

**ORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING  
28 NOVEMBER 2017**

---

**CCL 28/11/17  
ADOPTION OF DRAFT WICKHAM MASTER PLAN**

**Attachment B:** Summary of submissions to public exhibition of the  
Wickham Master Plan

**DISTRIBUTED UNDER SEPARATE COVER**



### Acronyms

The following is a list of acronyms used throughout the following tabled summary of submissions and planning responses:

- WMP - (draft) Wickham Master Plan
- TfNSW - Transport for NSW
- SA NSW - Subsidence Advisory NSW
- RMS - Roads and Maritime Services
- LRA - Land Reservation Acquisition
- LEP - Local Environmental Plan
- LATM - Local Area Traffic Management Study
- HOB - Height of Building
- FSR - Floor Space Ratios
- DCP - Development Control Plan

### Frequently Asked Questions

Ref	Question	Planning response
1.	What is the purpose of preparing a Master Plan for Wickham?	The WMP identifies a vision to manage change occurring as a result of increased development interest brought about by the construction of a new transport interchange and shift in the city's commercial core to Newcastle West. Furthermore the WMP outlines the strategies and actions required to implement the vision. This includes consideration of potential increases in building heights and density, improved links to adjoining areas, public domain embellishment, and infrastructure upgrades.
2.	Does the WMP propose to change the zoning of land in Wickham?	No. Land within the WMP project area is proposed to remain as B4 Mixed Use Zone. The Mixed use zoning will continue to allow a range of uses to co-exist.
3.	Why are building heights proposed to increase within parts of Wickham?	The WMP proposes for increases in HOB and FSR to be dependent on the provision of a measurable community benefit over and above the standard required developer contributions. Proposed building heights were determined in regards to the following competing factors: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Physical capacity of the land</li><li>• Likely impacts on adjoining land</li><li>• Traffic analysis</li><li>• Market feasibility and demands</li><li>• Proximity of emerging city centre within Newcastle West, including the imminent Newcastle Interchange located at the edge of the WMP area.</li></ul>

Ref	Question	Planning response
4.	How long will it take to implement the changes to building heights in Council's planning process?	Once the WMP is finalised and adopted by Council, amendments to Council's LEP and DCP will be initiated. This will include the introduction of bonus provisions for HOB and FSR as incentives for the provision of predetermined community benefits. The process for amending Council's LEP requires a separate public exhibition and usually takes 12 months to complete. Hence the current standards will continue to apply in the meantime.
5.	How long will it take to implement the proposed public domain improvements?	Council will sequence future works and funding within its ongoing delivery program, with some works already scheduled for the coming financial year. However, works may be brought forward where redevelopment occurs and associated funding becomes available through developer contributions.
6.	How will the skyline change?	The preparation of the WMP included development of a 3D interactive model, which demonstrates that the increases proposed in the HOB (in the project area) result in a more gradual transitioning from the existing 90m HOB within Newcastle West and the lower density residential neighbourhood to the north of Albert Street, when viewed from the adjoining area areas of Honeysuckle or Maitland Road, Islington.
7.	Will Council protect the existing murals within Wickham?	No. Murals and public art are usually provided as temporary installations to improve the visual amenity of blank walls. While Council appreciates the community's affection for these, protection of existing murals may result in other building owners being reluctant to offer their blank walls up for such initiatives if seen as lowering the redevelopment potential of their land.
8.	Does the WMP encourage existing businesses to leave the area?	No, the WMP encourages a continued mix of uses, given the economic benefits and local services these provide to the city. However the plan does acknowledge that over time, land owners may choose to redevelop their land for other uses (such as residential). Where this occurs, it is encouraged that opportunities be provided to support new businesses, including clean technological and creative industries, commercial uses and service industries within mixed use development.
9.	How can Council improve safety and amenity of local streets?	The WMP identified the need to prepare a LATM as a priority for identifying measures to calm and slow traffic.  To expedite this Council prepared and exhibited a LATM for Wickham together with the WMP. Once adopted, Council will request approval from RMS to provide their approval of a 40 km/h speed limit in the area. Council will also commence implementation of the proposed traffic devices (roundabout, speed humps, kerb extensions, etc.) as part of its annual works program.
10.	What can Council do about impacts on residential parking from construction activities within the Wickham local area?	Council has introduced a resident parking scheme in the Wickham area to assist residents, particularly those without off-street parking. Council will review this scheme as required to ensure it meets the needs of the residents.
11.	Why is part of Union Street between Throsby Street and Station Street being changed to one-way?	Changing Union Street to one-way will control traffic movements around the Newcastle Interchange. This will also allow Council to widen the footpath on the eastern side of the street for increased pedestrian mobility. Hence enabling Union Street to be the main north-south pedestrian thoroughfare to the Newcastle Interchange and Newcastle West.

## Government agencies' feedback

Ref	Description	Planning response	Action/outcome
1	Submission by Transport for NSW dated 20/07/17.		
1.1	Street network near new interchange to be designed to ensure ease of movement in the area, given high expected pedestrian and cycle movements in the area around the new Interchange.	The street network near the near interchange was determined within the planning work prepared by TfNSW during the design phase. Council appointed a traffic consultant to test various traffic scenarios having regard for the non-variable traffic conditions imposed on Station Street. This information informed the preparation of the WMP and a LATM to detail the type of mechanisms and solutions to ensure ease of movement while protecting pedestrian safety and amenity of the existing local street network.	No changes recommended to WMP
1.2	TfNSW is supportive of initiative for providing additional public transport options, including the identified opportunity for a ferry wharf in Throsby Creek. However further information is required to better understand the demand before committing to a ferry service.	The WMP identifies the potential expansion of the existing ferry service within the harbour to Throsby Creek, within the Vision for the Harbour edge precinct.  While Council may advocate for a new ferry stops with pedestrian links to other modes of public transport (at the new transport interchange), it will be the role of relevant agencies and/or service provider to initiate a detailed investigating of specific location, feasibility, or timing for this to occur. Hence the WMP does not provide detailed action for this to occur.	No changes recommended to WMP

Ref	Description	Planning response	Action/outcome
2	Submission by Subsidence Advisory NSW dated 21/06/17		
2.1	The proposed maximum development building envelope contained within the master plan exceeds the current SA NSW complying surface development guidelines and would need to be assessed on application. Depending upon the type and scale of development, this will likely include significant and costly engineering controls including grouting of the mine workings.	<p>The WMP recognises the extent of mine subsidence within Map 4 Constraints and challenges in section 3.1.5 Physical limitations, as well as the need for remediation works including grouting of the mine workings. Two options were considered.</p> <p>Option one was to maintain low densities so development is under the threshold for requiring remediation works; this was not considered favourable for the long term redevelopment of this location and strategic context.</p> <p>The second option, adopted by the WMP, is to allow building envelopes that can produce intentionally high yields to offset the high cost of remediation works. Whether this option is feasible within the current property market remains to be seen.</p>	No changes recommended to WMP
2.2	It should be noted some parts of Wickham fall within the area administered by the Newcastle Mines Grouting Fund and developers may be eligible for assistance under this Fund, whereby grouting costs are capped, subject to conditions. Further enquiries should be directed to HDC.	Noted	<p>Add an additional point to 3.2.3 Physical attributes as follows:</p> <p>"e. where land is constrained by mine subsidence, the Newcastle Mines Grouting Fund, administered by the Hunter Development Corporation, provides opportunity for eligible developers to apply for the cost of grouting to be capped (subject to conditions)."</p>
2.3	Given the known mine subsidence risks in the Wickham area, SA NSW recommends Council informs any proposed developer of the potential risks, limitations and financial costs associated with developing over the old mine workings.	Noted. Mine subsidence is advised within Planning certificates accompanying any contract for sale of land. Furthermore Council already brings this issue to the attention of potential applicants at pre-DA stage.	No changes recommended to WMP

Ref	Description	Planning response	Action/outcome
<b>3</b>	Submission by Roads and Maritime Services dated 13/06/17		No changes recommended to WMP
<b>3.1</b>	<p>Roads and Maritime comment that the intensification of the Wickham catchment may impact on Hannell Street, which is a classified State road (A43), in particular between Cowper Street and Hunter Street.</p> <p>It is recommended that Council undertake a corridor strategy for Hannell Street between Downie Street Maryville and Hunter Street Newcastle West.</p>	<p>Traffic assessment and modelling was undertaken on behalf of Council by Bitzios Consulting. The modelling included an assessment of the potential impacts from envisaged growth in the area on Hannell Street and the surrounding street network. Recommendations were incorporated in WMP.</p> <p>Traffic modelling indicated that regardless of development within WMP, traffic conditions along Hannell Street, in particularly at the Cowper Street roundabout would deteriorate in the future unless a suitable measure such as traffic lights was installed.</p> <p>Managing traffic along Hannell Street is the responsibility of the RMS as is the preparation of any corridor strategy recommended within the RMS submission.</p>	

Ref	Description	Planning response	Action/outcome
3.2	<p>Roads and Maritime has reviewed the draft Wickham LATM and raised objection to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. The plan shows many pedestrian crossings to be installed on raised thresholds. The installation of pedestrian crossings are not supported prior to the warrant for installation being met</li> <li>ii. Installation of traffic calming devices such as raised thresholds or speed humps on Throsby Street, Railway Street and Union Street,</li> <li>iii. Implementation of conflicting one-way designation on Union Street between Station Street and Throsby Street. One-way south towards between Throsby Street and Station Street is considered unacceptable.</li> <li>iv. Multiple (four) roundabouts proposed on Railway Street. It is considered that the Albert Street and Throsby Street roundabouts are sufficient to control traffic.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. The WMP identifies what is envisaged within the local street network in the mid to long term future when the area is redeveloped. Hence the changes and devices identified will not be installed before they are warranted.</li> <li>ii. The proposed measure identified within the WMP and the Wickham LATM will ensure pedestrian safety, local amenity, and universal access are improved to a standard expected within an inner city mixed use precinct. Location and provision of devices have previously been considered and supported by RMS staff and consultants during the preparation of the WMP.</li> <li>iii. Each part of Union street forms part of a separate component in the traffic network developed for the local area and tested by independent traffic modelling. The primary aim for Union Street is to facilitate pedestrian flows between the transport interchange and the adjoining neighbourhoods. Hence it is not intended as a thoroughfare for vehicles from one end of Wickham to the other. Hannell and Railway Streets are intended to be the main north south vehicle routes.</li> <li>iv. The WMP only proposes one roundabout, located at the intersection of Throsby and Railway Streets. However this is not proposed until traffic volumes increase to require this.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. No changes recommended to WMP</li> <li>ii. No changes recommended to WMP</li> <li>iii. No changes recommended to WMP</li> <li>iv. No changes recommended to WMP</li> </ul>



## Business Organisations and Professional Associations

Ref	Description	Planning response	Action/outcome
4.0	Submission from UDIA		
4.1	Concerns		
4.1.1	If densities proposed are not achieved, the Wickham area will not meet its potential in terms of projected dwelling targets to meet the projected population and will not provide the floor space to accommodate the expected commercial outcomes proposed for the centre.	<p>The current densities in LEP reflect the NURS targets. The additional densities identified within 5.3.1 of WMP are not based on 'population or floor space targets' but rather on a 'density potential' (i.e. maximum theoretical 'planning capacity of the land').</p> <p>These are densities achievable beyond what is identified as the minimum feasible density and are only intended where these results in a measurable community benefit.</p>	No changes recommended to WMP
4.1.2	If the controls do not achieve the minimum FSR that are identified in the economic analysis, developments are unlikely to be feasible and therefore will not progress.	<p>Council's economic consultants identified that redevelopment would generally need to achieve an FSR of 1.5 to 2.5 within the WMP study area in order to be feasible. This variation is based on the value of the asset (building) on the land.</p> <p>Given the current level of DAs in the area (most not meeting their maximum FSR) it would appear that for the most part development is feasible under the current controls (with a few exceptions that are proposed to be amended).</p> <p>Council is not seeking to accelerate the rate of redevelopment but rather manage development in a way that is complimentary to the redevelopment of the city centre as a whole, and/or where a community benefit may be achieved through a higher rate.</p>	No changes recommended to WMP

Ref	Description	Planning response	Action/outcome
<b>4.1.2a</b>	<p>The heights and FSRs cannot be compared to understand whether the FSR proposed can be achieved. In considering the current controls in Honeysuckle and the town centre, buildings are required to be set back at certain height limits. For example, at 16m a 6 metre setback is required from the street and 12metres at 45 metres. Similarly, with building separations, setbacks at ground floor, side setbacks and adherence to other controls such as SEPP 65 there is no way currently under the Master Plan to understand whether the sites will achieve the FSRs proposed.</p>	<p>To determine the potential HOB and FSR for each precinct 3D modelling was carried out using the proposed building envelopes &amp; setbacks. These controls will be reflected in a subsequent DCP. Analysis of FSRs currently being achieved for similar building typologies was carried out to ensure these controls are achievable.</p> <p>For the most part the FSR is higher than HOB in terms of meeting SEPP 65. This is due to the range of permissible land uses within the B4 zoning allowing a range of land uses (other than those to which SEPP65 applies). Hence one option is to apply different FSR for residential and non-residential land uses to reflect this. The alternate being proposed by the WMP is to enable an increase in HOB (to enable the additional FSR to be taken up) where a measurable community benefit is achieved (under a planning agreement).</p> <p>With respect to building design, a detailed DCP will be prepared to reflect the vision and 3D building envelopes identified in WMP. This will include setbacks and other controls applicable to the interface of development with the public domain. It is intended that other design principles and controls will reflect those in SEPP 65.</p>	<p>No changes recommended to WMP</p>
<b>4.1.2b</b>	<p>To achieve the desired higher density outcomes envisioned in the Master Plan, and to best leverage the investments in public transportation, the fragmented nature of Wickham should be better addressed. Consolidation of smaller lots will be necessary in order to meet the area's goals.</p>	<p>The HOB and FSR proposed within the WMP reflects the precincts identified in the Vision and also the redevelopment potential of the land.</p> <p>Development potential as shown in Map 6 is based on both existing use and assets on the land, and land parcel size (based on existing land ownership patterns).</p> <p>The WMP reflects land parcel size and ownership patterns by applying greater density to areas containing larger parcels and lesser HOB and FSR for fragmented areas (such as the Village Hub precinct).</p>	<p>No changes recommended to WMP</p>

Ref	Description	Planning response	Action/outcome
<b>4.1.2c</b>	<p>These initial controls do not consider the provision of car parking on lower floors, requiring buildings to have more height to achieve the necessary FSR to make development feasible. This again raises concerns with setbacks that may be required as a building increases in height, making it more difficult to achieve the required FSR to make a development feasible.</p>	<p>Provision of car parking was factored into consideration of HOB and FSR. The existing city centre parking rates were factored into testing and modelling on various sites in collaboration with local Architects, as well as through review or existing DA's.</p> <p>Building setbacks consistent with SEPP65 were considered as were those identified within the building envelopes. These are not proposed to be the same as for other parts of the City Centre given there is no need to achieve a continuous street wall/parapet (as is sought along Hunter and King Streets).</p>	<p>No changes recommended to WMP</p>
<b>4.1.2d</b>	<p>UDIA NSW is concerned about the conflict between achieving the desired density and jobs generation in Wickham with the constraint of the smaller lots which creates fragmented ownership. To achieve increased FSR or height or both on a site, a bonus is proposed in the economic analysis and also in the Master Plan for properties that will have land acquired to provide new road access or road widening. The mechanism to provide the bonus is unclear, and as the detail around setbacks and building separation is not known, it is uncertain whether these bonuses will actually be achieved and therefore provide the incentive for which they are designed. The fragmented ownership will often lead to smaller sites being developed which will not meet the development potential required to deliver the housing and commercial space required.</p>	<p>The implementation of WMP will identify which land will be acquired through a LRA in the LEP and which land may be acquired through notification.</p> <p>Generally any land required for road widening will be acquired through LRA at the time of land sale or DA. It is proposed that a mechanism be implemented (in LEP) to enable the transfer of FSR from the acquired land onto the remaining parcel, hence reducing the value of the LRA for Council and ensuring the landowner's development potential is not diminished.</p>	<p>No changes recommended to WMP</p>
<b>4.1.2e</b>	<p>In considering the feasibility of projects, the economic analysis has not taken into account the potential impacts of a NSW Special Infrastructure Contribution for the region. UDIA NSW understands that the SIC will be a "Hunter SIC" and not just for urban release areas. The additional costs that may be applied to development in Wickham via a broadening of the SIC will further require that FSRs be achieved that are at least as high as those proposed in the economic study.</p>	<p>This matter has been noted and will be considered in preparing the implementation actions of the WMP, including the development of community benefit incentives for increasing current HOB and FSR within the LEP.</p>	<p>No changes recommended to WMP</p>

Ref	Description	Planning response	Action/outcome
<b>4.1.2f</b>	The original study proposed the potential to reduce the requirements for car parking for developments located close to the transport interchange. The Master Plan provides no further information regarding this proposal.	Further details to be provided in DCP however WMP proposed that car parking ownership be decoupled from other residential land uses to encourage car parking to be used as a tradeable commodity, thereby increasing consumer choice, improving housing affordability, and maximising efficiency of distribution and opening opportunities for car sharing schemes or car rental businesses.	No changes recommended to WMP
<b>4.2</b>	Recommendations:	Furthermore this will enable car parking to be redeveloped for other uses in the future if private vehicle ownership declines due to technology.  Ideally car parking would be a market driven land use, with bonuses given where this use is provided but not being a requirement of development. However further consideration needs to be given to the implications of this approach.	
<b>4.2.1</b>	Identify the building controls that will be applied to the Wickham area to allow Newcastle City Council and industry to determine whether the FSRs proposed can be achieved to ensure that development provides for the anticipated growth and is feasible.	FSRs were considered and tested having regard to the requirements of SEPP 65 for Residential Apartment Design and the envisaged outcomes of the WMP.  Further details and building controls will be implemented through a new location specific DCP for Wickham, as identified in various Actions of WMP.	No changes recommended to WMP
<b>4.2.2a</b>	The mechanism for providing bonus FSR needs to be outlined to determine whether this will provide the incentive to develop sites as required. This should be both for the incentive scheme and for those land holders that are required to provide land for new roads and road widening.	Agreed. The mechanism and details for introducing community benefit incentives will be established and implemented as an action of the WMP once adopted.	No changes recommended for WMP

Ref	Description	Planning response	Action/outcome
<b>4.2.2b</b>	<p>UDIA NSW recommends that Council consider the opportunity to transfer unused FSR or height from under developed sites to sites that can accommodate the additional height and FSR. If the development controls for setbacks allow successfully amalgamated sites to be capable of exceeding the allocated height and FSR, then this would provide the opportunity to maximise the development potential of existing larger sites and also reward those developers that can amalgamate sites to create larger foot prints and allow larger developments.</p>	<p>Potential FSR and HOB were determined for the WMP having regard for the landownership patterns and envisaged future character and densities distributed across the project area.</p> <p>Mechanisms available for transferring 'community benefit incentives' will be investigated as part development and implementation of this action.</p>	<p>No changes recommended for WMP</p>
<b>4.2.2c</b>	<p>UDIA NSW also recognises one of the major barriers to the zone objectives being met in terms of density, is where several smaller lots owned by separate owners have no way to meet FSR and height limits without amalgamation. Given that many underdeveloped properties have higher property values as individual lots, this often leads to property owners renovating or improving individual lots, which could sterilise development potential for decades to come, as it makes sites unfeasible to acquire and amalgamate. UDIA NSW recommends that Council consider what incentives are possible to encourage property owners to amalgamate with their neighbours, to sell to, or partner with the development industry to create the outcomes that the zone objectives set out. UDIA NSW has a number of suggestions on how these incentives could work, and we would welcome the opportunity for further discussion.</p>	<p>As above, the densities proposed by the WMP reflect the potential of the land for redevelopment, which includes land ownership patterns. This is reflected by the character precincts and potential HOB and FSR. Hence greater densities are generally applied in areas having larger land parcels or where development potential already encourages amalgamation of smaller parcels due to the residual land values able to be offered to individual land owners.</p> <p>Furthermore the WMP recognises that redevelopment is likely to only occur on part of all land, hence maintaining the suburbs eclectic character and land use distribution.</p>	<p>No changes recommended for WMP</p>
<b>4.2.3</b>	<p>The plan should consider reduced car parking rates to provide the best opportunity to achieve the outcomes proposed in the study in terms of density. Reduced parking rates would also recognise the value of the multi-million-dollar investment of the transport interchange, the proximity to open space and the impending change to the public transport system that will be driven by a private operator.</p>	<p>As per submission 4.1.2f above</p>	<p>No changes recommended for WMP</p>



Ref	Description	Planning response	Action/outcome
5	Submission by The Newcastle Division of the Australian Institute of Architects Chapter dated 21 Jun 2017		
5.1	The plan currently lacks a central planning idea or concept; an improved connection between the Wickham Park area and Throsby Creek may provide the seed for this big idea	<p>The WMP was prepared in consultation with a range of stakeholders to build upon the opportunities of the locality while addressing identified challenges.</p> <p>The WMP is a result of evidence based design and testing, which includes three core initiatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Activate the edge of Wickham Park to connect between open space and built environment. This includes a proposed a pedestrian/cycle link between Maitland Road and the transport interchange along the southern edge of Wickham Park and beyond</li> <li>• Interpret the alignment of the former bullock island railway corridor through distinctive landscape treatment and incorporation of cycle/pedestrian links.</li> <li>• Create urban activation areas that provide opportunities human interaction and greening within the public domain. This will be achieved by providing development bonuses in exchange for provision of small parcels of land at identified street corners</li> </ul> <p>Various other big ideas were considered and tested, including a link between Wickham Park and Throsby Creek along Throsby or Church Street (as previously identified in the 2006 Urban Design Guidelines) but these were all dismissed on the basis of not being feasible or practical to implement in reality.</p>	No changes recommended to WMP
5.2	The plan is also an opportunity to create a precinct that provides a balance between housing, employment, entertainment and recreational opportunities. The worst result would be a dense high-rise dormitory suburb.	Noted. The WMP advocates for mixed use development, including a range of local services and opportunities for employment and business. However given its proximity to the new transport interchange, city centre, harbour and recreational open space (Wickham Park) Wickham is strategically suited to providing high density residential uses.	No changes recommended to WMP

Ref	Description	Planning response	Action/outcome
5.3	<p>We support plans for increased population density and building height near major transport nodes, but this must be balanced by improved amenity and access to open space and recreational opportunities. Social and community needs can be served by inclusionary zoning, developer contributions and integrated planning solutions.</p> <p>Precinct planning also needs to begin to address the social housing deficit in Newcastle as a whole.</p>	<p>The WMP identifies strategies for achieving improved amenity and access to open space and recreational opportunities.</p> <p>Furthermore the WMP identifies the possibilities of providing social housing through developer incentives such as increased HOB and FSR. This method ensures that development windfalls are shared for community benefit.</p>	<p>No changes recommended to WMP</p>
5.4	<p>We acknowledge the challenge of planning for a new precinct to replace the old one.</p> <p>We are concerned, however, that the current 'industrial village' character of Wickham is going to be completely lost. It is important to retain a 'sense of place' which doesn't sterilise the nature of the area</p>	<p>Wickham is identified as having an eclectic character, which includes a mixture of low scale residential and industrial uses. The WMP identifies the variation in envisaged character for each identified precinct. Implementation of the WMP will include preparation of a DCP to provide further guidance to future redevelopment outcomes.</p>	<p>No changes recommended to WMP</p>

Ref	Description	Planning response	Action/outcome
5.5	<p>The master plan fails to address how current residential density will compare to density under the proposed FSRs. Most of Wickham's residential density is 50 or less dwellings per hectare. The proposed FSRs will transform most of Wickham to 240 or greater dwellings per hectare.</p>	<p>Both existing and proposed densities are identified within the WMP. Furthermore the discussion report previously prepared to underpin the WMP identified densities of existing dwellings which found:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The majority of the WMP area (apart from the precincts identified as the 'Village Hub' and 'Railway Edge') does not consist any residential uses (hence no density).</li> <li>• Existing residential densities actually vary substantially from 50 to 240 dwellings per hectare due to variations in lot sizes rather than building typologies.</li> </ul> <p>Residential apartments do not necessarily always result in higher densities than other lower scale typologies such as terraces, as this is influenced by a number of factors including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provision of on-site car parking</li> <li>• Dwelling size (e.g. number of bedrooms, bathrooms, and living areas)</li> <li>• Provision of open space (private and/or communal)</li> <li>• Common areas/facilities</li> <li>• Fire stairs, lift/s and plant.</li> <li>• Other land uses within apartment buildings (especially within the B4 Mixed use zone), including lower level retail/services and/or commercial offices.</li> </ul>	<p>No changes recommended to WMP</p>
5.6	<p>We note that the proposed FSRs are based on the recommendations in the Economic &amp; Market Analysis report. This report has established the FSRs based on current market data. The problem is that the current volatility of the market may result in exaggerated FSRs.</p> <p>The 11 storey height limit in Map 15 is questionable; even eight storeys is too high.</p>	<p>The WMP identified the minimum FSRs required to ensure development is feasible. However the potential maximum HOB/FSRs identified are based on the capacity of the land and local street network as well as through 3D modelling of building envelopes to ensure adequate solar access, privacy and reflective of envisaged character precincts and uses.</p> <p>The WMP advocates that where increases to FSR or HOB are identified, these are only achieved where a quantifiable community benefit is provided as part of the development.</p>	<p>No changes recommended to WMP</p>



Ref	Description	Planning response	Action/outcome
<b>5.7</b>	Housing		
<b>5.7.1</b>	The plan should encourage development that facilitates the retention of community centres and childcare services and the expansion of local schools and public open space. A focus on young people, the homeless, industry and trade business hubs should also be encouraged.	WMP encourages provision of a mix of uses and services. The plan also advocates the provision of community benefits as an incentive for increasing development yields. This could include a range of community uses including those listed. Further detail of potential community benefits will be determined as part of implementing the relevant actions identified within the WMP.	No changes recommended to WMP
<b>5.7.2</b>	It is unclear how this plan links with the West End plan and the broader planning for greater Newcastle.	The WMP identifies the changing role of Wickham in supporting the new city centre within Newcastle East. Links between the adjacent areas is limited (due to the heavy railway line) but addressed in section 5.1 Improve accessibility and connectivity within Wickham and to adjoining areas.	No changes recommended to WMP
<b>5.7.3</b>	The plan must address the housing affordability issue within the context of a diverse mix of housing scales and types. In line with the recent "Common Ground" housing tower project in Brisbane and the NSW Government's "Going home staying home" policy, social housing must become an integrated part of the city's social balance, rather than relying on the usual approach of creating single building enclaves.  A minimum percentage of affordable housing should also be scattered through the precinct	As per comment for submission 5.3 and in 5.7.1 above, social housing is envisaged to be promoted through developer incentives.	No changes recommended to WMP
<b>5.7.4</b>	The opportunity to promote and reward developers who incorporate mixed housing types within single higher density developments should be explored. Buildings mixing bed-sits, two and three bed apartments, luxury housing, commercial and community spaces should be favoured.  The plan should allow for deliberative community-based housing models, such as the Nightingale concept that is being developed in Melbourne.	Noted. The WMP does not limit the future mix of housing delivered within the market, including community based housing.  Bonuses and incentives for social/affordable housing schemes will be considered as part of introducing developer incentives for community benefits.	No changes recommended to WMP

Ref	Description	Planning response	Action/outcome
<b>5.8</b>	Design		
<b>5.8.1</b>	The Institute recommends the preparation of a Newcastle specific housing design guide similar to the City of London's successful guide. This will ensure a minimum standard of housing design that is consistent across all new development. The guide can mandate a minimum level of private amenity for every dwelling and introduce universal design principles so that residents can age in their dwellings.	A new DCP is proposed for Wickham as part of implementing WMP. However this will not replace the requirements already provided within State Government guidelines and SEPPs.	No changes recommended to WMP
<b>5.8.2</b>	The implementation of design guidelines requiring streets, housing and public buildings are kept clean, neat and tidy will increase the longevity and presentation quality of the precinct.	Noted but not something Council polices unless a matter of public health or safety. The implementation of WMP will include preparation of requirements for the public domain given the selection of quality materials and easily maintained environments will ensure longevity and presentation quality.	No changes recommended to WMP
<b>5.8.3</b>	The plan should provide for the 'coordinated variety' of new development. This encourages the contributions of several designers, while collectively addressing their context.	The resultant DCP and public domain planning will ensure consistency while still allowing for diverse development outcomes.	No changes recommended to WMP
<b>5.8.4</b>	The plan should encourage upper level public and commercial spaces and bridging routes between neighbouring developments and across rail line and car traffic at Hannell and Railway Streets, incorporated with high level parking and flood refuge opportunities	While innovative proposals would be considered on their merit, the WMP does not include schemes that are beyond Council's control to coordinate or deliver.	No changes recommended to WMP
<b>5.8.5</b>	All new designed elements should meet rigorous environmental benchmarks.  The local architecture and planning professions can support good design by providing peer review services as part of the DA approval process.  Design excellence along the foreshore is particularly important. We recommend competitions as the means of procuring the best possible design.  A Wickham Design Ideas Competition would encourage new ideas on this area's design possibilities.	The WMP was prepared in liaison with local architects and planners in developing and testing options on various sites.  Council also already utilises an Urban Design Consultative Group, in reviewing DCPs and DAs to ensure design excellence of medium to high density residential development as well as other major proposals. This group consists of architecture, heritage and landscape architecture expertise.	No changes recommended to WMP

Ref	Description	Planning response	Action/outcome
<b>5.9</b>	<b>Flood Refuge</b>		
<b>5.9.1</b>	The whole precinct has been identified as being at significant flood risk. A comprehensive approach to water capture and treatment needs to be developed.  Wickham could be an exemplar for how to deal with these issues.	Noted. This is addressed in Council's Low Lying Suburbs Study and Plan, which applies to Wickham. Provisions of this study have been included in WMP.	No changes recommended to WMP
<b>5.9.2</b>	There is a need to integrate elevated public space into the planning for Wickham to provide refuge from extreme storm and tidal events identified in the LEP flood maps.	Addressed in Council's DCP	No changes recommended to WMP
<b>5.9.3</b>	The construction of new buildings within Wickham will intensify projected flood impacts onto the remaining open space. Flood refuge facilities therefore need to be financed or incorporated within each building approval. Developer contributions should be negotiated to manage the public safety needs of the community.	No buildings will be located in floodway or flood storage areas. Hence existing or new buildings will not impact on the local hydrology of the area.  Flood management devices and methods are addressed in Council's Low Lying Suburbs Study and Plan	No changes recommended to WMP
<b>5.9.4</b>	Stormwater detention needs to be integrated below roads, cycleways, parking areas, public spaces and landscape zones.  Landscape infiltration zones need to be provided as buffers between the rail corridor and residential development	Such measures are already considered and incorporated into the WMP.	No changes recommended to WMP
<b>5.9.5</b>	A semi permeable surface is needed to deal with ground water.  Green zones in streets will deal with storm water runoff and flooding and help with preventing the heat island effect.	As above.	No changes recommended to WMP
<b>5.10</b>	<b>Public Transport</b>		
<b>5.10.1</b>	Acoustic impact from the rail interchange must be managed carefully. Landscape buffers, land contouring, plantings, parking spaces and cycleways need to be provided between the railway corridor and residential buildings.	Noise and vibrations consideration and implications were addressed as part of the approval of the transport interchange and are a matter of consideration in DAs.	No changes recommended to WMP
<b>5.10.2</b>	City to Stockton traffic can be captured with a new Wickham Ferry Terminal that benefits Stockton links to local supermarkets through Wickham. This will reduce car traffic from Stockton.	Noted and supported in WMP	No changes recommended to WMP

Ref	Description	Planning response	Action/outcome
<b>5.11</b>	Traffic Management		
<b>5.11.1</b>	Key parking locations must be strongly linked to public transport. Parking should generally be minimised to encourage foot traffic and the use of public transport.	Noted	No changes recommended to WMP
<b>5.11.2</b>	The traffic flow through Wickham and around Wickham Park needs to be improved; one-way streets don't encourage easy traffic flow.	Traffic flows were modelled and assessed to improve the amenity and safety of local streets. The primary purpose of local residential streets is for people and not traffic flows.	No changes recommended to WMP
<b>5.11.3</b>	Car speeds should be reduced throughout the precinct.	The WMP and LATM propose a 40km/hr speed limit as well as traffic calming devices. Lower speeds are not supported by RMS.	No changes recommended to WMP
<b>5.12</b>	Cycleways		
<b>5.12.1</b>	The proposed cycleways need to be improved to reduce the reliance on cars in the area. Better cycleway connections - ensuring paths don't end randomly - and separation from main roads - particularly Hannell Street - will improve safety and reliability.	Noted and already addressed in WMP	No changes recommended to WMP
<b>5.12.2</b>	The plan should include bicycle hire locations and bicycle paths on every street.	Low traffic streets are not considered to require designated cycleway/lanes but these have been included where identified as necessary.	No changes recommended to WMP
<b>5.13</b>	Pedestrians		
<b>5.13.1</b>	The plan needs to be more pedestrian friendly, with a greater emphasis on pedestrians' needs rather than on cars and parking. This will be improved by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improved pedestrian access and traffic calming to the foreshore</li> <li>• Improved pedestrian connections to Throsby Creek</li> <li>• Access routes between Wickham Park and the Throsby city link foreshore</li> <li>• Pedestrian overpasses on busy roads</li> <li>• Priority for foot traffic on dedicated bike paths</li> <li>• Increased signage with directions to main streets, ovals and train stations</li> <li>• Creating a safe and easy connection to sailing club/foreshore across Hannell Street.</li> </ul>	These matters are addressed in section 5.1.1 Pedestrian and Cycling networks of the WMP.	No changes recommended to WMP

Ref	Description	Planning response	Action/outcome
5.13.2	Pedestrian links across Hannell Street also need to be greatly improved, particularly when the old Bullocks Island Railway route is zoned to become a public landscape corridor that will see pedestrian traffic emptying out at one of the busiest roundabouts in Newcastle.	These matters are addressed in section 5.1.1 Pedestrian and Cycling networks of the WMP	No changes recommended to WMP
5.14	Community Facilities and Character		
5.14.1	Wickham Park and 'Tree of Knowledge' Park should be improved to be 'destination' places with good landscaping and multi-use spaces.	This matter is identified and supported in WMP	No changes recommended to WMP
5.14.2	The character of Wickham Village needs to be maintained by retaining existing terraces and houses of value to the street and enhanced with more playgrounds and gardens.	The 'Village Hub' precinct in WMP identifies and supports this position.	No changes recommended to WMP
5.14.3	Green areas are needed on the streets connecting Wickham Park with the harbour edge.  We propose linking Wickham Park to Wickham Village by extending Church Street to the park. This could be achieved by a land swap that would benefit the affected landowners and the city	While there is no objection to this idea, a link between Wickham Park and Throsby Creek along Throsby or Church Street (as previously identified in the 2006 Urban Design Guidelines) was considered but dismissed on the basis of not being feasible or practical to implement in reality, particularly across Hannell Street and in acquiring land on the Harbour Edge precinct.  Furthermore this was not identified as a priority during consultation in preparing the WMP.  What was identified as important and is reflected in the WMP is the links between Wickham Park and the Village area, which will be achieved via Railway Lane, Holland Street, and along the Bullock Island corridor.  A dedicated cycle link is proposed along church street, however this will still require crossing Hannell Street at either Throsby or Cowper Street.	No changes recommended to WMP
5.15	Schools		
5.15.1	Population growth will create the need to expand local school sizes in the precinct.	The Department of Education and Training are aware of the proposed population growth in the City Centre and have assured Council that they have their own method for reviewing future supply and demand.	No changes recommended to WMP

Ref	Description	Planning response	Action/outcome
5.15.2	The old school is central to the Wickham Village identity and is heritage listed, but it has been converted into student housing; it should be reclaimed for school use.	This facility is actually utilised for disadvantaged students and is a valuable asset for providing social equity within the city centre. It is not owned by the Department of Education and Training (or even State Government) hence it is not appropriate to suggest it be reclaimed from its current owner. Furthermore it is likely to be more feasible to provide a new purpose built school elsewhere if demands require this.	No changes recommended to WMP
5.15.3	New schools could be accommodated on Rail Corporation NSW land.	Noted. This is a matter for Department of Education and Training or a private operator to pursue if wanted/needed.	No changes recommended to WMP
6	Submission by Throsby Basin and Hamilton Business Chambers dated 3 July 2017		
6.1	There are three keys issues that we would propose for reconsideration. These are relating to traffic, pedestrian access and green space	Noted	No changes recommended to WMP
6.2	Vehicle Traffic in and around Wickham is congested. Current construction around the Transport Interchange and residential and commercial developments has exacerbated the issue. We know from our members that congestion is already having serious ramifications on business and customer access.	Council appointed Bitzios Consulting to undertake traffic modelling and provide recommendation on measures to manage current and potential future traffic issue. As a result a LATM was prepared and exhibited for Wickham concurrent to the WMP.	No changes recommended to WMP
6.3	We note that the draft master plan suggests 50% of the DA approvals must have business located on the ground floor. While we welcome additional infrastructure for business, we suggest that some additional planning should be undertaken to improve road blockage while accommodating service access.	The WMP does not suggest a percentage for any land uses. However the vision does seek to support opportunities for employment/economic generating uses.  Traffic matter are addressed by WMP and LATM as noted above.	No changes recommended to WMP
6.4	In the 25 year Revitalisation Plan for Newcastle – updated 2009 the draft the vision for the area was to see it become a diverse and dynamic mixed use neighbourhood integrating with Honeysuckle and the West End. The addition of a dedicated Transport Interchange further reinforces the need the community to refocus its view on road transport while encouraging foot, pedal and ride share experiences to minimise road traffic congestion.	This position is supported within WMP.	No changes recommended to WMP



Ref	Description	Planning response	Action/outcome
6.5	<p>Disappointingly, we do not believe that the Plan has enough emphases on creating safe and accessible pathways for pedestrian or peddle traffic. Currently, footpaths cater for everyone; pedestrians, delivery trucks, essential services and power poles. Given that much of inner city Newcastle was created well before modern motor vehicles and large rigs, these aging narrow paths are becoming less effective in our city with many cracked, uneven or broken making them impassable to the aged, pram users and the disabled.</p>	<p>These matters are addressed in detail in section 5.1.1 Pedestrian and cycling network of WMP and furthermore section 5.2.1 Streetscapes. This includes detailed actions for further planning and implementation of public domain improvements.</p>	<p>No changes recommended to WMP</p>
6.6	<p>We believe that it is critical that pathways, pedestrian access that is including into the final plan. The focus must be on well-connected links between suburbs including Maryville, Hamilton and Carrington precincts. These must be safe and well lit. This will become even more important as the city's growing reputation as a cruise stop continues and savvy entrepreneurs look to tourism and visitor experiences that focus upon walking tours and bike riding to the thriving café and restaurant culture, as viable business options.</p>	<p>As above.</p>	<p>No changes recommended to WMP</p>
6.7	<p>Green spaces and public infrastructure is a major interest for the business community. Most recently both Chambers were briefed about an exciting residential development that proposed to use its Section 94 to redevelop public walking and bicycle space along the Maryville foreshore. It is this type of thinking that business chambers endorse and support. We propose that as part of the Plan, all developers are encouraged to work with communities and key stakeholder groups to work with Council to use these Section 94 contributions to create green spaces and public infrastructure not just around their own development, but into spaces where safety or access can be improved.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>No changes recommended to WMP</p>
7	<p>Submission by GLOW dated 5 June 2017</p>		
7.1	<p>Support collection of Section 94A developer contributions for use on Infrastructure and improvements in Wickham. Urban renewal is a generational opportunity for improvements within Wickham.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>No changes recommended to WMP</p>

Ref	Description	Planning response	Action/outcome
7.2	<p>Priority works in Wickham are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Greening</li> <li>• Paths upgraded for access (most paths are currently only 600ml [SIC] wide)</li> <li>• Lighting</li> <li>• Traffic management supported with good signage</li> <li>• Smart drainage</li> <li>• Street access across Wickham for emergency, safety and health</li> <li>• A request by Newcastle council to State Government, pleading to run the power underground to remove power poles taking up pathway space (and not conducive to Street tree planting)</li> </ul>	<p>These suggestions will be achieved by the following actions identified within the WMP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Detailed public domain planning</li> <li>• A new DCP for Wickham</li> <li>• LATM</li> </ul>	No changes recommended to WMP
7.3	<p>There needs to be a timeline for actions as the wording “Priority” is vague. Dates and recurring budgets are essential.</p>	<p>Noted; priorities identified relate to the four year integrated reporting framework adhered to by Council. report Council's the following clarification will be incorporated into the final WMP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High priority means commenced within the next financial year</li> <li>• Medium priority means commenced within the four year reporting cycle</li> <li>• Low means beyond four years</li> </ul>	Amend 'priority' column for Actions 'commence' and replace 'High', 'Medium', and 'Low' to 'Within 1 year', '4 years or less', and 'More than 4 years'.
7.4	<p>When developers pay \$2.8million dollars for Wickham “small lots” on Bishopsgate Street’, widening will not happen and should not be giving false hope.</p> <p>Objection /against land acquisition will occur.</p> <p>(This was evident when other Wickham Plans were last on exhibition in the 1980's and 1990's. <i>I.e. Landowners said <b>NO</b> in the strongest terms</i>)</p>	<p>Where street widening is identified as necessary, this will be achieved by either acquisition (funded by s94A) or in return for increased HOB or FSR on the land. Furthermore it is proposed that the development potential from the area being acquired will be transferred to the remaining parcel to ensure landowners are not disadvantaged but that the envisaged streetscape/access outcomes are achieved.</p>	No changes recommended to WMP
7.5	<p>There are at least 2 vehicles to every apartment.</p>	Noted.	No changes recommended to WMP



Ref	Description	Planning response	Action/outcome
7.6	Wickham's access streets with constructed high -rise, along 1880 laneway networks, with existing and proposed mixed use, and industry and proposed commercial traffic in this Master Plan continues to embed traffic congestion into Wickham's Renewal Plan, and is further compounded by the State Governments/ Newcastle Interchange Regional Infrastructure.	Council appointed Bitzios Consulting to undertake traffic modelling and provide recommendation on measures to manage current and potential future traffic issue. As a result a LATM was prepared and exhibited for Wickham concurrent to the WMP.	No changes recommended to WMP
7.7	Pedestrian, Industry and Community development is at 2017 tension levels. More infrastructure and budget with the timeline is essential for improved safety and movement of trucks over 5 tonne, pedestrians, transit commuters, Honeysuckle workers, residents and event visitors for concerts and harbour entertainment.	As above.	No changes recommended to WMP
7.8	Numbers of vehicle delivery to mixed use business and the numbers of cars owned by tenants and residential are increasing with more recent impact of removalist, garbage trucks and car warehousing.	Noted	No changes recommended to WMP
7.9	Planning Documents state that residents will be encouraged to NOT own a car. However inner city residents are the modern workforce for this modern regional city. I.e.- RAAF, Kooragang, NCIG, Orica, Stolt Fuel Warehouse and airport and coalfields employees. These employees drive in, drive out and all do shift work. Their car is essential to their shift work employment throughout the region. The car is essential and Wickham is the regional collector.	The WMP does not make assertions of car ownership but seeks to introduce flexibility for residents to decide if they wish to purchase parking with their dwelling or not. This will be done by separating car parking from residential units and allowing car parking to be a separate tradeable commodity. This in turn will enable individual choice of how many car parking spaces they wish to own or can afford.	No changes recommended for WMP
7.10	Pedestrian movement reflects the real social diversity across Wickham. Diverse with young children, pets, prams, and the elderly with walkers.  Wickham is a very diverse community and community building must be a priority with budget provided and Section 94.	Agreed. Section 5.2.2 Urban activation of WMP identifies the creation of public spaces through developer incentives to enable places that nurture community life.	No changes recommended for WMP

Ref	Description	Planning response	Action/outcome
7.11	<p>What does 'where possible' mean to re-use existing sandstone when relocating kerbs and gutters?</p> <p>Heritage sandstone in Wickham is to be respected and maintained by our network. 8 DA's in the coming months are planned for construction. Wickham residents stress in strong terms; "Heritage sandstone must be maintained". Please state that sandstone will be maintained 'whenever' any work takes place to kerbs and gutters. The stone is the original sandstone blocks and once they are damaged or removed there is no replacing them, which goes against the philosophy of maintaining the heritage character of Wickham.</p>	Noted	Reword to "existing sandstone is reused wherever work takes place to kerbs and gutters."
7.12	Tree planting - non-deciduous trees; as current trees fill the gutters with leaves and flooding occurs.	Noted	No changes recommended for WMP
7.13	Sunlight is lost as apartment <i>canyons</i> over narrow laneways leave dark, cold, damp streets and with no home frontages/no setbacks, there has been no set back with apartment blocks impacting badly on street activation.	The WMP identifies the envisaged building envelopes, which are proposed to be reflected within the subsequent DCP. These envelopes were established and tested utilising 3D modelling and shadow analysis to ensure new development addresses these issues.	No changes recommended for WMP
7.14	<p>What dialogue and implementation is occurring with HDC Executive Officers to bring the upgrade and extension of the site to sustain life of The Tree of Knowledge?</p> <p>20 years have passed and much has occurred, there is 12 metres on the eastern side until a fence line. Was this planned or an unfortunate over-site, forgetful about planning public space?</p> <p>Newcastle has Iconic Sites. This is important and needs to be carried out, rather than "on the never never" i.e. priority of 25 years.</p>	<p>Council engaged with HDC in preparing and exhibiting the WMP, which informed the Vision for the Harbours edge precinct, identified future connections along the Harbour and potential embellishments of the parkland near the 'tree of knowledge'.</p> <p>Ongoing dialogue will occur as the public domain improvements within the area are implemented and as the remaining lands within Honeysuckle are developed, east of the WMP project area.</p>	No changes recommended for WMP
7.15	<p>Can Wickham be confident that existing trees in Wickham will stay? Inner city renewal of Wickham area needs more green feel for community and liveability.</p> <p>1995 Wickham Plan deciduous trees were requested. This must have been lost in the detail.</p>	<p>The WMP advocates for street trees and landscaped areas to be incorporated within the public domain and in the front set back of development sites.</p> <p>Street trees will be managed in accordance with Council's current regime and the outcomes of subsequent detailed public domain planning.</p>	No changes recommended for WMP

Ref	Description	Planning response	Action/outcome
7.16	<p>Why can't houses with less than \$20m be considered for removal of overhead electrical wires and place power cable underground? This would add to safety and aesthetic of the new CBD Wickham – for instance, overhead cables bump the balcony of housing in these narrow lanes. On Throsby Street a screen was placed in front of the Penthouse balcony protecting inhabitants in Storms /wind events. Safety and amenities are expected.</p>	<p>The WMP does not exclude land under 20m wide from replacing overhead wires but rather stipulates that this should be a requirement of larger scale development of 20m or wider.</p> <p>The current situation [within Throsby Street] as described is not supported and it is intended that this will be reflected in the resultant DCP.</p>	No changes recommended for WMP
7.17	<p>Changing heights –Wickham Heights have increased greatly. Please explain how this was advised to 13 City Councillors. Wickham's 19 stories are situated on the RMS road that "collects" Traffic into Wickham Interchange and Albert Street? Heights are excessive and detrimental to the overall liveability and working function of the area.</p> <p>Additional congestion is a significant consideration in the initial Plan and the SEPP was adjusted in December 2010 to what was 12 stories.</p>	<p>Elected Council received a Workshop on the proposed draft WMP prior resolving to exhibit the plan. The workshop provided Councillors with an outlined the process, insight into the findings of the technical studies and 3D modelling that was undertaken to determine the potential densities and future built form.</p> <p>Traffic and transport assessment was carried out in preparing the WMP to determine capacity for the local street network and recommend changes to traffic flows and management.</p> <p>A LATM plan was prepared and exhibited together with the WMP which provides greater detail of the mechanisms required to manage traffic and protect the amenity of local streets and the public domain.</p>	No changes recommended for WMP
7.18	<p>Now there seems to be a need to be concerned about how apartments relate to neighbouring developments e.g. minimum separation distances and noise transmission.</p> <p>These are issues residents can't reasonably be expected to foresee or to understand fully in a technical sense.</p>	<p>The potential built form has been modelled to determine that densities can be achieved while maintaining compliance with SEPP 65 and the NSW Residential Apartment Guide.</p>	No changes recommended for WMP
7.19	<p>The National Construction Code requires the area of windows must be at least 10% of the floor area. Borrowed light is permissible.</p> <p>"Borrowed" seems to be the wrong term – the living room isn't denied the simultaneous use of the light and it's not temporary (and it's certainly not returned after use!). "Shared" or something similar would be a better term.</p>	<p>Noted. The WMP does not address detailed design requirements for apartments. This is achieved through compliance with SEPP 65 and the NSW Residential Apartment Guide.</p> <p>The envisaged built form was modelled to ensure densities proposed are able to be achieved having regard to design requirements and good practice.</p>	No changes recommended for WMP

Ref	Description	Planning response	Action/outcome
7.20	<p>Noise – an Acoustics Report is needed in the WMP and the Recommendation for this to be in Newcastle’s final approved Wickham Plan.</p> <p>A Report explaining acoustics along Station, Hannell, Throsby, Railway and Albert Streets in Wickham.</p> <p>Traffic Noise reports should be available giving transparency about heavily trafficked streets.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noise is a matter that is addressed and managed at the DA assessment of new buildings. The WMP does not propose any land uses or infrastructure that would increase noise from the levels experienced by the current road, rail and industry within the area.</p>	<p>No changes recommended for WMP</p>
7.21	<p>Across Wickham, NGO's have not been mentioned, in the 2017 Wickham Plan area (namely Matthew Talbot, Samaritans, Salvation Army and the Awabakal office)</p> <p>Wickham carries many services for the disadvantaged, this also includes Social Housing and Affordable housing.</p> <p>The diversity of Wickham is respected, engaged and safe. 30 years of input and community building by all has engaged a network to live, work and experience safety. This is about nurturing the community, street to street, inclusive of house to house.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>No changes recommended for WMP</p>
7.22	<p>Could it be recommended that Church’s offering free food boxes etc. should not setup at their door. It has proved dangerous and assaults do occur.</p> <p>From October 2017 many transits are to access Newcastle’s interchange and the area of Wickham and Wickham Park is to be the collector.</p> <p>Transits, temporary outdoor swagy’s/campers all arriving, waiting for free hampers and including men that have been refused entry to the Hotels have also caused distress to immediate Social housing and Affordable housing residents and local pedestrians.</p> <p>The old model of free boxes vouchers at the door is dangerous. A free handout is adhoc, without integrated support and management, surely needs to adopt with experienced NGO models, their experience is to cater and give a clearer direction for better risk management.</p>	<p>Noted, however this matter is beyond the scope of matters addressed within the WMP.</p>	<p>No changes recommended for WMP</p>

Ref	Description	Planning response	Action/outcome
<b>7.23</b>	<p>Climate Change- Sea rising should be managed by walls / high levy banks. Australia's regional river towns have man-made structures for protection. Sea level rising could be managed in the future if budgets allow for levy infrastructure.</p>	<p>Council has prepared a separate Low Lying Suburbs study which addresses these matters and proposes future mechanisms to manage this issue. The WMP recognises these and makes allowances for this to occur.</p>	<p>No changes recommended for WMP</p>
<b>7.24</b>	<p>Wickham lock down and/ or emergency access and exit is restricted. Density contributes to congestion when emergency services attend lifesaving incidents.</p>	<p>WMP seeks to improve accessibility and movement within and across the suburb and to adjoining areas.</p>	<p>No changes recommended for WMP</p>

## Community/landowner feedback

Ref	Description	Planning response	Action/outcome
8	Submission by Barr Property & Planning on behalf of their client [REDACTED] dated 31 May 2017		
8.1	<p>Supportive of an increase in development potential over and above the existing controls as well as the proposed provision to ensure acquisition does not reduce the redevelopment potential of the land, which is achieved by including the subject site area (that was acquired) as part of real calculations when determining potential gross floor area.</p> <p>However concerned about impact on development potential due to actual loss of land area and configuration of resultant lot due to the proposed road widening along Holland Street and the extension of Croft Street.</p>	<p>Noted. The 3D modelling undertaken in preparing the WMP demonstrates that where land is identified for acquisition, the resultant land is still able to accommodate a viable floorplate and achieve the same level of development.</p>	<p>No changes recommended for WMP</p>
8.2	<p>Suggests further increase in HOB to 60m and FSR due to cost of developing on land affected by mine subsidence and to accommodate GFA on left over parcel.</p>	<p>The proposed building heights are based on Council's assessment and modelling of building envelopes and envisaged densities. The proposed HOB of 45m provides a transition to the 60m HOB in the city centre south of the railway line, while still achieving adequate solar access to adjoin land. A 60m HOB is considered excessive in this location.</p> <p>Council's independent economic and market analysis demonstrated that the proposed building height will enable yields that are more than adequate to be feasible.</p>	<p>No changes recommended for WMP</p>
8.3	<p>Suggests a reduction in width of land required to extend Croft Street (to 4m) as new laneway on the southern side of the site will accommodate one way traffic with no on street parking.</p>	<p>An extended Croft Street is intended to be as a service lane rather than a local street, hence a reduction of width would be consistent with its intended purpose.</p> <p>Assessment of this issue demonstrates that the proposed width of the extended Croft street can be reduced to 5m, on the land to the north, provided any required loading facilities and public car parking is provided on site.</p>	<p>The extension of croft Street will be reduced in width to 5m along the Fuchs site to allow for one-way traffic, no parking but enough width for a footpath.</p>
8.4	<p>Requests removal of proposed restrictions for vehicle access to the site.</p>	<p>The restriction to direct vehicle access is only required to Railway Street to reduce traffic conflicts and avoid driveway crossovers along the foot path. Vehicle access is considered suitable from all other existing and new streets.</p>	<p>Amend vehicle access restriction to only apply along Railway Street</p>

Ref	Description	Planning response	Action/outcome
<b>9</b>	Submission by Shaddock Architects, on behalf of their client [REDACTED] dated 31 Jul 2017		
<b>9.1</b>	The site is a large (8,000sqm) triangular block of land, bounded by Railway Street to the east, Holland Street to the south, and the disused Bullock Island rail corridor land to the north west. "Shop Top Housing is considered the most appropriate development type for this site.	Noted	No changes recommended for WMP
<b>9.2</b>	Comments		
<b>9.2.1</b>	The lack of height graduation from this development site (25m) up to the significantly taller development site to the south (45m), accentuates a strong dominance of the buildings in the southern corner of Wickham Park.	Building envelopes (HOB and FSR) were determined having regard to solar access and shadowing, view sharing, as well as proximity to the new interchange and Newcastle West	Amend building envelope of triangular land north of Holland Street by increasing potential HOB by 10m to a HOB of 35m and FSR of 2.5, noting that this increase will be reflected by an increased requirement of community benefit to be achieved.
<b>9.2.2</b>	The lower scale nature of buildings proposed for the rear edge of the suburb, fronting the park, including this development site, appears to be a lost opportunity to increase population density where it would be most desirable and have minimal impact on neighbouring properties.	Noted. The WMP advocates for additional HOB and FSR to that within the current LEP to be achieved as a bonus where a measureable community benefit is achieved through a planning agreement. Hence additional HOB may be warranted where an increased benefit is able to be achieved.	No changes recommended for WMP
<b>9.2.3</b>	When viewed from the harbour the lack of taller buildings along the park edge reduces a clear visual delineation or "ridgeline" for the western edge of the suburb.	Noted. It was never an objective of the WMP to create a delineation or "ridgeline" for the western edge of the suburb nor is this necessarily considered desirable, with respect to view sharing and solar access.	No changes recommended for WMP



Ref	Description	Planning response	Action/outcome
9.2.4	The proposal to dedicate the northern 20m portion of this site for “open public domain improvements” is not a desirable outcome from a commercial viewpoint. The inclusion of this small portion of land projecting from one side of the proposed shared pathway detracts from the clearly defined axis established by the original Bullock Island Rail corridor.	The northern 20m portion is a small triangular parcel of no more than 200m <sup>2</sup> in area. The intent is that this land would still be part of the FSR calculations of the site, and would also contribute as a community benefit to obtain the additional HOB for the remainder of the site. The axis of the original Bullock Island Rail corridor can be strengthened by means of landscape treatment/plantings and does not necessarily need a built edge along its entirety. The creation of urban activation areas and improved direct cycle/pedestrian access to Wickham Park is considered of greater importance in delivering the vision of WMP.	No changes recommended for WMP
9.3	Suggestions		
9.3.1	Option 1: height limits for sites are graded down more sympathetically into the suburb to reduce the visual impact of the taller buildings. That is, increase the HOB of subject site by 10m (3 storeys) to provide a softer gradient in height from the taller buildings on southern corner of the site down to adjoining precincts.	Option 1 put forward would result in HOB and densities on the Klosters and Good Life Church sites that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• would cast long shadows over Wickham Park</li> <li>• would not provide an appropriate interface to existing housing along the northern side of Albert Street.</li> </ul>	No changes recommended for WMP
9.3.2	Option 2: height limits for sites adjacent Wickham Park be raised to increase the population density in this area and better define the park edge.  That is, adding 20m HOB to the subject site and an additional 10m to other sites in the precinct, providing better definition for the park edge interface, and to create a ridgeline for the rear of the suburb.	Option 2 is the preferred of the two options put forward but would be subject to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Assessment of shadowing to ensure adequate solar access to land on southern side of Holland Street (Fuchs)</li> <li>b) Additional community benefit being achieved (e.g. open space area +/- affordable housing +/- car parking)</li> </ol>	Amend building envelope of triangular land north of Holland Street by increasing potential HOB by 10m to a HOB of 35m and FSR of 2.5, noting that this increase will be reflected by an increased requirement of community benefit to be achieved.



Ref	Description	Planning response	Action/outcome
10.0	Submission by ADW Johnson, on behalf of their client [REDACTED] dated 20 June 2017		
10.1	The proposed increased building heights are supported, in particular those heights within the railway edge precinct in proximity to the transport hub. This height in our view can be easily accommodated in context of the overall built form of the CBD immediately to the south. The increased height is required in any event to allow the FSR previously envisaged for the locality to be effectively realised.	Noted	No changes recommended for WMP
10.2	The reduction in the number of proposed laneways is supported. Notwithstanding this a small number of proposed laneways remain. The connection proposed at the rear of our client's property is not supported. Connection through to Wickham is available a short distance south along Railway Lane and so a further connection in this location is considered unnecessary particularly given the extent of private land involved. Our client is already, as part of a development outcome, providing for the widening of Railway Lane, a key access to Wickham Park. Overall it is highly unlikely that private land owners will dedicate their properties for access, particularly with no compensation proposed. Whilst connectivity is important it needs to be balanced against impacts on private lands, cost benefit analysis of these is required.	Following further analysis and having regard to the DA on the land, it is agreed that the setback and acquisition of a new lane along the northern part of the site is not required. The extension of Croft Street can be accommodated to the land north of this site and is not required on the subject land.	Remove extension of Croft Street from land fronting railway lane
10.3	We do not support the property access restriction along Railway Lane to our client's property. Development options for this site will require access to Railway Lane. There are no current alternate access points and the proposed lane to the north is not supported as an access given the impacts as described above. Additionally, the access from the suggested laneway to the north is unlikely to be available to our client's site in the time required for delivery of a development outcome.	Upon consideration, it is acknowledged that a restriction to vehicle access along the entire southern boundary to Railway Lane, as proposed in WMP, would unduly restrict redevelopment of this site until the proposed new streets/lanes are able to be acquired and constructed.  Good pedestrian amenity may be achieved along Railway Lane, provided vehicle access is consolidated to one location, as proposed within the current DA for redevelopment of the site.	Remove access restrictions along Railway lane

Ref	Description	Planning response	Action/outcome
10.4	The requirement for a 6m setback from Railway Lane is not supported, particularly if this setback is applied to the realigned boundary after road widening is accounted for. Additionally, a setback of this size is not warranted given the lack of built form opposite and noting the width of the rail corridor.	<p>The proposed setbacks identified within the WMP are intended to be measured from the 'existing' site boundary; not the 'proposed' site boundary following the proposed land acquisitions/dedications.</p> <p>For example, the set back to Railway lane is proposed to be 6m from the existing southern site boundary. This equates to a 1m building setback once the required acquisition of land for road widening of Railway Lane is achieved.</p>	Clarify building setbacks are from existing front boundary and not from new boundary where land is acquired for road widening
10.5	Overall recreation, landscaping and public art opportunities to be maintained, proposed and enhanced for the area is supported and will significantly contribute to the success of Wickham as an urban village of high amenity.	Noted	No changes recommended for WMP
11	Submission by [REDACTED], landowner within Wickham dated 21 June 2017		
11.1	<p>In relation to the Urban Activation precincts under Section 5.2.2. We are supportive of this great initiative. However affected owners should be fairly and appropriately compensated by</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• being able to apply FSR density to the site area including the activation area required by council, and</li> <li>• given the smaller land area available for development be compensated by increases in FSR and Height Limits to the affect sites.</li> </ul>	This is consistent with what is proposed within the WMP.	No changes recommended for WMP

Ref	Description	Planning response	Action/outcome
12.0	Submission by Monteath & Powys Pty Ltd dated 21 June 2017		
12.1	<p>Heritage - It is noted that there are several heritage items in the masterplan area, including the Albion Hotel, Lass O'Gowrie, Seafarers Centre and Corner Albert and Hannell St. These areas are not identified in the Draft Plan for potential redevelopment, however, discussions with council officers suggest that a merits based assessment approach is more appropriate on these sites.</p> <p>While it is understood that due to the heritage nature of some sites a merits based assessment is an appropriate response, it is considered that the use of the term 'unlikely to change' (e.g. Map 6 of the master plan) is not the best terminology to be using, and other terms such as 'merits based assessment required' or 'redevelopment subject to site issues being addressed' is better terminology, in this instance.</p> <p>It is recommended that Council rephrase terminology in the draft master plan from 'unlikely to change' to a more relevant terminology.</p>	<p>While heritage items may be redeveloped sympathetically they are not envisaged to experience substantial physical change to the built form, nor are they targeted as land accommodating increased densities or redevelopment.</p> <p>Furthermore Map 6 is included in the background information to inform the Master Plan rather than being a means of enabling or restricting development.</p>	No changes recommended for WMP
12.2	<p>FSR - It is noted that the draft master plan proposes increase in heights limits, some nearly double those currently identified in Newcastle LEP. Nonetheless, there have not been similar increase in FSR to accommodate the increases in height. For example, the area just north of the railway corridor (southern end of the Wickham precinct) is proposed to increase in height from 24m to 45m but the FSR is to remain the same at 4:1. Other FSRs have been modified to accommodate increase in height. The issue here is not the height but ensuring the FSRs are appropriate to ensure development occurs with that proposed in the master plan.</p> <p>It is recommended that Council consider whether FSRs are appropriately identified for the significant increases in height that are being proposed.</p>	<p>The HOB and FSR identified in the WMP are a result of testing and modelling of potential built form having regard to the design requirements set out in the NSW residential apartment guide and other likely development controls. Furthermore these are based on discussion with Architects on various sites.</p> <p>It should also be noted that HOB and FSR are both maximums and not an as-of-right, hence they will not always correlate exactly due to variation in building design and land use requirements.</p>	No changes recommended for WMP

Ref	Description	Planning response	Action/outcome
12.3	<p>Infrastructure Provisioning -</p> <p>The Draft master plan identifies a 'codified community infrastructure incentives scheme'.</p> <p>There is little detail in the draft plan about what exactly this means. It is interpreted from the Draft Plan that this refers to 'using incentives and bonuses in exchange for additional building height and/or FSR...' There may be benefits to any developer and the community in this approach, alternatively it may also render developments unsustainable. There is also a lack of clarification about whether Council's Section 94A plan would still apply.</p> <p>It is recommended that further clarity around a community infrastructure incentives scheme be provided in the final master plan. The scheme should be reasonable and transparent if Council are going to go down this path, and the scheme should not hold any development to ransom if the proponent does not wish to participate in the scheme and just pay Section 94A contributions (or Section 94 contributions should an area specific plan be prepared). Any relevant mechanisms (e.g. VPAs) should also be identified.</p>	<p>Further clarification has been provided in the final WMP; however the specifics of the end mechanism are subject to further work which will be undertaken should the WMP be adopted. This will require an amendment to Council's LEP which is a separate process and will consist of further community and industry consultation to implement.</p> <p>The WMP flagged the concept of community benefit incentives as a means of gauging the level of support for pursuing this further.</p>	<p>Amend reference in WMP from "codified community infrastructure incentives scheme" to "bonus HOB provision within Council's LEP " and/or "bonus FSR provision within Council's LEP " as relevant.</p>
13.0	<p>Submission by Monteath &amp; Powys Pty Ltd, on behalf of a client, dated 23 June 2017</p>		
13.1	<p>The current draft master plan identifies the McCarrolls site as potentially having an FSR of 6:1 and a height limit of 60m. These planning controls are supported for this site.</p> <p>The subject land (bounded by Charles St, Dangar Street, Hannell Street and Bishopsgate Street), just to the north, is proposed to have a similar FSR but a lower height limit of 45m. Both these sites (given their physical location) are gateway sites into the western part of the CBD and will be adjacent to the new Wickham Interchange. Both sites are also adjacent to Honeysuckle Drive and the future Cottage Creek precinct.</p>	<p>Further modelling and assessment was carried out for the identified land, which concludes that the land could support greater height along Hannell Street, as identified within the submission. However this would not be suitable along the western portion fronting Charles Street given the lower scale of development/ current uses within the adjacent Village Hub precinct of WMP area. Additional HOB may be achieved where substantial public car parking is provided on the land given its proximity to the transport interchange and being identified as a need by Council's independent traffic and transport assessment.</p>	<p>No changes recommended for WMP</p>

Ref	Description	Planning response	Action/outcome
13.2	As the subject land will be a gateway site into the CBD is recommended that the proposed controls for the McCarrolls site also be applied to the subject land. The significance of these entry points into the CBD can also be viewed in Figures 12 and 13 of the draft master plan. It is considered that both sites can reasonable have the same FSR and height limits.	As above	No changes recommended for WMP
14.0	Submission on behalf of The Australian Christian Outreach Centre by Wilson Planning dated 21 June 2017		
14.1	support the proposed changes to Wickham outlined in the draft masterplan, including those within the 'Park Edge Precinct', within which the site is located.	Noted	No changes recommended for WMP
14.2	<p>Request Council consider amending the current land use zone of land located at the southern end of John Street (a public laneway off Albert Street) adjacent to the east of the playground and sporting fields of Wickham Park, currently known as The Good Life Church.</p> <p>The land is currently zoned RE1 - Public Recreation due to previously being a Crown land lease and used as a basketball stadium from the early 1960s until the late 1980s.</p> <p>The site was initially leased by the current owners from the Crown but later purchased in about 2005 and is now freehold land.</p> <p>The land and building are used as a place of public worship under a DA consent granted in 1989 for a Community centre (the use being covered by a component of the definition that included 'any other like facility or service of a non-profit nature'). However, Places of public worship are not permitted within the RE1 Public Recreation Zone of Council's current LEP and the church are operating under existing use rights.</p> <p>Given the proposed use, building height and scale identified for the land in the WMP, the adjoining B4 Mixed Use Zone would be more appropriate.</p>	<p>Agreed; all land within the Park edge precinct currently zoned RE1 Public Recreation should be included into the zone B4 Mixed Use Zone to reflect both the existing and envisaged use of the land.</p> <p>This issue may be resolved together with other LEP amendments resulting from the WMP.</p>	No changes recommended for WMP

Ref	Description	Planning response	Action/outcome
<b>15</b>	Submission on behalf of the Catholic Diocese by City Plan Services date 14 July 2017		
<b>15.1</b>	Our submission to the Draft Wickham Masterplan is made on behalf of the Diocese, specifically in relation to future development options the Diocese is currently considering for the Sacred Heart Precinct, which is land bounded by Tudor, Hunter, Selma and Parry Streets in Newcastle West,	Noted	
<b>15.2</b>	While the Diocese is generally supportive of the overall vision and intent driving the Wickham Master plan, the draft Wickham Masterplan does not suitably address relevant matters that may occur outside the Masterplan area boundary, but will be directly influenced by the development facilitated by the Masterplan actions, as currently proposed.	The WMP takes into account the local context of the area and its role within the city. WMP considers and addresses other strategies and plan that directly or indirectly have an influence on Wickham. . This is reflected by the proposed character, land uses, and densities.  Furthermore the WMP provides the means for improving access to and between adjoining areas.	No changes recommended for WMP
<b>15.3</b>	The Newcastle City Centre boundary shown on Map 1 does not correspond to the City Centre boundary in Council's LEP. As shown, it excludes the Sacred Heart Precinct from the City Centre. It is submitted that the Sacred Heart Precinct is functionally, historically and geographically part of the City Centre and should therefore remain so designated in the LEP.	Noted - This is an unintended mapping anomaly, which will be rectified in the final version of the WMP.	Amend Map 1 to ensure the City Centre Boundary is consistent with Council's LEP.
<b>15.4</b>	The draft Wickham Masterplan does not provide a suitable level of detail for broader pedestrian/cycle connections. Council's intentions to formalise car parking in Wickham Park (catering for City workers), and the reinstatement of the pedestrian rail crossing at Railway Street (currently under construction) will increase the volume of pedestrian and cycle traffic travelling to and through the Sacred Heart Precinct each day. The draft Wickham Masterplan does not provide sufficient detail on how these users will be afforded safe and convenient crossing points, particularly along Hunter Street.	The WMP is a strategic document that identifies the Vision for the area and also identifies strategies and actions to achieve the Vision.  The actions arising from the WMP will provide the design details of the connections with the surrounding cycle and pedestrian network, and car parking etc.  Hunter Street is not in the project area of WMP, hence no details are provided in relation to this. however this submsion has been forwarded on for consideration in the preparation of the Newcastle West public domain plan.	No changes recommended for WMP

Ref	Description	Planning response	Action/outcome
15.5	<p>The draft Wickham Masterplan does not identify opportunities to create City Centre views from within Wickham, particularly to the Cathedral. Our recommendations in this regard are substantiated by a preliminary visual assessment prepared by DWP, provided separately.</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that the Sacred Heart Cathedral in Newcastle West, is an item of local heritage significance and is of high cultural (religious) value to the local Catholic diocese.</p> <p>However, due to the Cathedral's scale, built form, location and placement (among other church owned buildings) the views (to and from Wickham) as identified by DWP's preliminary visual assessment, are essentially no more than a few coincidental vistas (or glimpses) to the church spire.</p> <p>Furthermore any recommendations to protect these views is fundamentally flawed, as it fails to take into consideration the impact from existing approved DAs nor potential impacts from future development of land within Newcastle West, located between the Cathedral and the WMP area.</p> <p>Analysis of Council's 3D city centre model demonstrates that the Cathedral has potential to elevate it's significance as a landmark along Hunter, Parry and Tudor Streets, if adjoining church owned buildings were removed, however Sacred Heart Cathedral does not have a comparable level of visual prominence as a landmark within the city's skyline as Christchurch Cathedral. Hence no reference was made within the WMP.</p>	<p>No changes recommended for WMP</p>



Ref	Description	Planning response	Action/outcome
15.6	<p>The Sacred Heart Cathedral is a prominent heritage item and landmark that is already visible from several locations in and surrounding Wickham. Noteworthy views from popular public gathering places, main thoroughfares, and other landmarks of local heritage significance, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. From within Wickham Park, currently afforded by the open space provided by the existing playing fields, and the low-lying nature of the area</li> <li>ii. From Industrial Drive, offering views from existing heritage items including the Wickham Public School, Former Infants School, and Tree of Knowledge</li> <li>iii. From Railway Street, near the heritage-listed Lass O'Gowrie Hotel, currently afforded by the Railway corridor and low-scale nature of surrounding development and</li> <li>v. Along the Hunter Street / Maitland Road corridor, framing the westernmost entry and exit to the City Centre</li> </ul>	<p>The existing views describes, are neither dominant nor significant due to the lack of presents the Cathedral has within the landscape and skyline.</p> <p>More specifically the identified views are not likely to be impacted by the outcomes of WMP for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. The view from within Wickham Park, currently afforded by the open space provided by the existing playing fields, and the low-lying nature of the area will not be impacted by buildings within WMP but will be lost due to the 60m HOB along the southern side of the railway line.</li> <li>ii. The view from existing heritage items including the Wickham Public School, Former Infants School, and Tree of Knowledge are already lost due to existing DA approvals in Wickham currently being constructed</li> <li>iii. The view from Railway Street, near the heritage-listed Lass O'Gowrie Hotel, currently afforded by the Railway corridor will be lost when the railway noise barrier fencing and overpass are constructed and due to the 90m and 60m HOB along the southern side of the railway line.</li> <li>iv. The view along the Hunter Street / Maitland Road corridor, framing the western most entry and exit to the City Centre is not within the WMP area but is likely to be lost if redevelopment of the land adjoining the Cathedral owned by the church occurs.</li> </ul>	<p>No changes recommended for WMP</p>



Ref	Description	Planning response	Action/outcome
15.7	<p>The Diocese has committed to reinforcing the Sacred Heart Cathedral as a landmark building through the redevelopment of the Sacred Heart Precinct. This includes transforming the curtilage surrounding the Cathedral to establish a more open environment, which will be publicly accessible space. A preliminary visual analysis by dwp (provided separately) demonstrates how development envelopes and other public domain transformations currently permissible in Newcastle West, and as envisaged within Wickham, are likely to erode current views, and limit view sharing opportunities to the Cathedral.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Development along the northern side of Hunter Street and on land within the identified 'Sacred Heart Precinct' will directly impact views to the Cathedral from adjoining areas.</p> <p>However, these areas are not subject to WMP.</p>	<p>No changes recommended for WMP</p>
15.8	<p>The implementation of view sharing considerations could involve a similar approach to that taken in Council's DCP Section 6.01.03.B2, which sets out General Controls for views and vistas in Newcastle City Centre, and provides a Views and vistas plan (Figure 6.01-24), which:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Identifies view corridors and vistas from specific locations, and</li> <li>2. Sets out general performance criteria to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Protect public views and sight lines to key public spaces, the waterfront, prominent heritage items and landmarks; and</li> <li>b. Ensure new development allows equitable view sharing from adjacent development.</li> </ol> </li> </ol> <p>We recognise these views will rely on development that may occur outside the Wickham Masterplan area. Nominating the recommended City View landmarks, including the Sacred Heart Cathedral, in the final Wickham Masterplan represents the only reasonable basis for incorporating these within Council's DCP as part of the process of implementing the Wickham Masterplan, once finalised.</p>	<p>Noted but not relevant to WMP due to the reasons identified above.</p>	<p>No changes recommended for WMP</p>

Ref	Description	Planning response	Action/outcome
15.9	The Diocese would also welcome Council's support in nominating the Sacred Heart Precinct and surrounds as a Key Precinct in Council's DCP, recognising the enhanced role this area will play as a genuine Gateway to Newcastle City Centre in future. If this is not supported, we kindly request Council's advice on an alternative pathway to enable a more flexible approach in applying density controls that would enable new development to predominantly be located within the westernmost part of the Sacred Heart Precinct.	Noted but not relevant to WMP.	No changes recommended for WMP
16	Submission by ████████ member of the Croatian Wickham Sports Club dated 27 July 2017		
16.1	Concerned that the Croatian Wickham Sports Club being pre-emptively referred to as "the former bowling club site" and strongly advocate that it remain identified as a 'community club - and not a commercial space or an unlicensed generic community space.	Noted and supported.	Amend references to the Croatian Wickham Sports Club from as "the former bowling club site" to 'community club'
16.2	The current entity is heavily utilised as the only accessible live music venue for do-it-yourself music gigs and an affordable function centre for community groups and families still surviving in the inner city area. This is a much loved and unique venue with Pizza oven, kitchen, large multiuse space, Fig tree community garden, stage and public bar.	Noted	No changes recommended for WMP
16.3	We advocate for this space to remain available as a cooperatively run licenced community club in the future (but with improved organisation and governance)	Noted	No changes recommended for WMP

Ref	Description	Planning response	Action/outcome
17	Submission by [REDACTED], resident of Carrington, dated 21 June 2017		
17.1	<p>It has been indicated through presentations that the Wickham development is planning on bring to the small suburb of Wickham over 1000 new dwellings. it would have to be assumed that with this number there would be a massive influx of children associated - let's assume 20% of these dwellings have at least one child.</p> <p>Therefore at least 200 new children would be living in the area. An entire school. At no point in the draft document has the public infrastructure of public schools been addressed. Parking appears to be a higher priority! I believe that this is inappropriate to plan such high density living with no co-ordination with NSW government to provide adequate basic and fundamental facilities.</p>	Noted, however the Department of Education and Training have assured Council that they are aware of the proposed population growth in the City Centre and have their own method for reviewing future supply and demand.	No changes recommended for WMP
17.2	Wickham park as the suburbs green space. The park is on the fringe of the suburb. It is not a "village green" type situation. Green space within the suburb itself is important and it feels like incorporating Wickham park is providing green space justification instead of real usability.	<p>The WMP identifies several actions for increasing green space within the urban areas of Wickham by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased setbacks to enable deep route planning and landscape provision</li> <li>• Implementing new urban activation areas within the public domain</li> <li>• Preparing a separate concept plan for Wickham Park that incorporates the needs of the local community as well as other stakeholders.</li> </ul>	No changes recommended for WMP
18	Submission by [REDACTED], resident of Albert Street Wickham, dated 15 Jun 2017		
18.1	<p>I am generally supportive of plan, as I understand the need for high-density living solutions in our modern cities.</p> <p>In particular, I am pleased to note the plans to calm traffic and reduce vehicle speed along Albert Street (and indeed to remove heavy vehicles from the street</p>	Noted	No changes recommended for WMP

Ref	Description	Planning response	Action/outcome
<b>18.2</b>	<p>The plans to increase planting of trees throughout the suburb, and especially along the restored Branch Street thoroughfare (the old railway line) and around Wickham Park, are most welcome. High-density residential development makes increased availability to genuine and usable green space crucial. Please do not let property developers take this plan away from the community's rights to improved living conditions.</p>	Noted	No changes recommended for WMP
<b>18.3</b>	<p>I am also excited about the addition of a number of dedicated cycle ways in the plan. Opening access to pedestrians and cyclists to cross Wickham Park in the direction of the rail interchange and the city beyond is an excellent idea. It is vital that these cycle ways be dedicated ones, as roadways will be narrow and sharing the road with cars (or indeed with pedestrians) is now a dangerous and outmoded concept.</p>	Noted	No changes recommended for WMP
<b>18.4</b>	<p>I remain concerned about parking. We should like access to some kind of privileging of parking for residents (permits, resident-priority areas...).</p>	This is already incorporated within the WMP and being considered by Council.	No changes recommended for WMP
<b>18.5</b>	<p>My concern that certain images on the front of forthcoming residential projects display images that are somewhat less than realistic. One current project has pictures of a block of flats nestling amongst what looks like a small forest. These trees will have to grow on the railway line on one side and in someone's house on the other, and as such are disingenuous and misleading... I can only hope that the Master Plan itself, with its images of abundant planting and green spaces, will not also prove to be an "artist's impression" ... I support the plan and want to have faith that the community's needs will be put ahead of any short-sighted plans that developers may have to fit a maximum number of (cheap and unattractive) residences into the available space.</p>	<p>The images in the WMP were captured from Council's 3D modelling and are scaled representations of potential development and landscaping.</p> <p>The WMP identifies the need for further public domain planning and DCP to ensure the envisaged landscape elements of the plan are achieved.</p>	No changes recommended for WMP

Ref	Description	Planning response	Action/outcome
<b>19</b>	Submission by [redacted], resident of Albert Street, Wickham dated 9 Jun 2017		
<b>19.1</b>	Support proposed lower speed and traffic calming for Albert Street to make it safer for us to cross over to the park.	Noted.	No changes recommended for WMP
<b>19.2</b>	Strongly opposed to a formal road being put behind the Croatian club. Currently our children are free to roam fairly widely around these areas safely. As this is the only significant green space between Wickham and town I would be very disappointed to see a road put through that may hinder us playing safely around the children's playground, around the preschool or crossing to Wickham oval. I would encourage the planners to view this park as a significant wild space for our children and people to use which is not accessed by cars.	The proposed one-way vehicle links shown are intended to be low volume and low speed access for vehicles and not streets. The intent is to formalise vehicle flows and parking at Wickham Park rather than having a continuation of the current random vehicle movements.  It is agreed that the terminology used in the plan should be amended to reflect this.	Rename references on map 10 - Envisaged traffic management from "new one-way street" to new one-way access lane" to better reflect the intent for low speed and low volume access.
<b>19.3</b>	It is crucial that green space, and greening of areas be key to successful living in these spaces. Currently many of the new developments in Wickham have very limited or no gardens, or green spaces made available. There is concrete pavements with no gardens, however small. Yes, there is tree planting proposed, but sticking a tree in a circle cut out of the concrete does not signify thoughtful greening of the area. Please, be progressive about your sustainability credential. We have one chance to get this right and small gardens along footpaths will make spaces where community can gather, or grow small herbs and find quality of living.	The WMP identifies several actions for increasing green space within the urban areas of Wickham by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased setbacks to enable deep route planning and landscape provision</li> <li>Implementing new urban activation areas within the public domain</li> </ul> Preparing a separate concept plan for Wickham Park that incorporates the needs of the local community as well as other stakeholders.	No changes recommended for WMP
<b>20</b>	Submission by [redacted] resident of Bishopsgate Street dated 3 May 2017		
<b>20.1</b>	How is it possible to widen the road along Bishopsgate Street when there is parking on both sides with just enough room currently for cars to drive down?  Where will the additional car parking be provided when there's currently limited parking to the number of current residence?	The WMP propose to widen the road reserve of part of Bishopsgate Street through acquisition of land consisting FACS housing, if redevelopment of the land were to occur.	No changes recommended for WMP

Ref	Description	Planning response	Action/outcome
20.2	<p>How is it justified to continue increasing height limits of developments?</p> <p>I bought into the Wickham area a year ago because of its character and charm with its mix of industrial and original houses. Within a year the height restriction has increased from 3 to 8 storeys. Why?</p> <p>With continued height increases Wickham will not only lose its skyline but also the small community feel which continues to be stated will be maintained.</p> <p>How will I be affected by shadowing and privacy?</p>	<p>Increases in density reflect the changing role of Wickham within the city centre. Areas of existing residential uses have predominantly been included in the Village Hub precinct, which does not propose increased densities.</p> <p>In areas proposed for increased height, each potential increase was modelled and analysed during the preparation of the WMP to ensure adequate solar access and privacy is able to be achieved on adjoining land.</p> <p>The WMP proposes to only increase height limits where a community benefit is provided as part of the development.</p>	<p>No changes recommended for WMP</p>
20.3	<p>Regarding the ever changing height restrictions –please explain how 19 storeys is justified in a village hub feel?</p>	<p>This is not the case. 19 storey building heights are only proposed on land within the Rail edge precinct adjoining the transport interchange. HOB in the Village Hub is generally limited to 11m (3 storeys).</p>	<p>No changes recommended for WMP</p>
20.4	<p>What upgrades will be made to storm water drainage with a mass increase of population when currently it is non-existent in Bishopsgate Street where I get continued flooding with the frequent rain in Newcastle?</p>	<p>Detailed infrastructure and public domain planning will be carried out as an action to implement the plan.</p>	<p>No changes recommended for WMP</p>
20.5	<p>What will be the speed limit around the streets of Wickham be? Cars currently speed down Bishopsgate and if a pedestrian, child or pet stepped out onto the road they will be hit and killed.</p>	<p>40km/hr. Council has prepared and exhibited a LATM that supports the WMP and provides greater detail of traffic calming devices and measures proposed to improve pedestrian and cyclist safety and amenity.</p>	<p>No changes recommended for WMP</p>
20.6	<p>What does 'where possible' mean to reuse existing sandstone when relocating kerbs and gutters?</p> <p>Why doesn't it state that sandstone will be maintained 'whenever' any work takes place to kerbs and gutters for we are talking about original sandstone blocks and once they are damaged or removed there is no replacing them which goes against the philosophy of maintaining the heritage character of Wickham. Just like the laying of tar over the original sandstone to create new roads – there is no going back the heritage character is lost forever.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>Reword to "existing sandstone is reused wherever work takes place to kerbs and gutters."</p>



Ref	Description	Planning response	Action/outcome
20.7	<p>When tree planting is taking place, will there be consideration on the type of trees planted? Such as ever greens because the current trees fill up gutters with leaves already.</p> <p>Can I be confident that existing trees in Wickham will remain? Again I bought into the area because of the green feel of the area with its already established trees.</p>	<p>Street trees will be managed in accordance with Council's current regime and the outcomes of subsequent detailed public domain planning.</p> <p>The WMP identifies further public domain planning to be prepared as an implementation action, which will provide greater detail of the proposed streetscape outcomes.</p>	No changes recommended for WMP
20.8	<p>Why can't houses with less than 20m frontage be considered for removal of overhead electrical wires and placed underground? It will add to the safety and aesthetics of the new Wickham.</p>	<p>The WMP does not exclude land under 20m wide from replacing overhead wires but rather stipulates that this should be a requirement of larger scale development of 20m or wider. This is proposed to be reflected in the resultant DCP implementing the WMP..</p>	No changes recommended for WMP



## Feedback forms filled out during the community drop-in session on 3 May 2017

Ref	Description	Planning response	Action/outcome
<b>21</b>	Feedback form from [REDACTED], Landowner and resident of Wickham		
<b>21.1</b>	The area lacks green open space. New development should include less buildings and more useable open space.	The WMP identifies the need for greater front setbacks that allow opportunities for greening and also the provision of open space areas within the public domain.	No changes recommended for WMP
<b>21.2</b>	Small gardens and landscaping is nice but needs sunlight therefore buildings should be further spaced with more open space.	Noted	No changes recommended for WMP
<b>21.3</b>	Ensure buildings do not overshadow Wickham Park	3D modelling carried out shows that for the most part Wickham park will not be overshadowed by proposed adjoining built form.	No changes recommended for WMP
<b>21.4</b>	Wickham Park should not be an excuse for not including green spaces in redevelopment sites	Agreed	No changes recommended for WMP
<b>21.5</b>	There needs to be a focus on provision of car parking areas	The WMP identifies a number of initiatives for providing car parking through developer incentives.	No changes recommended for WMP
<b>22</b>	Feedback form from [REDACTED] of Pumphouse school of Design in Greenway Street Wickham		
<b>22.1</b>	It is important to maintain unrestricted on-street car parking for customers rather than 2 hr parking zones.	Noted but not realistic to maintain unrestricted on street car parking within close proximity to the city centre.	No changes recommended for WMP
<b>23</b>	Feedback form from [REDACTED], resident of Hannell Street Wickham		
<b>23.1</b>	Open up Dangar Street as the traffic lights to allow flow of traffic to the interchange.	Noted but was not supported by RMS	No changes recommended for WMP
<b>24</b>	Feedback form from [REDACTED], resident of Hamilton East		
<b>24.1</b>	Wickham was isolated by blocking of Railway Street rail crossing. This needs a cycle/pedestrian link as a minimum	This will occur as part of the construction of the transport interchange.	No changes recommended for WMP

Ref	Description	Planning response	Action/outcome
24.2	Concerned of proposed one-way street through Wickham Park as currently use the park for dogs and consider roadway an infringement on parkland. Prefer just to have cycleway/walkway	This vehicle link is proposed as a low volume low speed laneway to formalise access and parking within this part of the park rather than the current random vehicle movements that occur from park users.	No changes recommended for WMP
24.3	Plan is strong on built outcomes but not on Council services and management of parkland	The WMP identifies the need for a separate piece of work to be undertaken to develop a concept for Wickham park involving stakeholder groups.	No changes recommended for WMP
25	Feedback form from [REDACTED], resident of Robert Street Wickham (outside of WMP study area)		
	It is imperative that pedestrian and cycle links across Hannell Street (around Cowper Street roundabout) are improved to allow access between the residential areas of Wickham to the Waterfront and connections east.	Noted. The WMP has identified the need for signalised pedestrian crossing in this area. However this street is under the control of RMS, which limits Council's ability to implement such measures.	No changes recommended for WMP
	Car parking needs of existing residents is required give the increased demand surrounding the interchange and light rail development.	The WMP advocates the introduction of resident parking permits.	No changes recommended for WMP
26	Feedback form from [REDACTED] resident of Albert Street Wickham		
	Drainage issues need improvement to improve current situation of water flooding street and footpaths after heavy down pours.	Council is undertaking separate infrastructure planning to address this within Wickham's public domain.	No changes recommended for WMP
	Important to maintain and improve green spaces throughout suburb	Noted	No changes recommended for WMP
	Parking issues likely to increase in area hence residential passes and parking areas to be provided	Addressed above.	No changes recommended for WMP
27	Feedback form from [REDACTED], resident of Carrington		
	Pedestrian and cycle conflicts occur due to a lack of understanding and respect from pedestrians. Where separation of users is not an option better educational signage is needed to explain how to use path and for pedestrians to understand use of bicycle bells	Noted	No changes recommended for WMP
	A safe crossing is needed at the Cowper street roundabout as well as signals to manage traffic ques.		No changes recommended for WMP

Ref	Description	Planning response	Action/outcome
28	Feedback form from Stephen Wines, resident at Boatmens Way Wickham (outside of WMP study area)		
	Request that crossing over heavy rail at the end of railway Street is cycle friendly and easy for cyclists to wheel their bicycles over using a ramp rather than relying on a lift.	The design and construction of this is part of the construction of the transport interchange by TfNSW.	No changes recommended for WMP
29	Feedback form from [REDACTED], treasurer of the Goodlife Church.		
	Would like Council to address flooding issues.	Council has prepared separate studies to address flooding and ground water issues within the low lying suburbs of Newcastle.	No changes recommended for WMP
	Would like Council to consider zoning of church land consistent to what is proposed in WMP and reflective of current ownership and use of the land.	Noted	Addressed above
30	Feedback form from [REDACTED], resident of The Lane, Maryville (outside of WMP study area)		
	Consideration needed for parking and traffic in Lindwood Precinct due to changes proposed in Wickham.	Noted	No changes recommended for WMP
	Need for cycle link to Newcastle West at Railway Street by ramp rather than requiring cyclist wheeling their bicycle up and down steps.	The design and construction of this is part of the construction of the transport interchange by TfNSW.	No changes recommended for WMP
	Supports overall reduction of speed limits in area to avoid serious injury.	noted	No changes recommended for WMP