exhibited draft Update, as Action 5 under the heading 'Ensure built environment is functional, responsive and resilient'.
WMP in general	1 from Wickham	As a whole, very supportive of the plan – in particular, plans to improve the Wickham Park precinct, the suburb's footpaths, and continued efforts to address the mine subsidence limitations faced by the area	Support noted.

Theme	Submission from	Issues raised	CN response/recommendation
WMP – suggested urban design element	1 from Wickham	Suggested that the Wickham Urban Village study completed by Rose Cogger had elements that should be incorporated into WMP: that dwellings don't have high front fences so occupants may have interchanges with passers-by.	Comment noted. The development controls applying to Wickham incorporate the design elements identified within WMP 2017. Controls for front fences already require a level of permeability to ensure natural surveillance of public areas. While the submission is noted, CN believes this needs to be balanced against the need for residents to enjoy a degree of privacy within the habitable areas of their home.
WMP – Potential additional redevelopment site -	1 from Wickham	The submitter owns two adjoining properties along Hannell St, Wickham (detailed description redacted). These two properties have site areas of 313m ² and 517m ² . Given these properties are adjoining, it provides for a total site area of 830m ² . With both properties in the same ownership, adjoining and greater than 600m ² they therefore meet the "Potential Redevelopment" site criteria. Currently Map 3 – Redevelopment potential notes the properties as "Minor infill or replacement". As such it is requested that this categorisation for these properties be updated to being "Potential Redevelopment" sites and this amended categorisation reflected in the broader planning in the Wickham Masterplan.	Comment noted However, Map 3 – Redevelopment potential is provided for information only and will change over time as land ownership is amalgamated. This has no bearing on the development potential of the land, particularly as the sites identified are located within the area identified as being undermined and therefore unable to achieve an increase in density from what is identified within Newcastle LEP 2012 (HOB 10m and FSR 1.5:1).
Wickham – public domain	1 from Wickham	Public domain is one area where the envisaged WMP should be implemented in full since CN should have complete control over this. The public domain requires clearer plans. CN has advised that the Public Domain Plan soon to be published will address this. I doubt it will provide sufficient detail for a developer to unambiguously build the interface.	Comment supported. CN has commenced public domain planning for Wickham. The process will include separate opportunity for community input and will deliver technical guidelines/manual to guide implementation.
Community Infrastructure Incentives	1 from Wickham	Community infrastructure incentives policy needs much more refinement to be further clarified and have more transparency around how qualitative judgements such as positive benefit to the local community is made before being tested in practice.	Comment not supported. Qualitative judgment as suggested are subjective and can be open to manipulation by individual opinions, whereas the Community infrastructure incentives policy is based on determining the quantitative monetary cost/value of providing improvements not otherwise afforded by CN through other existing revenue streams but that will deliver urban renewal. The community infrastructure projects are identified and developed through community engagement.
41 – 47 Throsby Street – proposed laneway	1 from Wickham	Lane along the western boundary of 47 Throsby Street, (connecting Furlong Lane to Throsby Street). It is unclear to us, and our community, what benefit such a laneway offers	Comment noted. Laneways are used to carry vehicles and provide pedestrian connections. The western end of Furlong Lane is currently a dead end and very narrow, which does not allow for vehicles to turn and travel in and out in a forward direction unless entering private property. This does not meet the appropriate standards. WMP 2017 identified the need to connect the laneway through to provide improved access to land and thereby avoid the need for vehicle access from the primary streets across the footpath thereby improving amenity and safety along Throsby and Church Street.
41 – 47 Throsby Street – proposed laneway	1 from Wickham	Concerns about existing traffic congestion in Wickham and additional traffic moving through Furlong Lane may impact its safety as a place for children to play	Comment noted and provided to CN's traffic and compliance section for consideration as part of any future review of the LATM.
41 – 47 Throsby Street – access	1 from Wickham	Driveway access to 41 – 47 Throsby Street should only be via Furlong Lane as shown in the WMP. Concept drawings shown at Council meeting show driveways on both Throsby Street and Furlong Lane, making Throsby Street footpath less safe.	Comment noted. This is already a consideration within the DCP for Wickham.

Theme	Submission from	Issues raised	CN response/recommendation
Wickham Park	1 from other	Wickham Park must be preserved for activities and events to offer residents a large recreational area for entertainment, music, sporting activities and relaxation.	Comment noted. This has been implemented by CN within the Sports Plan, which identifies the need to prepare a detailed Plan of Management for Wickham Park that implements the WMP.
Village hub	1 from other	Questions why the building occupied by The Good Car Garage on Bishopsgate Street is identified in the WMP as a key redevelopment site at the same time as being included in the Village Hub	Comment supported. This is proposed to be addressed by excluding this site from the extended Village Hub area.
Village hub	1 from other	Suggestion that current industrial buildings could be retained and re-purposed to sympathetic residential developments such as the former wool stores building – e.g. apartment conversion in Maryville	Comment noted. The Wickham Masterplan does not prevent industrial buildings being retained and repurposed (subject to meeting all other relevant environmental, structural, and amenity requirements for the proposed use/s, however it is noted that the scale and design of industrial buildings within this area are not comparable to the wool stores referred to.
Streetscape	1 from other	I generally support the setbacks and improvements to streetscape to make use of new developments to increase footpath widths, increase street trees and provide better cycleways.	Support noted.
Streetscape	1 from other	The importance of green areas and the proposed community garden cannot be overstated in the successful renewal of urban areas due to their unique ability to create community spirit and contribute to a well-rounded lifestyle.	Support noted.
Parking facility	1 from other	Support a visitor parking facility in the land behind Holland and Croft St's as displayed on Map 5 of the draft plan update as I feel this will be important in reducing the load on parking in residential streets - which as many homes in the village hub do not have driveways, is considerable.	Support noted. The final plans for this land are subject to CN acquiring this land from Sydney trains.
Croatian Wickham Club	1 from other	Additional item for long term consideration - The current Wickham Croatian Club and surrounding area is not in a mine subsidence zone. Is there a long-term opportunity to relocate the club to help activate the former bullock island corridor either alongside the corridor between Holland and Railway St - masa madre pizza or between Croft and Holland near the old club site and pay for that by developing the former club site on Albert St?	Comment noted. It is noted that the land occupied by the Croatian Wickham Sports Club is not part of Wickham Park under the ownership or control of CN. It is a Crown land reserve for which the Club is the appointed trustees. CN acknowledges the social contribution the current use has to the local community
Active transport	1 from other	Strongly support the council's suggestion for the development of the cycle lane at 10 Dangar St to link Wickham cyclists to the foreshore cycle path without contributing to traffic on Throsby St, which from experience can be precarious.	Comment noted.
Emerging industry quarter	1 from Wickham and Open Newcastle	The land north of Church Street should be retained in the Village Hub precinct. Church Street must have zoning for a mix of housing. Church Street Cottages are established and are a strong Village influence in their built form for liveability.	Comment not supported. The change in precinct along the northern side of Church Street reflects the redevelopment opportunity of the land, particularly where fronting Hannell Street, for employment uses but does not restrict opportunity for residential uses permitted within the B4 Mixed Use zone.
Village hub	1 from Wickham	Opposes Map 10 and requests low-rise development should remain along entire stretch of Bishopsgate Street with interface to character and heritage of Wickham Superior Public School, Tree of Knowledge and in the area Wickham School of Arts Cottage Creek. This Wickham Master Plan diminishes the Village. Low-rise in character, the entire Bishopsgate Street - East to West is Railway Street. The aim is that character of Village Hub is upheld on the corner of Charles Street and extend along to opposite the heritage listed Lass O Gowrie Hotel.	Comment supported. CN has amended Map 10 – Area B to only apply to land that is proposed to be excluded from the updated Village Hub.

Theme	Submission from	Issues raised	CN response/recommendation
Village hub	1 from Wickham	The extension of the Village Hub west along Bishopsgate Street is not supported. I am unsure of the justification for this; I think some residents want lower scale development in this area. Personally, I think the scale in the WMP 2017 is appropriate for this area and its development potential should not be limited. If the extension is to proceed, the larger blocks at the western end of Bishopsgate Street should not be part of the extension.	Comment noted. It is proposed to exclude the larger parcels of land at the western end of Bishopsgate Street from the Village Hub.
Village hub	1 from Wickham	The proposed revisions do little to critically address the many suggestions that were canvassed at the recent consultation process regarding extension of the Village precinct, traffic movement problems, parking as well as realistic alternative uses for existing industry buildings.	Comment noted. All matters previously identified through CN's stakeholder engagement have been considered and where necessary addressed within the draft Update or otherwise included within CN's feedback document on the exhibition webpage.
Former rail corridor	1 from Wickham	The former used rail corridor must become either by NCC or State Govt a critical feature (as a high) priority of the proposed revitalisation process - e.g. residential development and better traffic management rather than any extension of Wickham Park. Why have a Rail Interchange facility without any off-street parking for the many employees involved?	Comment noted Given the restrictions to potential densities able to be achieved on the site, due to mine subsidence, CN believes residential redevelopment of the land does not offer the best use. However, the draft Update does not propose for this land to be incorporated into Wickham Park, instead, it recognises the value of the site as an asset that complements the use of Wickham Park, with potential for providing public car parking, event space and other operational uses of CN.
Emerging industry quarter	1 from Wickham	With much of the Emerging Industry Quarter area now requiring bulk grouting there is a real possibility for this area to being identified for high job occupancy in emerging industries. Ideally the new industries would build on the current vehicle repair industries and transition to electric vehicles. Or be promoted for renewable energy business, etc. This can get high paying employment closer to where people live. CN Planners have advised that something like this is under review, and this is strongly supported. If such a precinct were to be established, then changing the land north of Church Street from Village Hub to Emerging Industry Quarter is supported. That is, getting high-value jobs close to where higher paid people live is more important than a Village Hub look-and-feel.	Support noted. The amendment made to the NLEP 2012 to permit high technology industries in the B4 Mixed Use Zone, because of the WMP 2017 enables such employment uses.
Community Infrastructure incentives	1 from Wickham	Wickham cannot in its present mixture of old dilapidated dwellings, large old decaying industrial buildings with ageing asbestos roofs be ideal as an entrance to a major city in this State particularly near the Newcastle Rail Interchange. The plan talks about revitalisation - but will such occur - without any concerted incentives either by Government or NCC. In my view greater incentives need to be granted for the Village Hub which is located outside of the mine subsidence area particularly where consolidation of allotments arises with eliminating of off-street parking plus road widening.	Comment noted.
Community Infrastructure incentives	1 from Wickham	In Table 3, Description of Proposed Community Infrastructure Projects, in the WMP Update (2021), the described infrastructure projects are very likely to not reflect community expectations at the time the land becomes available. The last column's title of "Description" should have a footnote that reads something like "The actual infrastructure may differ from that described and will be subject to community consultation at the time the land becomes available".	Comment not supported. The draft Update proposes a range of community infrastructure projects, consistent with the urban activation areas, public domain elements, pedestrian connections and laneways identified by the WMP 2017. The summary of each was used as the basis for CN to obtain cost estimates, which were used to test the viability of introducing development incentives within Newcastle LEP 2012. Further detail will be developed in consultation with the community through public domain planning CN has commenced, which will include the preferred design and inclusions of each urban activation area.

Theme	Submission from	Issues raised	CN response/recommendation
Building heights / Floor Space Ratios	1 from Wickham	<p>The gradual increase in HOB and FSR with lot size is supported. However, in Table 4 the HOB and FSR for lot sizes 2500 m2 and larger must reflect the maximum potential identified in the WMP 2017.</p> <p>Area C the incremental increase from 13m to 14m to accommodate floor level increase of 1m for flooding is supported.</p> <p>Area D the maximum increase HOB 24 m and FSR 3:1 for sites 2000 m2 and larger is not supported. The proposal for 41-47 Throsby Street should not be reflected in the WMP as inconsistent with WMP 2017.</p> <p>Area E is the same as WMP 2017, but the developer of 'Bowline' is proposing a HOB 105m and FSR 8.5:1. The images of their proposal shown to GLOW are supported as visually pleasing but additional HOB and FSR should not be supported as inconsistent with WMP 2017.</p>	<p>Support for graduated scale and density in WMP 2021, based on site area and WMP 2017 is noted.</p> <p>WMP 2017 identified a potential density of FSR 2:1 and scale HOB being 14m and 25m. WMP2021 identifies potential to increase density and scale as incentives to development for the provision of community infrastructure but subject to a site area that enables appropriate upper level setbacks to streets and adjoining sites, particularly in areas proposed for a transition in character.</p> <p>Incentive density and scale available for proposed development on land within Area D of Map 9 – Areas proposed for development incentive, are identified in Table 4 – Potential development incentives for provision of community infrastructure, as being a FSR of 2:1 and HOB of 14m for development sites of 1000m², or greater. This is proposed to increase to an incentive FSR of 3:1 and HOB 24m where sites have a combined area of 2000m² or greater.</p> <p>Part of Area D is subject to a PP for 41 and 47 Throsby Street, which seeks to amend FSR to 3 and HOB to 28m (on 47 and part of 41 Throsby Street) and 22m (on the residual part of 41 Throsby Street). The proposed amendments are subject to a planning agreement and if made will not rely on the development incentives proposed in WMP 2021. Hence, a footnote was included to Table 4 that states "The HOB and FSR for 41 & 47 Throsby Street is subject to separate planning proposal."</p>
Building heights / Floor Space Ratios	1 from Wickham	Unsure of reference to Cl7.10 in Area E	Cl7.10 reference is Clause 7.10 in LEP which provides for a greater FSR incentive in Area E from 5 to 6 for non-residential development.
Active transport	1 from Wickham	Every effort should be made to get the "Proposed Active Transport Route" to skirt just north of the substation adjacent to the rail corridor rather than connect with the western end of Holland Street. It is noted that this area is flagged for parking, so the southern edge of any carpark should incorporate a cycleway to provide the most direct connection between Maitland Road and Honeysuckle.	Comment noted and provided to CN's traffic and compliance section for consideration as part of implementing future cycleways.
Active transport	1 from Wickham	The removal of the dedicated cycleway along Church Street is supported. This was always a cycleway to nowhere, and required a section of shared pathway along Hannell Street which is unsuitable for a shared pathway	Comment noted and provided to CN's traffic and compliance section for consideration as part of implementing future cycleways.
Active transport	1 from Wickham	The "Proposed Active Transport Route" along Station Street is strongly supported as a much better option than the Church Street cycleway. Submission also includes detailed design suggestions for consideration when implementing the cycleway route.	Comment noted and provided to CN's traffic and compliance section for consideration as part of implementing future cycleways.
WMP in general – extent of area	1 from other	Query as to why area North of Albert Street is not included in the Masterplan	Comment noted, however the WMP area consists of land identified as being part of the Newcastle City Centre with the map of the NSW State Environmental Planning Policy (Urban Renewal) 2010.
WMP in general – COVID effect	1 from other	The WMP was made pre COVID when urban densities were pursued, and immigration was at a peak of 200,000 immigrants per year. This is not the case now when immigration has ceased and is unlikely to return to its pre Covid levels for many years. The whole WMP should be re-thought and the consideration and care of public space, and the ambience of Wickham Village be given its proper due.	<p>Comment not supported.</p> <p>The WMP has a time horizon of 2040 and beyond. International immigration into Australia (with a population more than 27 million) has a lesser impact on the demand for housing on a suburb level, in comparison to the influences of trends such as domestic migration out of Sydney due to a greater shift in the ability for remote working since the start of the COVID pandemic.</p>
WMP in general	1 from other	As a resident of Newcastle East who passes through Wickham and patron of venues, not supportive of the WMP revision	Comment noted.

Theme	Submission from	Issues raised	CN response/recommendation
WMP – version control	1 from other	<p>The WMP Update 2021 is useful for clearly seeing what changes CN are proposing. However, once changes are accepted, they should be rolled in the WMP 2017. That is, the Wickham Master Plan 2017 should be revised to incorporate the changes.</p> <p>This avoids having to read to documents and the inevitable conflicts that will arise. This approach will also make future updates of the WMP easier.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>However, the WMP 2017 and the draft Update were prepared to provide a coordinated approach to implementing urban renewal initiatives by CN throughout the identified actions within the plan. The action will be implemented through CN planning framework, contribution framework, public domain plans and guidelines and work plans.</p> <p>Once implemented the WMP will no longer have a purpose to exist as it is a means to an end, not a document that the public will need to refer to in perpetuity.</p>
WMP – potential redevelopment site	1 from other	<p>Strongly support the council's suggestion that the land on the corner of Lindus and Railway St's (29 Bishopsgate) categorised as a potential redevelopment site be developed into the Wickham Green to complement the existing hospitality businesses in the area by bringing more day-time patronage to the suburb</p>	<p>Comment supported.</p> <p>CN recommends for this land to be excluded from the Village Hub Precinct within Map 3.</p>
Wickham in general	1 from other	<p>The need for improved community planning to ensure the Wickham Village has the funds needed to improve the “look and feel” of an old suburb which now has multiple high storey buildings, with increased population adding more traffic through streets and narrow lanes</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>However, while the Village Hub is located within the city centre, the lower densities sought by the local community make it comparable to other residential areas of the city. Hence, the need for improving the “look and feel” of Wickham needs to be balanced by CN against other parts of the city. With a reduction in density from what was previously envisaged, the means of delivering improvements as land redevelops is reduced.</p>
Support for live music venue in Wickham	1 from other	<p>Express the importance of supporting the Lass O'Gowrie as an iconic live music venue in Newcastle.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
Heritage	1 from other	<p>Built and historical heritage has been overlooked by the WMP. Questions what criteria were used for the statement that found Wickham did not warrant listing as a heritage conservation area. Provides several historic facts about Wickham.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Heritage was considered in preparing both the WMP 2017 and the WMP update, which resulted in the heritage listing of the Former Bullock Island Rail Corridor within Newcastle LEP 2012.</p> <p>CN's Heritage Planner considered suggestions from the community engagement of listing additional suggested dwellings and/or listing the Village Hub as a Local Conservation Area within the LEP. The conclusion was that all properties in Wickham were previously assessed having regard for the standard criteria used for assessing heritage significance. Items of local significance were already included within the LEP and while other dwellings were "old" per se, this alone does not provide grounds for listing. Furthermore, none of Wickham meets the criteria to warrant the inclusion as a heritage conservation area. There is not a consistent example of several contributory items related to a specific timeframe (or grouping) that cannot be found elsewhere within the city.</p>
Heritage	1 from other	<p>The changes proposed in the Wickham Masterplan 2021 do not augur well for the retention of the liveability of the suburb, or for its heritage, or neighbourhood and village ambience.</p>	<p>Comment not supported.</p> <p>Wickham has been continuously evolving from its history as a post-industrial suburb consisting of an eclectic mix of dwellings, scattered among industrial and automotive businesses, abandoned contaminated sites, and even including bikie gang headquarters, brothels, and the like to what it is today and what is envisaged for the future.</p> <p>The WMP vision seeks to build on the eclectic characteristics of Wickham's past but provide for an urban mixed use neighbourhood catering for a range of complementary land uses accessible to public and active transport routes, open space areas, and with an improved public domain that supports opportunities for positive social interaction and improved amenity.</p>

Theme	Submission from	Issues raised	CN response/recommendation
Heritage	1 from other	The buildings associated with the old School of Arts on the East side of Hannell Street, for example, need to be genuinely incorporated into the Wickham Master Plan. To situate additional and excessive high rise at the Railway/Stewart Avenue corner, for instance, would be detrimental to the future showcasing of these historic buildings and their association with Henry Lawson. Call for buildings associated with old School of Arts on the east side of Hannell Street should be incorporated into WMP.	Submission not supported The identified land is part of the Honeysuckle development area on the site known as 'Wickham'. CN advise that any concerns can be raised directly with the landowner/developer, the Hunter Central Coast Development Corporation.
Heritage	1 from other	Newcastle Council should look to preserving the Wickham Village much as they preserved Cooks Hill. It's unique to Newcastle and could become like Cooks Hill a special part of the city. Creating vast towers around it will destroy this.	Comment not supported. CN Heritage Planner has advised that Wickham does not meet the necessary criteria to be listed as a heritage conservation area and does not demonstrate a consistent grouping of contributory items related to a specific timeframe (or other culturally significant link) that cannot be found elsewhere within the city.