



PRESERVING OUR HERITAGE

PO Box 85, Hunters Hill, NSW 2110
www.huntershilltrust.org.au

Submission to the Draft Community Strategic Plan 2022:

References:

- Item 4.2 Attachment 1 Draft Community Strategic Plan downloaded from <https://www.huntershill.nsw.gov.au/council/about-council/council-meetings/>
- Draft Community Strategic Plan Item 4.2 Council Meeting 16-3-2022
- Community Survey Results (<https://www.huntershill.nsw.gov.au/news/community-survey-results/>) and associated detailed report from Micromex April 2022)
- OLG Community Strategic Plan: <https://www.olg.nsw.gov.au/councils/integrated-planning-and-reporting/framework/community-strategic-plan/>

Preamble

This document fails in its stated aim of being 'a vision and framework to guide the aspirations and needs of the Hunters Hill community over the next 10 years'. It doesn't 'articulate a vision for the future', or 'outline expected levels of service'. Neither does it 'address the level of resources that will be realistically be available to achieve these aspirations and needs'.

There is confusion over the name of this document; currently the cover page titles it as the '*Draft Community Strategic Plan*', as does Figure on p4, whereas the term '*Community Plan*' is used within the document, making it unclear whether the reference is to itself or some other document. Since the Office of Local Government uses the full term '**Community Strategic Plan**', this term should also be used for our document.

A major deficiency of the draft Community Strategic Plan (dCSP) is that it fails to include SMART objectives, or to refer to other Council plans that contain such objectives. In particular, the Objectives (p1 and repeated on pp11 to 15) fail to be *Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, or Time-Bound*.

Presentation

This 20 page document is unnecessarily long, and could be condensed to, say, 10 pages without the removal of any text or making it less readable:

- Pages 11, 12, 13, 14 and 15 can be deleted because they simply copy-and-paste the items listed on p1,
- Most pages consist largely of white space, unnecessarily large headings, and untitled 'filler' photographs

Compliance with Office of Local Government Guidelines

The dCSP fails to address many of the items identified in the OLG Guidelines:

- While the Plan identifies community **Priorities** (established via the 2021 and 2022 telephone surveys), it fails to identify the community's **Aspirations**.
- The Plan fails to establish a vision for the next ten years; the page titled 'Vision' (p5) is almost all written in the present tense, and quite fails to outline Council's future intentions.

- In particular, the dCSP address only the first of the *'four key questions for the community,'* namely:
 - *'Where are we now?'*
 - ***'Where do we want to be in ten years' time?'***
 - ***'How will we get there?'***
 - ***'How will we know when we have arrived?'***

Problems with the Plan's Vision (p5)

- While there are many examples of historic architectural excellence in Hunters Hill, this is not *'evident throughout Hunters Hill,'* and certainly architectural excellence requires more than being *'limited in height of 2 storey in residential areas'.* In fact, most recent construction (especially in Boronia Park and other parts not classified as Conservation Areas) consists of repetitive 'knockdown-rebuild,' 'block' houses with double concrete driveways and tiny gardens. This paragraph must be either removed or qualified to acknowledge the continuing loss of Architectural Excellence.
- Unless there is a valid source for the statement that *'Our Aboriginal heritage and cultural diversity are reflected in a vibrant cultural scene and harmonious community'*, this statement should be removed.
- Contrary to the statement that *"Residents and visitors can get where they want to go easily via an integrated public transport system"*, the detailed report of the telephone survey (p7) gives *'Availability of public transport'* as a *'Priority Issue'*.

Priorities (p6)

The Detailed Report of the telephone survey identifies the top Priority Issues (p7), to be *'Roads, Footpaths and Traffic Congestion'*; accordingly, this expression should be carried into the dCSP.

Similarly, the second highest priority identified by the telephone survey is reported as *'Managing overdevelopment'* (and *'Less high density development'*). This wording, too, should be carried into dCSP, and not robbed of its intensity by being re-written as *'Managing development and the development application process'*.

The CSP should address the findings of the detailed report of the telephone survey which shows a significant fall in the Overall Satisfaction score (from 43% down to 32%) compared with last year, and a value significantly lower than the Micromex LGA Benchmark Metro figure.

Key Challenges (p7)

Para 3:

- No source is given for the statement that *'we have an ageing population at one end, but at the same time we have a high proportion of our community that are between the ages of 5-17'.*
- Is there evidence for the statement that Hunters Hill has an unusually difficulty in ensuring that *'the needs of our elderly are met at the same time as providing facilities and services for our younger generation'?*

Para 4:

- Using the data provided in the report of the telephone survey, it would be more accurate to write *'Through community surveys and feedback we understand that our **residents** expect an improvement in the management of assets'*,

The Quadruple Bottom Line (p16)

The dCSP **lists** many items in the Quadruple Bottom Line (mostly by copying and pasting them from the OLG Guidelines).

ENVIRONMENTAL:

The dot-points '**Land use**' and '**Foreshores**' require additional explanation

ECONOMIC:

The dot-point '**Public and private partnerships**' seems an inappropriate inclusion, since these should be regarded as possible means rather than as independent aspirations

CIVIC LEADERSHIP:

Two critical entries included in the OLG Guidelines, '**Ethical practices**' and '**Community ownership and implementation of the strategic plan**' should be added to the HH CSP.

'**Decision making**' and '**Allocating priorities**' appear to be an incomplete transfer of the single dotpoint '**Decision-making principles and allocation of priorities**' from the OLG Guidelines/

'**Legislative adherence**' is redundant since adherence to legislation must underlie all of Council's actions

'**Employer of choice**' and '**workforce development programs**' are really separate items in that the first is an aspiration and the second a means to become more efficient. But they are probably implicit under '**Business efficiency and probity**'

Documents listed in the dCSP as references (p18)

Several of the listed documents are not accessible (and may not exist), and therefore should not be quoted as references:

Affordable Housing Strategy:

No such document is accessible from Council's website. Indeed, Council's Local Housing Strategy states '**Council does not have an affordable housing policy**' or funding in place to develop one and therefore has no mechanism through which to levy contributions towards affordable rental housing or housing for key workers. This shortfall is also impacted by a lack of medium-high density residential development within the LGA, that would support the formation of affordable housing policy.

Sport and Recreational Plan

A draft Sport and Recreational Plan was circulated in November 2012, but no document by this name is accessible from Council's website

NSROC Regional Planning Strategy

No document of this name is accessible from either Council's or NSROC's websites

Alister Sharp
President
Hunters Hill Trust