



ORDINARY MEETING OF COUNCIL

MINUTE ITEM ATTACHMENTS

Tuesday 17 March 2026

**ORDINARY MEETING OF COUNCIL MINUTE ITEM ATTACHMENTS
17 MARCH 2026**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ITEM	SUBJECT	PAGE NO
8.1	Tabling of JVRRA traffic survey results and correspondence	
1	JVRRA Traffic survey results and correspondence	2
8.2	Tabling of the ALGA 2026-27 Federal budget submission	
1	ALGA - 2026-27 Federal Budget submission	24

Item 6.1

Enclosure 2

Item 9.2 - New Item (9.1) Tabling of xxx

01 - JVRRA Traffic survey results and
correspondence

From: JVRRA Secretary <jvrrasecretary@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, March 13, 2026 11:04:09 AM
To: Stuart Larkins <stuart.larkins@kiama.nsw.gov.au>; Council <council@kiama.nsw.gov.au>
Subject: Jamberoo Community Traffic survey

To Councillor Stuart Larkins
cc. Kiama Council
From: Jamberoo Valley Ratepayers & Residents Association Inc. (JVRRA)

Dear Councillor Larkins,
Attached please find a copy of the Report on the Jamberoo Community Traffic Survey that JVRRA conducted in September-October 2025. We would be grateful if this Report could be tabled at the upcoming Kiama Council Business meeting, March 2026.
JVRRA conducted the survey of Jamberoo households in order to collect information on how residents travel within and beyond the area, and to document concerns and suggestions for improving traffic safety.
The questions covered basic demographic data and transport options, with comments invited on residents' concerns about local traffic, opinions on speed limits, views on the need for traffic calming devices, and the experience of pedestrians and cyclists. Options were provided for qualitative comments, with the opportunity to raise additional concerns and set priorities.
Survey forms were distributed to all Jamberoo village and rural households, with the request that only one survey per household be completed. The response rate was strong, with 211 surveys received. Respondents took the time to provide detailed, thorough responses.
The Jamberoo Traffic Survey Report contains data that we hope Kiama Council will find of interest, both in terms of (a) understanding and responding to the needs of our local community and (b) in Council's work on developing municipality-wide local traffic safety strategies in preparation for a contribution to a National Road Safety Action Plan.
JVRRA thanks Kiama Council and Councillors for considering the information we have provided on behalf of Jamberoo residents.
Kind regards,

Roslyn Neilson
Secretary, JVRRA
On behalf of the JVRRA Committee and Traffic Sub-committee
[REDACTED]
[E:jvrrasecretary@gmail.com](mailto:jvrrasecretary@gmail.com)

Item 6.1

Enclosure 2

Jamberoo Community Traffic Survey

Jamberoo Valley Ratepayers & Residents Association Inc. March 2026

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	2
Report: Jamberoo Community Traffic Survey 2025	4
Introduction	4
Method	4
Results and Discussion	5
Response rate	5
Location of households	5
Demographic data	5
Means of Transport	7
Number of registered vehicles used for transport	7
Additional means of transport	7
Speed limit: Jamberoo village	8
Current speed limit within Jamberoo Village	8
Consideration of a speed limit of 40 km/h in Jamberoo village	9
Speed Limit: Mt Terry to Jamberoo	10
Concerns about driver behaviour in Jamberoo village	11
Degree of concern	11
Nature of concerns about driver behaviour	12
Kinds of vehicles	12
Locations	12
Times	12
Problem behaviours	13
Traffic Calming	13
Traffic Calming Options	13
Additional specific traffic calming suggestions	14
Roundabouts	14
Pedestrian experience in Jamberoo	14
Ease of walking	15
Improvements to footpaths	15
Pedestrian crossings in Jamberoo village	16
Cycling experience in Jamberoo	17
Number of cyclists	17
Cycling safety within the village	17
Cycling safety along Jamberoo Road to Browns Lane	18
Anticipated use of a shared pathway	18
Further comments on the shared pathway	18
Key priorities and further comments	19
Priorities	19
Other issues	19
Conclusions and Recommendations	20

1 of 21

Executive Summary

Jamberoo Valley Ratepayers & Residents Association Inc. (JVRRA) conducted a survey of Jamberoo households in the last quarter of 2025 to collect information on how residents travel within and beyond the area and to document concerns and suggestions for improving traffic safety.

All surveys were filled anonymously. Hard copy survey forms were distributed to all households in Jamberoo village and valley, with instructions to return them to a box provided in a local business office. JVRRA members were given the option of submitting their responses online. Quantitative and qualitative analyses of the responses were conducted by the JVRRA Traffic Subcommittee.

Survey questions covered:

- Demographic information and transport options
- Opinions on speed limits within the village and on Jamberoo Road
- Opinions on potential traffic calming devices and roundabouts
- The experience of pedestrians in Jamberoo
- The experience of cyclists in Jamberoo
- Options were provided for respondents to set priorities, submit additional information, and/or raise additional issues for discussion.

The first two questions in the survey asked respondents to identify the part of Jamberoo in which their homes were located. Three subgroups within the total sample were identified for the purpose of analysing responses to those questions where the specific location of the house might be relevant - that is, issues involving village speed limits, driver behaviour, and pedestrian experience.

- Subgroup A: Households located in the rural zone of Jamberoo valley (as defined by household waste collection).
- Subgroup B: Households located in Jamberoo village, along the main thoroughfare of Allowrie and Churchill Streets.
- Subgroup C: Households located in Jamberoo village, along any of the minor roads leading off the main thoroughfare.

Main findings

The Total Sample consisted of surveys submitted by 211 Jamberoo households.

The demographic represented in the Total Sample included a relatively large proportion of residents who had lived in the area for many years and were, on average, slightly older than in other areas of the Kiama LGA. The Total Sample, however, did contain a reasonable proportion of working families with younger children. (See pages 5-7)

Analysis of the data revealed the following strong majority trends:

- Residents' very high use of cars and substantial use of bicycles or e-bikes, with many locals also relying on walking within the village. (See pages 7-8)

Item 9.2 - New Item (9.1) Tabling of xxx

01 - JVRAA Traffic survey results and
correspondence

- Majority dissatisfaction with the recent reduction in the speed limit from Albion Park to Jamberoo. (See page 10)
- A strong vote, from non-cyclists as well as cyclists, in favour of the extension of the Browns Lane cycleway/ shared pathway to Jamberoo Village, with safety being the main concern. (See pages 18-19)

The three location-based subgroups showed largely similar trends in response patterns to all the issues raised by the survey, although the strongest concerns about driver behaviour and the strongest support for speed reduction and traffic calming devices were expressed by householders who live along the main thoroughfare through Jamberoo Village. The majority of concerns expressed by all respondents related to speed and/or noisy, erratic driving and motorbike riding, especially on weekends, with comments relating to the entire road from Albion Park to Kiama via Jamberoo. (See pages 11-13)

Opinions on speed limits in the village and on specific traffic calming devices within the village were somewhat divided, with two-thirds of the survey sample offering a range of constructive suggestions. Half of responding households favoured roundabouts as suitable traffic-calming devices, and the majority of these identified both village entrances as suitable locations. (See pages 13-14)

The anticipated construction of a large new residential subdivision on Golden Valley Road generated several comments throughout the survey, all suggesting the need to plan ahead for traffic and pedestrian safety. Several comments related to the future need for a roundabout east of Araluen house to calm traffic and assist with the challenge of schoolchildren having to cross Jamberoo Road to catch the school bus, as well as the provision of speed bumps in the minor roads adjacent to Golden Valley Road, to ameliorate the anticipated increased use of these roads for through traffic. (See pages 13-16)

Conclusions to the study (see page 21) include the observation that the respondents put an impressive amount of effort into providing detailed responses and thoughtful suggestions.

Recommendations from the survey (see page 21) emphasise the importance of traffic authorities and local government planners taking into account residents' local knowledge when making decisions. A holistic approach to planning is essential to ensure that Jamberoo and its residents can continue to thrive in a changing world.

3 of 21

Report: Jamberoo Community Traffic Survey 2025

Introduction

The Jamberoo Community Traffic Survey was designed and implemented by the Traffic Subcommittee within Jamberoo Valley Ratepayers & Residents Association Inc. (JVRRA). JVRRA is a volunteer association that aims to provide an open community forum for discussing local concerns and ideas.

The Jamberoo Community Traffic survey aimed to collect data from Jamberoo households to document how residents currently travel within and beyond Jamberoo and to collate residents' concerns and suggestions for improving road and travel safety.

A copy of the survey as distributed to Jamberoo residents is provided [here](#).

Method

The survey consisted of 25 multiple-choice and/or open-ended questions, covering issues that had emerged from discussions within JVRRA meetings over the previous several years.

The survey was distributed in September 2025 in paper format via letterbox drop to all Jamberoo village households, and via mailout to the post office boxes of rural households. JVRRA members had the option to submit the survey electronically, and Jamberoo Preschool provided a link to the survey to their enrolled families.

The survey instructions stated that responses were to be submitted anonymously and that the collated results would be made publicly available.

Only one survey per household was required. Households were asked to discuss the survey questions with members of their households so that information could be collected that reflected the views of a reasonably wide demographic.

Most of the survey questions included an option for respondents to record differing views within their households and to add further comments and explanations. All qualitative responses were transcribed and coded by the Traffic Subcommittee team via consensus for reporting purposes.

The first two questions in the survey asked respondents to identify the part of Jamberoo in which their homes were located. Three subgroups within the total sample were identified for the purpose of analysing responses to questions in which the specific location of homes might be associated with different patterns of responding.

- **Subgroup A - Rural:** Households located in the rural zone of Jamberoo valley (as defined by Kiama LGA household waste collection)
- **Subgroup B - Main road:** Households located in Jamberoo village, along the main thoroughfare of Allowrie and Churchill Streets
- **Subgroup C - Minor roads:** Households located in Jamberoo village, on any of the minor roads

Results and Discussion

Response rate

The Total Sample comprised 211 completed surveys that were received by the stated deadline, which was the end of October 2025. A total of 182 paper surveys and 29 electronic surveys were submitted.

Discussion: Response rate

With an estimated 650 ratepaying households in Jamberoo village and valley, this represents a strong response rate of 33%.

Location of households

Questions 1 and 2: The first two questions in the survey asked respondents to identify the part of Jamberoo in which their homes were located. Three subgroups within the total sample were identified for the purpose of analysing responses to those questions where the specific location of the homes might affect respondents' experiences.

Table 1 shows the total number of surveys received and the number of households in each subgroup location.

Total Sample	211 surveys received All Jamberoo village and valley		
	Number of surveys	Location of household	Percentage of the Total Sample
Subgroup A	51	Rural zone	24%
Subgroup B	43	Village: Main thoroughfare	20%
Subgroup C	117	Village: Minor village roads	56%

Table 1. Number of surveys received. The Total Sample is further divided into Subgroups A, B and C, indicating the locations of households within Jamberoo.

Demographic data

Number of residents per household

Question 3: Respondents were asked to state the number of permanent residents in their household.

Household size, as documented in the 211 surveys, ranged from one to six residents. The breakdown of the number of residents per household was as follows:

- 1 resident: 12%
- 2 residents: 61% of households
- 3 residents: 15% of households
- 4 or more residents: 12%

Discussion: Size of households

There was a relatively high proportion of two-person households in this survey. This echoes the pattern in the Kiama LGA as a whole, which, according to the [Kiama Local Housing Strategy 2025](#), shows a significantly higher proportion of two-person households than is reported in the Illawarra Shoalhaven Region and the NSW averages.

Age of residents

Question 4: Respondents were asked to supply the ages of all the residents in their households. Ages were provided for 473 individuals. The median age of householders was 64 years, the mean was 56 years, and ages ranged from 0 to 79 years. The distribution of ages in the Total Sample was as follows:

- Under school age: 4%
- School age (5 to 17 years): 6%
- Working age (18 to 67 years) 46%
- Retirement age (68 and over): 44%

Discussion: Age of residents

The median age of 64 years among respondents to the Jamberoo Community Traffic Survey was higher than the reported median age of 48 years across the whole Kiama Local Government Area ([Kiama Local Housing Strategy, 2025](#)). This skew towards an older population in this survey may be representative of Jamberoo as a whole, with its large over-55s subdivision in the village. The skew may also reflect relatively high community engagement, as shown by the large number of older long-term residents of Jamberoo (see next section), with more of them responding to the survey.

Despite the skew toward an older population, 29 householders with young children (17 years or younger) responded to the survey, representing 14% of the Total Sample. Table 2 shows the percentage of householders who included young children in the Total Sample and in each of the three location-based subgroups.

	Total Sample - all Jamberoo locations	Subgroup A Rural	Subgroup B Village - Main thoroughfare	Subgroup C Village - Minor roads
Number of respondents	211	51	43	117
Families with young children	14%	8%	18%	15%

Table 2. Families in the Total Sample and in each of the location-based subgroups with children 17 years of age or younger.

Discussion: Data from families with young children

The proportions shown in Table 2 suggest that, among households that responded to the survey, more families with young children lived in the village itself than on rural properties. Although householders with young children frequently contributed extensive and useful comments, it will be important in future surveys to include more households with young children.

Item 9.2 - New Item (9.1) Tabling of xxx

01 - JVRAA Traffic survey results and
correspondence

Item 6.1

Enclosure 2

Length of time living in Jamberoo

Question 5: Respondents were asked to state how long they had lived in Jamberoo. The distribution of length of residence in Jamberoo in the Total Sample was as follows:

- Over 10 years: 64%
- Between 1 and 10 years: 31%
- Less than one year: 5%

Discussion: Length of time living in Jamberoo

This survey showed a very high proportion of long-term residents. It should be noted that patterns of responses from a survey like this may change as new housing subdivisions are incorporated into Jamberoo Village.

Means of Transport**Number of registered vehicles used for transport**

Question 6: Respondents were asked to state the number of registered vehicles (cars or motorbikes) kept at their household and used on a regular basis. Within the Total Sample of 211 households, the distribution of vehicle ownership was as follows:

- One vehicle: 24%
- Two vehicles: 48.5%
- Three vehicles: 16%
- Four or more vehicles: 11%
- No registered vehicle: 0.5% (one householder)

Discussion: Motorised vehicle ownership

The high car ownership shown in this survey highlights the fact that Jamberoo residents are almost entirely dependent on having a car to travel beyond the village.

Additional means of transport

Question 7: Residents were asked to list all the additional means of transport used in their households. Within the Total Sample of 211 households, many reported having no other mechanised or wheeled means of transport, while several households reported using several different means of transport. Many respondents specified 'walking' as a means of transport - often with an exclamation mark in their comments. The distribution of different kinds of transport in the Total Sample was as follows:

- 63% of households (144/211 respondents) reported using no other means of transport besides cars or motorbikes, with 19% of these respondents commenting that they instead relied on walking.
- 26% of households also used bicycles or scooters.
- 7% of households also used E-bikes or E-scooters.
- Three households specified motorhomes, tractors or buggies.
- Three households mentioned using the public bus.
- Two householders used rideshares or had a carer drive them.

7 of 21

The additional reference to 'walking' as a means of transport was distributed according to household location as follows:

- Subgroup A Rural:16%
- Subgroup B Main road: 25%
- Subgroup C Minor village roads: 18%

Discussion: Alternative means of transport

The comment from respondents that they relied on walking when not driving came predominantly from households situated along the main thoroughfare, but was not limited to these households. While for many village residents, the commercial and sporting amenities within Jamberoo village are within convenient walking distance, it is also clear that residents across the entire valley use walking as a form of exercise. Overall, foot traffic is very important in Jamberoo village and valley.

The very low mention of use of a public bus in the survey may reflect that the currently available bus service is not well-tuned to the needs of the older Jamberoo residents. Further research is needed to focus on the use of school buses by school-age children.

It should be noted that the reported use of e-bikes or e-scooters was limited to 7% of households, but this proportion is likely to have increased in the months since the survey was completed, given the rapid rise in e-bike popularity among the general population.

Speed limit: Jamberoo village

Current speed limit within Jamberoo Village

Question 8: Respondents were given three options for expressing their opinion of the current speed limit in Jamberoo village, which is 50 km/h: "About right", "Too high" or "Too low". Responses are shown in Table 3, with results from the Total Sample of 211 householders in Column 1, followed by a breakdown of those responses into the three location-based subgroups in Columns 2, 3 and 4.

	Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4
Options	Total Sample n=211	Subgroup A Rural n=51	Subgroup B Village - Main Thoroughfare n=43	Subgroup C Village - Minor Roads n=117
About right	85%	86%	77%	88%
Too high	11%	8%	17%	7%
Too low	4%	6%	5%	5%

Table 3. Comments on the current speed limit of 50 km/h in Jamberoo Village: Percentage responses within the Total Sample (n=211 households) and three location-based subgroups

Discussion: Current speed limit in Jamberoo

The majority of Jamberoo residents stated that they felt the current 50 km/h speed limit was

“about right”.

The pattern of opinions across the three location-based subgroups mirrored that of the Total Sample, although there was a tendency for a higher percentage of residents living along the main thoroughfare to express the opinion that the 50 km/h speed limit was too high.

Consideration of a speed limit of 40 km/h in Jamberoo village

Question 9: Respondents were asked to consider a hypothetical 40 km/h speed limit that might be introduced for Jamberoo village. If they thought the lower speed limit might be appropriate, they were given choices about where to suggest it be applied.

As shown in Column 1 of Table 4, within the Total Sample of 211 households, 59% of the Total Sample offered suggestions about various locations for a lower speed limit, while only 41% maintained that no lower speed limit was appropriate.

Columns 2, 3, and 4 of Table 3 show a similar pattern across the three subgroups, with the majority of location-based subgroups open to considering a 40 km/h limit. The highest proportion was shown among householders living along the main thoroughfare.

	Column 1	Column2	Column 3	Column 4
	Total Sample, all locations n=211	Subgroup A Rural n=51	Subgroup B Village - main thoroughfare n=43	Subgroup C Village - minor roads n=117
Suggestions for locations for lower speed limit	58%	51%	70%	57%
No 40 km/h limit in the village	41%	49%	30%	41%
No response	1%	nil	nil	2%

Table 4. Option of a 40 km/h speed limit: Percentage responses within the Total Sample (n=211 households) and three location-based subgroups

Discussion: Option of a 40 km/h speed limit

The majority of respondents across all locations were prepared to suggest suitable locations for a 40 km/h speed limit in Jamberoo village, including many who had commented in response to the previous question that a 50 km/h limit was “about right”. It should be noted that several other areas within the Kiama LGA have 40 km/h limits in high-pedestrian areas.

Across the three location-based subgroups, rural dwellers were less likely to consider speed reduction in the village than those actually living in the village. Households on the main thoroughfare showed the greatest interest in a speed reduction.

In Table 5, Column 1 shows the preferred locations among the 123 respondents (58% of the total sample) who suggested locations for a 40 km/h speed limit. Columns 2, 3 and 4 show how these preferences were distributed within the three location-based subgroups.

Item 9.2 - New Item (9.1) Tabling of xxx

01 - JVRAA Traffic survey results and correspondence

	Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4
Preferred location for a lower speed limit	Total Sample 123 households	Subgroup A - Rural 26 households	Subgroup B Village - Main thoroughfare 30 households	Subgroup C Village - Minor roads 67 households
Central shopping area, Reid Park and school areas	64%	69%	50%	67%
All village streets	30%	23%	43%	25%
Other locations in the village	6%	8%	7%	8%

Table 5: Distribution of location choices for the respondents who considered that a 40 km/h speed limit in Jamberoo Village might be appropriate.

The central shopping area, extending around to the Public School on Churchill Street, was the most popular choice for a speed reduction for all three location-based subgroups. Those householders living along the main thoroughfare had the highest proportion of residents in favour of speed reductions across all village streets, including the minor roads.

Comments from those who did NOT want any reduction of the Jamberoo village speed limit included:

- "Having a number of speed limits may confuse drivers."
- "Rather than change speeds, consider an interactive speed sign at both ends of the town - the optics would be great and deal with the problems."

Speed Limit: Mt Terry to Jamberoo

Question 10: Residents were asked for their opinion on the recent change in the speed limit from 80 km/h to 60 km/h between Mt Terry (Albion Park) and Jamberoo village.

- 70% stated that it should revert to 80 km/h
- 17% offered an alternative suggestion of changing the limit to 70 km/h
- 11% felt it should remain at 60 km/h
- Three respondents suggested varying the limit along the route.

Comments from the 70% majority who were opposed to the speed limit reduction included the following arguments:

- The change was unnecessary (the word 'ridiculous' was used frequently), and appeared to be merely a revenue raiser
- The change triggered dangerous driving
- There was a lack of community consultation
- There was an unfortunate flow-on effect: Swamp Road was being used as an alternative route out of Jamberoo. It was commented that Swamp Road is not ideal

10 of 21

Item 9.2 - New Item (9.1) Tabling of xxx

01 - JVRRA Traffic survey results and correspondence

for heavy traffic; it needs resurfacing, and the intersection of Swamp Road and Jamberoo Road is dangerous to navigate.

Comments from the much smaller group (11%) who were in favour of the speed limit reduction included:

- Consideration of the residents who live along the route
- Perceived reduction in accidents

Although this option was not presented as one of the choices in the survey, it was noted that when respondents spontaneously suggested 70 km/h, they often framed it as a “reasonable compromise”.

Discussion: Speed limit between Albion Park and Jamberoo

The clear majority of respondents were opposed to the recent introduction of a 60 km/h speed limit between Albion Park and Jamberoo, with a strong theme of driver frustration over what was seen as an ‘unnecessary’ change that triggered dangerous driving. The strength of this community opinion suggests that further discussion with the State authorities is indicated.

Concerns about driver behaviour in Jamberoo village

Degree of concern

Question 11: Residents were asked if they were concerned about speeding and/or noisy, erratic driving and motorbike riding in Jamberoo village.

Table 6 shows the spread of concern ratings, with the Total Sample responses in Column 1 and Columns 2, 3, and 4 showing the ratings for the three location-based subgroups.

	Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4
Rating of concern re driver behaviour	Total Sample (n= 211)	Subgroup A (n=51) Rural	Subgroup B Village - main thoroughfare (n=43)	Subgroup C Village - minor roads (n=117)
Very concerned	25%	18%	46%	21%
Moderately concerned	25%	27%	26%	24%
Minor concern	33%	27%	19%	39%
No concern	17%	28%	9%	16%

Table 6. Location-based degree of concern regarding driver behaviour in Jamberoo village

Discussion: Degree of concern about driver behaviour

Looking at the sample as a whole, about half of the respondents reported being ‘very concerned’ or ‘moderately concerned’ about driver behaviour in Jamberoo village. Within the location-based subgroups, residents whose homes were along the main thoroughfare were the most affected by driver behaviour, with 72% of these respondents reporting moderate or serious concerns.

Item 9.2 - New Item (9.1) Tabling of xxx

01 - JVRAA Traffic survey results and
correspondence

Item 6.1

Enclosure 2

Nature of concerns about driver behaviour

Question 12: Residents were asked to provide qualitative responses that expanded on their concerns about driver behaviour, including the types of vehicles involved, the locations, the times when problems occurred, and the nature of the erratic or reckless behaviour. Within the 151 responses that indicated some degree of concern (minor, moderate or serious), the following issues were mentioned:

Kinds of vehicles

There were 201 responses registering concerns about specific kinds of vehicles, with several residents mentioning more than one kind of vehicle. The concerns about vehicles were distributed as follows:

- Motor bikes - 44%
- Cars - 22%
- Utes, 4x4s - 9%
- E-bikes and E-scooters - 6%
- Heavy vehicles - 6%
- Bicycles - 5%
- P-plate driven vehicles- 4%
- Luxury cars- 3%

Locations

There were 147 locations identified as being of concern, with some residents mentioning more than one. The concerns about locations were distributed as follows:

- Road between Jamberoo and Albion Park - 29%
- Churchill/Allowrie Streets - 25%
- Road between Jamberoo and Kiama - 22%
- Rural roads in Jamberoo valley - 12%
- Jamberoo Mountain Road - 8%
- Swamp Road - 3%
- Mt Brandon - 3%
- "Everywhere" - 3%

Times

There were 95 responses that specified the times when concerns were experienced. These times were distributed as follows:

- Weekends - 56%
- "Any time" - 22%
- Before/after work hours - 12%
- Late at night - 9%
- Dusk to dawn - 1%

Problem behaviours

There were 172 responses that specified the driver behaviour that concerned them. These behaviour concerns were distributed as follows:

12 of 21

Item 9.2 - New Item (9.1) Tabling of xxx

01 - JVRAA Traffic survey results and
correspondence

Item 6.1

Enclosure 2

- Speeding - 43%
- Dangerous driving (e.g. unsafe overtaking) - 31%
- Noise - 17%
- "Hooning" (burnouts, etc.) - 7%
- Dangerous cyclist behaviour - 2%

Discussion: Nature of concerns about driver behaviour

Concerns amongst Jamberoo residents centred on speeding, noisy and/or erratic driver or motorcyclist behaviour along the entire road from Albion Park to Kiama via Jamberoo. Unsafe overtaking was frequently mentioned in the context of cyclists competing with cars on the road, as well as in the context of the recently lowered speed limit between Albion Park and Jamberoo. Noisy, speeding motorbikes were the most unpopular, especially on weekends.

It was noted that where people lived affected the specific concerns they reported. A large proportion of complaints about motorbike speed and noise came from residents living along the main Jamberoo thoroughfare. It was rural residents who tended to express concerns about inconsistent speed limits outside the village, and the problem of wildlife kill on the roads.

Since this survey was conducted, e-bikes have become more popular, and public concerns about their safety have grown. Although concerns in this area did not loom large in this survey, the survey responses did include several specific, extended comments about ebikes, including suggestions that a licensing system might help.

Traffic Calming**Traffic Calming Options**

Question 13: Residents were presented with a list of possible traffic calming measures and asked to check all the options that they would support for Jamberoo village.

- Of the 211 respondents, 34% commented that they did not support any of the suggested calming measures.
- Amongst the 140 respondents (68% of the survey sample) who expressed a preference for at least one traffic calming measure, 261 positive votes for the various options were recorded. The distribution of choices was as follows:
 - Speed bumps - 23%
 - More signage - 20%
 - Increased police presence - 20%
 - Start the 50 km/h zone east of the village at the stone wall sign - 15%
 - Speed cameras - 14%
 - Chicanes - 8%

Discussion: Traffic Calming measures

While the majority of respondents were in favour of at least one way to calm traffic in Jamberoo, there was no consensus about how this might be achieved. The responses that argued against the introduction of any traffic calming measures included concerns such as:

13 of 21

Item 9.2 - New Item (9.1) Tabling of xxx

01 - JVRAA Traffic survey results and
correspondence

- Rejection of speed bumps on the grounds of noise and inconvenience.
- The opinion that Jamberoo is already over-targeted with speed cameras.
- The observation that poorly designed chicanes force cyclists into the traffic lane.

Additional specific traffic calming suggestions

Several respondents raised alternative ideas for traffic calming, including:

- Warning signage for wildlife on rural roads, including Mt Brandon Rd near Jerrara Dam, Curramore Road, and Jamberoo Mountain Pass.
- Signage indicating that elderly residents and children use the minor streets.
- More signage for the existing pedestrian crossing.

Roundabouts

Question 14: Residents were asked to indicate all locations where they would like to see a roundabout installed.

- 50% of respondents specified that they did not want any roundabouts.
- Of the 105 respondents (50% of the sample) who expressed an opinion in favour of roundabouts, the following location preferences were recorded, with several respondents mentioning more than one location:
 - 52% - On Jamberoo Road at the eastern entrance, coming in from Kiama.
 - 41% - Intersection of Jamberoo Road and Jamberoo Mountain Road.
 - 7% - Other roundabout options were suggested, including Allowrie/Minnamurra Lane; Allowrie/Young; Macquarie/Wyalla; slip road Spring Creek/Jamberoo Rd; Curramore Rd/Jamberoo Rd; Swamp Rd/Jamberoo Rd.

Discussion: Roundabouts

Several responses noted the relevance of a roundabout to the construction of the new Golden Valley Road subdivision, arguing that a roundabout should be provided at some point along Jamberoo Road. For example, "An additional access road to the new Golden Valley Estate should create the official boundary to the village and a 50 km zone via a roundabout." Safety of vehicular and pedestrian traffic going in and out of the subdivision was a major theme.

Pedestrian experience in Jamberoo

Question 15: Respondents were asked to comment on how easy it was to walk around the village and were invited to suggest improvements to footpaths and accessibility.

Ease of walking

- 43% of respondents reported having no concerns at all, and many commented that walking around the village was a pleasure.
 - One householder commented that local footpaths were not a concern, provided that parking was available at the IGA.

14 of 21

Item 9.2 - New Item (9.1) Tabling of xxx

01 - JVRAA Traffic survey results and correspondence

- 42% responded with comments and suggestions for improvement.
- 15% did not respond to this question.
 - Most of the residents who did not respond lived outside the village.

Discussion: Pedestrian experience

Survey responses to the questions about pedestrian experience were detailed and extensive, clearly shaped by individual local experience and individual needs. Foot traffic in Jamberoo village is of major importance.

Improvements to footpaths

Concerns and suggestions for improvements to footpaths included the following themes:

- Extensions needed to existing footpath coverage and/or completion of partial coverage:
 - North side of Allowrie St, east of Minnamurra Lane; Drualla Rd; Macquarie St, Beattie St, Wyalla Rd, Golden Valley Road.
- Safety concerns: There was frequent mention that there are no footpaths at all on busy residential streets such as Macquarie St, Beattie St and Drualla Rd, and this is a concern for parents with prams, elderly pedestrians, those on mobility scooters, and children walking to school and/or playing on the road. Vision on these streets is limited by parked cars, caravans, and boats. Several respondents commented that as traffic increases on these streets with the building of new subdivisions, the pressure on the minor roads is likely to worsen.
- Repairs needed to existing footpaths.
 - Slipperiness and trip hazards: Allowrie Street west of the pub; Churchill Street near the croquet courts.
- There were comments that the main exit roads from Jamberoo village - the extensions of Churchill Street and Allowrie Street - are unsafe for pedestrians, as well as unsafe for those on mobility scooters. It was noted that these thoroughfares are also used extensively by cyclists.
- There were several constructive suggestions from Jamberoo pedestrians who enjoy longer walks from Jamberoo village along the rural roads, for fitness and to walk their dogs. The relevant rural roads include Minnamurra Lane, Wyalla Road, Wallaby Hill Road, Golden Valley Road, Curramore Road and Burra Creek Road. The general point was that more attention should be paid to maintaining the verges of all these rural roads, so pedestrians can move safely to the side when a vehicle is approaching. Even when there are verges of a reasonable width available, several respondents pointed out that the verges often prove to be unsafe - unpredictably steep, muddy or overgrown.

Pedestrian crossings in Jamberoo village

Questions 17 and 18: Residents were asked whether they would like to see more pedestrian crossings in Jamberoo and, if so, where they should be located.

15 of 21

Item 6.1

Enclosure 2

Item 9.2 - New Item (9.1) Tabling of xxx

01 - JVRAA Traffic survey results and
correspondence

- 73% responded that they did NOT want any more pedestrian crossings. Several commented that pedestrian crossings can be dangerous for those who use them if motorists do not respect their right-of-way or slow down in time to stop.
- Amongst the 55 residents (27% of the sample) who were in favour of extra crossings, there was a range of locations suggested:
 - A location near the Reid Park gate or the Allowrie/Churchill Street roundabout to support pedestrian access to the sporting precinct.
 - The school crossing to be made permanent and raised as a traffic-calming device.
 - Additional locations along Allowrie Street, to support residents on the eastern side of the village. Particular mention was made of the Minnamurra Lane corner.
 - Several comments related to the anticipated needs of future residents of the Golden Valley Estate. When a bus stop is installed on the northern side of Allowrie Street for schoolchildren to catch the bus into Kiama, they will need protection as they cross Allowrie Street.
- The existing pedestrian crossing in Allowrie Street generated several comments:
 - Extra signage should compensate for the fact that, at certain times of day, drivers are affected by glare as they approach the crossing.
 - Several respondents commented that the design of the crossing is dangerous, as the crossing on Allowrie Street is impacted by cars accessing the IGA car park and turning into and out of Young Street. For example: *"Pedestrian crossing outside the Real Estate Office is dangerously located, right on the busy Young St corner opposite the car park. Further along Allowrie St would be a safer option, or a 4-way crossing in its present location: across carpark entry, butcher to post office, and post office to real estate with retention of existing crossing."*

Discussion: Pedestrian crossings

The issue of safe pedestrian crossings in Jamberoo village is critical. It is recommended that authorities carefully consider this issue in the near future, as new subdivisions are constructed and the village population grows. It is recommended that pedestrian crossings be considered alongside decisions made by authorities about speed limits in the village.

Cycling experience in Jamberoo**Number of cyclists**

Question 19: Residents were asked if their household included cyclists, and if so, whether they rode within the village and/or beyond the village.

- 60% of households reported having no cyclists.
- Of the 83 households that included cyclists (40% of the sample)
 - 33% cycled only within the village
 - 67% cycled beyond Jamberoo village as well

16 of 21

Item 6.1

Enclosure 2

Item 9.2 - New Item (9.1) Tabling of xxx

01 - JVRRA Traffic survey results and correspondence

Item 6.1

Enclosure 2

A larger proportion of households with cyclists were located in the village than in the rural areas.

Discussion: Cyclists in Jamberoo

With 40% of surveyed households including cyclists, it is important for planners to take cyclists' interests and safety into account.

Cycling safety within the village

Question 20: Residents were asked whether they were in favour of dedicated cycleways within the village. Of the 202 householders who responded to this question:

- 58% responded 'Yes'
- 42% responded 'No'
- Many respondents added qualitative comments, clarifying their reasons for supporting or not supporting the construction of dedicated cycleways within the village. The following themes emerged:
 - Frequently expressed arguments in favour of planning ahead for a connection within the village to the point where the Browns Lane cycleway might eventually reach Jamberoo.
 - Frequently expressed concern that there was not enough space on Jamberoo village roads and footpaths to provide extra cycleways, especially with parked cars present.
 - Comments on the danger of children on bikes and e-bikes not giving way to pedestrians on existing footpaths.
 - Concern that cyclists might not use dedicated cycleways, and it was not worth the expense.

Discussion: Safety for cyclists

The majority of respondents favoured dedicated cycleways within the village, with safety being the major concern. At present, cycling within Jamberoo village necessarily involves the dilemma of whether cyclists should use the roads or the footpaths (where available). It is recommended that the issue of dedicated cycleways be considered, with a focus on the routes normally used by schoolchildren, as well as on the section of Allowrie Street within the village that will eventually connect to the shared pathway/cycleway at Browns Lane.

Cycling safety along Jamberoo Road to Browns Lane

Question 21: Residents were asked to comment on the safety involved in riding along Jamberoo Road to and from Jamberoo and the Browns Lane cycleway. Those who responded to this question included both those with no cyclists in their households and cyclists.

- 33% of the whole sample (70 households) responded with qualitative comments.
 - 97% of the comments stated that it was unsafe for cyclists to travel along Jamberoo Road to the Browns Lane cycleway.
 - All cycling families with children in their households reported that they drive to the Browns Lane connection to use the Swamp Road Cycleway.
- The qualitative comments concerning the safety issue consistently included the following themes:

17 of 21

Item 9.2 - New Item (9.1) Tabling of xxx

01 - JVRAA Traffic survey results and correspondence

Item 6.1

Enclosure 2

- "The road is busy and carries heavy traffic, and in most spots there is no safe verge on Jamberoo Road for cyclists to move to the side of the road."
- "It is dangerous for motorists to overtake cyclists on this section of Jamberoo Road."

Anticipated use of a shared pathway

Question 22: Residents were asked whether it would change the way they use the Swamp Road cycleway if the connection from Browns Lane were extended to Jamberoo village.

- 63% of the whole sample (132 households) responded to this question. Of those who responded to the question:
 - 40% said they don't use the cycleway now but would start using it if there were a connection to Jamberoo village. This number included walkers as well as cyclists.
 - 51% reported that they do currently use the cycleway, but would increase their use of it.
 - 2% said it would have no impact on their use of the pathway.
 - 7% providing other comments about cyclists in general, mostly echoing opinions expressed in response to the following question.

Further comments on the shared pathway

Question 23: A further question inviting qualitative comments on the extension of the cycleway from Browns Lane to Jamberoo village received responses from 55% of the Total Sample (115 respondents).

- 90% of these respondents argued strongly in favour of a speedy completion of the cycleway extension.
- 10% commented along the lines of not being sure it would ever be done, or said that they were not in favour of spending money on it because dedicated cyclists might not use it. For example, "This would be a good idea if cyclists were banned from the roads."

Discussion: Completion of the Cycleway/Shared Pathway

56 of the 103 respondents who argued for supporting the completion of the cycleway expanded at some length on their reasons (note that several households mentioned more than one reason). The following themes emerged from these 56 respondents:

- Safety - 48%
- Active recreation and associated health benefits; family-friendly recreation; opportunities for teenagers to cycle to Kiama independently - 36%
- Tourism benefits for the LGA and for local Jamberoo businesses - 16%

Additional comments about the cycleway extension addressed the following themes:

- Urgency and frustration at the delay
- Suggestions for alternative routes that avoid Jamberoo Road in order to provide a pleasanter and safer ride.

18 of 21

Key priorities and further comments

Priorities

Question 24: Respondents were presented with a set of 8 items covering the entire survey, from which they could nominate as many issues as they wanted to be considered top priorities.

188 households (89% of the sample) responded to the prioritisation question and voted for at least one of the options. Of the 11% who did not nominate any priority, there were five households who commented “none of the above”.

Of the eight items listed for prioritisation, the following votes were recorded as priorities (the percentages are expressed as proportions of the whole sample of 211 households):

- Improved cycleways outside the village, including the extension of the cycleway from Browns Lane: 64%
- Improved pedestrian facilities/footpaths within the village: 30%
- Improved cycleways within the village: 27%
- Roundabout on Jamberoo Road at Jamberoo Mountain Road entrance: 27%
- Roundabout on Jamberoo Road entering from Kiama: 26%
- Lower speed limit in the commercial precinct of the village: 24%
- Speed bumps at key locations: 20%
- Lower speed limit in the whole of the village: 12%

Other issues

Question 25: A final question invited respondents to raise any other issues that had not been covered by the survey questions.

The following topics were raised by respondents at the end of the survey, either to re-emphasise earlier responses they had made or to raise new issues that had not been broached:

- Rural roads: There is a need to focus on sharing rural roads with wildlife in Jamberoo Valley. The roads that were mentioned as wildlife hotspots included: Jamberoo Mountain Road; Minnamurra Falls Road; Curramore and North Curramore Roads; Wallaby Hill road; Wyalla Road; Golden Valley Road; Mt Brandon Road; Fountaindale Road. Respondents requested warning signs to protect wildlife (and cars) from roadkill from dawn to dusk.
- It was noted that the speed limits on the rural roads are inconsistent, and are inconsistently marked.
- E-bikes and e-scooters were raised as potential hazards, especially when they are used on pedestrian footpaths.
- There was a request for more consistent flood indicators - for example, on Jamberoo Road near Fountaindale Road.

Item 9.2 - New Item (9.1) Tabling of xxx

01 - JVRAA Traffic survey results and correspondence

- Public transport: Jamberoo residents are dependent on driving, and members of the aging population expressed concerns about how they would cope when they could no longer drive. Targeted bus services were suggested, servicing the hospitals and shopping centres.
- Parking was mentioned, with the suggestion that clearly marked parking bays were needed to ensure that cars parked considerably and did not obstruct access driveways or lines of sight. Relevant locations were:
 - At Jamberoo Public School at drop-off and pick-up times..
 - Outside the Post Office, in the 15-minute area.
 - At the entrances to Club Jamberoo, the IGA and the Pub;
 - In the Jamberoo Preschool carpark. It was also requested that residential vehicles avoid using the preschool carpark during preschool hours.
- Respondents frequently re-emphasised concerns about how the planned Golden Valley Estate/s may affect several aspects of traffic and pedestrian safety.
- Respondents frequently re-emphasised their exasperation at the reduction of the speed limit between Albion Park and Jamberoo.
- The need for integrated planning was mentioned, with a focus on separating moving vehicles and people. *"An integrated plan that considers the user experience as a whole while addressing mobility and safety issues... As some adjustments are made, other issues may occur - e.g. a 40 km/h main zone would encourage more side street driving."*

Conclusions and Recommendations

Analysis of the Jamberoo Valley Ratepayers & Residents Association's 2025 Jamberoo Community Traffic Survey has revealed a picture of a village with an engaged community, including an older demographic who have lived there for many years. The strong response rate to this survey involved many residents taking the opportunity to voice their opinions, contribute comments, and offer constructive suggestions.

This survey suggests that the relative isolation of Jamberoo village is both its strength and its vulnerability. The local amenities are necessarily limited given the population size, and residents rely on motor vehicles to access services and employment opportunities beyond the village. Jamberoo residents' dependence on cars brings with it strongly argued reactions to changes to speed limits that are imposed without consultation. The issue of dependence on cars is exacerbated for non-drivers. The elderly who can no longer drive will need an efficient shuttle bus to reach services. The youngsters have no independent way of travelling to Kiama other than the school bus, and there was a strong consensus in the community that there is a need for safe, family-friendly access to the cycleway/shared pathway that is yet to be completed, connecting Jamberoo Village to Kiama.

Data from the survey support the conclusion that Jamberoo's identity as a *small* village is integral to residents' lives. Residents enjoy the fact that almost all the local amenities are

20 of 21

Item 9.2 - New Item (9.1) Tabling of xxx

01 - JVRAA Traffic survey results and
correspondence

accessible on foot, and they are looking to Council to ensure that pedestrian accessibility and safety will continue to be taken into consideration.

Jamberoo is a community experiencing change, with new subdivisions bringing an increase in population and an increase in traffic. Respondents' carefully argued comments indicate that the community feels it has the right to be included in the town planning required by these housing changes, to ensure the safety of motorists and pedestrians.

Respondents to the survey were somewhat divided about the prospect of increased traffic control and traffic calming within the village, with many rejecting the prospect of additional traffic rules and regulations. Many, however, took the opportunity to offer their opinions on what specific traffic safety measures might be introduced, and where they should be located. Many in the village are concerned about the traffic that is associated with weekend tourism, especially those who live along the main thoroughfare. There was strong consensus that the recent speed limit reduction between Albion Park and Jamberoo was inappropriate. It is hoped that Council and Traffic NSW will respond to the importance of community consultation in future planning for traffic control.

Respondents to the survey brought up several issues that had not been directly canvassed. One of these was the issue of the rural roads that surround the village, all of which traverse environmentally sensitive areas. As traffic on these rural roads increases, the risk of collisions with wildlife also rises. It is hoped that careful attention will be given to speed limits and warning signs in order to protect Jamberoo Valley and all its residents.

The respondents to the Jamberoo Community Traffic survey have, as a group, made it clear that social planning needs to be holistic and integrated if it is to serve the best interests of particular communities in particular areas. The community hopes that those who make the decisions about how we move about within our environment, will take the time to listen to us.

Jamberoo Valley Ratepayers & Residents Association Inc.

E: jvrrasecretary@gmail.com

Item 6.1

Enclosure 2



2026-27 Federal Budget Submission

National Priorities Need Local Solutions

P 02 6122 9400

E alga@alga.asn.au

Building Better
Communities.

Item 9.2 - New Item (9.2) Tabling of Budget doc

01 - ALGA - 2026-27 Federal Budget
submission

Item 6.1

Enclosure 2



Our Members



About ALGA

The Australian Local Government Association (ALGA) is the voice of local government in Australia, representing 537 councils across the nation. In structure, ALGA is a federation of state and territory local government associations.

ALGA was established in 1947 and throughout its history has been actively involved in issues of national significance affecting local government and local communities.

ALGA's policies and strategic priorities are determined by the ALGA Board, comprising two representatives from each of the member associations, who elect the President and two Vice Presidents.

Page 1 of 8



Message from the ALGA President



Australia's local governments are pivotal partners in advancing our nation's productivity. As the tier of government closest to the community, councils deliver essential services that support the health, wellbeing, liveability and economic vitality of every region across the country.

Our libraries, community centres, playgrounds, and sporting grounds are not just amenities - they are the heart of our communities, fostering connection, wellbeing, and a vibrant local life, as well as supporting workforce participation and contributing to local economies. Local government are the trusted, frontline responders that communities turn to when storms, fires, floods or other disasters hit, helping communities not only during an emergency but in the recovery, which can take weeks if not months.

Local governments are increasingly called upon to address national challenges at the community level, from delivering affordable housing and responding to natural disasters, to improving road safety and adapting to climate change.

While councils are prepared to lead with tailored, place-based solutions that meet the unique needs of every community, they are being asked to do more with less. The ability to deliver on these priorities depends on financial sustainability and adequate funding. Many councils are already active in these areas but are constrained by insufficient and unpredictable funding.

Long-term, secure funding arrangements are urgently needed to enable councils to plan effectively, respond to growing community pressures and contribute to national productivity goals.

We urge the Australian Government to recognise local government as a key partner and return annual Financial Assistance Grant funding to 1% of Commonwealth Taxation Revenue. As pressures mount on our councils, we also call for new, untied, formula-based funding streams distributed across all councils to meet national priorities.

This non-competitive funding will enable local governments to play a meaningful and sustained role in addressing the challenges facing our nation, for the benefit of every community

Mayor Matt Burnett
ALGA President

Page 2 of 8



Summary of 2026-27 Budget Commitments Sought

Issue	Portfolio	Funding Ask	Distribution method
Financial Sustainability	Treasury	A return of Financial Assistance Grants to 1% p.a of Commonwealth taxation revenue over three years.	Formula based untied funding
Housing Infrastructure	Treasury	\$1.1 billion per year for enabling infrastructure that will unlock housing supply	Formula based funding provided to all councils
Community Infrastructure	DITRDCA	\$500 million per year to support councils to build, maintain and revitalise community infrastructure	Formula based funding provided to all councils
Safer Roads	DITRDCA	\$600 million per year for local government to deliver safer roads	Formula based funding provided to all councils
Emergency Management	Department of Home Affairs (National Emergency Management Agency)	\$900 million per year for natural disaster mitigation and resilience, and to improve local government's emergency management capacity and capability	Formula based funding provided to all councils
Climate adaptation	DCCEEW	\$400 million per year for local government climate adaptation initiatives	Formula based funding provided to all councils

Page 3 of 8

Priority 1 – Financial Sustainability

Commitment sought

A return of Financial Assistance Grants to 1% p.a of Commonwealth taxation revenue over three years to restore the financial sustainability of local government and support councils to deliver national priorities

What is the issue?

Councils are being asked to deliver more essential services and infrastructure, increasing disaster frequency, and mounting asset renewal backlogs. However, long term funding for local government has not kept pace with these pressures. Competitive and short term grant programs create uncertainty, reduce efficiency and prevent councils from planning and sequencing multi year projects that support national goals such as housing supply, road safety, disaster resilience and climate adaptation.

Why does it matter to local government?

As the tier of government closest to communities, councils manage more than one third of Australia's public infrastructure and carry key responsibilities across housing and community infrastructure, local roads, emergency management and climate adaptation. Without predictable, untied funding, councils cannot invest early, maintain essential assets, or co deliver major national reforms.

Further information

Financial Assistance Grants have fallen from 1% of Commonwealth taxation revenue in 1996 to just 0.5% today, limiting councils' ability to keep up with rising costs and increased service expectations. Cost-shifting and rate-capping have further reduced councils' capacity to raise revenue while delivering additional responsibilities without matching funds.

Restoring FA Grants to 1% would give councils stable, equitable funding to meet growing community needs and contribute to national priorities. Councils manage more than \$130 billion in infrastructure, much of it ageing, and 40% report delaying new housing developments due to funding constraints with an extra \$5.7 billion needed to meet National Housing Accord targets.

Councils also maintain 75% of Australia's road network, costing \$30 billion annually. Initial data recently collated by ALGA found that 526 councils experienced a natural disaster (bushfire, cyclone, flood, storm, and/or earthquake) in 2024/25 alone, reinforcing the need for sustained mitigation investment. ALGA's Adapting Together modelling shows every \$1 invested in local adaptation returns up to \$3.10 in avoided damage.

Short-term, competitive grants do not support long-term financial sustainability. They create administrative burden on all levels of government, hinder multi-year planning, and require councils to compete for limited funding, often unsuccessfully, disadvantaging smaller councils and widening disparities between communities

Page 4 of 8



Priority 2 – Housing Infrastructure

Commitment sought

\$1.1 billion per year to be distributed to all councils to fund enabling infrastructure that will unlock housing supply.

What is the issue?

Australia's housing crisis is resulting in more people experiencing housing insecurity, homelessness and affordability pressures. Housing availability and affordability is also a fundamental pillar of economic productivity across the nation.

Why does it matter to local government?

ALGA's research shows that a lack of funding for councils for enabling infrastructure – including roads, and water and sewerage treatment connections and facilities – is a significant barrier to facilitating new housing developments.

Further information

Research from [Equity Economics](#) notes that 40 per cent of local governments have cut back on new infrastructure developments because of inadequate enabling infrastructure funding.

This research also shows that achieving the National Housing Accord's housing targets would incur an additional \$5.7 billion funding shortfall on top of infrastructure funding gaps already being felt by councils and their communities.

To support local government to address this gap and enable the development of new housing across the country, ALGA is proposing a new five-year, \$1.1 billion per annum funding program, to be provided to all councils on a formula basis. This would enable councils to maintain and service both existing and newly developed enabling infrastructure—a substantial, long-term financial obligation that presently rests with local government.

ALGA would also welcome further investigation into permanent infrastructure funding solutions, to relieve local government's reliance on short-term grants, subsidies, funds and loans. Longer-term secure funding is critical to sequencing the budgets and works required to support new housing.



Priority 3 – Community Infrastructure

Commitment sought

\$500 million per year for councils to build, maintain and revitalise community infrastructure

What is the issue?

ALGA's 2024 State of the Assets Report shows that \$8.3 billion worth of local government buildings and facilities are in poor condition.

The surge in housing supply needs to be supported by access to community infrastructure that creates livable communities, and supports a more mobile, skilled and healthy workforce.

Why does it matter to local government?

The local facilities that councils provide – including libraries, pools, recreation centres, bike paths and sporting facilities – are vital to the livability, wellbeing and productivity of every Australia community.

Further information

Australia's 537 councils maintain more one third of Australia's public infrastructure, including more than \$100 billion worth of buildings and facilities and \$32 billion worth of parks and recreation assets. This includes libraries, recreation centres, bike paths and sporting facilities, which are vital to the liveability, social cohesion, wellbeing and productivity of every Australia community.

The Local Roads and Community Infrastructure Program, introduced in 2020, provided councils with \$3.25 billion to build, maintain and revitalise local roads and community facilities. This program had a significant impact on the condition of local government buildings and facilities, with the 2024 National State of the Assets report highlighting a \$1 billion improvement since 2021.

However, this report also highlighted that \$8.3 billion of local government facilities, as well as \$2.9 billion worth of parks and recreation assets, are in poor condition and require attention.

A new \$500 million per year community infrastructure funding program – provided to all councils on a formula basis – would support all councils to build, maintain and revitalise the community infrastructure that Australians rely on.

Page 6 of 8



Priority 4 – Safer Roads

Commitment sought

\$600 million for councils to deliver safer roads, including \$500 million for road safety infrastructure funding and \$100 million for road safety programs that uplift local government leadership and planning capacity

What is the issue?

Each year, nearly 40,000 Australians suffer serious injuries from road crashes, with an economic and social impact exceeding \$30 billion annually.

Road networks also underpin significant economic activity in Australia and the safety of those roads is paramount.

Why does it matter to local government?

Local roads comprise over 75% of Australia's road network, and more than half of fatal crashes occur on local government roads. Funding for roads is critical to local government, and despite significant recent improvements to funding, there is still a shortfall.

Further information

During the 12 months ending September 2024, the [Bureau of Infrastructure and Transport Research Economics \(BITRE\)](#) identified there were 1,288 road deaths in Australia – an increase of 5.6% from the 12-month period ending September 2023. The rate of annual deaths is 4.7 per 100,000 population, which is a 3.2% increase compared to the rate for the 12-month period ending September 2023.

Local government has an important part to play in addressing Road Safety, but direct support is needed from the Commonwealth. To address road safety, local governments require a nationally coordinated capability and capacity uplift.

Councils would also benefit from a federally developed, nationally consistent road safety support framework that provides advice on best practice approaches for road safety across varying local government areas (e.g. remote, regional, peri-urban and city).

The doubling of the Roads to Recovery Program announced in November 2023 was welcomed by councils, but independent research from the Grattan Institute indicates this will only go halfway to meeting the current annual funding backlog.

Page 7 of 8



Priority 5 – Emergency Management

Commitment sought

\$900 million per year in dedicated funding for councils to improve mitigation and resilience, and build their capacity and capability to undertake the emergency management role required of them including recovery

What is the issue?

Australia is experiencing natural disasters of greater intensity, severity and frequency – which is having increased impacts on communities and council resources.

The financial impact of these disasters, due to issues including asset damage, clean-up costs, reduced economic activity, and social costs, is significant.

Why does it matter to local government?

Local governments play a critical role in supporting communities across the whole emergency continuum. However, under the current funding arrangements, local governments lack the capacity and resources to prepare their communities for, respond to, and recover from, disasters.

Further information

Over the past two years, more than 60 per cent of local government areas have been declared natural disaster areas, with many of them experiencing concurrent or cascading events.

In 2021, Deloitte Access Economics estimated natural disasters cost Australia \$38 billion per year, which is predicted to rise to \$73 billion per year by 2060. This does not include other national disasters that the country faces, such as biosecurity or cybersecurity issues.

Local governments in regional areas are typically those most exposed to natural disasters and have the lowest capacity to invest in new programs or initiatives due to restrained revenue.

Independent emergency management reviews by [Colvin](#) and [Glasser](#) both recommended a strategic shift towards disaster risk and mitigation, with the Colvin review also supporting a major capacity uplift for local government and an enhanced national training and exercise regime which tests and builds local government capacity.

The first three rounds of the Government's Disaster Ready fund have supported hundreds of disaster mitigation and resilience projects, but rounds have been heavily oversubscribed meaning council projects that would have a real impact on reducing risk have missed out.

ALGA continues to call for an ongoing, untied, fund of \$900m for councils to support their activities in the risk reduction and resilience building, emergency response, and recovery.

Page 8 of 8

Priority 6 – Climate Adaptation

Commitment sought

A \$400 million per year climate adaptation fund, provided to all councils, which allows them to implement a place-based approach to climate adaptation

What is the issue?

Climate change creates increasingly acute (e.g. more frequent and severe) disasters and chronic impacts (eg coastal erosion and rising heat) which is impacting on the liveability of Australian communities. This impact poses a risk to Australia's financial sustainability and economy.

Why does it matter to local government?

Councils need support to adequately assess climate risk and vulnerabilities and adequately address them in plans, policies investment decisions and engagement with communities. Funding and support from other levels of government has failed to keep pace, placing an inequitable burden on the sector.

Further information

Councils are at the forefront of grappling with climate impacts as asset managers, land use decision makers, and the closest tier of government to the community.

Future-proofing communities from the changing climate continues to be a national priority, and Australia's councils are leading the way by investing heavily in climate resilience solutions. The adaptation work that councils do directly reduces the pressure on the long-term budgetary sustainability of other governments.

Councils have been demonstrated ability to deliver high return on investment and are ideal delivery partners for climate risk mitigation.

ALGA's [Adapting Together report](#) (2025) presents conservative modelling which estimates that for every \$1 of climate adaptation work delivered by councils, the community benefits equate to between \$0.8 and \$3.1 (via avoided costs and benefits gained).

Local governments will have to deal with climate impacts. Councils require consistent funding if they are to be successful in adapting effectively and efficiently; leading to less disruption to supply chains, better health and social outcomes, and economic resilience.

ALGA is calling for the Government to establish a local government climate adaptation fund which allows councils to implement a place-based approach to adaptation. The fund should be a minimum 10-year formula-based program with funding provided to every council.

Page 9 of 8