

Council Report to NRDCAA (the Association) meeting 16th November 2015.

There were two meetings of Council, 27 October and the 10th of November 2015.

The report covers main issues as determined by the CoM that could affect residents and ratepayers west of the river or is a matter of public interest.

This report should not be relied upon by residents and ratepayers. Council Business Papers and Minutes of each meeting are available on the Council website.

Council Meeting, 27 October 2015.

All Councillors in attendance.

Mayoral Minute (MM). Release of IPART Final Report.

Councillor Rasmussen moved suspension of standing orders, which was seconded by Councillor Lyons-Buckett, and would have allowed those community members present to speak on this very important item.

After debate Council voted 6 for, 6 against. Councillor Ford used his casting vote to ensure community members could not speak. Subsequently, Councillor Ford used his casting vote another two times.

The six Councillors who did want to hear from the community were Councillors Ford, Mackay, Porter, Reardon, Tree and Creed.

The MM outlined the impact of the NSW Government's Fit for the Future Program as it relates to our Council and proposes a response to further strengthen HCC as a stand-alone body to genuinely represent our community, *we hope*.

The majority of Councillors who spoke, expressed concerns due to lack of leadership, vision and that the Council was dysfunctional.

Three Councillors, Mackay, Reardon and Tree made no contribution to the debate.

The preferred option (1) sponsored by Councillor Ford Mayor, of HCC was rejected by Councillors.

Comment: This reflects a vote of no confidence in Councillor Ford in his capacity as Mayor.

An amendment was moved by Councillor Conolly and seconded by Councillor Creed, which was adopted to the effect that, Council respond and comment on the IPART findings as requested by the NSW Government.

Secondly, a further report is submitted to Council regarding possible strategies to amend Council's FFTF proposal, including the considerations of significant cost savings and a reduced Special Rate Variation (SRV). The report should also consider the effectiveness and logistics of any possible amalgamation.

And finally, the report options are presented to a Councillor Briefing Session prior to being reported to Council.

The NRDCAA CoM sent a submission to all Councillors as the Code of Meeting Practise does not allow the community to speak on MM's, see below.

Mayoral Minute-Fit for The Future October 27 2015 Meeting----NRDCAA CoM's position.

The NRDCAA cannot support option 1 or 2 for the following reason.

1) Community Indicators Mid Term Report Item 164, August 2015 at p 69, Shaping our Future Together, to achieve community respect through good corporate governance and community leadership and engagement and Make decisions in ways that are transparent, fair, balanced and equitable supported by appropriate resource allocation.

The Report indicated that out of the six indicators, one is neutral, (16.7%) three heading in the wrong directions, (50%) and two, no data available, (33.3%).

A very poor result.

Worse still, survey results in 2011 and 2013, reveal very similar results with regards to **leadership of Council/ satisfaction with Council.**

In short HCC's problem is reflected in the survey results over a long period that is the leadership of Council.

In any organisation if the leader/s can't turn the ship around after at least four years they should step down from the leadership role, in Council's case that is the Mayor. That would be the honourable thing to do.

Councillor Ford said recently "The 2015 Hawkesbury Community Survey is a statistically valid representative sample survey of Hawkesbury residents,"

So, if the surveys have been a valid sample on what the community says, why does not Councillor Ford stand down from his position as Mayor?

His deputy has been a Councillor for a long time, he also should step down. The community are screaming out for leadership that the community can respect and who will listen to and support the community.

2) From the Business Papers, 27th of October 2015, at p8 says: We (IPART) have *assessed Hawkesbury as meeting the scale and capacity criterion as its proposal is consistent with the ILGRP's preferred option for no change. However, Hawkesbury did not meet the financial criteria overall based on its negative operating performance ratio of -1.1% in 2019-20. In addition, the improvement in its operating performance relies on a proposed SV of 16.0% above the rate peg over five years from 2017-18 (29.7% including the rate peg) to approach break-even, as well as unspecified service level reductions to fund asset maintenance and renewals.*

Further, at p10 of the Business Papers reference is made to operating savings of \$1,484,900 to be achieved by 2019/2020, some of which be deprived from *road operations*. We understand that a major concern for residents and ratepayers is the poor state of our roads!

Now Hawkesbury (Hope) City Council (HCC) want IPART to increase rates by 29.7% over 4-5 years and Council proposes to decrease dollars (\$1,484,900) to road operation and other cost areas.

Councillor Ford, Mayor of HCC and his fellow Councillors have been well aware of HCC precarious financial position and poor road conditions for a very long time. Business Papers, Council Reports have repeated the dilemma on many occasions.

3) There has been no real community consultation with regards the huge rate increase or options, including the two at p11. It is policy on the run.

In addition, how does that fit the claim on p11, of the BP it conforms to the Hawkesbury Community Strategic Plan ***Have constructive and productive partnerships with residents, community groups and institutions?***

4) There are many more reasons, like rezoning land before addressing the transport infrastructure west of the river, the destruction of our heritage and rural landscapes, cost shifting and taxes imposed on Council by State Governments not challenged vigorously enough, and the fiasco that is Windsor Bridge.

Suggested NRDCAA amendment to the MM:

That all Councillors need to meet urgently (this week) to address the leadership issue in a positive non political way and select two new Councillors on merit to lead Council, and then decide an option in consultation with the community that could be acceptable to the residents and ratepayers as an interim measure.

Authorised by NRDCAA CoM, 27 October 2015.

Item: 172 Tourist and Visitor Accommodation Grose Vale.

This is reported as a matter of interest. Six community members spoke on the item and it seemed that in view of the staff recommendation not to support the proposal, but, the willingness of all involved to continue dialogue that an amendment moved by Councillor Paine and seconded by Councillor Conolly for a site inspection was warranted, however Councillor Ford again used his extra vote as Mayor to scuttle the amendment.

The proposal received the tick of approval.

Item: 174 89 Boundary Road Glossodia Modifications to the landfill and associated matters.

Item 174 has been ongoing for over 10 years.

Over the years the applicant has not complied with conditions set by Council. This has inconvenienced neighbours mainly due to truck

movements onto the site causing dust, noise and in some cases carrying contaminated fill.

Council, after considerable debate, modified three conditions, deleted four conditions and amended one.

Comment: The NRDCAA CoM understand the neighbours are satisfied with the outcome and are hopeful the flower farm will be productive very soon.

Item: 175 Draft Business Case for the Dredging the Hawkesbury River, Windsor to Sackville.

The Council have been debating the positives and negatives of dredging the Hawkesbury River for nearly five years.

Studies have been undertaken by reputable firms.

One of the firms, Worley Parsons Consultants prepared a business case which was the subject of the debate.

The debate that followed was difficult to follow, particularly when Councillor Creed moved an amendment which was seconded by Councillor Reardon. Clearly Councillor Creed was not full bottle on the item.

The Council resolved to receive and note the report dated 31 July 2015. And, **call for expression of interest for undertaking the requirements for and ultimate dredging of the Hawkesbury River in the seven locations referred to in the report, including any returns or royalties to Council for dredging material.**

Notice of Motions:

1) A motion was lodged and moved by Councillor Lyons-Buckett and seconded by Councillor Paine which called for **a meeting between the Member for Hawkesbury, Hon. Dominic Perrottet MP, Councillors and Council representatives to discuss infrastructure issues in the Hawkesbury LGA.**

And, **congratulate CAWB on their commitment to heritage protection and their recent award for community advocacy from the National Trust.**

The motion was amended by Councillors Conolly and seconded by Councillor Mackay. The amendment deleted the second part of Councillor Lyons-Buckett motion.

The amended motion was supported by Council.

2) A notice of motion was lodge by Councillor Lyons-Buckett and seconded by Councillor Paine, **that Council write to the Vice Chancellor of Western Sydney University and our local Member, Louise Markus expressing our concern at the proposed changes to the Hawkesbury EarthCare Centre at Western Sydney University Hawkesbury campus.**

The motion was supported by Council.

3) A notice of motion was lodged by Councillor Paine, seconded by Councillor Rasmussen **that Council give the required 28 days-notice of its intention to provide Narelle Robertson of 227 Spinks Road Glossodia with a donation under section 356 of the Local government Act of \$2,572 the payment of the S94A contributions that Council has requested and the matter be reported to Council at the conclusion of the advertising period.**

Questions;

Councillors, Reardon 1, Mackay 2, Williams 1, Paine 2, Calvert 1, Rasmussen 2.

Council Meeting 10th of November 2015.

All Councillors in attendance.

Item 188: Voluntary Planning Agreements in the Kurmond-Kurrajong Investigation Area.

The Business Papers (BP) advises Council has received a number (does not detail the number) of planning proposals within the investigation area.

Five of those proposals have received Gateway determination.

The applicants are all aware that condition of approval is that satisfactory progress is made towards resolving infrastructure provisions for the planning proposal.

Four planning proposals have received Gateway determinations in Kurmond, 63 lots and Kurrajong 9 lots.

They will be subject to VPA which will reflect the detail works, but will equal \$30,000, per lot. The BP confirms the contributions will be **expended on local and district infrastructure and facilities, upgrades such as cycleways, bus shelters, landscapes and park embellishment and local road improvements.**

The NRDCAA unsuccessfully spoke against the officer's recommendation on the basis the Council had not received advice from the RMS on the capacity of Richmond Bridge to date. The request for that information was as a result of successful efforts by NRDCAA to have Council Officers recommendation amended (October 28 2014 Council meeting) to reflect the need for that information so Councillors could make informed decisions.

Our concerns are there 1399 lots approved for Redbank, 580 at Glossodia, 72 lots in Kurmond /Kurrajong. In addition, Council Officers say the average rate of dwelling constructions per year west of the river over the last two years equals 110 dwellings.

And, if Redbank and Jacaranda Ponds were finalised by 2021 the total would be approximately 2640 dwellings (Council letter to RMS 18 February 2015)

Council resolved to support the Officers recommendation, see p12 of Council minutes 10 November 2015.

Councillors, Calvert, Creed, Lyons-Buckett, Rasmussen and Williams voted against the Officers recommendation.

Councillors, Ford, Mackay, Paine, Conolly, Porter and Reardon supported the recommendation.

Item 91: Hawkesbury War Memorial Honour Roll Eligibility.

This reported as a matter of public interest.

There are two Sub Branches of the Returned and Services League in the HLGA, Windsor and Richmond.

There is a difference of opinion on the criteria for the placements of names on the Hawkesbury War Memorials.

Both Branches addressed Council with their point of view.

The Council with the casting vote (twice) of Councillor Ford, Mayor of HCC supported the Windsor Branch.

The detailed report is at p 36-40 of the BP.

Comment, the NRDCAA felt that that the Richmond Branch was seeking an amendment to the criteria which was fair and reasonable and had precedent on War Memorials in the HLGA.

Questions: Councillors Reardon 1, Porter 1, Lyons-Buckett 3, Williams 2, Calvert 3, Rasmussen 2.

Authorised by the CoM NRDCAA, November, 16 2015.