NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN in accordance with Sections 83, 84, 87 and 88 of the Local Government Act 1999, that a meeting of the

COUNCIL

and

• Urban Services Standing Committee
• Governance Standing Committee

of the

CITY OF WEST TORRENS

will be held in the Council Chambers, Civic Centre
165 Sir Donald Bradman Drive, Hilton

on

TUESDAY, 1 JULY 2014
at 7.30 PM

Terry Buss
Chief Executive Officer

City of West Torrens Disclaimer
Please note that the contents of these Council and Committee Agendas have yet to be considered by Council and officer recommendations may be altered or changed by the Council in the process of making the formal Council decision.
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1. **MEETING OPENED**

1.1 Evacuation Procedure

2. **PRESENT**

3. **APOLOGIES**

   Council Members:
   Cr Frances
   Cr Scotcher

4. **DISCLOSURE STATEMENTS**

   The following information should be considered by Council Members prior to a meeting:

   1. Consider Section 73 of the Local Government Act and determine whether they have a conflict of interest in any matter to be considered in this Agenda; and

   2. Disclose these interests in accordance with the requirements of Sections 74 and 75 of the Local Government Act 1999.

   The following disclosures of interest have been made in relation to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Elected Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

5. **CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES**

   **RECOMMENDATION**

   That the Minutes of the meeting of Council held on 17 June 2014 be confirmed as a true and correct record.

6. **MAYOR’S REPORT**

   **(Preliminary report as of Thursday night 26 June 2014 for the agenda to be distributed Friday, 27 June 2014)**

   In the two weeks since the last Council Meeting of 17 June 2014 functions and meetings involving the Mayor have included:

   **16-18 June**  Attended the ALGA Conference, Canberra – including an unsuccessful deputation representing five councils (though only two actually participated) to meet Assistant Minister for Infrastructure and Regional Development, Jamie Briggs MHR, seeking Federal funding for one-third of the Brown Hill and Keswick Creeks Stormwater Management Project.
Thursday 19 June
11.00am Participated as a panel member for the LGMA Professional Management Programme conducted at 10 Pulteney Street campus of Adelaide University.

Friday 20 June
8.50am Presented certificates to students at Richmond Primary School for their participation in the DPTI Way2Go Bike Education Programme.
5.00pm With Deputy Mayor Demetriou attended the LGA and Migrant Resource Centre reception in recognition of World Refugee Day 2014.

Sunday 22 June
12 noon Attended the pre match lunch prior to the game between West Adelaide and Port Adelaide at City Mazda Stadium.

Tuesday 24 June
7.30pm Participated in a Policy Planning and Performance Committee meeting.

Wednesday 25 June
4.00pm Interview with Michael Smyth, ABC Drive Time Programme.

In addition, after the compilation of this report on Thursday as part of the distributed Agenda, but before next Tuesday's Council meeting, I also expect to have attended or participated in the following:

Friday 27 June
7.30pm Mendelson Foundation Scholarship Presentation Ceremony.

Tuesday 1 July
6.00pm Pre meeting briefing.
7.30pm Council meeting.

RECOMMENDATION
That the Mayor's Report be noted.

7. ELECTED MEMBER REPORTS
8. PETITIONS

8.1 Policy Area 30 - Subdivision of Land and Developments Facing Laneways

A petition has been submitted via Cr Polito on behalf of 99 petitioners that are owners of land in the City of West Torrens Historical Conservation area, requesting that Council revokes the decision carried on the 19th November 2013 regarding Policy Area 30 prohibiting the subdivision of land and development facing laneways (Attachment 1).

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended to Council that the petition be received.
ATTACHMENT 1

PETITION

To: The West Torrens Council,

We the undersigned being Owners of land in the City of West Torrens Historical Conservation area, petition you to revoke the decision carried on the 19th November 2013 regarding Policy 30 prohibiting the subdivision of land and developments facing laneways because:

- The proposed policy 30 prohibits subdivisions and developments facing laneways in an area where Council has already extensively permitted such subdivisions and developments over the past decade;
- Council has already compulsorily acquiesced one (1) metre of land from sub divided properties facing laneways in anticipation of future developments facing laneways;
- Council has failed in its duty to properly and transparently inform owners of the impact of policy 30 and failed in its duty to consult fully with affected owners.
- Policy 30 will result in the devaluation of properties and it will cause financial hardship to owners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hall Rose</td>
<td>64 Hughes St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurora Weir</td>
<td>2 Glengowan Rd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on behalf of</td>
<td>Pat Galagos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67th Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con Dyer</td>
<td>58 Kookaburra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kayla Mekhail</td>
<td>33 Karrinyup</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jiri Iordan</td>
<td>88 Dungarvon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Fidgley</td>
<td>43 Hughes St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob Tavener</td>
<td>83 Hughes St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Reavell</td>
<td>35 Hughes St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Reavell</td>
<td>37 Hughes St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Reavell</td>
<td>39 Hughes St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Reavell</td>
<td>21 Hughes St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Reavell</td>
<td>21 Hughes St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Geninahalab</td>
<td>17 Hughes St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Geninahalab</td>
<td>17 Hughes St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camielo Fagiolo</td>
<td>6 Gladstone Rd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucrezia Fagiolo</td>
<td>6 Gladstone Rd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzanne Fagiolo</td>
<td>15 Gladstone Rd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter MMA</td>
<td>15 Gladstone Rd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jasmin Faith</td>
<td>8A Gladstone Rd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remi Kramer</td>
<td>17 Gladstone Rd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Georgopoulos</td>
<td>15 Gladstone Rd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darren Wilson</td>
<td>28 Gladstone Rd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camilla Tarran</td>
<td>52 Gladstone Rd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Distributed and collected by. ELENA
9. DEPUTATIONS

9.1 Subdivision of Land and Developments Facing Laneways - Policy Area 30

Mr Richard Warley and Mr Vince Forza wish to address Council in relation to the petition regarding Policy Area 30, which prohibits the sub-division and development of land facing laneways in Mile End.

9.2 Traffic Management - Hardys Road

Mr Jason Boccaccio wishes to address Council in relation to Urban Services Standing Committee Item 11.1 - Hardys Road Traffic Management regarding a petition tabled at the Council meeting on 3 June 2014.

10. ADJOURN INTO STANDING COMMITTEES

RECOMMENDATION

That the meeting be adjourned, move into Standing Committees and reconvene at the conclusion of the Governance Standing Committee.

11. ADOPTION OF STANDING COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

11.1 URBAN SERVICES COMMITTEE

RECOMMENDATION

That the recommendations of the Urban Services Standing Committee held on 1 July 2014 be adopted.

11.2 GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE

RECOMMENDATION

That the recommendations of the Governance Standing Committee held on 1 July 2014 be adopted.

12. ADOPTION OF GENERAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

12.1 AUDIT AND RISK COMMITTEE

RECOMMENDATION

That the Minutes of the Audit and Risk General Committee dated 24 June 2014, attached, be noted and the recommendations be adopted.
12.2 POLICY, PLANNING AND PERFORMANCE COMMITTEE

RECOMMENDATION
That the Minutes of the Policy, Planning and Performance General Committee dated 24 June 2014, attached, be noted and the recommendations be adopted.

13. QUESTIONS WITH NOTICE
Nil

14. QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

15. MOTIONS WITH NOTICE

15.1 Crime Prevention Messages
At the meeting of Council on 17 June 2014, Cr Mangos moved the following motion which the Presiding Member ruled would be deferred to the meeting of Council on 1 July 2014.

That the Administration approach the South Australian Police with the aim of using Council's existing banner site locations and its variable message board signs (VMS) to promote appropriate messages that reinforce the importance of crime prevention within our city.

15.2 Expired Military Equipment
At the meeting of Council on 17 June 2014 Cr McKay moved the following motion which the Presiding Member ruled would be deferred to the meeting of Council on 1 July 2014.

That the CEO and Mayor write to the Federal member for Hindmarsh, Matt Williams MP and ask him to investigate what expired military surplus equipment could be given to the City of West Torrens Memorial Gardens.

15.3 Laneways in Policy Area 30, Mile End
Cr Polito has indicated his intention to move the following motion:

That Council write to the Minister for Planning:

1. Advising him of the representations received in respect of development in Mile End, and,

2. Formally request that the Minister amend the Desired Character Statement in Council's draft Housing Diversity DPA for Residential Zone - Mile End Conservation Policy Area 30 to permit new allotments to be created that have their primary frontage to a laneway.

16. MOTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE
17. REPORTS OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

17.1 Adoption of the Budget and Annual Business Plan and Declaration of the Rates for 2014/15

Brief
This report proposes adoption of the budget and annual business plan, and the long term financial plan, and declaration of the rates for 2014/15.

Council needs to adopt each numbered recommendation in A separately, along with recommendations in B and C separately.

RECOMMENDATION(S)

A. Rates

The following recommendations are made in exercise of powers contained in Chapters 8, 9 and 10 of the Local Government Act 1999 for the financial year ending on 30th June 2015:

1. Adoption of the Annual Business Plan

Pursuant to and in accordance with Section 123 of the Local Government Act 1999 and Regulation 6 of the Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 2011, having considered all submissions in accordance with Section 123(6) of the Local Government Act 1999, the Annual Business Plan for 2014/15, included as a part of the Budget and Annual Business Plan 2014/15, be adopted.

2. Adoption of the Budget

The budget for 2014/15, included as a part of the Budget and Annual Business Plan 2014/15, and prepared in accordance with Section 123 of the Local Government Act 1999 and Regulation 7 of the Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 2011, as detailed in the budget papers laid before the Council at this meeting, including:

- the budgeted statement of comprehensive income;
- the budgeted statement of financial position;
- the budgeted cash flow statement; and
- the budgeted statement of changes in equity;
be adopted.

3. Adoption of the Valuations

Pursuant to Section 167(2)(a) of the Local Government Act 1999, the most recent valuations of the Valuer-General available to the Council of the capital value of land within the Council’s area, totalling $xx,xxxx,xxxx,xxx, be adopted for rating purposes.
4. **Attribution of Land Uses**

(1) The numbers indicated against the various categories of the land use prescribed by Regulation 14(1) of the *Local Government (General) Regulations 2013*, be used to designate land uses in the assessment record;

(2) The use indicated by those numbers in respect of each separate assessment of land described in the assessment record on this date (as laid before the Council) be attributed to each such assessment respectively; and

(3) Reference in this resolution to land being of a certain category of land use means the use indicated by that category number in the said Regulations.

5. **Declaration of General Rates**

Having taken into account the general principles of rating in Section 150 of the *Local Government Act 1999*, and the requirements of Section 153(2) of the *Local Government Act 1999*, the Council determines that:

(1) Differential general rates be declared pursuant to and in accordance with Sections 153(1)(b) and 156(1)(a) of the *Local Government Act 1999* on the capital value of all rateable land within the Council’s area according to the use of the land as follows:

(a) 0.xxxxxx cents in the dollar on rateable land of category 1 use;

(b) 0.xxxxxx cents in the dollar on any rateable land of category 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 or 9 use.

(2) Pursuant to Section 158(1)(a) of the *Local Government Act 1999*, a minimum amount payable by way of general rates of $826 is fixed in respect of rateable land within the Council’s area.

(3) Pursuant to Section 153(3) of the *Local Government Act 1999*, there be no fixed maximum increase in the general rate to be charged on a principal place of residence of a principal ratepayer.

6. **Declaration of Separate Rate - Regional Natural Resources Management Levy**

In accordance with Section 95 of the *Natural Resources Management Act 2004* and Section 154 of the *Local Government Act 1999*, in order to reimburse the Council for an amount of $1,196,573 contributed to the Adelaide and Mt Lofty Ranges Natural Resource Management Board, a separate rate of 0.00xxxx cents in the dollar be declared on all rateable land in the area of the Council and the Board based on the capital value of that land.

7. **Payment of Rates**

Pursuant to Section 181(1) and (2) of the *Local Government Act 1999*, all rates are payable in four equal or approximately equal instalments on the day on which each of four instalments falls due as follows:

(i) 1st September 2014 in respect of the first instalment;
(ii) 1st December 2014 in respect of the second instalment;
(iii) 2nd March 2015 in respect of the third instalment; and
(iv) 1st June 2015 in respect of the fourth instalment.
B. Adoption of the Long Term Financial Plan

Pursuant to Section 122(1a)(a) of the *Local Government Act 1999*, the long term financial plan included as Section 9 of the 2014/15 Budget and Annual Business Plan be adopted.

C. Budget Review

The Council be provided with reviews of its budgetary position throughout the year consistent with the requirements of Regulation 9 of the *Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 2011*, including a framework for development of the 2015/16 budget.

Introduction

This report proposes adoption of the budget and annual business plan, along with the long term financial plan which forms a part of the budget, and declaration of the rates for 2014/15.

Discussion

The recommended budget and annual business plan for 2014/15 is substantially the same as the draft previously tabled, except for the following changes:

- March 2014 Budget Review changes adopted by Council on 20 May 2014, including estimates for 2013/14, have been incorporated;
- Changes adopted by Council during its review of the draft budget and annual business plan have been incorporated;
- A number of other relatively minor changes have been made.

A number of other adjustments, including those related to the 2014 Commonwealth budget, will be made in the September 2014 budget review.

The budget proposed for adoption is based on the following:

- An average rate increase of 4.0 per cent for both residential and non-residential ratepayers;
- The minimum rate being increased by 4.0 per cent to $826; and
- The generation of rate income of $43,990,000.

Recommendations for adoption have been reviewed by Kelledy Jones Lawyers.

Final rate model details upon which Council’s rate declaration is based will be tabled on Tuesday evening.

A copy of the recommended budget is included with the agenda under separate cover.

Conclusion

This report proposes adoption of the budget and annual business plan, and the long term financial plan, and declaration of the rates for 2014/15.
17.2 Financial Assistance Grants - Indexation Freeze

Brief
This report seeks Council's support to partner with the Australian Local Government Association to lobby the Federal Government to reverse its decision to freeze the indexation of Local Government Financial Assistance Grants (FAGs) for three years until 2017-18.

RECOMMENDATION(S)
It is recommended to Council that:

1. The Australian Local Government Association be advised that Council supports their move to lobby the Federal Government to reverse its decision to freeze the indexation of local government Financial Assistance Grants (FAGs)

2. The Chief Executive Officer write to our local Coalition Federal Members of Parliament and Senators to reinforce the message of this Council's disappointment with the decision by the Federal Government to freeze the indexation of Financial Assistance Grants to local government and seek their support for a review of the Government's decision.

Introduction
A decision made as part of the May 2014 Federal Budget resulted in the freezing of indexation applied annually to Financial Assistance Grants paid to local government. It is estimated that this decision will cost councils around Australia an estimated $925 million in FAGs by 2017-18. This financial impost will have a devastating effect on councils and their ability to provide and maintain a range of programs and services to local residents.

Discussion
The President of the Australian Local Government Association, Dr Felicity-ann Lewis, has written to Council on this issue and her letter is self-explanatory regarding the impacts this decision will have on local government if it is not reversed. Refer Attachment 1

The decision to freeze the indexation of FAGs is devastating enough but when coupled with the axing of $18 million of Supplementary Local Road funding to South Australian councils, this presents a 'double whammy' for South Australian local government. Accordingly, support to the Australian Local Government Association to lobby the Federal Government to reverse its decision to freeze the indexation of local government FAGs is strongly recommended.

Conclusion
The recent Budget decision by the Federal Government to freeze the indexation of FAGs for three years until 2017-18 will have a financial impact on this Council and local government generally to continue to provide a range of programs and services to its local residents and any initiative to seek the Federal Government to reverse this decision should be strongly supported.
Dear Mayor/Shire President,

I am writing to you and the mayor and shire president of every council across Australia to ask you to join ALGA’s call to have the Government reverse its decision to freeze the indexation of the local government Financial Assistance Grants (FAGs) for three years until 2017-18.

On 16 June delegates of the National General Assembly for Local Government resolved to call on the Commonwealth Government to restore indexation of Financial Assistance Grants in line with CPI and population growth immediately. (Resolution attached).

ALGA will take this matter forward directly with Federal Government Ministers but I seek your continued support to send the message to your local Federal Government representatives.

The decision announced in the Budget on 13 May 2014, will cost councils an estimated $925 million in FAGs by 2017-18. Unfortunately, the impact will continue beyond that date because the base level of FAGS will be permanently reduced by over 12%. In 2017-18 the estimated reduction in FAGS will be $321 million. Even if indexation is restored in 2017-18 (at an estimated 4.2%, which reflects CPI and population movements), the gap will continue to widen and FAGS will be about $334 m less in 2018-19 and almost $350m less in 2019-20.

In fact, by 2018-19 when the current extension of Roads to Recovery (R2R) is due to end, the loss of FAGS will be the equivalent of 95% of R2R funding. Almost the entire value of the R2R program will be lost.

The FAGs are a vital part of the revenue base of all councils. For many smaller rural and remote councils, FAGs form the majority of their revenue. These councils are likely to be hit hardest by the reduction in grants.

The FAGs are absolutely essential to allow local communities across Australia to provide a reasonable level of service and infrastructure to local residents. These grant are used to maintain a great range of infrastructure including local roads, bridges, parks, swimming pools, libraries and community halls as well as services to the young, the elderly and community groups of all kinds.

ALGA has been fighting to have the value of the FAGs restored to a level equivalent to 1% of tax revenue, the level they were at when John Howard came to power in 1996. In recent years they slipped to 0.7% but we are shocked to see that they will decline to just 0.53% by 2017-18.
There has been talk of the Federal Government forcing the states to push for a GST increase. In the case of councils, the Federal Government seems to be intent on forcing councils to cut services or consider whether rate rises may be necessary to maintain services. This is grossly unfair given that our local residents have already paid taxes to the Federal Government and expect an adequate level of that revenue to be returned to councils to provide local services and infrastructure.

The impact of the Government’s decision on local communities must be brought home in a factual and clear way to all Coalition Federal Members of Parliament and Senators. I believe that this would best be done by local mayors and shire presidents writing to their Federal Government representatives, highlighting the implications of the decision for local services and asking Coalition representatives whether they continue to support the decision. I would hope that many Federal Government members would recognise the severe impact on their communities and support a review of the Government’s decision.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

Mayor Dr Felicity-ann Lewis
President

19 June 2014

Resolution
Delegates of the 2014 National General Assembly, in recognition of the vital importance of the Financial Assistance Grants (FAGs) to local government for the provision of equitable levels of local government services to all Australian communities, call on the Commonwealth Government to:

- restore indexation of Financial Assistance Grants in line with CPI and population growth immediately,
- reject Recommendation 22 of the National Commission of Audit in which the Commission recommends that tied grants to local government cease, and to the extent that programmes are identified as priorities, local and state government provide them to the communities they serve.

Further Delegates resolve that:

- it is imperative that the Commonwealth consult with local government, the states and territories and local communities in the development of the White Paper on Reform of the Federation and the White Paper on Taxation; that the Government's White Papers must genuinely reflect the wishes of the Australian people; and that future Federal-state and local financial relationship arrangements must ensure long term sustainable distribution of taxation revenues between the levels of government that are commensurate with the roles and responsibilities of each level government in our modern Federation.
17.3 Mayors’ and Chairpersons’ Residential Seminar 2014

Brief
The Local Government Association's Mayors' and Chairpersons' Residential Seminar will be held at the Intercontinental Adelaide on 25-26 July 2014.

RECOMMENDATION(S)
It is recommended to Council that:

1. Subject to his confirmation, Council approves the attendance of Mayor Trainer at the LGA Mayors' and Chairpersons' Residential Seminar being held at the Intercontinental Adelaide on 25-26 July 2014.

2. Expenses be reimbursed in accordance with Council policy.

Introduction

Discussion
The Seminar will provide the opportunity for Mayors and Chairpersons across the State to hear from experts on a range of key issues currently facing local government and to share views with colleagues from other councils.

The Friday sessions will begin at 9.30am and conclude at 5.00pm with an overview of the day followed by pre dinner drinks at 6.00pm and dinner. Saturday commences at 9.00am and concludes at 3.00pm.

The Seminar topics will include:

- Australian LG Financial Reform - A Federal Perspective
- Planning and Development Reforms
- Caretaker Guidelines
- Meetings and Meeting Procedures - Tips and Traps
- Update on National Issues

Cost of registration is $650 + GST and is inclusive of the dinner and meals (except breakfast). Partners are welcome to attend the dinner for an additional charge of $100 + GST per partner.

A detailed copy of the program is attached for Members’ information (Attachment 1).
MAYORS' AND CHAIRPERSONS' RESIDENTIAL SEMINAR

PROGRAM

25 & 26 July 2014
The Intercontinental Adelaide, North Terrace, Adelaide 5000

DAY 1: 25 JULY 2014

9:00am REGISTRATION

9:30am Official Welcome
Speaker: Mayor David O'Loughlan, LGA President

9:40am Opening Address
Speaker: Hon Geoff Brock, Minister for Local Government and Regional Development
Minister Brock provide an overview of his role and responsibilities in the Cabinet, his approach to his portfolio and key issues that are important to the future development of Local Government and regions and relationships with the other spheres of government and communities.

10:15am MORNING TEA BREAK

10:30am Australian LG Financial Reform- a Federal Perspective
Speaker: John Comrie, Director, JAC Consultancy
John has written much of the guidance material produced by the LGASA to assist councils to improve their financial sustainability strategies and performance. In this session John will discuss "In Our Hands- Strengthening Local Government revenue for the 21st Century", a paper he prepared and researched on behalf of the ACELG.

12:00pm LUNCH
1:00pm  Code of Conduct

Speakers: Megan Philpot, Acting Ombudsman, Bruce Lander, Commissioner, ICAC, and Dr Gabrielle Appleby, Project Co-ordinator, University of Adelaide

This session will provide an opportunity for members to hear about the way in which the Code of Conduct complaints are managed through the ICAC legislation and the resulting changes to the Local Government Act. The Acting Ombudsman, Megan Philpot will provide a presentation along with Independent Commissioner Against Corruption Bruce Lander and Dr Gabrielle Appleby the project co-ordinator of the Independent Study into Attitudes to corruption, misconduct and maladministration in Local Government.

2:00pm  Intergovernmental Relations

Speakers: Wendy Campana, CEO

This session will update participants on intergovernmental issues facing local government and the LGA’s role and activities to support these relationships.

3:00pm  AFTERNOON TEA BREAK

3:15pm  Planning and Development Reforms

Speaker: Brian Hayes QC

This session will provide an update on the activities of the State Government’s Planning Reform Group.

4:15pm  Caretaker Guidelines

Speaker: Amanda Harfield, Legal Services Associate, LGA

Amanda will outline the important issues about the Election caretaker period for Elected Members.

5:00pm  PLENARY SESSION- OVERVIEW OF THE DAY

Speaker: Wendy Campana, LGA, CEO

6:00pm  Pre-dinner Drinks

7:00pm  DINNER

TOPIC: Treachery Close to Home? – Machinations in SA State Politics

Speaker: Associate Prof Haydon Manning, School of Social and Policy Studies, Flinders University
DAY 2: 26 JULY 2014

9:00am Welcome

Speaker: Mayor David O'Loughlan, LGA President

9:05am Meetings and Meeting Procedures – Tips and Traps

Speakers: Felice D'Agostino, Partner, Norman Waterhouse Lawyers

This session will be an open discussion on some of the issues that Council Members experience and how the meeting regulations and procedures can be used to make good, inclusive and wise decisions for local communities.

11:00am MORNING TEA BREAK

11:15am Update on National Issues

Speaker: Mayor Felicity Ann Lewis, President of the Australian Local Government Association

This session will highlight actual examples of issues that elected Councils are confronted with. It will cover relationships, legal issues and industrial relations matters.

12:30pm LUNCH

1:15pm POLITICAL MANAGEMENT IN AUSTRALIAN LG- Exploring Relationships between Mayors and CEO’s

Speaker: Graham Sansom, Australian Centre of Excellence for Local Government

The working relationship between the Mayor and the CEO is one of the most important relationships in local government. Mayors and CEOs recognise that the breakdown in this relationship can have long lasting, negative impacts on the capacity of a local government to deliver value for money services to its community. Despite this, there is little research which illuminates this relationship, and certainly little that is based on the Australian local government scene.

3:00pm CLOSE
17.4 2014 LGA Roads and Works Conference

Brief
The 2014 Local Government Association Roads and Works Conference is to be held in Port Lincoln on 28-29 August 2014.

RECOMMENDATION(S)
It is recommended to Council that:

1. Subject to confirmation, Council approves the attendance of Cr/s .................... at the Local Government Association Roads and Works Conference being held in Port Lincoln on 28 and 29 August 2014 at the Ravendale Club.

2. Expenses be reimbursed in accordance with Council policy.

3. Subject to their confirmation, Council approves the attendance of the spouses/partners of attending Elected Members and further, consistent with Council policy, that costs, other than air fares, be met by Council.

Introduction
The 2014 Local Government Association (LGA) Roads and Works Conference will be held from 28 to 29 August 2014 at the Ravendale Club in Port Lincoln (Attachment 1).

Discussion
The 22nd LGA Roads and Works Conference is a highly successful roads event held in South Australia each year.

The Hon Tim Fischer AC, former Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Trade has been announced as the keynote speaker.

The topics for discussion include:

- Local Government Disaster Assistance
- Bitumen Trials
- Performance Management
- Developing Tourism Infrastructure (Boating Facilities)
- Regional Local Government Road Strategy

The draft program is attached for Members’ information (Attachment 2).

The total conference package is $450 + GST and includes the Pre-Conference Dinner (27 August 2014) at the Port Lincoln Yacht Club, morning teas, lunches and the Official Conference Dinner (28 August 2014) at the Nautilus Theatre, Civic Hall.

The total cost of air fares and accommodation will be approximately $530.
# 2014 LGA Roads and Works Conference - Circular 22.10

**To:** Chief Executive Officer  
Community Services Staff  
Corporate Services Staff  
Economic Development and Tourism Staff  
Elected Members  
Emergency and Risk Management Staff  
Employee Relations - Human Resources  
Environment Staff  
Environmental Health Staff  
Information - Engineering Staff  
Information - Technology Staff  
Marketing and Public Relations Staff  
Parks and Recreation Staff  
Planning - Building Staff  
Policy and Strategic Planning Staff  
Procurement Staff  
Recycling - Waste Management  

**Contact:** Rebecca Wake  
Email: rebecca.wake@lga.sa.gov.au  

**Response Required:** No  

**Summary:** The 2014 LGA Roads and Works Conference Committee is pleased to announce that Tim Fischer AC, former Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Trade will be the keynote speaker at the Conference. Further information can be found in this Circular.

The 2014 LGA Roads and Works Conference will be held at the Ravenale Club, Port Lincoln on Thursday 28 & Friday 29 August.  
A pre-conference dinner will be held on Wednesday 27 August at the Port Lincoln Yacht Club and formal dinner will be held on the 28 August at the Nautilus Theatre, Civic Hall.

**Program:**  
The Hon Tim Fischer, AC, former Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Trade is the keynote speaker and will lead a thought-provoking array of topics and speakers at this Conference. Tim will draw on his broad range of experience in public and private life to present on Local Government infrastructure. Other presentations include:  
- Local Government disaster assistance  
- Blumen trials  
- Performance Management  
- Developing Tourism Infrastructure (Boating Facilities)  
- Regional Local Government Road strategy

A program will be available shortly.

**Registrations:**  
Registrations will be open mid June.

**Accommodation:**  
Please contact the Port Lincoln Visitor Information Centre on 1300 788 378 if you have any queries regarding accommodation.

**Future Conference locations:** (Nominate your Council now)  
The committee would also like to offer Councillors the opportunity to nominate to host future Roads and Works Conferences. If your Council is interested in hosting a future Conference please fill out the [Criteria Form](mailto:rebecca.wake@lga.sa.gov.au) and return to rebecca.wake@lga.sa.gov.au by 5pm Friday 18 July 2014.
### Draft Program

#### Day 1 - Thursday 28 August 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.00am</td>
<td>Registrations open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.40am</td>
<td><strong>Official Opening and Welcome to Port Lincoln</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mayor Bruce Green, City of Port Lincoln</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.50am</td>
<td><strong>LGA President’s Welcome</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mayor David O’Loughlin, LGA President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.00am</td>
<td><strong>Boosting Community and Local Government: Ingredients and Infrastructure that matter!</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Hon Tim Fischer, AC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.50am</td>
<td><strong>Eye on the Eyre Peninsula</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local Government Perspective on the Eyre Peninsula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Tillack, District Council of Streaky Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.10am</td>
<td><strong>Getting it together</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional Local Government Road strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David Hitchcock, LGA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.20am</td>
<td>Sponsor Presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.25am</td>
<td>Morning Tea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.20am</td>
<td>Sponsor Presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.25am</td>
<td><strong>Bitumen trials Part 1: Outcome of the trials</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rod Ellis, IPWEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.45am</td>
<td><strong>To Spray or not to Spray</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Panel Session discussing the views and operations on spray pavers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rod Ellis, IPWEA, Kelly Manning, Boral, Peter Levet, City of Salisbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.05pm</td>
<td><strong>Big Wheels Keep on Rollin’</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National Heavy vehicle Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department of Planning Transport and Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.25pm</td>
<td><strong>Looking after your back</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Getting an idea up - Bitumen repairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Charles Sturt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.45pm</td>
<td>Panel Q&amp;A Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.55pm</td>
<td>Sponsor Presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00pm</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15pm</td>
<td>Sponsor Presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20pm</td>
<td><strong>A Bird in the Hand!</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tracking Corellas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Simon Grenfell, Alexandria Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.40pm</td>
<td><strong>Can’t see the Woods for the Trees?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tree Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alex Lewis, SA Power Networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00pm</td>
<td><strong>I can see clearly now the trees have gone</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Native Vegetation &amp; Road Clearance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.20pm</td>
<td><strong>Without a Paddle</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaborative approaches to CWMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rick Gayler, Gayler Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.40pm</td>
<td>Panel Q&amp;A Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.55pm</td>
<td>Sponsor Presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00pm</td>
<td>Close of Day 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Draft Program**

**Day 2 - Friday 29 August 2014**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.15am</td>
<td>Registrations open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.45am</td>
<td><strong>Welcome by Conference Chairperson</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mayor Bruce Green, City of Port Lincoln</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.50am</td>
<td><strong>Putting Humpty back together again</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Infrastructure damage assessment &amp; Local Government Disaster Assistance Guidelines</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anna Osman, Kangaroo Island Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.10am</td>
<td><strong>Looking after your Dollars</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>LGA Procurement - Introduction of the Engineering Services Panel</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rob Ackland, LGA Procurement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.30am</td>
<td><strong>Float my Boat</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Developing Tourism Infrastructure (Boating Facilities)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glen Jones, Boating Industry Association of SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.50am</td>
<td><strong>Performance does Count</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Performance Management</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faye Bound, Bound Consulting Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.10am</td>
<td>Panel Q&amp;A Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.20am</td>
<td>Sponsor Presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.25am</td>
<td><em>Morning Tea</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.15am</td>
<td>Sponsor Presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.20am</td>
<td><strong>Big Brother is Watching</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Work Health and Safety and adapting to the new legislation</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jo Callis, LGA Mutual Liability Scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.40am</td>
<td><strong>Don’t Fight Fire with Fire</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Bushfire Emergency &amp; Response (iResponda)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Country Fire Service &amp; Scott Loechel, LGA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.10pm</td>
<td><strong>Rebirth of the Valley of Eden</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Bush Fire Recovery</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mid Murray Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.30pm</td>
<td>Panel Q&amp;A Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.45pm</td>
<td>Sponsor Presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.50pm</td>
<td>Final outcomes from the 2014 Roads and Works Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>(including acknowledgements, prize draws and announcement of 2015 Conference Venue)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.10pm</td>
<td>Official Close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.15pm</td>
<td>Mayor Bruce Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.15pm</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Pre Conference Reception will be held on Wednesday 27 August at the Port Lincoln Yacht Club at 7.00pm.*

*The Official Conference Dinner will be held on Thursday 28 August at the Civic Hall at 6.30pm.*
18. LOCAL GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

18.1 Local Government Circulars

Brief
This report provides details a listing of current items under review by the Local Government Association.

RECOMMENDATION
It is recommended to Council that the Local Government Circulars report be received.

Discussion
The Local Government Association (LGA) distributes a weekly briefing on a range of matters affecting the general functions, administration and operations of councils through a 'General Circular'.

The indices attached for Members' information in this report are numbers 24 and 25.

Should Members require further information, they may contact the Chief Executive Officer's Secretariat. In some circumstances, it may then be appropriate for the Member to contact the relevant General Manager for more information.

The LGA Circulars are also available on the Members' Extranet.
### General Circulars

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachment</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24.6</td>
<td><strong>Council of the Future</strong> Workshop Consultation Paper&lt;br&gt;The LGA is currently consulting with Councils about the reforms and recommendations made within the Local Excellence Expert Panel (LEEP) final report on the Council of the Future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.4</td>
<td><strong>Review of the Codes of Conduct</strong>&lt;br&gt;The Minister for Local Government has written to the LGA stating that the Government is proposing to review the codes of conduct for Council Members and employees. The LGA is seeking feedback from Councils.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.1</td>
<td><strong>Draft Cadastre Reform National Strategy - Invitation to Comment</strong>&lt;br&gt;The Intergovernmental Committee on Surveying and Mapping is seeking Council input on a draft National Strategy on Cadastre Reform ‘Cadastre 2034: Powering Land and Real Property’. Comments are invited by 31 July 2014.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.3</td>
<td><strong>Emergency Management - Response Policy and Disaster Funding Inquiry</strong>&lt;br&gt;This Circular contains a model policy for Councils support to the emergency services during emergencies. A copy of the LGA Submission to the Productivity Commission Public Inquiry into Disaster Funding is also included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.7</td>
<td><strong>Guidelines for Sustainable Management of Community Recreation Facilities</strong>&lt;br&gt;Local Governments provide a wide range of recreation and sporting facilities, enjoyed by thousands of community groups and individuals. The LGA has now released Guidelines for the sustainable management of these facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.2</td>
<td><strong>Department of Social Services Grant Funding Applications</strong>&lt;br&gt;The Australian Government’s Department of Social Services invites applications for funding to deliver services and activities from 1 January 2015 under four key programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.5</td>
<td><strong>FINAL PROGRAM - Senior &amp; General Managers’ Residential Seminar - 10 &amp; 11 July 2014</strong>&lt;br&gt;The Senior and General Managers’ Residential Seminar will be held on 10 &amp; 11 July 2014 at the Crowne Plaza, Adelaide. Registration details and a copy of the program are included in this Circular.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Representatives on Outside Bodies Section

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Industrial Relations Section

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
## General Circulars

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25.3</td>
<td><strong>Mayors’ and Chairpersons’ Residential Seminar - 26 &amp; 26 July 2014</strong>&lt;br&gt;The LGA Education &amp; Training Service is holding the Mayors’ and Chairpersons’ Residential Seminar on Friday 25 and Saturday 26 July 2014 at the Intercontinental Adelaide. All Council Mayors and Chairpersons are encouraged to attend. Registration details and the program are contained in the Circular.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.1</td>
<td><strong>Registrations now open - 2014 LGA Roads and Works Conference</strong>&lt;br&gt;Registrations are now open for the 2014 LGA Roads and Works Conference. Program detail and further information can be found in this Circular.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.2</td>
<td><strong>Council Member Emails must be Captured as Council Records</strong>&lt;br&gt;The Ombudsman has recently released a report of an investigation into the City of Playford in which the issue of Council Members’ email correspondence formed part of the investigation. The Ombudsman found that some Members of the Council were not dealing with emails appropriately to ensure that the emails were captured by the Council’s records management system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.5</td>
<td><strong>SAVE THE DATE! Public Health and Community Wellbeing: Planning for the Future 24 July 2014 1-5pm</strong>&lt;br&gt;International public health and wellbeing expert and 2007 Adelaide Thinker in Residence, Professor Ilona Kickbusch will provide a keynote address on “The critical role of local government in public health planning and action—international experiences and trends” as part of a half day workshop.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Representatives on Outside Bodies Section

|   |   |   |
### Industrial Relations Section

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>25.4</th>
<th>Allocation of Tasks is not Bullying</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Fair Work Commission has warned employees who believe they are being bullied that they are not immune to normal expectations that they comply with workplace policies and practices.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
19. MEMBERS' BOOKSHELF

Nil

20. CORRESPONDENCE

20.1 Members' Information

20.1 Building Height Referral Regulations

Correspondence has been received from the Federal Member for Hindmarsh, Matt Williams MP, regarding the response he received from the Hon John Rau MP in relation to building height referral regulations adjacent to Adelaide Airport (Attachment 1).

RECOMMENDATION

That the correspondence be received.
05 Jun 2014

Mr Terry Buss
CEO
City of West Torrens
165 Sir Donald Bradman Drive
HILTON SA 5033

Dear Terry

I have received correspondence from the Hon John Rau MP, South Australian Minister for Planning in response to my letter to him regarding the building height referral regulations adjacent to Adelaide Airport.

Please find enclosed that letter. I am pleased to read that the South Australian Government is currently working with other state and territory and Commonwealth Governments on the resolution of this issue. I will continue to monitor the situation and follow up as necessary to ensure it is resolved as quickly as possible.

Yours sincerely

Matt

Matt Williams MP
Federal Member for Hindmarsh
The Hon John Rau MP

2 2 MAY 2014

Mr Matt Williams MP
Federal Member for Hindmarsh
2/ 670 Anzac Highway
GLENELG EAST SA 5045

Dear Mr Williams

Request for an amendment to Schedule 8 of the Development Act 1993 and Development Regulations 2008

I write in response to your letter about airport building height referral regulations adjacent to Adelaide Airport.

I understand that current referral requirements for Adelaide Airport, particularly in those areas identified as ‘Zone A’ in the West Torrens Development Plan, result in some unnecessary referrals to the Commonwealth Department of Infrastructure and Regional Development.

The South Australian Government, together with other State jurisdictions and the Commonwealth, is currently involved in the National Airport Safeguard Framework (NASF) project, which aims to establish consistent controls around airports to protect them from activities that might otherwise impact on their operation. Principles that will ensure this is achieved have already been agreed to, which the States are now implementing.

One of these principles seeks to ensure that intrusions into protected airspace are avoided. More recent mapping of Adelaide Airport’s Obstacle Limitation Surface (OLS) (i.e. controlled airspace) provides a more up to date and realistic reflection of the necessary height controls required for aircraft flight paths in relation to Adelaide Airport. The existing airport building height mapping in Overlay Map WeTo/1 in the West Torrens Council Development Plan does not reflect the more up-to-date OLS mapping. Achieving better alignment in the Development Plan with the current OLS, particularly in areas close to the airport, has been identified as an issue that needs to be considered as part of the implementation of NASF in South Australia.

Please note that the current building referral heights contained in the West Torrens Development Plan are also contained in the Civil Aviation (Buildings Control) Regulations 1988 and the Airports (Building Control) Regulations 1996. I am advised that the Commonwealth Regulations also need to be changed to achieve the desired outcome as these are the basis for the current mapping. The Department of Planning, Transport and...
Infrastructure (SA) will liaise with the Commonwealth Department as required to ensure this is implemented consistently.

Yours sincerely

John Rau
Deputy Premier
Minister for Planning

Att.: Overlay Map WoTo1
Overlay Map WeTo/1
DEVELOPMENT CONSTRAINTS
WEST TORRENS COUNCIL
Consolidated - 31 October 2013
21. CONFIDENTIAL

Nil
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1. MEETING OPENED

2. PRESENT

3. APOLOGIES

Council Members:
Cr Frances
Cr Scotcher

4. DISCLOSURE STATEMENTS

The following information should be considered by Committee Members prior to a meeting:

1. Consider Section 73 of the Local Government Act and determine whether they have a conflict of interest in any matter to be considered in this Agenda; and

2. Disclose these interests in accordance with the requirements of Sections 74 and 75 of the Local Government Act 1999.

The following disclosures of interest have been made in relation to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Elected Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

5. CONFIRMATION OF PREVIOUS MINUTES

RECOMMENDATION

That the Minutes of the meeting of the Urban Services Standing Committee held on 3 June 2014 be confirmed as a true and correct record.

6. COMMUNICATIONS BY THE CHAIRPERSON

7. QUESTIONS WITH NOTICE

Nil

8. QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

9. MOTIONS WITH NOTICE

Nil

10. MOTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE
11. URBAN SERVICES DIVISION REPORTS

11.1 Hardys Road Traffic Management

Brief
To provide Council with a report on the concerns raised by residents about traffic management in Hardys Road through a petition tabled at the Council meeting on 3 June 2014.

RECOMMENDATION(S)
It is recommended to Council that:

1. The proposed road closure at Hardys Road (south approach) to Ashley Street suggested by the petitioners not be adopted but that consideration be given to other traffic management measures that may be identified in the Underdale/Torrensville LATM study.

2. The head petitioner be advised of Council’s resolution accordingly.

Introduction
A petition was recently received by Council from a resident of Hardys Road and presented to the Council meeting of 3 June 2014. The petitioners requested that Hardys Road, between Ashley Street and Henley Beach Road, be reclassified as a "Local Street" and to remove the classification of Hardys Road as a "Social Access Route". The petitioners also requested Council to redirect current and future Hardys Road cut through traffic via Ashley Street and Holbrooks Road by blocking Hardys Road at the intersection of Ashley Street (similar to Stephens Avenue). The Council meeting resolved that a report be presented to the Urban Services Standing Committee meeting of 1 July 2014.

Discussion
Hardys Road is defined as a "major collector road" and "social access route" in the Council's Transport Plan. This is a higher order road than local streets because of its intended function to distribute traffic to the adjacent arterial roads. There are existing angled slow points and a roundabout in Hardys Road, between Henley Beach Road and Ashley Street. These devices have been present in the street for many years. The section of Hardys Road subject to this report is shown in Attachment 1.

In recent consultation undertaken as part of the Underdale/Torrensville LATM study (currently in progress), residents have expressed concerns about the volume of traffic, speed of traffic and safety at the intersection of Hardys Road/Ashley Street. Some residents have also previously expressed the view that the existing angled slow points are not effective in slowing traffic down.

The suggestion by petitioners to close Hardys Road at its southern approach to Ashley Street has been considered in detail by the Administration.

A traffic count undertaken by Council for Hardys Road in November 2011, between Ashley Street and Stuckey Avenue, showed that the street carried approximately 3,000 vehicles per day. The latest traffic count undertaken in June 2014 showed that the traffic volumes have reduced to approximately 2,650 vpd. This represents a reduction of approximately 10% in daily traffic volumes since 2011. A similar reduction in traffic volumes was also noted for Hardys Road near Henley Beach Road.

The latest traffic counts for Hardys Road, between Ashley Street and Stuckey Avenue, also show that the 85th percentile speed was 43.6 km/hr and the commercial traffic volume of approximately 4.0%.
Peak hour turning counts were undertaken at the intersection of Hardys Road/Ashley Street in September 2012 as part of the Underdale/Torrensville LATM study. The peak hour turning counts show that:

Inbound movements
- 50% turn right from Ashley St into the subject section of Hardys Rd;
- 30% travelled straight across from Hardys Rd north; and
- 20% turn left from Ashley St into the subject section of Hardys Rd.

Outbound
- 45% turn left from Hardys Rd to Ashley St;
- 45% travelled straight across to Hardys Rd north; and
- 10% turn right from Hardys Rd to Ashley St.

If Hardys Road is closed, as suggested by the petitioners, traffic would be diverted as follows:

- Stuckey Avenue - estimated increase of 1,550 vehicles per day.
- Sheriff Street, between Stuckey Avenue and Ashley Street - increase of 1,850 vpd.
- North Parade, between Hardys Road and Hayward Avenue - increase of 750 vpd.
- West St - increase of 750 vpd.

The traffic impact of a road closure would therefore be very significant for the adjacent streets. On this basis, a road closure is not supported.

The Underdale/Torrensville LATM study has reached the stage whereby the Administration is in the process of finalising which streets within the study area require traffic management treatment and, over the whole study area, how the treatment areas are to be prioritised. It is envisaged that for each street, a compilation of the range of treatments that could be applied to that particular street is also being prepared (to form the basis of future consultation with particular streets as part of an Implementation Strategy of the LATM). These options and the processes involved are currently being finalised to the stage where the matter would shortly be presented to the LATM Working Party and subsequently to the Council and community for consultation.

The subject section of Hardys Road has already been identified as a street requiring traffic management treatment in the current LATM study. The treatment, however, does not include a road closure, but other measures such as intersection treatments and upgrade of existing devices to make them more effective in reducing speeds for instance. Because a road closure is not appropriate from a traffic impact perspective, the functional classification of Hardys Road need not be reviewed. That is, further traffic management treatment may be implemented to address some of the concerns, such as reducing speeds and improving safety, without having to change or affect the classification of the street.

**Conclusion**

It is recommended that the petitioners be advised that Council is not in favour of a road closure in Hardys Road and that other traffic management treatment would be considered to address the concerns of speeding and safety as part of the current Underdale/Torrensville LATM study. The classification of the street would also not be changed.
11.2 West Beach Road Master Plan Stage 2 - Consultation Summary Report

Brief
To provide Council with the Stage 2 community consultation results on options for the West Beach Road Streetscape Master Plan.

RECOMMENDATION(S)
It is recommended to Council that:

1. The West Beach Road Streetscape Master Plan Stage 2 Summary Report be received and its contents noted.
2. Council continue to work with the relevant stakeholders (internal and external) including identifying potential future funding opportunities.
3. The residents be advised of the consultation outcomes accordingly.
4. A further report be presented to Council following consideration and further development by the respective project clients, ie the City of West Torrens, City of Charles Sturt, Adelaide Airport Limited and Adelaide Shores (West Beach Trust) and major stakeholders.

Introduction
A streetscape master plan for West Beach Road is currently being developed as part of a joint study by the City of West Torrens, City of Charles Sturt, Adelaide Airport Limited and Adelaide Shores (West Beach Trust). At the meeting of 15 April 2014, Council approved the undertaking of the Stage 2 consultation with the community. This report summarises the results of that consultation.

Background
The study is a master planning project to identify a preferred option for future upgrade and streetscaping of the road. Stage 1 of the consultation was undertaken in October 2013, during which the community's views about the current state of the road, the issues, concerns and ideas for improvement of the road and surrounds were obtained. Based on the information provided by the community, four options were then developed by the consultant.

Stage 2 of the community consultation on the four options was undertaken during June 2014.

The methodology for the Stage 2 consultation follows that undertaken for Stage 1, ie:

- Letterbox drop of nearby residences in both Council areas. (Approximately 200 surveys distributed within the City of West Torrens)
- Providing information on the Council websites.
- Conducting an onsite drop in session (Tuesday 10 June 2014).
- Providing feedback forms and display forms on the Council websites and during onsite consultation.
Discussion

The four options put forward for the Stage 2 consultation were:

Option 1 – Linemarking + Minor Landscaping (Estimated cost $0.5-1.0 million)
Option 2 – Bike Lane + Shared Path (Estimated cost $2-2.5 million)
Option 3 – Service Road (Estimated cost $4.5-6.0 million)
Option 4 – Divided Road with Central Median (Estimated cost $4.2-5.5 million)

Respondents were requested to rank the options from 1 to 4 with 1 being most preferred and 4 being least preferred. All of the preferences were then totalled. To help determine the preferred option, the rankings were then weighted. Each option was then allocated points and the option with the highest point score would then be the preferred option of the community.

Based on the above methodology, Options 3 and 4 were found to be very similar in the final point score, being 124.9 and 122 respectively. Option 3 is the most preferred.

The consultant also advised that there were a number of properties that submitted multiple survey forms (11 properties submitted two survey forms each and 1 property submitted 3 survey forms). Equitably, only 1 survey form per household should be analysed. If only 1 survey form was used for the analysis, the consultant has found that Options 3 and 4 would have point scores of 115.2 and 115.4 respectively. Option 4 is the most preferred.

Given the closeness of the point scores, it can be seen that Options 3 and 4 are the two preferred options. Both also have similar estimated costs, albeit Option 3 is marginally higher by 10%.

Options 1 and 2 have significantly lower point scores, i.e. they are the least preferred options of the community.

The Stage 2 Summary Report is provided under separate cover. The City of Charles Sturt has advised that this Summary Report would also be discussed with the Charles Sturt's West Beach Community Reference Group.

In the report to the Council meeting of 15 April 2014, the Administration advised that two conditions would also need to be met for any preferred option to be progressed further, ie:

1. The preferred option would need to be agreed to by all the respective clients for the project, ie the City of West Torrens, City of Charles Sturt, Adelaide Airport Limited and West Beach Trust.

2. If agreement is reached, implementation of the Streetscape Master Plan would be subject to each Council’s annual budgetary considerations and funding being successfully obtained from other sources.

While the consultation process to date has helped to identify the community's preferred option for the future upgrade and streetscaping of West Beach Road, there are other financial and technical considerations that would need to be taken into account as part of the overall process, which is not uncommon for road projects of this scale and cost magnitude. Like all major road projects, Council would need to arrive at a decision, based on balancing the community's views against the financial cost and technical implications.
Given that the consultation report has only recently been issued by the consultant, at this stage, the four client stakeholders, ie City of West Torrens, City of Charles Sturt, Adelaide Airport Limited and Adelaide Shores (West Beach Trust), have not had the opportunity to discuss the survey results or consider the financial and technical implications that are relevant for this assessment. As part of this process further work would be needed to evaluate the technical aspects of the proposals and seeking appropriate funding opportunities prior to a further report being prepared for Council.

Conclusion
It is recommended that the West Beach Road Streetscape Master Plan Stage 2 Summary Report be received and its contents noted and that the residents be advised of the consultation outcomes accordingly. It is also recommended that a further report be presented to Council following further consideration of the consultation results and technical evaluation by the respective client stakeholders and the sourcing of funding opportunities.
11.3 Establishment of a Dog Park on Westside Bikeway (Moss Ave, Marleston)

Brief
This report provides a summary of the results of the public consultation and seeks Council's approval to proceed with the development of the dog park on the Westside Bikeway at Moss Ave, Marleston.

RECOMMENDATION(S)
It is recommended that Council proceed with the development of the dog park on the Westside Bikeway located at Moss Ave, Marleston, with the scope of works based on the concept drawing provided to the community for consultation, and:

1. That funding in the amount $196,667 be transferred from Council Reserves into the 2014/15 Capital Works Program to undertake the project.

2. That new budget funding for the ongoing periodic maintenance of the dog park be referred to the September 2014 Budget Review process.

3. That the Administration be authorised to execute with the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure (DPTI) to extend/amend the existing licence agreement or enter into a new licence agreement for the Westside Bikeway (also known as the Old Glenelg Railway Reserve) to include 39 Broughton Ave, Kurralta Park.

Introduction
This report provides a summary of the results of the public consultation for the establishment of a dog park on the Westside Bikeway at Moss Ave, Marleston and seeks Council approval to proceed with the project.

Background
At its meeting on 4 March 2014, Council resolved the following:

1. The Administration undertake public consultation with interested parties and neighbouring properties located near the proposed location of the dog park in Moss Ave, Marleston.

2. The Administration be authorised to negotiate with the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure (DPTI) to extend/amend the existing licence agreement or enter into a new licence agreement for the Westside Bikeway (also known as the Old Glenelg Railway Reserve) to include 39 Broughton Ave, Kurralta Park.

3. A further report to be presented to Council following the period of public consultation.

A copy of the Council Report of 4 March 2014 providing detailed background information on the dog park project is contained in (Attachment 1).

Discussion
Consultation

On 6 May 2014, approximately 4,100 consultation letters, fact sheets and survey forms were distributed to residents and businesses in the areas of Kurralta Park, North Plympton and Marleston bounded by Richmond Rd, Marion Rd, South Rd and Anzac Hwy. A copy of the information distributed to residents is provided for information in (Attachment 2).
In addition to the distribution of correspondence to residents, an advertisement was placed in the Messenger Newspaper advising the wider community of the proposal and inviting them to complete the survey online. An article was also included in Council's publication 'Talking Points' (Autumn Edition) providing information on the project and a copy of the concept drawing.

The consultation period closed on 30 May 2014 and at that time a total of 327 responses had been received of which 230 were provided via the survey form, email or by letter and 97 responses via the online form on Council's website.

The results of the responses to the survey are summarised in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dog Park Concept At Moss Ave (Westside Bikeway)</th>
<th>Supported</th>
<th>Not Supported</th>
<th>Total Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Survey Form</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website (on-line)</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>307</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>327</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey Responses

Of the 327 responses received, 307 were in favour of the dog park and 20 not in favour of the dog park.

Comments and responses provided by those in favour of the dog park can be summarised as follows:
- Increase the size of the area for large and small dogs.
- Provide more dog agility equipment.
- Install shelters and furniture both within and external to the dog park and along the bikeway reserve.
- Install pedestrian lighting both within the dog park and along the bikeway.
- The dog park will be an improvement to this section of the bikeway which is currently unused.

The limited number of negative feedback from residents can be summarised as follows:
- Concerns with the increase in pedestrian/vehicular traffic and parking within the immediate areas of Moss Ave and Broughton Ave.
- The cost of delivering the project and ongoing maintenance of the dog park.

Some of the negative feedback was received from residents who reside near the proposed location of the dog park who had concerns with the amenity of the area. The proposed design will include some form of 'green' buffer to residents that face the dog park from Broughton Ave/Clifford Ave, Kurralta Park which could include planting established mature trees or alternatively, installing a green fence until less mature trees provide this screening.

As previously documented it is estimated there are approximately 50 to 70 on street car parking spaces in the immediate area within a suitable walking distance. Further consideration for additional off-street car parking (located within the bikeway reserve) may be considered in the future if there is a requirement.

A number of the other requests contained in the survey responses may be considered and accommodated in the future development of the dog park area and the bikeway. The current budget allows for the development of the area and the provision of some facilities for dog owners. As future budgets allow, the current concept for the dog park could be expanded to include other requests such as shelters and additional dog agility equipment.
Project Funding

The current project budget for the dog park concept is estimated at $196,667, (including overheads) and is required to be transferred from the Council Reserves into the Capital Works Budget.

In regard to the ongoing maintenance regime for the dog park, it has been estimated that the current concept would require two staff members (including plant/equipment/materials) to attend the site for approximately two to three hours twice a week. Ongoing maintenance of the dog park is additional to the current operational budget and is estimated at $38,000 per year.

Conclusion

This report provides a summary of the results of the public consultation into the establishment of a dog park on the Westside Bikeway at Moss Ave, Marleston and provides a recommendation to Council to proceed with construction of the dog park based on the concept provided at the Council Meeting on 4 March 2014.
11.2 Proposal for a Dog Park - Moss Ave, Marleston

Brief
This report provides updated information regarding a possible location for the establishment of a dog park on the Westside Bikeway at Moss Ave, Marleston.

RECOMMENDATION(S)
It is recommended to Council that:

1. The Administration undertake public consultation with interested parties and neighbouring properties located near the proposed location of the dog park in Moss Ave, Marleston.

2. The Administration be authorised to negotiate with the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure (DPTI) to extend/amend the existing licence agreement or enter into a new licence agreement for the Westside Bikeway (also known as the Old Glenelg Railway Reserve) to include 39 Broughton Ave, Kurralla Park.

3. A further report to be presented to Council following the period of public consultation.

Introduction
The Administration has continued to undertake further investigation into a possible location for the establishment of a dog park within our City. The Westside Bikeway (also known as the Old Glenelg Railway Reserve) at Moss Ave, Marleston has been identified as a suitable location and an initial concept design has now been developed for Council's consideration.

Background
To date a number of locations within the City of West Torrens have been explored for the possible establishment of a dog park. Each location has presented a number of factors which have proved to render them unsuitable for this purpose.

Council, at its meeting of 3 September 2013, considered a report proposing that the land located at Kitt Street Reserve, which lies on the western side of Tapleys Hill Road opposite the Adelaide Airport, may be suitable as a potential location for a dog park. At this meeting, Council resolved that:

'...The relevant public consultation to occur with adjoining residents and ratepayers in relation to this proposal...'

In the ensuing period, the land located on the Westside Bikeway at Moss Ave, Marleston was identified as a more suitable location and hence the public consultation on Kitt St Reserve has been deferred pending Council's decision on this alternative location.

Discussion
The proposed location for the establishment of a dog park is on the Westside Bikeway at Moss Ave, Marleston and 39 Broughton Ave, Kurralla Park, (Attachment 1).

Council currently has a licence agreement with DPTI for the area land known as the Westside Bikeway which expires on 30 June 2015. The proposal is to locate the dog park on this section of the Westside Bikeway land (along Moss Ave, Marleston) and the Commissioner of Highways land located at 39 Broughton Ave, Kurralla Park.
The land at 39 Broughton Ave is currently not included in the existing licence agreement however preliminary discussions have been held with DPTI and the land would be available to Council at no cost via an extension/amendment to the current licence agreement or the drawing up of a new licence agreement.

On the basis that the land at 39 Broughton Ave would be available to be used as a dog park together with the land currently licensed to Council, an initial concept land has been prepared for Council's consideration, (Attachment 2). The concept plan has been developed by a consultant who has provided concept work for the City of Adelaide. The proposed concept for a dedicated dog park provides for irrigated and dry land areas, with complementary recreational facilities and segregated areas for large and small dogs. The concept includes three points of entry for users of the dog park facilities.

This current proposal allows for no off street car parking. It is estimated that there are approximately 50 to 70 car parking spaces in the vicinity of the proposed dog park. Additional off street car parking spaces along the reserve area could be considered in the future depending on usage of the facility.

Funding for the project is available from Council's Budget Reserves in the amount of $92,000 to proceed with the works. Preliminary estimates for the current concept plans indicate that the total project cost would be $150,000 to $180,000. The final project budget and the future ongoing maintenance costs to the dog park must also be considered in any future budget discussions. This information will be provided in a future report along with the outcomes from public consultation.

Conclusion
An opportunity to provide a dedicated dog park within the linear park land known as the Westside Bikeway has been identified by the Administration. The current licence agreement with DPTI for this land will need to be varied to include the additional land in Broughton Ave. Should Council determine that it wishes to proceed with a dog park at this location, it would be necessary to undertake community consultation in regard to this proposal in accordance with Council policy.
6 May 2014

TO THE RESIDENT / RATEPAYER

Dear Sir/Madam

Proposed dog park consultation – Moss Avenue, Marleston

The City of West Torrens is seeking feedback on plans for a new dog park along the Westside Bikeway at Moss Ave, Marleston (map enclosed).

During the past few years Council has investigated a number of options for the establishment of a dog park within the city and this area has been identified as a possible option.

Fenced off-leash dog parks are becoming popular throughout the greater metropolitan area and are receiving positive reviews for the social, health and wellbeing benefits for dogs and their owners.

Council is seeking your feedback for the establishment of the dog park at the Moss Ave location.

Residents in the streets surrounding the proposed Moss Ave site have been sent this letter to ascertain their views on the proposed dog park.

A concept plan for the park has been enclosed along with a survey form and fact sheet.

A public notice will also be placed in the Messenger Newspaper advising residents of the public consultation period together with a public notification on the site.

To help us determine the views of the community on this proposal, please complete the survey and return it in the reply paid envelope provided. The survey can also be completed online at the Council’s website - westorrens.sa.gov.au, from the home page, click on the news item entitled 'Moss Ave dog park consultation'. Only one consultation reply per person will be accepted, either by email or post.

The closing date for consultation is Friday 30 May 2014 at 5pm.

On completion of the public consultation period, a further report will be provided to Council on the outcomes of the public consultation before any final decision is made on the establishment of a dog park.

Should you require further information on the proposed dog park, please contact Leigh Pedder on 8416 6301.

Yours sincerely

Dean Ottanelli
Manager City Works

Enc Dog park map, survey form, fact sheet & replied paid envelope
Cc Plympton Ward Councillors – Cr Mark Frances & Cr Arthur Mangos
Cc Keswick Ward Councillors – Cr Michael Farnden & Cr Helen Scothcher
Proposed dog park for Moss Avenue

The City of West Torrens has been preparing a concept plan for a dog park within the south west area of West Torrens.

The preparation of this concept plan has been in response to requests from the community for Council to establish a dog park within our city.

The site for the proposed dog park, along Westside Bikeway, is Moss Avenue, Marshall. This site was chosen following a lengthy evaluation of a number of other possible locations.

**Dog park concept**

The dog park would be set in a semi industrial area with minimum residential housing adjacent to it.

The area chosen currently has low levels of amenity and the proposed dog park has been designed to enhance the area for neighbouring residents. It also provides plenty of parking for dog park users.

The initial concept provides for irrigated and dry land areas and open areas as well as:
- dog agility equipment
- grassed lawn area for all dogs
- segregated area for smaller breeds
- dog wash down area
- sheltered seating.

The dog park would be fully enclosed to minimise disruption to pedestrians and cyclists using the Westside Bikeway.

**Feedback**

Before Council makes a final decision to establish the dog park on Moss Avenue, we would like further feedback. We have enclosed a short survey which you can complete and return in the reply paid envelope or, alternatively, you can complete the survey online at westtorrens.sa.gov.au.

Replies are required by 5pm on Friday 30 May 2014. Only one response per person will be accepted.

Once the public consultation period is completed, a detailed report will be presented to Council, after which a final decision will be made.

A copy of the concept plan can be viewed overleaf, or a more detailed version can be viewed in the Council offices, 165 Sir Donald Bradman Drive, Hilton, during office hours (8.30am - 5pm). It can also be accessed from our website, westtorrens.sa.gov.au.

**More information**

For more information contact Leigh Pedder on 8416 6301.
Survey

Dog park - Westside Bikeway
Moss Avenue, Marleston

This survey can also be completed online at www.westtorrens.sa.gov.au/dogpark

Personal details
This information must be completed if you wish your responses to be taken into consideration.

First name: 
Surname:
Address: 
Post code:

1. Do you support the proposed plan for a dog park on the Westside Bikeway at Moss Avenue Marleston?
   ☐ Yes      ☐ No
   If you have selected 'no', please provide reasons why you do not support the dog park.

2. Additional comments:

Please return the completed survey form in the reply paid envelope by 5pm on Friday 30 May. Only one response per person will be accepted.
11.4 Former Lockleys Kindergarten - Revocation of Community Land Classification

Brief
This report provides a summary of the responses received from interested persons following the public consultation process undertaken in regard to the proposal to revoke the Community Land status for the former Lockleys Kindergarten property at 14A Rowells Road, Lockleys.

RECOMMENDATION(S)
It is recommended to Council that:

1. The responses from parties having an interest in the proposal to revoke the Community Land Classification for the property known as the former Lockleys Kindergarten at 14A Rowells Road, Lockleys be received;

2. The comments provided by the Administration in relation to the submissions be noted; and

3. The Administration seek the approval of the Minister to revoke the Classification of Community land for the property.

Introduction
Members will be aware that, following concerns raised in regard to the significant trees on the site, the Lockleys Kindergarten ceased operation at the commencement of 2013. The Department of Education and Childhood Development (DECD) handed the property back to Council in June 2013, after removal of kindergarten property and the establishment of an alternate facility on the grounds of the Lockleys North Primary School.

At its meeting of 21 January 2014, Council endorsed the public consultation document for the possible revocation of the former Lockleys Kindergarten property at 14A Rowells Road, Lockleys and resolved (as follows) to proceed with the revocation process.

It is recommended to Council that approval be given for the Administration to commence the Revocation of Community Land Classification of the former Lockleys Kindergarten property at 14A Rowells Road Lockleys (formally described as Certificate of Title Register Volume 5516 Folio 851) and that the draft document attached, which constitutes the information that is required to be made available to the public as part of the public consultation phase (in accordance with Section 194 (2) of the Local Government Act 1999), be endorsed.

Discussion
In accordance with the resolution and Council's public consultation policy:
(a) Advertisements were placed in the Weekly Times and Messenger Guardian newspapers on 19 and 26 March 2014;
(b) Approximately 300 residential properties and business operating in the vicinity of the former kindergarten property were letterboxed;
(c) Information relating to the proposal was placed on Council's webpage from 18 March 2014 until the close of the public consultation period (close of business Thursday 17 April 2014); and
(d) A copy of the public consultation proposal was available for viewing at Council's customer service counter during the consultation period.

Three written submissions were received from interested parties during the consultation period. The submissions acknowledged that the functions associated with the former kindergarten have been relocated to other facilities.

Copies of the written submissions are attached (Attachments 1, 2 and 3).
The submission lodged by Ms Williams provides an historical recount of the possible gifting of land parcels by the Rowell family to other family members and acquaintances. The Administration does not question the accuracy of the information provided but does wish to advise that the validity of this information has not been confirmed (although searching of some historical records has been undertaken). More importantly, and as indicated in the documentation that was collated and made available in the public realm for the duration of the public consultation process, the parcel of land upon which the kindergarten operated was acquired by Council from the South Australian Housing Trust (SAHT) by way of reservation (subdivision of a larger parcel of land) i.e. Council’s acquisition of the property did not arise from a gifting of the land by the Rowell family but rather, as indicated above, via reservation from the SAHT. The revocation process seeks to negate that reservation.

The principal matters raised by Mr and Ms Johnston centre on the retention of the significant stand of trees, the capacity of Council to best manage that stand of trees and a desire that the land be used for an alternate community purpose.

With the exception of the actions of SA Power Networks (SAPN) and/or its contractors (in regard to necessary pruning works in accordance with its regulations) any potential tree damaging activity or contemplated removal of any, or all, of the stand of significant trees (by Council or any third party) would trigger a need for development approval to be obtained. This protection does, and will continue to, exist irrespective of whether or not Council continues to own the land. Further, the act of revocation of the community land status does not play a role in this regard.

Mr & Mrs Johnston also acknowledge that the land has been unavailable for use by the wider community for some considerable time, but suggest that the local area would benefit from use of the land as a park. Whilst this comment is noted, it is also necessary to acknowledge that Mellor Park (a reasonably significant reserve with an open/green space component - i.e. excluding built improvements and tennis courts - of some 10,240m² or thereabouts) is only 330 metres or so east of the former kindergarten property.

The submission lodged by Mr Offe also makes reference to possible detrimental impacts to the stand of significant trees should the land be sold. As intimated above there is no direct nexus between revocation of the community land status and possible/ eventual sale of the land, and possible damage to, or removal of, the stand of significant trees. Any proposed development of the site (including any initiatives that may be proposed which would be likely to impact the stand of significant trees) would require development consent.

**Conclusion**

A public consultation exercise, undertaken as part of the process to determine whether Council should further consider revoking the community land status of the former Lockleys Kindergarten property at 14A Rowells Road, Lockleys, resulted in the submission of three (3) responses from interested parties.

The responses seek retention of the land for use as a community park or an alternate community use (including possible retention of the building) and retention of the land as a mechanism to negate the likelihood or possibility of any, or all, of the stand of significant trees being removed.

The presence of the Mellor Park Reserve, which is a short distance from the former kindergarten site, would appear to provide suitable alternate open space. Further, any future use of the site which may impact the stand of significant trees would be subject to development consent.

It is the view of the Administration of Council that the concerns raised do not preclude the Council continuing with the revocation process.
ATTACHMENT 1

Mr. Watson,
Senior Property Assets Advisor,
City of West Torrens,
Hilton SA 5033

Dear Mr. Watson,

Re your letter regarding the former Kindergarten block at 14a, Rowells Road, Hackleys

I think your Council will need to look into the history of the late Colonel Rowell.

Colonel Rowell gifted a stretch of land on the eastern side of Rowells Road beginning at the corner of Annesley Street and finishing near Counter Avenue.

The first block on the corner was gifted to a Rowell relative who built his house on it. There was a farm of the back of it which belonged to a connection of Colonel Rowells and the farm had an outlet for their use into Rowells Road next to the Rowell House.

Next came the block gifted to the Lockleys Community on which the Kindergarten was built. Across Conlon Avenue was a block on the corner gifted to Mrs. Sharrold for exceptional services to the Rowell family. This block has later sold and a new house built on it.

As a new Kindergarten has been built on land where the Lockleys North Primary School stands and there is a Child Care Centre on the corner of Rowells Road and Herley Beach Road, this has covered the situation now.

I would like the Community Block of land to be made into a reserve, for the use of the community, to which it was gifted. The building could remain for the community to enjoy games, bowls or cards and the odd cup of coffee etc. The trees could remain and be examined for flaws such as white ants, dryness, rotting and the decision made to retain them or not.

I await with interest the decision when the Lockleys Community is fully aware of the situation.

Yours sincerely,
Iris Williams

City of West Torrens
Management Unit
City of West Torrens  
165 Sir Donald Bradman Drive  
Hilton SA 5033  

21 March 2014

We are writing in response to your letter dated 14 March 2014 from Steve Watson regarding the Council's resolve to proceed with revoking the Community Land classification for the former Lockleys Kindergarten.

We are extremely disappointed to read that the Local Government proposes to revoke this Community Land Classification.

The trees that surround the land have not only been deemed 'significant' by the council, but are also historically significant to the area, with some of the trees predating European settlement. Accordingly we believe it should be retained as Community Land.

We believe the land should be retained as its original purpose as a park. Although it may have been used by DECD for a significant period of time, this does not mitigate the fact that the local area would still benefit from use of this land as a park. Although the Council wishes to invest in a Community Hub, our family is unlikely to utilise this facility, but would utilise this land if converted to a park.

Obviously the large trees pose a risk of falling branches as recognised by the DECD, however we believe the Council with a team of gardeners and access to arborists for other parks is in a better position to ensure the safety of the trees and the public than any potential business or resident.

In addition the area is predominately residential, and any business using the land must not affect the feel of the local area.

We feel the significance of the trees and their history should ensure the land is made accessible to the community. This could be in the form of a park, a community centre, or a museum of the local area. The only other acceptable solution would be for the land to be deemed residential.

We are definitely against revoking the Community Land Classification.

Regards

Bridgid and Charlie Johnston
From: Jason & Vicki [Vame]
Sent: Monday, 14 April 2014 9:26:29 AM
To: Council Enquiries
Subject: Lockley's Preschool community title

To whom it may concern,
Regarding the title of the land on Rowells Rd., the land that had been the Lockley's Preschool, I believe this land should keep it's community title & that the council use the existing building or revert it back to open space. I believe selling the land will go against the council's Development Plan, eg, pg 81 (5. Land should not be divided or developed where the division or development would be likely to result in a substantial tree-damaging activity occurring to a significant tree.)

Jason Ofie
11.5 Kesmond Reserve - Former Jaguar Clubroom Building

Brief
This report provides Elected Members with an update on the current state of the former Jaguar Drivers’ Club clubroom building on Kesmond Reserve, Keswick.

RECOMMENDATION
It is recommended to Council that a development application be lodged by the Administration and that demolition of the former Jaguar Drivers’ Club building on the southern side of Kesmond Reserve occur subject to the grant of any necessary planning consents.

Introduction
The former Jaguar Drivers’ Club of South Australia clubroom building is sited on the western side of Kesmond Reserve. The reserve is bounded by Everard Avenue (to the south), Surrey Street (to the west) and Farnham Road (to the east) in Keswick (Attachment 1).

The clubroom building has remained unoccupied since the property was vacated by the Club on, or about, 21 February 2009.

The building is constructed of red brick, timber window and tiled roof circa 1945. It has an area of approximately 61m² and is disposed as two rooms and amenities. Due to the age of the building and its lack of occupancy there still remains some asbestos present within it.

The building was listed on the Local Heritage Register in 2008 as a result of its prior use as a Child Heath Centre. The listing criteria identified at the time were as follows:

- the building displays historical, economic or social themes that are of importance to the local area; and
- it has played an important part in the lives of local residents.

Discussion
The property review undertaken by the Administration and reported to Council in March 2007 recommended that:

‘That the Jaguar Drivers Clubrooms, Kesmond Reserve be demolished and reverted back to open space’.

Following consideration of the report, Council resolved to ‘defer the matter indefinitely’.

The building condition audit recently undertaken by Council's consultants has served to refocus attention on this property and identifies a number of issues with the building. The audit suggested an expenditure requirement (primarily maintenance backlog) in the order of $125,000 for the 2013 financial year and suggested a total expenditure of $344,000 over a 10 year period to bring the building up to fit for use standard, should retention of the building be contemplated. The audit further advised that ‘… it [the building] is in poor condition and … should be replaced, substantially refurbished, including removal of asbestos elements or demolished’.
As part of the cyclical valuation program, undertaken for financial reporting and other related matters, Council's valuers have recently determined that the valuation of the building for insurance purposes is $138,500. This valuation determines a current replacement cost of the building on a like-for-like basis as the building is listed on the heritage register and other costs associated with the rebuild. As is evident, the cost of replacement is marginally higher than the existing maintenance backlog and significantly less than the cost of upgrading and maintaining the property over the 10 year time period as determined by the building audit.

The small size of the building coupled with the poor quality of facilities available within it and consequently the very limited use it offers as well as the significant costs of maintaining and upgrading the building in comparison to its identified replacement cost, serve to confirm the consultant's advice and reinforce the opinion that the building should not be retained.

The cost of demolition and make good/conversion of the building footprint to green open space is in the order of $15,000.

Whilst this expenditure has been identified within the works program in the 2014/15 budget, the presence of the building on the Local Heritage Register may provide a possible impediment to any demolition of the building proceeding at this time. Nevertheless, an application for demolition of the building may still be lodged and determined. Given the issues identified above it is suggested that this course of action be undertaken.

In addition to any costs of demolition and make good of the building footprint area/conversion to open space etc, there will be a requirement to provide power to the existing barbecue facility which is currently powered from the former Jaguar clubroom building. This could be achieved by the use of a power take-off from the National Servicemen's building, which lies approximately 10 metres north of the Jaguar building.

**Conclusion**

The former Jaguar Drivers' Club building on Kesmond Reserve, Keswick has remained vacant since the club vacated the premises in February 2009. Although Council determined to indefinitely defer its decision in regard to this building as part of the 2006/07 property review process, the costs identified to bring the building up to standard and the limited use it offers should that expenditure be committed, suggests that demolition of the building should again be considered.
11.6 Urban Services Activities Report

**Brief**
To provide Elected Members with information on activities within the Urban Services Division.

**RECOMMENDATION**
It is recommended to Council that the Activities Report be received.

**Summary**
This report details the key activities of the City Assets and City Works Departments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Special Project Work</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mile End Cowandilla Airport Drainage</strong></td>
<td>All contracted Civil Works have been completed, with a few minor Civil Works variations and defects to be addressed in the coming month. All major works associated with the interface of the project with West Beach Road have also been completed, with landscaping of this area the only remaining major element of the Contract yet to be completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mile End Cowandilla Catchment (Rankine Rd)</strong></td>
<td>After post tender negotiation and clarification, Civil Works associated with this project have been awarded, with the contractor anticipated to commence on site at the end of July 2014. Funding for 50% of the Water Sensitive Urban Design elements of this project has recently been secured.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marshall Tce Rain Gardens</strong></td>
<td>Detailed design of these works is complete and works will be scheduled within the existing annual contracts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roebuck St Drainage Upgrade</strong></td>
<td>This project is incorporated with the Roebuck Street Road Reconstruction Project which commenced on 16/05/2014.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stormwater Trunk Drain - Brickworks Site</strong></td>
<td>The majority of the new drainage in association with this project has been completed. Connection of the system at the upstream end of the scope of works has been delayed due to programming of other site management schedules.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brown Hill / Keswick Creek Remediation Section: Upstream of Anzac Highway</strong></td>
<td>Approximately 75% of the original scope of works associated with this project has been completed. Existing site conditions and sourcing of materials has made the exact scoping of the project challenging. As such the scope of works has increased to provide appropriate protection to adjoining properties. These additional works are currently anticipated to be within budget, but will see the project completion extend into July/August 2014. Access to the site and progress on the project is also dependant on weather conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brown Hill and Keswick Creeks (Flood Mitigation)</strong></td>
<td>The project consultants are continuing with investigations to assist in the development of options for the creek capacity upgrade.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rutland Ave/May Tce Stormwater investigation project</strong></td>
<td>Modelling of mitigation options within this area is progressing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital Works Program</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Playground Upgrade 2013/14** | Tenders have closed from selected playground suppliers for the 2013/2014 program. Works are expected to commence shortly.  
The program for 2013/2014 includes:  
- Baroda Avenue Reserve, Netley;  
- Cross Terrace Reserve, Kurralta Park;  
- Errington Street Reserve, Plympton;  
- Golflands Reserve, Glenelg North;  
- Pacific Parade Reserve, West Beach;  
- Peake Gardens Reserve, Marleston;  
- Sandringham Reserve, (Kinkaid Ave), North Plympton;  
- Shephard Court Reserve, Novar Gardens. |

| **Reserve Developments - Various** | Construction works are underway on both the community gardens for Clifford St Reserve, Torrensville and the upgrade to the landscaping at Reedbeds Community Centre (Fitch Rd, Fulham). Expected completion of both projects is mid-July. |

| **River Torrens Linear Park – Pedestrian Lighting Project** | The installation of new LED pedestrian lights (stage 3, between Riverview Drive and Rowells Rd, Lockleys) has commenced with trenching for underground cables for the lights. Works are expected to be completed in July/August.  
Investigation and design has also commenced for the next stage (stage 4 and 5) of new pedestrian lighting between Rowells Rd and Henley Beach Rd. Works are planned for 2014/15 subject to the necessary budgetary approvals. |

| **Reserve Irrigation Upgrades 2013/14** | The 2013/14 Irrigation Upgrade program of works has commenced with the following reserves nominated/completed:  
- DCA Reserve, Beare Ave, Netley / Adelaide Airport – irrigation and minor landscaping works completed  
- Noble St Reserve, Lockleys – irrigation and minor landscaping works completed  
- Siesta Ave Reserve, West Beach – irrigation and minor landscaping works completed  
- Good St Reserve, Fulham – irrigation and minor landscaping works completed  
- Westside Bikeway, Plympton, (selected area) – irrigation and minor landscaping works completed  
- Ashburn Avenue Reserve (Coral Sea Road), Fulham (western end) – irrigation has been completed, with minor landscaping works underway on site. |

| **Urban Forest James Congdon Drive** | The tender period closed on 11 June, and tender submissions are currently being evaluated. Tender award is anticipated to be undertaken in the week beginning 23 June 2014 with works to commence in mid-July. |

| **Pocket Park Richmond Oval** | Tenders have been received and are currently being evaluated. Tender award is anticipated to be undertaken in the week beginning 23 June 2014 with works to commence in mid-July. |
### Deferred Capital Works

The following roads projects within the 2013/14 transport program have been placed on hold due to either rescoping of works, pending major development adjoining the road and major service utility installations/upgrades:

- Stirling Street (End to West Thebarton Rd)
- Winwood Street (Holland Street to End)
- Aldridge Terrace (Richmond Road to Lucknow Street)
- Elizabeth Avenue (Marion Road to Maynard Road)
- Holland Street (Anderson Street to Phillips Street)

### Road Reconstruction Program - 2013/14

- A contract for Brooker Terrace has been awarded with works to commence in early July 2014.
- Duncan Street Laneway, Lockleys - Design and documentation are nearing completion. The scope of project includes the construction of a detention tank and associated pumping system and the asphalt sealing of the laneway.
- Smith Street, Thebarton - Currently out for tender, with a closing date of 23 June.

**Works in Progress:**

- Gray Street, Kurralta Park. Scheduled for Practical Completion on 27 June.
- Roebuck Street reconstruction commenced on 16 May and is progressing.

### Kerb & Watertable Program - 2013/14 (completed)

The following streets on the 2013/14 Kerb and Watertable program of works have been completed:

- Filsell St, Thebarton
- James St, Thebarton
- Maria St, Thebarton
- Admella St, Thebarton
- Cawthorne St, Thebarton
- Neville Rd, Thebarton
- Danby St, Torrens ville
- Clifford St, Torrens ville
- Hayward Ave, Torrensville
- Howie Ave, Torrens ville
- Howard St, Underdale
- Kenneth Ave, Underdale

- Fern Ave, Lockleys
- Malrus Ave, Lockleys
- Myzantha St, Lockleys
- Cornwall St, Lockleys
- Graham Cres, Novar Gardens
- Marsh Crt, Novar Gardens
- Irwin Crt, Novar Gardens
- Thomson Crt, Novar Gardens
- Nagle Cres, Novar Gardens
- Creslin Tce, Camden Park
- Clifton St, Camden Park
- Audrey St, Novar Gardens
- Alkira Ave, Glenelg North
- Burrupa Ave, Glenelg North
- Iluka St, Novar Gardens
- Capri Ave, Novar Gardens
- Bonynthon Ave, Novar Gardens
- McLachlan Ave, Glenelg North
The following streets on the 2013/14 Kerb and Watertable program of works are scheduled for commencement or are underway:

- Henley Beach Rd, (Service Rd), Fulham
- Main St, Lockleys
- Chippendale Ave, Fulham
- Ayton Ave, Fulham
- Garfield Ave, Kurralta Park
- Beauchamp St, Kurralta Park
- Herbert Rd, Ashford
- Davenport Tce, Hilton
- Good St, Fulham
- Lowry St, Fulham
- Miami Ave, West Beach

The following streets on the 2013/14 Road Reseal program of works have been completed:

- Grey St, Mile End
- Claremont St, Mile End
- David Ct, Lockleys
- Barrow Cres, Lockleys
- Torrens St, Torrensville
- Miami Ave, West Beach
- Southern Ave, West Beach
- Admella St, Thebarton,
- Fashoda Ave, Camden Park
- Montgomery St, Netley
- Creslin Tce, Camden Park
- Clifton St, Camden Park
- Burrupa Ave, Glenelg North
- Coorilla Ave, Glenelg North
- Graham Cres, Novar Gardens
- Thomson Crt, Novar Gardens
- Marsh Crt, Novar Gardens
- Irwin Crt, Novar Gardens
- Montreal Ave, Novar Gardens
- Neville Rd, Thebarton
- Maria St, Thebarton
- Filsell St, Thebarton
- Errington St, Plympton
- Redin St, Richmond
- Bartholomew St, Richmond
- MacKay Ave, North Plympton
- Bonynthon Ave, Novar Gardens
- Kenneth Ave, Underdale
- Iluka Ave, Glenelg North
The remainder of the works program is currently scheduled for completion by 30 June 2014.

The Footpath works program for 2013/14 has commenced. The program for 2013/14 includes:

**Footpath Renewal Program**

- Ann Street, Thebarton (West Thebarton Road to end); - Completed
- Ballantyne Street, Thebarton (Dew Street to Brown Street);
- Bartholomew Street, Richmond (Lucas Street to Richmond Road);
- Birmingham Street, Mile End South (South Road to Pymbra Street);
- Brown Street, Thebarton (West Thebarton Road to Ballantyne Street);
- Deeds Road, North Plympton (Starr Avenue to Kinkaid Avenue);
- Everard Avenue, Keswick (Ashford Road to Kent Road);
- Goodenough Street, Mile End (James Congdon Drive to Parker Street);
- Henley Beach Road (various locations);
- Holland Street, Thebarton (end to Winwood Street);
- James Place, Lockleys (Henley Beach Road to end);
- John Street, Marleston (Sarah Street to South Road);
- Marion Road, Plympton (Anzac Highway to Lydia Street);
- Richmond Road, Richmond (Marlow Road to Croydon Road);
- Starr Avenue, North Plympton (Morpeth Road to Deeds Road).
### New Footpath Construction Program
- Allchurch Ave, North Plympton (Birdwood Tce to Park Tce) (Rex Jones Reserve);
- Arctic Ave, West Beach (Windsor Tce to Dennis Dr);
- Burbridge Rd, West Beach (Tapleys Hill Rd to Davis St) - Completed
- Charles Veale Dr, West Beach (Mountbatten Grove to Tapleys Hill Rd - north and south sides) - Completed
- Foreman St, West Beach (Davis St to end) - Completed
- Ingerson St, West Beach (Tapleys Hill Rd to Davis St) - Completed
- Kevin Ave, West Beach (Cambridge Ave to Northern Ave) - Completed
- Kitt St, West Beach (Ingerson St to Northern Ave) - Completed
- May Tce, Lockleys (Henley Beach Rd to Sir Donald Bradman Dr);
- Moorine Ave, Camden Park (Deeds Rd to Morphett Rd);
- Morphett Rd, Camden Park (Moorine Ave to Penong Ave);
- Northern Ave, West Beach (Kitt St to Baltic Ave) - completed
- Pacific Parade, West Beach (Southern Ave to Arctic Ave) - completed
- Southern Ave, West Beach (Flavel St to Kevin Ave) - completed
- Tapleys Hill Rd, West Beach (Charles Veale Dr to Ingerson St).

### Footbridge Rehab - Holland St
The Holland Street Bridge (Sir William Goodman Bridge) remediation works have been completed and the additional surrounding works at the approaches on the North and South of the bridge will be commencing shortly.

### Bridge Ancillary Works (see Audit)
The contractor has commenced works on the installation of the Frontage Road footbridge hand railing. Once completion of the Frontage Road footbridge deck surface is sealed, the contractor will then commence installation of the handrail (DDA Compliant) to the Torrens Avenue footbridge. Following on from the two footbridges, the contractor will proceed with upgrading the three (3) Railway Terrace footbridges.

### Bus Shelters
Council has received funding for two extra shelters to be installed this financial year. Bus shelter hardstands have been completed for the majority of the sites for this year and shelters will be installed in the next few weeks. Sites included in this year's allocation are:
- Stop 11A east side Sters Rd (awaiting civil works)
- Stop 13 west side Rowells Rd (awaiting civil works)
- Stop 3 south side George St
- Stop 17 west side St Andrews Crescent (awaiting civil works)
- Stop 12 north side Pierson St (awaiting civil works)
- Stop 12 south side Moorine Ave (awaiting civil works)
- Stop 14A south side Stonehouse Ave
- Stop 4A west side South Rd (awaiting consultation)
- Stop 21 north side Henley Beach Rd (awaiting consultation, relocation and civil works).

### BioScience Precinct Works
Development of concepts and engagement with stakeholders are continuing. An area wide stormwater study is also being undertaken.

### Parking and Traffic Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parking - London Road Mile End South</th>
<th>Business requested time limit parking installed for customer access.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control (previous) - unrestricted</td>
<td>Control (new) - 2P 7am - 5pm Mon - Fri. (32m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galway Avenue North Plympton</td>
<td>Business requested time limit parking installed for customer access. Control (previous) - unrestricted Control (new) - 1/2P 7am - 5pm Mon - Fri. (31m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Beach Road West Beach</td>
<td>Traffic impact statement and plans completed to formalise the relocation of the bus stop to the new indented stopping area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortimer Street Kurralta Park</td>
<td>Survey of businesses underway following a request for the installation of time limited parking fronting the businesses at 41 - 47 Mortimer Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeanie Street, Mabel Terrace and Salisbury Terrace Camden Park</td>
<td>Survey of residents on the removal of the &quot;Race Days&quot; parking controls completed. Residents voted 15:2 for removal of the restrictions. As racegoers can no longer access Morphettville Racecourse directly from these streets, parking demand has decreased and the parking controls are not necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Management</td>
<td>The Road Safety Group will be progressing with the Mock Crash this year to be held on the tentative date of Thursday 25 September. Four schools have expressed interest in the event totalling almost 500 students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Management Schemes</td>
<td>A further meeting with the Developer of the land situated at 105 Hardys Road, Underdale (adjacent the Linear Park shared path) has occurred and negotiations are continuing. It is anticipated that a resolution will be forthcoming in the coming month. Funding has been received from the State Bicycle Fund to upgrade the crossing facilities along the Westside Bikeway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Lighting</td>
<td>Awaiting confirmation on grant application submitted by the City of Marion on behalf of Council for Mike Turtur Shared Path along Glengyle Tce.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Thebarton Rd</td>
<td>Confirmation letter sent to Power Line Environment Committee (PLEC) regarding Council's funding commitment to project and awaiting advice from PLEC regarding submission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Rd / Ashwin Pde Upgrade</td>
<td>Minor works have commenced in the way of service relocation and installation of common service trench.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Beach Rd West Beach</td>
<td>The second round of Community Consultation closed on 13 June 2014. A summary report on the second stage of the community consultation is provided in this Agenda.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torrensville / Thebarton / Underdale LATM</td>
<td>Development of solutions paper is almost complete.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reid St Permit</td>
<td>Confirmation is being sought from the University of Adelaide re their agreement to the terms and conditions of the proposed new permit agreement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weigall Oval</td>
<td>Feedback from the lessee/licensee stakeholders session held on 20 May 2014 has been included within the &quot;final draft&quot; Masterplan document which is currently being reviewed. Consideration is also being given to award the public consultation phase of the project to a consultant.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lockleys Oval
Preparation of a consultant brief for the development of Master Plan / design works etc has been completed and a Request For Quotations has been issued for tender.

Camden Hall - Carlisle St
The project to install DDA toilet facilities in the building has commenced with an expected completion in July.

Lockleys Kindy Site
Community consultation has occurred regarding the proposed revocation of Community Land classification for the property. A report is currently being prepared for Council's consideration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civil and General Maintenance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Concrete &amp; Asphalt Footpath/Dr Crossover</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Road Repairs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Line marking</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kerbing &amp; Watertable/Inverts</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Graffiti Removal</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Signage</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drainage and Cleansing Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Side Entry Pit Cleaning (SEP)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>St Sweeping</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pump Station inspections</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Illegal rubbish dumping</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Road Sweepers</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Horticulture Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monthly Update</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trees Pruned</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Removals</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weed Control (Reserves, Verges, Traffic Islands)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. MEETING OPENED

2. PRESENT

3. APOLOGIES

Council Members:
Cr Frances
Cr Scotcher

4. DISCLOSURE STATEMENTS

The following information should be considered by Committee Members prior to a meeting:

1. Consider Section 73 of the Local Government Act and determine whether they have a conflict of interest in any matter to be considered in this Agenda; and
2. Disclose these interests in accordance with the requirements of Sections 74 and 75 of the Local Government Act 1999.

The following disclosures of interest have been made in relation to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Elected Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

5. CONFIRMATION OF PREVIOUS MINUTES

RECOMMENDATION
That the Minutes of the meeting of the Governance Standing Committee held on 3 June 2014 be confirmed as a true and correct record.

6. COMMUNICATIONS BY THE CHAIRPERSON

7. QUESTIONS WITH NOTICE

Nil

8. QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

9. MOTIONS WITH NOTICE

Nil

10. MOTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE
11. GOVERNANCE REPORTS

11.1 Elections Period Caretaker Policy - Review

Brief
The Elections Period Caretaker Policy has been reviewed and, following endorsement by the Policy, Planning and Performance Committee, is presented to Council for approval.

RECOMMENDATION
It is recommended to Council that the revised Elections Period Caretaker Policy be approved.

Introduction
The Elections Period Caretaker Policy (Attachment 1) was last reviewed in March 2010 and has been reviewed in line with the requirements of s91A of the Local Government (Elections) Act 1999.

The Elections Period Caretaker Policy (the Policy) was presented to the 24 June 2014 meeting of the Policy, Planning and Performance Committee which resolved the following:

‘That the Policy, Planning and Performance Committee recommends to Council that the revised Elections Period Caretaker Policy be approved.’

As this is a statutory policy, it requires direct consideration and approval by Council rather than via the approval of the minutes of the Policy, Planning and Performance Committee so is presented to Council accordingly.

Discussion
The review of this Policy has been conducted by the General Manager Organisational Support and Governance to ensure the information within the policy reflects current practice and current requirements in relation to the:

- Local Government Act 1999;
- Local Government (Elections) Act 1999;
- Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935;
- Independent Commissioner Against Corruption (ICAC) Act 2012;
- Directions and Guidelines for Public Authorities and Public Officers (ICAC)
- Code of Conduct for Council Members;
- Code of Conduct for Council Employees; and
- Associated legislation/regulations.

The review resulted in the following main changes to the policy:

- Updated Preamble, Purpose and Scope
- Inclusion of definitions for Campaign Material, Caretaker Mode, Council Contact Officer, Council Liaison Officers, CWT Employee, ECSA, ICAC, Office of the Public Integrity (OPI) and Returning Officer.
- Inclusion of the obligations of the mandatory Code of Conduct, ICAC Act and Directions and Guidelines for Public Authorities and Public Officers within the following areas:
  - Designated Decisions in relation to s91A of the Local Government (Elections) Act 1999
  - Publications during a Caretaker Period
- Mandatory Public Consultation
- Council Resources relating to expenses incurred by Elected Members, Council Equipment and Infrastructure and CWT Employees
- Media and Communications in relation to media advice, Elected Members and CWT Employees
- Schedule 1 - Table of Major Policy Decisions in relating to restricted proposed decisions and who the decision would impact.

Due to the extent of this policy review, track changes have not been used. The draft policy is provided in Attachment 2 for further reference.

The Caretaker Period for the 2014 local government general elections will commence at 12 noon on Tuesday 16 September 2014 until 5pm on Friday 7 November 2014.

Conclusion
The revised Elections Period Caretaker Policy (Attachment 2) is presented for Council's approval.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification:</th>
<th>Council Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy Number:</td>
<td>CPP.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Issued:</td>
<td>October 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dates of Review:</td>
<td>3 March 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Version Number:</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DW Doc set ID:</td>
<td>1316669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next Review Due:</td>
<td>November 2011 (within 12 months of a periodic election)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicable Legislation:</td>
<td>- Local Government Act 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Local Government (Elections) Act 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Local Government (Elections) Regulations 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related Policies or Corporate Documents:</td>
<td>- Code of Conduct for Council (Elected) Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Code of Conduct for Council Employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Delegations Process Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Purchasing, Tendering, Sale and Disposal of Assets Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Elected Members Attendance at Conferences Council Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associated Forms:</td>
<td>See LGA Model Caretaker Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Manager:</td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmed by General Manager:</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved by Executive:</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table of Contents

1. Preamble .......................................................................................................................... 3  
2. Purpose ........................................................................................................................... 3  
3. Scope .................................................................................................................................. 3  
4. Definitions ........................................................................................................................ 4  
5. Policy Statement .............................................................................................................. 6
COUNCIL POLICY - Elections Period Caretaker Policy

1. Preamble

1.1 During a Caretaker Period, Council will be required to assume a "caretaker mode", avoiding actions and decisions which could be perceived as influencing voters or having significant impact on the incoming Council.

1.2 During the Caretaker Period, the City of West Torrens (CWT) as a whole will continue to provide the same level of services to (and for) the community.

1.3 During the Caretaker Period, the Council, as an elected body will continue to fulfil its responsibilities, with each Councillor meeting their commitment for the full term of their appointment as an Elected Member.

2. Purpose

2.1 This policy meets the statutory requirements under Section 57 of the Local Government Act 1999 and the requirements under Section 81A of the Local Government (Elections) Act 1999 and related legislation.

2.2 This policy aims to provide a clear approach regarding ongoing Council business operations and responsibilities during a Caretaker Period.

2.3 This policy provides a robust set of principles within which Elected Members and Council employees are expected to make sound judgements based on the circumstances of the particular situation.

2.4 This policy has been designed to implement a set of standards that are generally regarded as necessary for the promotion of transparent and accountable government during Caretaker Periods. It has been developed to ensure that:

2.4.1 The elections are conducted in a manner that is ethical, fair and equitable and is publicly perceived as such.

2.4.2 The incumbent Council does not inappropriately make decisions that will be binding on an incoming Council and limit its freedom.

2.4.3 The day to day business of the Council continues efficiently and in a normal manner.

2.4.4 Council resources are not diverted for, or influenced by, electoral purposes or used to improperly advantage existing Elected Members as candidates in the election.

2.4.5 Council employees act impartially in relation to all candidates.

3. Scope

3.1 The policy applies for the duration of the Caretaker Period to Council, Elected Members, electoral candidates, independent audit committee members and employees of the City of West Torrens.

3.2 This policy is to be taken to form a part of the relevant Codes of Conduct.
3.3 This policy applies to decisions of Council, a Committee of Council, or a Delegate of Council.

3.4 Consideration must be given to the magnitude and significance of any decision that is to be made prior to the exercise of a delegated power. (See Major Policy Decisions Table for further clarification)

3.5 This policy covers:

3.5.1 Decisions that are made by Council;
3.5.2 Materials published by Council;
3.5.3 Attendance and participation in functions and events;
3.5.4 Nomination to Boards or Committees;
3.5.5 Use of Council resources;
3.5.6 Access to Council information;
3.5.7 Media services issues, and;
3.5.8 Public Consultation processes

3.6 This policy only applies to actual decisions made during a Caretaker Period, not the announcement of decisions made prior to the Caretaker Period. While announcement of earlier decisions may be made during a Caretaker Period, as far as practicable any such announcements should be made before the Caretaker Period begins.

3.7 This policy does not apply to statutory requirements or matters required by law (for example, the production of the Annual Report and matters that are required to be reviewed pursuant to the Development Act, etc).

4. Definitions

4.1 Candidate

Any person (including a current Elected Member) who has lodged a valid nomination for the purpose of a forthcoming Local Government periodic or general election (the election) with the Electoral Commission of South Australia.

4.2 Caretaker Period

The Caretaker Period commences on the day of the close of nominations for the election. The Caretaker Period terminates at the 'conclusion of the election' as defined in Section 4(2) of the Local Government Act 1999 for the relevant periodic or general election being the time at which the last result of the election is certified by the returning officer.

4.3 Designated Decision

Designated decision is defined in the Local Government (Elections) Act 1999 and means any decision –

4.3.1 Relating to the employment or remuneration of a Chief Executive Officer, other than a decision to appoint an Acting Chief Executive Officer; or

4.3.2 To terminate the appointment of a Chief Executive Officer; or
4.3.3 To enter into a contract (other than a Prescribed Contract), arrangement or understanding, the total value of which exceeds whichever is the greater of $100,000 or 1% of the Council’s revenue for rates in the preceding financial year; (See Purchasing, Tendering, Sale and Disposal of Assets Policy)

4.3.4 Allowing the use of council resources for the advantage of a particular candidate or group of candidates (other than a decision that allows the equal use of council resources by all candidates for election).

4.4 Prescribed Contract

Prescribed contract means a contract entered into by Council for the purpose of undertaking –

4.4.1 Road construction or maintenance; or

4.4.2 Drainage works.

4.5 Major Policy Decision

A Major Policy Decision is any decision which has a significant impact on the ‘normal’ operations of council.

See Schedule 1 for the Major Policy Decisions Table for further details and examples. A Major Policy Decision is not limited to this list.

4.6 Council Resources

For the purposes of this policy, Council Resources relates to (but is not limited to) staff, support staff, volunteers, hospitality services including venue and function facilities, equipment, machinery, electronic facilities, photographs and stationery.

4.7 Electoral Material

Electoral Material refers to materials that are calculated, intended or likely to affect voting in an election.

4.7.1 Material will be considered electoral material if it contains an express or implicit reference to, or comment on, the election, a candidate, or an issue which has been raised with voters in connection to the election.

4.7.2 Material produced by Council relating to the election process by way of information, education or publicity, or materials produced by, or on behalf of, the returning officer for the purposes of conducting an election will not be considered electoral material.

4.8 Events and Functions

Events and Functions are gatherings of internal and external stakeholders to discuss, review, acknowledge, communicate, celebrate or promote a program, strategy or issue which is of relevance to the City and its stakeholders and may take the form of conferences, workshops, forums, launches, promotional activities or social occasions such as dinners, receptions and balls.

4.9 Public Consultation

For the purposes of this policy, public consultation means the process of inviting public comment on a proposed action, decision or issue.
4.10 **Elected Members**

For the purposes of this policy, Elected Members means the Mayor and Councillors of the City of West Torrens.

4.11 **Chief Executive Officer**

Chief Executive Officer (CEO) includes any person acting in that capacity.

5. **Policy Statement**

5.1 **Initiating Caretaker Period**

5.1.1 **Role of the Chief Executive Officer in Implementing the Caretaker Mode**

5.1.1.1 The caretaker mode commences at the beginning of the Caretaker Period.

5.1.1.2 The CEO will ensure, as far as possible, the provision of 30 days advance notice to the Elected Members, independent Members of Council Committees, Council staff and the public of the beginning date of this period.

5.1.1.3 The CEO will provide guidelines for all relevant staff on the role and responsibilities of staff in the implementation of this policy.

5.1.1.4 The CEO will endeavour to ensure that all announcements regarding decisions made by the Council, prior to the Caretaker Period, are publicised prior to the Caretaker Period.

5.2 **Policy Decisions**

5.2.1 **Designated Decisions**

5.2.1.1 A designated decision made by Council in contravention of this policy is invalid, except where an exemption has been granted by the Minister.

5.2.1.2 Any person who suffers loss or damage as a result of acting in good faith on a designated decision made by Council in contravention of this policy is entitled to compensation from the Council for that loss or damage.

5.2.2 **Extraordinary Circumstances Requiring Exemption**

5.2.2.1 Should Council determine that there are extraordinary circumstances which require the making of a designated decision during the Caretaker Period, it must apply in writing to the Minister for an exemption.

5.2.2.2 An application for Ministerial exemption may only be made by resolution of Council.

5.2.2.3 Should the Minister be satisfied that there are extraordinary circumstances, the Minister may grant an exemption subject to any conditions or limitations that the Minister considers are appropriate.
5.2.3 Scheduling Consideration of Major Policy Decisions

5.2.3.1 So far as is reasonably practicable, the CEO should avoid scheduling major policy decisions for consideration during a Caretaker Period and instead, ensure that such decisions are either:

a) Considered by Council prior to the Caretaker Period and beginning of caretaker mode.

b) Scheduled for determination by the incoming Council.

5.2.3.2 Any person who is unsure whether a particular decision falls within the operation of this clause should consult the CEO.

5.2.3.3 All items listed for consideration by the Council through agendas prepared during the Caretaker Period will be assessed by the CEO for compliance with this policy.

5.2.4 Major Policy Decisions during Caretaker Period

5.2.4.1 The table of policy decisions or exercise of delegated powers at Schedule 1 outlines those decisions or activities which are expressly restricted by this policy, the Local Government Act 1999 and/or the Local Government (Elections) Act 1999.

5.2.5 Considerations for the Chief Executive Officer in Granting Approval

5.2.5.1 Where the CEO has discretionary approval under this policy, which is not expressly prohibited by Section 5.1.2, the CEO should have regard to all of the circumstances when deciding to approve it or not, including, but not limited to:

- Whether the decision is ‘significant’;
- The urgency of the issue;
- The possibility of financial repercussions if it is deferred;
- The nature of the decision;
  - Will it be controversial?
  - Will it provoke considerable public interest?
- Will it provoke considerable media attention?
- The best interests of the Council and the City of West Torrens.

5.2.6 Appointment or Removal of Chief Executive Officer

5.2.6.1 Whilst Section 5.2.4 establishes that a Chief Executive Officer may not be appointed or dismissed during a Caretaker Period, in the case of an emergency, Council may act to appoint an Acting Chief Executive Officer or suspend the current Chief Executive Officer, pending the election, after which date a permanent decision can be made.

5.3 Council Publications during the Caretaker Period

5.3.1 Prohibition on Publishing Certain Material during Caretaker Period

5.3.1.1 The Council must not print, publish or distribute, or cause, permit, or authorise others to print, publish or distribute on behalf of Council any advertisement, handbill, pamphlet or notice that contains electoral material during the Caretaker Period.
5.3.2 Council Publications

5.3.2.1 Council publicity and communications will be restricted to promoting normal Council activities and services and for informing residents about the conduct of the election.

5.3.2.2 Council publications produced before a Caretaker Period containing material which may be construed as electoral material are not to be circulated or displayed during the Caretaker Period, however, they may be made available to members of the public on request.

5.3.2.3 Council is required by Section 131 of the Local Government Act 1999 to prepare, adopt and publish a copy of its Annual Report before November 30 of each year. The Annual Report will not contain material that could be regarded as overt electioneering or that inappropriately promotes individual Elected Members.

5.3.3 Council Website

5.3.3.1 During a Caretaker Period new material which is precluded by this policy will not be placed on the Council website.

5.3.3.2 Any information which refers to the election will relate to the election process by way of information, education or publicity.

5.3.3.3 Information about Elected Members will be restricted to names, contact details, titles and their membership on Council Committee(s) or other bodies as a Council representative.

5.4 Public Consultation during the Caretaker Period

5.4.1 Prohibition

5.4.1.1 It is prohibited to undertake public consultation during the Caretaker Period (either new consultation or continue an existing consultation process) which relates to a topical or contentious issue without the prior approval of the CEO.

5.4.1.2 This policy does not prevent any of the mandatory public consultation requirements under the Local Government Act 1999 or other Acts affecting Local Government (for example the Development Act, 1993).

5.4.2 Approved Public Consultation

If the CEO has provided approval for public consultation:

5.4.2.1 The result of that consultation will not be reported to Council until after the completion of the Caretaker Period.
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5.4.2.2 Approved consultations will avoid express or implicit links to the election.

5.4.2.3 The CEO reserves the right to postpone a consultation if he/she comes to the view that the issue may affect voting.

5.5 Elected Member Attendance at Events and Functions during the Caretaker Period

5.5.1 Events Staged by External Bodies

5.5.1.1 Elected Members may continue to attend events and functions staged by external bodies during a Caretaker Period. (see Elected Members Attendance at Conferences Council Policy)

5.5.1.2 Elected Members appointed to community groups, advisory groups and other external organisations as representatives of the City of West Torrens shall not use their attendance at meetings of such groups to either recruit assistance with electoral campaigning or to promote their personal or other candidate electoral campaigns.

5.5.1.3 As a matter of policy position, Elected Members should not participate in any interstate or overseas travel for the duration of the Caretaker Period. However, Council may approve the attendance of the Mayor (or proxy) to represent Council on a delegation or forum or similar event if circumstances so warrant.

5.5.1.4 Unless there is a requirement of Council to do so, Elected Members will not be appointed to positions on external bodies or authorities during the Caretaker Period.

5.5.2 Council Events and Functions

5.5.2.1 Council events and functions held during the Caretaker Period will be reduced to only those essential to the operation of the Council. These events and functions should not in any way be associated with any issues considered topical or relevant to the election.

5.5.2.2 All known candidates are to be invited to Council organised events and functions during the Caretaker Period.

5.5.2.3 Community meetings will not be organised by Council during a Caretaker Period.

5.5.3 Addresses by Elected Members

5.5.3.1 Elected Members may continue to make speeches at events staged by external bodies during the Caretaker Period, however, the speech must not have any political reference which may be construed as giving a sitting Member any advantage.

5.5.3.2 Elected Members who are also candidates may not give speeches or keynote addresses at Council organised or sponsored events and functions during a Caretaker Period. Elected Members may make short welcome speeches at events or functions organised or sponsored by the City during the Caretaker Period.
5.5.4 Publication of Promotional Material

5.5.4.1 In preparing any material concerning a Council organised or sponsored function or event which will be published or distributed during the Caretaker Period, such preparation must be consistent with Clause 5.3 of this policy.

5.6 Council Resources

5.6.1 General

5.6.1.1 Council resources may not be used to assist any candidate for electoral purposes during the Caretaker Period.

5.6.1.2 The Administration will ensure due propriety is observed in the use of all Council resources, and Council staff are required to exercise appropriate discretion in that regard.

5.6.1.3 In circumstances where the use of Council resources might be construed as being related to a candidate’s election campaign, such use must be referred to the CEO for approval.

5.6.1.4 Elected Members must not, in any way, exert undue influence over the timing of works or the delivery of Council services that may result in political gain for electoral purposes.

5.6.1.5 Section 62(b) of the Local Government Act 1999 prescribes serious penalties for any Elected Member who inappropriately makes use of their position or information obtained in the role of an Elected Member to gain advantage.

5.6.2 Expenses Incurred by Elected Members

5.6.2.1 Reimbursement (or payment) of Elected Member expenses during the Caretaker Period will only apply to those costs that have been incurred in the performance of normal Council duties under the approval of the CEO.

5.6.2.2 Reimbursement will not be available for expenses that could be perceived as supporting or being connected with a candidate’s election campaign.

5.6.3 Council Branding and Stationery

5.6.3.1 Council logos, letterheads, or other City of West Torrens branding may not be used for, or linked in any way, to a candidate’s election campaign.

5.6.3.2 Elected Members should ensure that their Council business cards are used only for purposes associated with the normal role of an Elected Member in servicing their electorate. Elected Member business cards may not be used in a manner that could be perceived as an electoral purpose.

5.6.3.3 Elected Members should ensure that any publications bearing their name will not include the position title, i.e. Cr John Smith. Preferred use would be John Smith, Councillor for the City of West Torrens.
5.6.4 Council Equipment and Infrastructure

5.6.4.1 Council equipment and infrastructure, including the use of photocopiers, stationery or computer equipment, are not to be used for any election campaign activities.

5.6.4.2 Where Elected Members have Council funded services, such as mobile phones, land lines, and internet connections, and where it is impractical for Elected Members to discontinue their use of these during the election, Elected Members will reimburse the Council for usage of those services during the Caretaker Period when it exceeds their normal usage levels.

5.6.5 Employees and Support Staff

5.6.5.1 Council staff will continue to provide their normal level of support to the Mayor and Elected Members during this time.

5.6.5.2 Council staff, including in their private capacity, must not be asked to undertake any tasks directly or indirectly connected to an election campaign. Any involvement will be considered a breach of the Code of Conduct for Council Employees.

5.6.6 Correspondence

5.6.6.1 General correspondence addressed to Elected Members will be answered in the usual manner. However, Elected Members will sign only the necessary minimum of correspondence during a Caretaker Period.

5.6.6.2 Correspondence in relation to significant, sensitive or controversial matters should be signed by the CEO. Replies will be prepared in a manner to protect Council from any perceptions of political bias.

5.7 Access to Council Information

5.7.1 Information and Briefing Materials

5.7.1.1 All candidates may have access to any information that is on the public record and can be provided within reasonable staff resource limits.

5.7.1.2 Elected Members retain their statutory right to access Council information relevant to the performance of their function as Elected Members. However, this access to information should be exercised with caution and be limited to matters that the Council has under active consideration.

5.7.1.3 Any information that the Council holds must not be used for election purposes. Any improper use will be considered a breach of the Code of Conduct for Council (Elected) Members and may be a breach of Section 92(9) of the Local Government Act 1999.

5.7.2 Information Request Register

5.7.2.1 An Information Request Register will be maintained by the Manager Governance during the Caretaker Period. This register will be a public
document that records all the requests for information made by candidates, and the response given to those requests, during the Caretaker Period.

5.7.2.2 If information requests are made from candidates directly to a staff member, the staff member will advise the candidate that they will transfer the request to the Chief Executive Officer at their earliest convenience.

5.7.2.3 Any requests for information not on the public record, or which require excessive use of staff resources, will be managed using the principles from the Freedom of Information Act 1991.

5.8 Media and Communications

5.8.1 Media Advice

5.8.1.1 Council’s Communications Team are intended to promote Council activity or initiatives and must not be used in any manner that might favour a candidate during a Caretaker Period.

5.8.1.2 Media advice will not be provided in relation to election issues or in regard to publicity that involves individual Elected Members.

5.8.1.3 Any requests for media advice or assistance from Elected Members during the Caretaker Period will be referred to the CEO. If satisfied that advice sought by an Elected Member during the Caretaker Period does not relate to the election of publicity involving any specific Elected Member(s), the CEO may authorise the provision of a response to such a request.

5.8.2 Media Releases / Spokespersons

5.8.2.1 Where it is necessary to identify a spokesperson, other than the CEO, the CEO will consult with the Mayor before nominating an appropriate spokesperson.

5.8.3 Publicity Campaigns

5.8.3.1 During the Caretaker Period, publicity campaigns (other than for the purpose of conducting and promoting the election) will be avoided wherever possible.

5.8.3.2 If a publicity campaign is deemed necessary it must be approved by the CEO.

5.8.3.3 Approved publicity during the Caretaker Period will be restricted to communicating normal activities and initiatives.

5.8.4 Elected Members

5.8.4.1 Elected Members will not use their position or their access to Council resources to gain media attention in support of, or to the detriment of, theirs or any other candidate’s election campaign.

5.8.4.2 Press releases or other such media statements will not feature any photograph, quote or name of Elected Members during the Caretaker Period.
5.8.4.3 To ensure Elected Members are afforded the same opportunities as other candidates, individual Elected Members may make statements as candidates in the election provided that they are clearly communicated as personal opinions and do not undermine the standing of the Council in the community.

5.8.4.4 While Elected Members may refer to adopted Council policies or decisions, there should be a clear distinction between the adopted Council position and any political commentary the candidate may wish to make.

5.8.5 Council Employees

5.8.5.1 During the Caretaker Period, no Council employee other than the CEO (or a nominee of the CEO) may make any public statement(s).

5.9 Equity in Assistance to Candidates

5.9.1 Candidate Assistance and Advice

5.9.1.1 Any assistance and advice provided to candidates, as part of the conduct of the election, will be provided equally to all candidates.

5.9.1.2 The types of assistance that are available (e.g. advice on interpretation of electoral roll data or legislative requirements) will be documented and communicated to all candidates in advance.

5.9.1.3 The Administration will liaise with the Electoral Commission SA to confirm dates for candidate information sessions to be held prior to the opening of nominations and during the nomination period.

5.9.2 Election Process Enquiries

5.9.2.1 All election process enquiries from candidates will be directed to the Returning Officer, or where the matter is outside the responsibilities of the Returning Officer, to the Chief Executive Officer.

5.10 Grievances

5.10.1 Grievances

5.10.1.1 Any complaints or grievances against an Elected Member or staff member in relation to this policy should be referred to the Chief Executive Officer.

5.10.1.2 Grievances will be handled in confidence but must be based on tangible evidence outlining how this policy has been breached so that further investigations can be made.

5.10.1.3 Any complaints or grievances in relation to the conduct of another candidate should be referred to the Returning Officer or the Electoral Commissioner.
# SCHEDULE 1  Table of Major Policy Decisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Decision</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Who this impacts?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Entering into a contract (other than a prescribed contract) with a total value exceeding either $100,000 or 1% of Council's rate revenue (based on the preceding financial year figures), whichever is the greater, in a Caretaker Period pursuant to Section 56 of the Local Government Act 1999 | This is an internal requirement in the best interest of accountability and transparency. Under normal operations, this decision can only be carried out by the Council or via a position with delegated powers. | • Electsed Members  
• CEO and Executive  
• Delegated Officers |
| Entering into a contract with a total value exceeding $100,000 where Section 56 of the Local Government Act 1999 has been declared to apply to Council by the CEO | This applies unless approval is granted by the Minister pursuant to Section 57 of the Local Government Act 1999, or the decision falls within the scope of Section 57(4) | • Electsed Members  
• CEO and Executive  
• Delegated Officers |
| Entering into a lease with the rent payable by the lessee at any time exceeds $100,000 | This applies unless approval is granted by the Minister pursuant to Section 57 of the Local Government Act 1999, or the decision falls within the scope of Section 57(4) | • Electsed Members  
• CEO and Executive  
• Delegated Officers |
| The appointment or dismissal of a CEO in a Caretaker Period or where Section 56 of the Local Government Act 1999 has been declared to apply to Council by the CEO | This is an internal requirement as well as Section 57 of the Local Government Act 1999. Only in the case of an emergency can the Council act to suspend the current CEO, pending the election, after which date a permanent decision can be made. | • Electsed Members  
• CEO Review Panel (Comprised of Electsed Members) |
| The variation of the CEO remuneration in a Caretaker Period | This restriction applies in the interests of accountability. | • Electsed Members  
• CEO Review Panel (Comprised of Electsed Members) |
| The execution of an irrevocable decision that has significant impacts on the Council, Council area or Community | This internal restriction applies unless approval is granted by the CEO. | • Electsed Members  
• CEO and Executive |
| Any other significant decision not specified above which will bind the incoming Council | This internal restriction applies unless approval is granted by the CEO. | • Electsed Members  
• CEO and Executive |
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COUNCIL POLICY - Elections Period Caretaker Policy

1. Preamble

1.1 The City of West Torrens (CWT) is required by s91A of the Local Government (Elections) Act 1999 to adopt a caretaker policy and assume a "caretaker mode" for a minimum period of seven (7) weeks prior to a local government general election, to avoid actions and designated decisions which could be perceived as:
   • influencing the conduct of the elections; and/or
   • influencing voters; and/or
   • having significant impact on candidates; and/or
   • having significant impact on the incoming Council.

2. Purpose

2.1 This policy articulates the standards that are generally regarded as necessary for the promotion of transparent and accountable government during Caretaker Periods. It has been developed to ensure that:

2.1.1 The statutory requirements of s91A of the Local Government (Elections) Act 1999, s57 of the Local Government Act 1999 as well as related regulations and legislation are met.

2.1.2 Council's responsibilities during a Caretaker Period are clearly documented, accountable and transparent.

2.1.3 The Council continues to fulfil its responsibilities, with each Elected Member meeting their commitment as a member of the Incumbent Council during the Caretaker Period.

2.1.4 The incumbent Council does not inappropriately make decisions that will be binding on an incoming Council and limit its decision making ability.

2.1.5 The election campaigns of incumbent Elected Members are conducted in a manner that is ethical, fair and equitable and are publicly perceived as such.

2.1.6 The day to day business and level of services of the Council continue efficiently, in a normal manner and are not impacted by the elections.

2.1.7 Council resources are not diverted to, or influenced by, campaign purposes or used to improperly advantage incumbent Elected Members as candidates in the election.

2.1.8 Council employees understand the required behaviours and expectations placed on them during an election including that they act impartially in relation to all candidates.

3. Scope

3.1 The policy applies for the duration of the Caretaker Period to Council, Elected Members, Elected Members who are electoral candidates, independent Audit and Risk Committee members, Development Assessment Panel members and employees of the CWT.

3.2 This policy only applies to actual decisions made during a Caretaker Period, not the announcement of decisions made prior to the Caretaker Period.
3.3 This policy does not apply to statutory requirements or matters required by law (for example, the production of the Annual Report and matters that are required to be reviewed pursuant to the Development Act 1993, etc.).

4. Definitions

4.1 Campaign Material means the information and resources used by and in relation to individual candidate's election campaigns.

4.2 Candidate means any person (including a current Elected Member) who has lodged a valid nomination for the purpose of a forthcoming Local Government periodic or general election (the election) with the Electoral Commission of South Australia (ECSA).

4.3 Caretaker Mode relates to the protocols to be observed during a caretaker period.

4.4 Caretaker Period means the period that commences on the day of the close of nominations for the election to the 'conclusion of the election' as defined in s4(2) of the Local Government Act 1999 for the relevant periodic or general election being the time at which the last result of the election is certified by the Returning Officer.

4.5 Chief Executive Officer means the appointed CEO or any person acting in that capacity.

4.6 Council Contact Officer means the person nominated by the CEO to liaise with the ECSA and manage CWT's responsibilities throughout Council elections.

4.7 Council Liaison Officers are those people nominated by the CEO to assist the Council Contact Officer during Council elections.

4.8 Council Resources includes (but is not limited to), for the purposes of this policy, employees, support staff, volunteers, hospitality (including venue and function facilities), equipment, materials published by Council, access to Council information, media services, machinery, electronic facilities, photographs and stationery.

4.9 CWT Employee means all employees covered by the CWT Health Services Employees Enterprise Agreement, CWT Enterprise Agreement (Local Government Employees), CWT Municipal Officers Enterprise Agreement, CWT - ANMF Nursing Employees Enterprise Agreement, contractors, volunteers, and support staff.

4.10 ECSA means the person appointed to the position of Electoral Commissioner of South Australia.

4.11 Elected Members means the Mayor and Councillors of the CWT.

4.12 Election/Electoral Material means the information and promotional material produced by the CWT or ECSA related to the election.

4.13 Events and Functions means formal and informal gatherings of internal and external stakeholders to discuss, review, acknowledge, communicate, celebrate or promote a program, strategy or issue which is of relevance to the City and its stakeholders and may take the form of conferences, workshops, forums, launches, promotional activities or social occasions such as dinners, receptions and balls.

4.14 Designated Decision means a decision that is not able to be made in accordance with s91A of the Local Government (Elections) Act 1999 (refer to clause 5.3.1.3).
4.15 Independent Commissioner Against Corruption (ICAC) means the person appointed to identify, investigate and refer for prosecution corruption in public administration, to establish and oversee the Office of Public Integrity and to assist inquiry agencies to identify and deal with misconduct and maladministration in public administration.

4.16 Major Policy Decision is any decision which has a significant impact on the ‘normal’ operations of Council.

See Schedule 1 for the Major Policy Decisions Table for further details and examples. A major policy decision is not limited to those examples included on this list.

4.17 Office of the Public Integrity (OPI) means the entity that manages complaints about public administration and referral to the relevant inquiry agency.

4.18 Prescribed Contract means a contract entered into by Council for the purpose of undertaking:

- Road construction or maintenance; or
- Drainage works.

4.19 Public Consultation means, for the purposes of this policy, the process of inviting public comment on a proposed Council action, decision or issue.

4.20 Returning Officer means the person or persons appointed by the Electoral Commissioner to assist EUSA with the conduct of the election as defined in s10 of the Local Government (Elections) Act 1999.

5. Policy Statement

5.1 Initiating Caretaker Period

5.1.1 Role of the CEO in Implementing the Caretaker Period and Mode

5.1.1.1 The caretaker mode commences at the beginning of the Caretaker Period, i.e. 7 weeks from the opening of nominations to the conclusion of the elections.

5.1.1.2 The CEO will ensure, as far as possible, the provision of 30 days advance notice to Elected Members, Independent Members of Council Committees, CWVT employees and the public of the commencement date of the Caretaker Period.

5.1.1.3 The CEO will endeavour to ensure that all announcements regarding decisions made by the Council, prior to the Caretaker Period, are publicised prior to the Caretaker Period.

5.2 Code of Conduct for Council Members

5.2.1 The Code of Conduct for Council Members (the Code) continues to apply to Elected Members throughout the duration of the Caretaker Period.
5.3 Policy Decisions

5.3.1 Designated Decisions

5.3.1.1 A designated decision made by Council in contravention of legislation and this policy is invalid; except where an exemption has been granted by the Minister for Local Government (the Minister).

5.3.1.2 Any person who suffers loss or damage as a result of acting in good faith on a designated decision made by Council in contravention of legislation and this policy is entitled to compensation from the Council for that loss or damage.

5.3.1.3 A designated decision does not contravene legislation or this policy if the decision is to enter into a contract, arrangement or understanding (other than a prescribed contract) for the total value of which exceeds whichever is the greater of $100,000 or 1% of the Council’s revenue from rates in the preceding year and:

- relates to the carrying out of works in response to an emergency or disaster within the meaning of Emergency Management Act 2004, or under s298 of the Local Government Act 1999; or
- is an expenditure or other decision required to be taken under an agreement by which funding is provided to the council by the Commonwealth or State Government or otherwise for the council to be eligible for funding from the Commonwealth or State Government; or
- relates to the employment of a particular CWT employee (other than the CEO); or
- is made in the conduct of negotiations relating to the employment of CWT employees generally, or a class of CWT employees, if provision has been made for funds relating to such negotiations in the budget of the council for the relevant financial year and the negotiations commenced prior to the election period; or
- relates to a Community Wastewater Management Systems scheme that has, prior to the election period, been approved by the council;

5.3.1.4 A decision is exempt from the definition of a ‘designated decision’ if it relates to the suspension of a CEO for serious and wilful misconduct.

5.3.2 Extraordinary Circumstances Requiring Exemption

5.3.2.1 If Council determines that there are extraordinary circumstances which require the making of a designated decision during the Caretaker Period, it must apply in writing to the Minister for an exemption.

5.3.2.2 An application for Ministerial exemption may only be made by resolution of Council.
5.3.3 Scheduling Consideration of Major Policy Decisions

5.3.3.1 So far as is reasonably practical, the CEO will avoid scheduling major policy decisions for consideration during a Caretaker Period and will ensure that such decisions are either:

a) Considered by Council prior to the Caretaker Period and beginning of caretaker mode.

b) Scheduled for determination by the incoming Council.

5.3.3.2 Any person who is unsure whether a particular decision falls within the operation of this clause should consult the General Manager Organisational Support.

5.3.3.3 All items listed within a Council agenda during the Caretaker Period will be assessed by the General Manager Organisational Support for compliance with this policy.

5.3.4 Major Policy Decisions during Caretaker Period

5.3.4.1 The table of policy decisions or exercise of delegated powers at Schedule 1 - Table of Major Policy Decisions (Attached) outlines those decisions or activities which are expressly prohibited by the Local Government Act 1999 and/or the Local Government (Elections) Act 1999 and/or this policy.

5.3.5 Considerations for the Chief Executive Officer in Granting Approval

5.3.5.1 Where the CEO has discretionary approval under this policy, which is not expressly prohibited by clauses 5.3.1.3 and 5.3.1.4, the CEO will have regard to the following criteria:

- Whether the decision is 'significant';
- The urgency of the issue;
- The possibility of financial repercussions or other consequences both for the current Council and the incoming Council if it is deferred;
- The nature of the decision, i.e.:
  - Will it be controversial?
  - Will it provoke considerable public interest?
  - Will it provoke considerable media attention?
  - The best interests of the Council and the CVT.

5.3.6 Appointment or Removal of the CEO

5.3.6.1 Council must not appoint or dismiss the CEO during a Caretaker Period without the approval by the Minister unless clause 5.3.1.4 applies.

5.3.6.2 In an emergency situation, Council may appoint an Acting CEO or suspend the current CEO pending the election, after which date a permanent decision can be made by the incoming Council.
5.4 Publications during the Caretaker Period

5.4.1 Elected Members' campaign material

5.4.1.1 Elected Members' campaign materials must not purport that the material originates from, or is authorised by, Council (eg by the use of Council logos).

5.4.2 Council Publications

5.4.2.1 CWT will publish election material, as required by the relevant acts, including (but not limited to) material in a range of media that:
- provides information about the elections;
- promotes public participation in the elections;
- seeks candidate nominations;
- is information relating to those candidates who are standing within each area/ward;
- the conduct of the elections; and
- the outcome of the elections.

5.4.2.2 Council publicity and communications, not related to the elections, will be restricted to promoting normal Council activities and services.

5.4.2.3 Council publications produced before a Caretaker Period but which contain material that could be used in connection with the elections, other than strictly relating to the election process, will not to be circulated or displayed during the Caretaker Period.

5.4.2.4 While Council is required by s131 of the Local Government Act 1999 to prepare, adopt and put on public display a copy of its Annual Report before November 30 of each year, during the Caretaker Period the Annual Report will not contain material that could be regarded as overt electioneering or that inappropriately promotes individual Elected Members.

5.4.3 Council Website

5.4.3.1 Any information which refers to the elections which is made available on the website, including on social media, will only relate to the election process by way of information, education or publicity as required by legislation or as directed by the ECSA.

5.4.3.2 During a Caretaker Period, new material which is precluded by this policy or legislation will not be placed on the CWT website or on social media.

5.4.3.3 During the Caretaker Period, information provided about Elected Members will be restricted to names, contact details, titles and their membership on Council Committee(s) or other bodies as a Council representative.
5.5 Public Consultation during the Caretaker Period

5.5.1 Mandatory Public Consultation

5.5.1.1 Any mandatory public consultation as detailed in the Local Government Act 1999 or other Acts relating to local government (for example the Development Act 1993) can be undertaken during the Caretaker Period however, public consultation that is not legislatively mandated and relates to a topical or contentious issue is subject to approval of the CEO prior to its commencement.

5.5.2 Approved Public Consultation

If public consultation has been approved by the CEO:

5.5.2.1 The result of that consultation will not be reported to Council until after the completion of the Caretaker Period, i.e. to the incoming Council.

5.5.2.2 Approved consultations will avoid express or implicit links to the elections.

5.5.2.3 The CEO reserves the right to postpone a consultation at any time during the Caretaker Period if he/she comes to the view that the issue may affect voting.

5.5.3 Publicity Campaigns

5.5.3.1 During the Caretaker Period, publicity campaigns (other than for the purpose of conducting and promoting the election) will be avoided wherever possible.

5.5.3.2 Any publicity campaign that is considered necessary must be approved by the CEO.

5.5.3.3 Approved publicity during the Caretaker Period will be restricted to communicating normal activities and initiatives.

5.6 Elected Member Attendance at Events and Functions during the Caretaker Period

5.6.1 Events Staged by External Bodies

5.6.1.1 Elected Members may continue to attend events and functions staged by external bodies during a Caretaker Period (see Elected Members Gifts, Benefits and Hospitality Council Policy).

5.6.1.2 Elected Members appointed to community groups, advisory groups and other external organisations as representatives of the CWT must not use their attendance at meetings of such groups to either recruit assistance with electoral campaigning or to promote their personal or other candidate electoral campaigns.

5.6.1.3 Unless there is a requirement to do so, Elected Members will not to be appointed to positions on external bodies or authorities during the Caretaker Period.
5.6.2 Council Events and Functions

5.6.2.1 Council events and functions held during the Caretaker Period will be reduced to only those essential to the operation of the Council. These events and functions should not in any way be associated with any issues considered topical or relevant to the election.

5.6.2.2 All known candidates are to be invited to Council organised events and functions during the Caretaker Period.

5.6.3 Addresses by Elected Members

5.6.3.1 Elected Members may continue to make speeches related to Council business at events staged by external bodies during the Caretaker Period, however, the speech must not have any political reference which may be construed as giving a sitting Member any advantage.

5.6.3.2 Elected Members who are also election candidates must not give speeches or keynote addresses at Council organised or sponsored events and functions during a Caretaker Period. Elected Members may make short welcome speeches at events or functions organised or sponsored by the CWT during the Caretaker Period.

5.6.4 Publication of Promotional Material

5.6.4.1 Any material concerning a Council organised or sponsored function or event which is to be published or distributed during the Caretaker Period must be consistent with clause 5.4 of this policy.

5.7 Council Resources

5.7.1 General

5.7.1.1 Council resources must not be used to assist any candidate’s campaign during the Caretaker Period.

5.7.1.2 The Administration will ensure due propriety is observed in the use of all Council resources and CWT employees are required to exercise appropriate discretion in that regard.

5.7.1.3 In circumstances where the use of Council resources might be construed as being related to a candidate’s election campaign, such use must be referred to the CEO for approval.

5.7.1.4 Elected Members must not, in any way, exert undue influence over the timing of works or the delivery of Council services that may result in political gain for electoral purposes.

5.7.1.5 Elected Members must not use their position as a member of Council or information obtained in their role as an Elected Member to, directly or indirectly, gain an advantage for themselves or for another person as serious criminal penalties apply under s254 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935 and s62(3) and 62(4) of the Local Government Act 1999. Any alleged breaches will be reported to the OPI as required by the ICAC Act 2012.
5.7.2 Expenses Incurred by Elected Members

5.7.2.1 Reimbursement (or payment) of Elected Member expenses during the Caretaker Period will only apply to those costs that have been incurred in the performance of normal Council duties and approved by the CEO.

5.7.2.2 Reimbursements will not be provided for election campaign expenses or for expenses that could be perceived as being related to a candidate's election campaign.

5.7.3 Council Branding and Stationery

5.7.3.1 Council logos, letterheads, or other CWT branding must not be used for, or linked in any way, to a candidate's election campaign.

5.7.3.2 Elected Members should ensure that their Council business cards are used only for purposes associated with the normal role as an Elected Member in servicing their electorate.

5.7.3.3 Elected Members' business cards must not be used in a manner that supports their election campaign or other election purpose.

5.7.3.4 During the Caretaker Period, Elected Members must ensure that any publications bearing their name will not include their position title, i.e. Cr John Smith, Preferred Use would be John Smith, Councillor for the City of WestTorrens.

5.7.4 Council Equipment and Infrastructure

5.7.4.1 Council equipment and infrastructure, including the use of photocopiers, stationery or computer equipment, must not be used for any election campaign activities.

5.7.4.2 Elected Members who have Council funded services, such as mobile phones, landlines, ipads, and internet connections must only use these Council resources for normal Council business and must not be used to assist them in their, or others', election campaign(s).

5.7.4.3 Any use of Council funded equipment for election campaigns could result in an allegation of misconduct or corruption under the ICAC Act 2012 and subject to a complaint to the OPI.

5.7.5 CWT Employees

5.7.5.1 CWT employees will continue to provide the normal level of support to the Mayor and Elected Members during the Caretaker Period.

5.7.5.2 Elected Members must not ask CWT employees, including in their private capacity, to undertake any tasks directly or indirectly connected to an election campaign.

5.7.5.3 Any Elected Member involved with requesting assistance from a CWT employee with election campaigning would be in breach of the Code and s252 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935 and could result in an allegation of misconduct or corruption under the ICAC Act 2012 and be subject to a complaint to the OPI.
5.7.5.4 CWT employees who assist an Elected Member in relation to their election campaign will be in breach of the Code of Conduct for Council Employees and s251 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935. Alleged breaches must be reported to the OPI and could result in an allegation of misconduct or corruption under the ICAC Act 2012 and be subject to a complaint to the OPI.

5.7.6 Correspondence

5.7.6.1 General correspondence addressed to Elected Members will be answered in the usual manner. However, Elected Members will sign only the necessary minimum of correspondence during a Caretaker Period.

5.7.6.2 Correspondence in relation to significant, sensitive or controversial matters should be signed by the CEO. Replies will be prepared in a manner to protect Council from any perceptions of political bias.

5.8 Access to Council Information

5.8.1 Information and Briefing Materials

5.8.1.1 All candidates can access any information that is publicly available and can be provided within reasonable resource limits.

5.8.1.2 Elected Members retain their statutory right to access Council information relevant to the performance of their function as Elected Members. However, this access should be exercised with caution and be limited to matters that the Council has under active consideration.

5.8.1.3 Any information that the Council holds, other than that determined by the Council Contact Officer to be relevant to informing the public about the conduct of an election, must not be used for election purposes. Any improper use will be a breach of the Code and may be a breach of section 62(3) of the Local Government Act 1999 and s251 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935.

5.8.2 Information Request Register

5.8.2.1 An Information Request Register will be maintained by the Council Contact Officer during the Caretaker Period. This register will be a public document that records all the requests for information made by candidates, and the response given to these requests, during the Caretaker Period.

5.8.2.2 If information requests are made by candidates directly to a CWT employee, the CWT employee will advise the candidate that the request will be transferred to the CEO.

5.8.2.3 Any requests for information not publicly available, or that require excessive use of resources, will be managed in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act 1991.
5.9 Media and Communications

5.9.1 Media Advice

5.9.1.1 The CWI Media and Events department will continue promoting normal council business which has been endorsed or is supported by Council during the Caretaker Period. However, publications should be written in a way that does not result in a perception that the publication favours a particular candidate or group of candidates.

5.9.1.2 Media advice will not be provided to candidates or Elected Members in relation to election issues or in regard to publicity that involves individual Elected Members.

5.9.1.3 Any requests for media advice or assistance by Elected Members during the Caretaker Period will be referred to the CEO. If satisfied that advice sought by an Elected Member during the Caretaker Period is not for personal gain the CEO may authorise the provision of a response to such a request.

5.9.2 Media Releases / Spokespersons

5.9.2.1 While in Caretaker Mode, if it is necessary to identify a spokesperson, other than the CEO, the CEO will nominate an appropriate spokesperson.

5.9.3 Elected Members and Media

5.9.3.1 Elected Members must not use their position or their access to Council resources to gain media attention in support of, or to the detriment of, their own or any other candidate’s election campaign. To do so, would be in breach of the Code and s251 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935 and could result in an allegation of misconduct or corruption under the ICAC Act 2012 and be subject to a complaint to the OPI.

5.9.3.2 Press releases or other such media statements will not feature any photograph, quote or name of Elected Members during the Caretaker Period.

5.9.3.3 To ensure Elected Members are afforded the same opportunities as other candidates, individual Elected Members may make statements as candidates in the election provided that they are clearly communicated as personal opinions and do not undermine the standing of the Council in the community.

5.9.3.4 Elected Members may refer to adopted Council policies or decisions but there should be a clear distinction between the adopted Council position and any political commentary the candidate may wish to make.

5.9.4 CWI Employees

5.9.4.1 During the Caretaker Period, no CWI employee other than the CEO (or a nominee of the CEO) may make any public statement(s).

5.9.4.2 Any CWI employee that breaches the provisions of this policy could be subject to investigation for misconduct and referral to the OPI.
5.10 Equity in Assistance to Candidates

5.10.1 Candidate Assistance and Advice

5.10.1.1 Any assistance and advice provided to candidates, as part of the conduct of the election, will be provided equally to all candidates.

5.10.1.2 The Administration will liaise with ECSA to confirm dates for candidate information sessions to be held prior to the opening of nominations and during the nomination period.

5.10.2 Election Process Enquiries

5.10.2.1 All election process enquiries from candidates will be directed to the Returning Officer, or where the matter is outside the responsibilities of the Returning Officer, to the Council Contact Officer.

5.11 Complaints and Grievances

5.11.1 Alleged Breaches of the Local Government (Elections) Act 1999

5.11.1.1 Allegations of breaches of the Local Government (Elections) Act 1999 should be made to the ECSA.

5.11.1.2 Allegations of breaches of the Local Government (Elections) Act 1999 made to the CEO, will be referred to ECSA.

5.11.2 Alleged Breaches of Part 2 of the Code of Conduct for Council Members (refer clauses 2.17 to 2.25)

5.11.2.1 Complaints or grievances that allege the behaviour of an Elected Member during the Caretaker Period constitutes a breach of Part 2 - Behavioural Code of the Council Members Code of Conduct must be submitted, in writing, to the CEO detailing the clauses alleged to have been breached and relevant evidence.

5.11.2.2 On receipt of such a complaint, the CEO will assess whether the complaint is vexatious or frivolous. If the CEO finds that the complaint is vexatious and/or frivolous then the matter will not be investigated and the complainant advised, in writing, accordingly.

5.11.2.3 If the CEO determines the complaint is not vexatious or frivolous he/she will ensure a full investigation is undertaken which could include referral to an external investigator.

5.11.2.4 In the event the investigation confirms that Part 2 of the Council Members Code of Conduct has been breached the CEO will, in line with clause 2.24 of the Code, ensure a report into the matter is presented to a public meeting of Council (within three weeks of receipt of the investigation outcome report in the instance that the investigation has been undertaken by an external body).
5.11.2.5 Following consideration of this report, Council may by resolution and in accordance with clause 2.25 of the Code:

- Take no action
- Pass a censure motion in respect of the Council Member
- Request a public apology, whether written or verbal
- Request the Elected Member to attend training on the specific subject found to have been breached
- Resolve to remove or suspend the Elected Member from a position within the Council (not including the Member’s elected position on Council)
- Request the Elected Member to repay monies to Council.

5.11.3 Alleged Breaches of Part 3 of the Code of Conduct for Council Members

5.11.3.1 Allegations that constitute a breach of Part 3 of the Code during the Caretaker Period can be made to the CEO, the Ombudsman, the OPI or the ECSA (if it relates to a breach of clause 3.8 of the Code regarding campaign donations).

5.11.3.2 Any such allegation must be made in writing and provide tangible evidence.

5.11.3.2a A public officer who makes a complaint to the OPI must have regard to Section 11 of the Directions and Guidelines for Inquiry Agencies, Public Authorities and Public Officers issued by the ICAC.

5.11.3.3 In accordance with the Code, the CEO will refer any allegation that constitutes a breach of Part 3 of the Code to the Ombudsman for investigation in accordance with s263 of the Local Government Act 1999.

5.11.3.4 The CEO will ensure, in accordance with the provisions contained within the Code, that a report from the Ombudsman which finds an Elected Member has breached Part 3 of the Code is presented to a public meeting of Council.
## SCHEDULE 1 - Table of Major Policy Decisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Decision</th>
<th>Status/Comment</th>
<th>Who this Impacts?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entering into a contract (other than a prescribed contract) with a total value</td>
<td>This is considered a major policy decision in the best interest of accountability and transparency.</td>
<td>• Council • CEO and Executive • Delegated Officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exceeding either $100,000 or 1% of Council’s rate revenue (based on the preceding</td>
<td>Under normal operations, this decision can only be carried out by the Council or via a position with</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>financial year figures), whichever is the greater, in a Caretaker Period pursuant</td>
<td>delegated powers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to Section 56 of the Local Government Act 1999.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entering into a contract with a total value exceeding $100,000 where Section 56</td>
<td>Restricted unless approval is granted by the Minister pursuant to Section 57 of the Local Government</td>
<td>• Council • CEO and Executive • Delegated Officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of the Local Government Act 1999 has been declared to apply to Council by the CEO.</td>
<td>Act 1999, or the decision falls within the scope of Section 57(4).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entering into a lease if the rent payable by the lessee at any time exceeds</td>
<td>Restricted unless approval is granted by the Minister pursuant to Section 57 of the Local Government Act</td>
<td>• Council • CEO and Executive • Delegated Officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000.</td>
<td>1999, or the decision falls within the scope of Section 57(4).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The appointment or dismissal of a CEO in a Caretaker Period or where Section 56 of</td>
<td>Restricted. Only in the case of an emergency can the Council act to suspend the current CEO, pending</td>
<td>• Council • CEO Review Panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Local Government Act 1999 has been declared to apply to Council by the CEO.</td>
<td>the election, after which a permanent decision can be made.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The variation of the CEO’s remuneration in a Caretaker Period.</td>
<td>Restricted.</td>
<td>• Council • CEO Review Panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The execution of an irrevocable decision that has significant impacts on the</td>
<td>Restricted unless approval is granted by the CEO.</td>
<td>• Council • CEO and Executive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council, Council area or Community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other significant decision not specified above which will bind the incoming</td>
<td>Restricted unless approval is granted by the CEO.</td>
<td>• CEO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11.2 Key Election Dates and Application for Enrolment on the Voters Roll Forms

Brief
This report details the key dates associated with the Local Government Elections to be held in November 2014 along with enrolment to vote information.

RECOMMENDATION
It is recommended to Council that this report be received.

Introduction
The Electoral Commission of South Australia (ECSA) has recently released the key dates for the Local Government Elections to be held in November 2014. Information has also been released regarding enrolment on Council's Voters' Roll (the Roll).

Discussion

Key Dates
The key dates for the November 2014 Local Government elections are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voters Roll Closes</td>
<td>Friday 8 August 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate Nominations Open</td>
<td>Tuesday 2 September 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate Nominations Close</td>
<td>12 noon Tuesday 16 September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draw for Position of Candidate Names on the Ballot Paper</td>
<td>4pm Tuesday 16 September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail Out of Voting Material to Electors</td>
<td>Monday 20 to Friday 24 October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Day for Postal Issue/Reissue of Voting Material</td>
<td>5pm Wednesday 5 November 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Day for Personal Issue/Reissue of Voting Material</td>
<td>5pm Friday 7 November 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close of Voting</td>
<td>5pm Friday 7 November 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Election Day</td>
<td>Saturday 8 November 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scrutiny and Count</td>
<td>9am Saturday 8 November 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisional Declaration</td>
<td>Immediately after count is completed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Enrolment
On 1 January 2014, in accordance with the requirements of the Local Government (Elections) Act 1999, voters' details were purged from the Roll. This process does not impact on those people who are enrolled on the State Electoral (House of Assembly) Roll.

The purging of the Roll means that residents, including natural persons, businesses, body corporate or groups that are not on the State Electoral Roll are no longer included on the Roll. Consequently, in order for these people or entities to vote in Council's elections they need to apply for inclusion on the Roll before the close of business on Friday 8 August 2014 by completing the appropriate 'Application for Enrolment' form.

Bodies corporate and groups of persons will need to nominate a designated person on the ‘Application for Enrolment’ Form to vote (and/or nominate as a candidate) on their behalf.

Application forms are available on Council's website.
All applications to enrol will be assessed for eligibility and cross-checked with the State Electoral Roll after the Roll closes on 8 August, 2014.

**Conclusion**

This report details the key dates for the Local Government Elections to be held in November 2014 and enrolment to vote information.
11.3 Request to Fly Rainbow Flag - The Feast Festival

Brief
This report re-presents the request from the 'Feast Festival' for Council to fly the 'Rainbow Flag' from 15 November to 30 November 2014.

RECOMMENDATION(S)
It is recommended to Council that:

1. The request from the 'Feast Festival' to fly the 'Rainbow Flag' from 15 November to 30 November 2014 be approved.

2. Council accepts the offer of a loan of a 'Rainbow Flag' from the 'Feast Festival' to be flown from 15 November to 30 November 2014.

Introduction
The 'Feast Festival' is Adelaide's lesbian, gay, bi-sexual, transgender, intersex and queer (LGBTIQ) arts and cultural festival and is a member of Festivals Adelaide, the peak body for Adelaide's major international festivals.

At the 3 June 2014 meeting of Council, a request from the 'Feast Festival' for Council to fly the 'Rainbow Flag' (the Flag) from 15 November 2014 to 30 November 2014 was presented. At that meeting Council resolved the following:

'Council is supportive of the request from the 'Feast Cultural Festival' to fly the 'Rainbow Flag' from 15 November to 30 November 2014, subject to an amended request being re-presented to Council that meets Council's approved Flags Policy criteria.'

Consequently, the Feast Festival has resubmitted its request in line with this resolution (Attachment 1).

Discussion
Council's Flag Policy allows for the flying of the Flag with Council approval. The resubmitted request from the 'Feast Festival' now meets all of the criteria contained in the current policy as follows:

The request:

a) Is in writing addressed to the Chief Executive Officer
b) Includes a colour example of the design
c) Specifies the preferred dates of display
d) Details the relevance or significance of the Flag to the City of West Torrens
e) Has been received at least three (3) weeks before the required display date
f) Includes contact details of the person responsible for supply and collection of the flag.

In addition, the 'Feast Festival' has agreed to loan a Flag to Council for the period of time that the Flag is to be flown.

Conclusion
The resubmitted request from the 'Feast Festival' to fly the 'Rainbow Flag' from 15 to 30 November 2014 now meets all the criteria of Council's Flag Policy therefore, it is recommended that the request be approved.
20 June 2014

Terry Buss
Chief Executive Officer
City of West Torrens
165 Sir Donald Bradman Drive
HILTON SA 5033

RE: Flying the Rainbow Flag – Celebrating Diversity

Dear Mr Buss

I am writing to request that The City of West Torrens display the rainbow flag during the month of November. I would firstly like to apologise for not following The City of West Torrens’ Flag Policy protocol in my previous request. In particular section 6.2 which states that ‘Applications must be:

   a) In writing addressed to the Chief Executive Officer

In my naivety I presumed that the democratically elected members of Council through the Mayor would be the person to approach in such matters. Please thank Liz Johnson, Team Leader Governance and Business Improvement for her correspondence pointing out my errors in regard to this matter. In future I will be sure to follow the policy procedures.

Hence, I write to you as CEO of the City of West Torrens to invite The City to engage in and support a very exciting and important project Flying the Rainbow Flag – Celebrating Diversity as part of our annual Feast Festival.

   b) Include a colour example of the design

The rainbow flag is 57.5cm x 150cm. As a gesture of goodwill I have enclosed a rainbow flag that we would like to gift to the Council to utilise during this period if it agrees to fly the flag.

   c) Specify the preferred dates of display

The dates we are requesting the flag be flown is from 15 – 30th November 2014.

   d) Detail the relevance or significance of the flag to the City of West Torrens

Feast Festival is a 15 day cultural festival that includes theatre, comedy, music, literature, visual arts, youth, community and sporting events in the Adelaide CBD and metro and regional areas of South Australia. The festival promotes pride, community identity, inclusion and celebration to maximise community involvement and social inclusion. For the many rate payers, residents, school students and business owners who identify as Lesbian, Gay, Transgender, Bisexual and or Intersex (Queer) living or working in your municipal area it is an excellent opportunity for the Council to promote inclusiveness and acceptance amongst your constituency.

Feast Festival is not a political organisation or a commercial organisation. We are a not-for-profit organisation whose aim is to develop artistically excellent, ground breaking arts projects involving
gay, lesbian, queer artists and allies with a focus on youth, Indigenous, culturally and linguistically diverse communities.

There have been many advances for our LGBTQ community(ies) over the past years, however, the LGBTQ community is still subject to discrimination, violence, misunderstanding and fear which can manifest in violent attacks, verbal abuse and bullying.

Through positive engagement and strategic partnerships we can actively contribute to acceptance of the diversity of sexuality that makes up our community.

By participating in the Flying the Flag project your City will create greater understanding and acceptance of our diverse communities and help dispel homophobia, for those who identify as LGBTQ, their friends and families.

By doing this you will be actively contributing to the health and wellbeing of the whole community. It will be your way of helping celebrate the Feast Festival state-wide, as well as publicly acknowledging your City’s role as a leader in promoting and celebrating diversity and social wellbeing.

By flying the rainbow flag, your City will be added to our roll call, which we will list in our 64 page 2014 Feast Program Guide which is distributed nationwide as well as on our webpage, phone app and on our Facebook page which are accessed globally.

By flying the flag you will be flying a positive beacon to your constituency and for those visitors to your area.

   e) Be received at least three weeks before the required display date

This request is well within the required time frame for the display date.

   f) Include contact details of the person responsible for supply and collection of the flag

The person responsible for the supply of the flag is:
Catherine Fitzgerald
Artistic Director
ad@feast.org.au
PO Box 8183
Station Arcade SA 5000

If you have any questions please do not hesitate to ring me and I would be happy to answer them for you.

Thank you for the time taken to consider this important request.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

Catherine Fitzgerald
Artistic Director

Encl.

Cc. Honourable John Trainer
Cc. Liz Johnson
11.4 Legislative Progress Report - June 2014

Brief
This report identifies the status of proposed legislative changes affecting Local Government dealt with in Parliament, by the Local Government Association or contained in the Government Gazette during the preceding month.

RECOMMENDATION
It is recommended to Council that this report be received.

Introduction
This report provides a monthly update on the progress of Bills through Parliament using Parliament's defined stages as well as items contained within the Government Gazette that relate to the City of West Torrens. It also contains information provided by the Local Government Association (LGA) relating to proposed amendments to legislation or other relevant matters.

Discussion

Summary of Proposed Amendments to Legislation

Fees and Charges - 1 July 2014

The following Acts and associated Regulations will be varied to include the new fees and charges schedule for 2014 which will come into operation on 1 July 2014:

- Housing Improvement Act 1940.
- Local Government Act 1999
- Environment Protection Act 1993
- Food Act 2011
- Roads (Opening and Closing) Act 1991
- Development Act 1993
- State Records Act 1997
- Private Parking Areas Act 1986
- Valuation of Land Act 1971
- Liquor Licensing Act 1997
- Expiation of Offences Act 1996
- Freedom of Information Act 1991
- Expiation of Offences Act 1996
- Heritage Places Act 1993
- Natural Resources Management Act 2004
- Road Traffic Act 1961
- Motor Vehicles Act 1959
- Heavy Vehicles National Law (South Australia) Act 2013

Further information can be found in Government Gazette No 44 - 19 June 2014.
### Bills previously reported on where status remains unchanged

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill</th>
<th>Status since</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development Act 1993 – Motion to Disallow Regulated Trees Regulations</td>
<td>adjourned since February 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government (Waste Collection) Amendment Bill 2013</td>
<td>adjourned since March 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion for Disallowance of Codes of Practice made under the Work Health and Safety Act 2012</td>
<td>adjourned since May 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion for Disallowance of Development Regulations 2008 - Schedule 8 - Referrals and Concurrences</td>
<td>adjourned since June 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government (Rates) Amendment Bill 2012</td>
<td>adjourned since November 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electoral (Optional Preferential Voting) Amendment Bill 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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01 Background

The City of West Torrens, together with the City of Charles Sturt, Adelaide Shores and Adelaide Airport are preparing a Concept Plan for West Beach Road to improve its existing condition.

Stage 1 of the community consultation, the ‘information gathering’ phase was undertaken in October 2013.

Following this, four road layout options were prepared and provided to the community for comment as part of Stage 2 community consultation.

This report provides a summary of the Stage 2 consultation.

STAGE 2 CONSULTATION SUMMARY

The Stage 2 consultation process included:

- Invitation/flyer, road layout options and survey mailed-out to nearby residents in both the City of West Torrens and the City of Charles Sturt (refer Appendix A for Consultation Materials).
- Information and survey provided on both Council websites.
- ‘Drop in’ session on 10 June 2014 at the new Football Centre on West Beach Road. Residents and community members invited to chat with the project team about the four layout options prepared for West Beach Road and share any ideas they have.

An estimated 75 people attended the drop-in session.

SURVEY RESULTS

A total of 224 responses to the survey were received via hard-copy and both of the Council websites. This feedback has been reviewed and collated. Key findings are summarised in Part 02 of this report.
02 Key Findings

This section summarises the key findings from the survey. A full compilation of responses is included in Appendix B.

### QUESTION 1
Which council area do you live in?

- City of Charles Sturt: 63.7%
- City of West Torrens: 36.3%

### QUESTION 2
Do you currently live along West Beach Road?

- No: 77.3%
- Yes: 22.7%
QUESTION 3  How do you currently use West Beach Road? (tick all that apply)

- Driving: 94.2%
- Catching the bus: 29.8%
- Parking – residential: 17.8%
- Walking: 66.2%
- Cycling: 33.3%
QUESTION 4  Please review the 4 design options. Overall, please rank the 4 options in order of preference (with 1 being most preferred and 4 being least)

Overall results*  

* Note analysis is not restricted to one per property. 11 property addresses submitted 2 responses, 1 property address submitted 3 responses.

The pie chart presents the ranking score after preferences (as above) in percentage format.
QUESTION 4

Please review the 4 design options. Overall, please rank the 4 options in order of preference (with 1 being most preferred and 4 being least)

Residents living along West Beach Road (as per Question 2)

The pie chart presents the ranking score after preferences (as above) in percentage format.
QUESTION 4

Please review the 4 design options. Overall, please rank the 4 options in order of preference (with 1 being most preferred and 4 being least)

Residents not living along West Beach Road (as per Question 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
<th>Option 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linemarking + Minor Landscaping</td>
<td>Bike Lane + Shared Path</td>
<td>Service Road</td>
<td>Divided Road with Central Median</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77.1</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>83.8</td>
<td>96.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The pie chart presents the ranking score after preferences (as above) in percentage format.
QUESTION 5  Do you have any additional comments on the options?

Comments varied. The more common responses are listed below:

Option 1 – Linemarking + Minor Landscaping
- Doesn’t make a difference to existing conditions. Not a long-term solution. (25)
- Doesn’t improve driveway access / safety for residents (11)
- Parking needs to be included. More parking needed (11)
- The road works OK as it is. This option is all that is needed. Need to minimise spending. (10)
- No consideration for cyclists. Need to provide cycle facilities. (10)
- Little improvement to amenity/landscaping (5)
- Unsealed service road needs upgrading (5)

Option 2 – Bike Lane + Shared Path
- Don’t need both bike lanes and shared path – use this width elsewhere (19)
- Parking needs to be included. More parking needed (11)
- Doesn’t adequately improve driveway access / safety for residents (10)
- Doesn’t go far enough. Not a long-term solution. (9)
- Option provides good balance for cost and outcomes (7)
- Like improvements for cyclists (cycle lanes and shared paths) (6)

Option 3 – Service Road
- Best option for improving residents driveway access / safety (35)
- Not necessary, too costly, only benefits residents (25)
- Don’t need both bike lanes and shared path – use this width elsewhere (19)
- Prefer the service road to be two-way (8)
- Parking needs to be included. More parking needed (7)

Option 4 – Divided Road with Central Median
- Best option for overall/long-term function, streetscape and amenity (31)
- Not necessary, too costly (20)
- Doesn’t adequately improve residents driveway access, service road a better option (14)
- Don’t need both bike lanes and shared path – use this width elsewhere (10)
- Parking needs to be included. More parking needed (7)
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APPENDIX B  Collated Survey Responses
The City of West Torrens, together with the City of Charles Sturt, Adelaide Shores and Adelaide Airport are preparing a Concept Plan for West Beach Road to improve its existing condition.

Stage I of the community consultation, the ‘information gathering’ phase was undertaken in October 2013. Four road layout options have been prepared and are now available for comment.

Join the project team at a drop-in session to chat about the project and answer any questions.

**When:** 4:30 - 7:00pm, Tuesday 10 June 2014  
**Where:** Football Centre, West Beach Road

Surveys will also be available online at  
www.westtorrens.sa.gov.au  
www.charlessturt.sa.gov.au

Consultation closes **Friday 13 June 2014.**

**Project Goals:**
> Improved amenity and streetscape condition.  
> Improved access and safety for residents along West Beach Road.  
> Review of parking arrangements on both sides of West Beach Road.  
> Improvements to walking and cycling routes.  
> Incorporate Water Sensitive Urban Design (WSUD) eg. rain gardens.

For more information please contact City of West Torrens (08) 8416 6333 or City of Charles Sturt (08) 8408 1111
**WEST BEACH ROAD UPGRADE**

**Have your say**

The City of West Torrens, together with the City of Charles Sturt, Adelaide Shores and Adelaide Airport are preparing a Concept Plan for West Beach Road to improve its existing condition.

Stage 1 of the community consultation, the ‘information gathering’ phase was undertaken in October 2013. Four road layout options have been prepared and are now available for comment.

**Project Goals:**

- Improve amenity and streetscape condition.
- Improve access and safety for residents along West Beach Road.
- Review parking arrangements on both sides of West Beach Road.
- Improve walking and cycling routes.
- Incorporate Water Sensitive Urban Design (WSUD) e.g. rain gardens.

**Project Timeline**

1. Commence West Beach Road Concept Project - August 2013
2. Stage 1 consultation ‘information gathering’ - October 2013
3. Road layout options developed
4. Commence Detailed Design Phase - early 2015 subject to both Council’s approval
**OPTION 1 - LINE MARKING + MINOR LANDSCAPE WORKS**

**ESTIMATED COST - $0.5-1.0M**

*Preliminary estimate subject to detailed design*

- New line marking for existing roadway.
- Marked parallel parking against the northern kerb (residential side).
- Bollards and signage along the southern verge.
- Landscape step upgrade between main carriageway and unsealed 'service road'.
- Minor upgrade to unsealed service road for car park access.

**TYPICAL SECTION (LOOKING EAST)**

- Estimated roadway width.
- New line marking.
- Marked parallel parking along northern kerb (residential side).
- Bollards and signage along southern verge.
- Landscape step upgrade between main carriageway and unsealed 'service road'.
- Minor upgrade to unsealed service road for car park access.

**TYPICAL AERIAL VIEW**

**INDICATIVE PLAN**

- Footpath
- Lane
- Unsealed service road
- Vehicle control
- Existing street trees
- Existing roadway width.
- New line marking.
- Existing trees adjacent sports fields (shown indicatively)
- Existing entry roads
- Existing shared path
- Existing entry to service station - possible relocation of entry subject to future detailed design.
- Existing entry road to Adelaide Shores
- Existing sports facility building (Adelaide Shores)
- Future entry road to Adelaide Shores & Wetlands
- Future path to Wetlands
- Existing entry from South Road
- Existing entry from South Road - shown in green is temporary until further assessment to ensure it can be detailed elsewhere.
- Existing entry to South Road - shown in blue is temporary until further assessment to ensure it can be detailed elsewhere.

**ESTIMATED COST = $0.5-1.0M**

*Preliminary estimate subject to detailed design*
**OPTION 2 - BIKE LANE + SHARED PATH**

**ESTIMATED COST = $2-2.5M (EXCLUDES OFF-ROAD CARPARK)**

*PRELIMINARY ESTIMATE SUBJECT TO DETAILED DESIGN*

- New line marking for existing roadway and marked parallel parking against the northern kerb (residential side).
- Builds on Option 1 by adding:
  - on-road bike lanes and
  - an off-road shared path.
- Kerb and Water Sensitive Urban Design (WSUD) planting along southern verge.

**TYPICAL SECTION (LOOKING EAST)**

**TYPICAL AERIAL VIEW**

**INDICATIVE PLAN**
OPTION 3 - SERVICE ROAD

ESTIMATED COST = $4.5-6M (EXCLUDES OFF-ROAD CAR PARK)*

*PRELIMINARY ESTIMATE SUBJECT TO DETAILED DESIGN

- Full-road reconstruction.
- Service road (one-way) adjacent to residents.
- On-road cycle lanes.
- Off-road shared path.
- Marked parallel parking against the northern kerb (residential side).
- Kerb and Water Sensitive Urban Design (WSUD) planting along southern verge and some WSUD in service road median.

TYPICAL SECTION (LOOKING EAST)

TYPICAL AERIAL VIEW

INDICATIVE PLAN
**OPTION 4 - DIVIDED ROAD WITH CENTRAL MEDIAN**

*Estimated Cost - $4.2-5.5M (Excludes Off-Road Carpark)*

- Full-road reconstruction
- Central median with tree planting and WSUD
- On-road cycle lanes
- Off-road shared path
- Marked parallel parking against the northern kerb (residential side)
- Kerb and Water Sensitive Urban Design (WSUD) planting along southern verge.

**Typical Section (Looking East)**

**Typical Aerial View**

**Indicative Plan**
Appendix B Collated Survey Responses
WEST BEACH ROAD UPGRADE - SURVEY RESPONSES (VERBATIM)

1. Which council area do you live in?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council Area</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of West Torrens</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Charles Sturt</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>63.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitcham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live in City of West Torrens. Own property in City of Charles Sturt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Do you currently live along West Beach Road?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. How do you currently use West Beach Road?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Driving</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catching the bus</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking – residential</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avoid driving if possible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossing the road to use sporting facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Running + Sports Parking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backing out of my daughters driveway, often blind, with 2 little kids in the back seat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Running</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily usage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't use it often but am interested in the area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike riding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>walking across to get to the fields on barratte reserve, wailing up and down, riding bikes, walking dog use the road everyday to get in and out of our street.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Please review the 4 design options. Overall, please rank the 4 options in order of preference (with 1 being most preferred and 4 being least)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>1 (highest ranking)</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4 (lowest ranking)</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>95.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>96.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>124.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>69</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>122.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Do you have any additional comments on the options?

Option 1 – line marking and minor landscape works:

A quick fix but not as safe

All that is needed.

Barely any different to what is is now. Only window dressing! Do it properly the first time and it won't need re-doing in the future

Best cost effectiveness  Maintain capital value

Best option as the most urgent requirement is to have enough car parking for events held in the parklands.

Bike lanes best/safest when away from cards. There is plenty of space to do so

Bollards for vehicle control looks ugly and would be an infringement to the current ambiance of West Beach. It reminds me of the Trust home set up at West Lakes Boulevard when walking to Football Park in the past few years - retro out dated look. No thanks.

Bus shelters must be provided - strong winds and heavy rain make it impossible to keep umbrellas up.

Centre medium strip needs more nice, all time flowers bushes as it lookes neglected.

Cheapest, less disruptive option. Restrict casual parking on residential side. Allow for future further off road car parking on sports fields (if needed).

Clearer/new line marking is critical to the safety of this road. Currently landscaping looks tired so renewal is important

Concern that there is not a footpath on southern side where the service road is. This is the most popular side for us to walk down to the beach and back.

Considers sport parking - could have a shared path for cyclists

Current setup is not working especially since the opening of the soccer oval there is too much traffic and parking congestion and it is a dangerous set-up.

Definitely not this option! This option does not solve the parking problem on West Beach Road.

Does little to alleviate or improve access and safety for West Beach Road, residents and West Beach residents in general. Does little to improve amenity and streetscape conditions.

Does not address safety concerns regarding heavy vehicle traffic and safe driveway access. Does not address concerns that Council land is being used to provide parking to users of the West Beach Trust facilities despite ample ability for the Trust to accommodate its own users.

Does not fix any of the existing problems.

Does not improve access and safety for residents along West Beach Road

Does not meet the needs of the community

Does not resolve the issues of residents safely exiting properties and be protected from the main traffic flow

Does nothing for safety

Dual cycle lanes should be included on part existing verge and service road

Easiest, maybe not so costly, even Councils need to rein in spending. Ratepayers like neat, tidy roads etc. but not with a huge rate rise - unnecessary

Economically most acceptable but shows very little improvement to the existing conditions
Existing unsealed road needs to be sealed. Very difficult for northern residents to exit driveway. Not enough car parking space.

Fine for now!

Have you seen the cars parked there (27 May!) Define the 2 roads All options don’t take in the amount of parked cars. Is there ever going to be a car park (near Tapleys Hill Road?)

I do believe that this off road parking is a must

I like this option. Keep it simple and far less expensive for taxpayers. That makes great sense and probably less costly to maintain for all years going forward.

I think the minor upgrades would be of very little improvement and in a very short time would need upgrading again, in short a waste of money.

I think this is a optional thing but line marking is so important due to the lane.

Insufficient to the needs of the community

Just the same as it is now - no respite for residents on West Beach Road - no respite from the future development of West Beach Trust !!! There would still be traffic re the parking - Trust needs to provide parking within their land. No!

Leaving everything as is is just ok ("ok" is good)

Line marking - no real comments Minor landscape works - Lots of low line native bushes and plants to encourage wildlife and bring colour without blocking views

Line marking and speed humps to reduce traffic speed

Line marking only

Little improved amenity and streetscape condition.

Looks boring - may as well leave it the way it is

Make the existing grass verge (where cars currently park on sports days) a car park which is sealed. Seal the access road for car parking the entire length. Would also double as a cycle lane

Makes use of parking much needed during sports eventsKeeps cost down Use existing facilities. Add footpath on southern side

Minimum cost should be spent. Road works well as is

Modified with a sealed service road with controlled one way traffic and a shared path added.

More dangerous than what we have now. The bollards add an extra hazard as there is no escape for cars to avoid potential collisions by vehicles travelling east, using both lanes of West Beach Road because they think its a divided carriageway - happened twice to me in the past 3 weeks

Most cost effective and practicle. Parking must be retained for sporting events. Sometimes people are forced to park streets away. Bollards are a wast of money. Road needs resurfacing. Service road should be resurfaced

Needs lighting

No

No bike paths

No bike lane, minimal improvement on existing road.

No consideration has been given for cyclists - worst option in my opinion.
No different and will lean to an increasing number of accidents as traffic continues to increase with further developments by Adelaide Shores.

No good! Due to West Beach Trust ideas and future developments, they are not providing internal car parking in their decisions.

No great benefit but one would have thought it should have been an on going maintenance program. I personally first complained to council regarding the dust pit opposite my home about twelve years ago and then gave up complaining after five years.

No parking on north side of West Beach Road. Develop parking on south side of West Beach Road.

Not in favour since no provision for cyclists. In 2014 and beyond there should not be a development that fails to separate cyclists and motorists.

Not suitable.

Not worth the effort.

On the positive side, the amount of cars that park verge/existing unsealed service road, even though I personally don't have any need to as I live around the corner, I cannot imagine where they are all going to park if you were to remove this parking space. It would make a mess of the local surrounding streets if sports field visitors were to park & walk. Where would I & my visitors park? This would be my second option to basically keep the layout of the area the same - but it is definitely time for a road surface upgrade! I can't understand why the bus stop on the Eastern end of the road has already been redone if the rest of West Beach Road is supposedly still being planned. Surely this area should be part of this Consultation also since it is part of the map that has been included within the blue dotted line?

Out of all 4 options this option is the worst one because it is exactly the same as at the present time. It will continue to create traffic problems as all parking are at the verge.

Poor option, just a ban aid measure.

Prefferable option as parking is essential when sportsfield are being used.

Seal service road or upgrade.

The issue of traffic speeding on West Beach Road is not addressed. While the bollards and new line and parallel marking is welcomed more detail is required (eg how close to driveway entrances will cars be allowed to park, where are the exits/entrances for the parallel parking and if the exits will have STOP signs installed).

The minimum requirement should be for the installation of a bike lane. Considering the abundance of parking on the southern side of the road reserve the removal of on-street parking to be replaced by a full-time bike lane should be considered.

The missing part is the dual bike/walking lane. Having livie here for the last 12 years bar parking is a must if sporting is going to increase.

there is not much change to the real problem that is exsiting .you are not seperating the traffic from the residents.

Theyonly plan that some areas for car parking

This could actually be Ok if done well.

This is a wonderful opportunity to enhance the landscape with large shady trees in this desolate, hot and windy area. Much of our coastal landscape has puny scrubby trees and although perhaps natural to the area, are unattractive and not overly functional. Glenelg Council has shown us that Norfolk Island Pines, Moreton Bay Fig Trees and London Plane trees can be grown successfully in coastal regions. But please, allow them room to grow without discovering in a few years time that roots are causing problems with roads and services. Many council make the mistake of not allowing large trees to grow properly and eventually remove them. this is not
good forward planning. This is a tourist and recreational area and should be much more attractive and have much more natural canopy shade amenity

This is backward thinking - car traffic to the area should be minimised. Bowden has planning like this.

this is simply a cosmetic touch-up with no regard to safety of ALL users of West beach Rd. It does nothing to upgrade and beautify the whole road.

This is what we have at the moment and does not give residents safe access in and out of their homes.

This option is not going to solve any problems for residents or road users at all. It is basically providing car parks which should have been( and should be in the future), constructed inland by the West Beach Trust to provide parking for the soccer ventures which they have constructed and are planning for the future. This option does not provide for the increase in traffic flow for future years and is only a bandaid effect that will need to be re-done in years to come.

This option is not really an improvement to the road conditions.

This option offers no change to the existing situation. It is still extremely dangerous to exit our driveways and to walk along West Beach Road

this option seems to be the best for allowing car parking for the sports fields. if we have a look at charles sturt council and their ridiculous and offensive parking fines they hand out to the thousands of people on a saturday at jubilee park where they cant find parking for kids sports we MUST make sure that there are enough carparks for sport to save people parking in the back streets.

This option will make no difference to what is already in place i.e. unsafe for local residents who live on West Beach Road

Token effort that doesn't account for increased traffic and major entrance to West Beach and surrounding facilities (tourist, sporting, beach, etc)

Useless

Very Basic. No Safety

West Beach Trust have to provide public parking for any events. Residential parking area needs sign posts to restrict public parking on event days

With cars parked on north side of West Beach Road coming out of side streets find it hard to see traffic coming out.

Won't achieve much.

**Option 2 – bike lane and shared path:**

A segregated bike lane is preferred

A service road is more critical to safety.

always a good idea especially when lots of tourists and families are around using pedal power

An improvement on option 1 however, it still does not solve the problems for all the residents or the future years. The buffer creates a dangerous situation where residents think they can use it when reversing out of their driveway and traffic also think they could use it if a bus, large truck, trailer or caravan was coming in the opposite direction.

Better off doing a proper job

Bike lane should be dedicated - some cyclists are aggressive towards pedestrians and act as though pedestrians have no right to be on the shared path

Bike lane there and not part of road - better idea too dangerous! But still no respite to residents - no good.
Bike lanes are too dangerous. You show a shared path - that's plenty. No good for residents

Bike lanes best/safest when away from cards. There is plenty of space to do so

Bike lanes is not needed because it is not a popular road for bikes. Would be a waste of money

Bike lanes not necessary if dual bike/walking lane is wide enough. Not enough parking for sports using facilities. Professional bike riders like roads mostly from my observation have used beach dual lane regularly

Bike path not necessary as there are no bike lanes on Tapleys Hill Road

Both bike lanes and shared path are NOT required. Bike lanes only. Shares paths can be dangerous - speeding cyclists.

By far the best option - clearly shows bike lanes and clearly defines unmade road that leads to parking for the playing fields

Car park will take up parklands. Waste of land use. Extra cost of car park

Considering the number of cars that park in the current verge/existing unsealed service road space, I can not see any benefit whatsoever to anyone in turning this area in to just a footpath & grass. There is enough grass on the field & there is a footpath on the other side of the road.

Defeats purpose that requires proper vehicular traffic separation.

Do we need 2 road cycle lanes as well as cycling on the shared path? I would rather just cycling on the shared path.

Does not fix all existing problems.

Does not help the issue of parking and congestion

Does not improve access and safety

Does not meet the needs of the community

Does not resolve the issues of residents safely exiting properties and be protected from the main traffic flow

Don't need both bike lanes and a shared path

Dual travel lane not necessary. Shared path should be one way service to parking on verge

I do not understand why both are available to cyclists - they are dangerous to pedestrians if there is a bike lane the paths should be pedestrian only

I have no problem with a bike lane however in this option there doesn't seem to be enough off road parking

I think better upgrading is required for the future of our growing traffic etc.

Inadequate parking for use of sports grounds in short term. Why is there a bike track and shared path.

Insufficient to the needs of the community

Interrupts the walking pattern and accidents could occur as walkers do not hear/know when bikes are behind.

Kids are OK on bikes as they need elders to protect them

Is it necessary to have both cycle lanes and a shared path?

Is sensitive to the environment.

It does address concerns regarding use of southern verge by West Beach Trust users but pushes heavy traffic towards residents. It does not resolve safe driveway access, however I suggest re-voing the 3m at bike lanes to create a wider northern verge to provide a buffer zone to traffic and create line of sight for safe driveway access.
Like this one the best.

More than one bike lane is needed.

Most acceptable relative to estimated cost. Appears to meet all of the improvements necessary regarding traffic flow and car parking including the verge, trees, planting, etc

My concern is not understanding where the car parking will be i.e. Where will people be pulling into and out of parking for sports events?

My preferred option. A reasonable cost and a shared path for pedestrians and cyclists. Not sure why there is a need for bike lanes in addition to the shared path.

My Third preference, but still does not solve the problem of safety exiting property

Next best bike/walking lane woul dbe good for my grandchild and family activities, at the cost of losing much needed parking

No comment - number 4 is best

No parking on north side of West Beach Road. No cycle lanes - develop shared path. Incorporate parking on south side of West Beach Road.

Not a high priority as a footpath is available on north side of road.

Not enough parking in this option

Not necessary to have 2 bike lanes and shared path and footpath.

Not needed and have not seen a person on a cycle.

Not suitable

Offers improvement to road at a more reasonable cost

Option 1 also preserve the existing aesthetic which I also favour.

option 2 is much the same as option 1 , althought now you are throwing more traffic on the shared road ,that is more likely to get hit. still not fixing the main problem.

Option 2,3 & 4 - why do we need up to 3 pushbike lanes???

Plan 2 already has provisions for cyclists so they don't need to use the shared path.

Possible

Put the bike lanes with the shared path

Retain car parking adjacent sports oval - this is a must

Safety concerns and access to driveways still an issue. Shared path good but proposed bikeways are dangerous given boats, caravans and buses using the road

same as option 1. There is no improvement in the safety of ALL users except perhaps for cyclists which totally misses the whole and main purpose of the road upgrade

Same comments as Option 1 only marginally better than Option 1

Share path for me I think its important because public can use it also.

Shared path only, no extra bike lanes, there are ones on Tapleys Hill Road and along foreshore - enough. No to more separate bike lanes.

Significant improvement for ½ cost of option 3 & 4, with bike lanes included.
Southern double lanes will be under utilised

Still not good for the residents who need to get safely in and out of their driveways on what has now become an incredibly busy road.

The bike lane on road seems important as it links the bike path on Tapleys Hill Road to the Coast. A shared path will significantly increase safety for non car access to the Coast and Harbour Town - very important

The issue of traffic speeding on West Beach Road is not addressed. With the shared path and the 2 bike lanes there is 6M (plus footpath and verge on the northern side of another 1.5/2.0 M) while cars and parking occupy 9 M. Too much space in proportion provided to cyclists and shared path given the core issues effecting residents. I would also seek verification from a peak cycling group (eg Cycling SA) as to the current view of where bike lanes should be safely located in the WBR upgrade.

The most efficient way to connect Harbour Town to West Beach

This is a more equitable and inclusive option that meets the needs of all road users.

This is the second best option after option 4. It is not that expensive and hope it will solve the traffic and parking problems as long as off road parkings are provided.

This looks good. anything to do with bike lanes is great although to be honest as a cyclist not many people use west beach road for cycling. the only bike traffic would be from people travelling adjacent tapleys hill road. i ride that path daily and not many use it. Any money spent on bike lanes should be spent on the most popular bike route in south australia and that is military rd adjacent the caravan park, along the coast to outer harbour.

This option is not really an improvement to the road conditions.

This option is still unsafe, not addressing safety concerns due to the volume of traffic that continues to increase with the upgrades of Adelaide Shores.

This option will entice bike riders to use road and may cause injury or death as people exit property

Too many bike lanes/paths  Lack of parking  Cost blow out

Traffic has increased considerably. Not the most safe carriageway if travel lane size is going to be reduced. More dangerous for cyclists with this road scenario.

Useless

We don't have much bike traffic to warrant 3m of road being taken up.

We don't need a bike lane - bikes all travel along Military Road anyway  Footpath OK now as is but extend to Harbour Town

Weak, no real improvement. Still just as dangerous for ys to exit our property. All it gains is no cars parked on the Southern side of the road. Whats the big green space for?

Why shared path and bike lane? Very few cyclists. No consideration of sport parking which is a major problem

Would create an immediate parking problem.

Option 3 – service road:

2 roads not needed.

A service road is a good idea but it would be better for the playing fields as there are a lot less residents than sports people

As above

As in Option 4

As per Option 2
Best design to separate residential from sports field

Best option but needs tweaking. Remove bike lanes and widen road. 1.5m cycle track much too dangerous. Better to be part of shared path, also cyclists rarely travel east-west on West Beach Road - normal route along beach.

Best option for me if the area for bike lanes were to be included in the service lane. I don’t see many bikes used on this part of W/Beach road. I bought a caravan in the last year and would not want to big a median strip even on option three as I would never get the van out of my drive.

Best option for residents.

Best solution. Addresses all the existing problems.

Bike riders do not use our road a lot, Military Rd is the one used.

Central median might reduce confusion re 2 way though we don’t see extra value by going that option

Don’t need both bike lanes and shared path

Dual travel lane not necessary. Shared path should be one way service to parking on verge

Estimated most expensive while very appealing it would be financially too ambitious with insignificant improvements compared to Option 2

Excellent option - addresses safety and parking concerns. Would recommend removing 3m of bike lanes for 2 way access to service road

Expensive to ratepayers Bike Lanes only - NO shared path West Beach Trust to provide car parking

Get rid of the shared path and make the service road 2 way. People can use the existing footpath to walk on. Plan 3 already has provisions for cyclists so they don’t need to use the shared path. How will the concept of a shared path work with people entering and exiting Barrett reserve for their sporting events? Surely it will be a hazard for pedestrians. Aren’t they better off using the footpath on the Northern side where residents properties are? They could then cross the road with a road crossing for safety. The bicyclists can use the dedicated bike lanes.

Good compromise option that effectively will increase the value of residential properties adjacent

Good idea for sporting people.

Good option. Not sure why there are bicycle lanes next to the road AND a shared path where you can cycle.

How will residents in streets off West Beach Road enter their street via ”West Beach Road”. Is the ”only” entry Military Road end. No entry pictured on diagram

Hugh waste of money. Unnecessary. Waste of land building a road when we have an existing road

I anticipate this will be the preferred option for residents that reside along this road strip

I belive this is the safest and most practical for such a busy road and also a road that will get even busier.

I cannot see any reason why the service road cannot be two ways. Take out bicycle lanes and you have much more space to make service road wider.

I do not believe that the extra cost of this option is warranted. Temporary parking control measures on the northern side of the road would provide safe access for the residents during events. At other times traffic on West Beach Road is not that heavy

I find that existing service road works well for those trying to find parking at sports events. It separates those looking for parks from the normal traffic using the main carriageway.
I have doubts about the service road because people/drivers may not be aware it is a service road not travel lane.

I would not like to see anymore of the current lawns paved over for more parking. The parking as it is now - move in formal and on dirt or even strip.

If construction is looking to the future with all the sporting facilities eg:- Soccer, baseball, softball and any others, the residents are going to need the service road for ease of getting in and out of their properties.

If this is the cheapest option

If you have a 3.5m wide shared path (for walking/jogging & cycling) I am not sure why you still need 1.5m bike lanes on each lane. Why not make the shared path wider and you can also make the travel lanes wider.

Important, need more space.

In my experience as a police officer I believe service roads make it very difficult to find and get to houses in a rush when you need to. a waste of space.

Inadequate parking for use of sports grounds in short term. Why are there bike tracks + share path.

Is it necessary to have both cycle lanes and a shared path?

Is it really needed? If the road was widened with a median strip and turning lanes then the service road would be redundant.

Is totally unacceptable - this design prioritises the needs of a few and not the many.

Largest expense with minimal benefit except for residents on that section of W. Beach Road

Meets all 5 of your and our objectives. Safety guaranteed. Well designed, except for a total of 6.5m of bike lanes is ridiculous. Whose safety is being looked after? Cyclists or ours?

My favourite as it creates a buffer for West Beach Road residents. It is safer but I would question bike lanes on main road. Why can't they be part of shared path?

My preferred option, however I would like the bike lanes from the main road or the shared path removed to add onto the Service Road.

No cycle lanes required. One direction service road and parking is a good idea.

Not enough car parking

Not enough parking

Not in favour. Too costly and service road for residents seems excessive. Plus if a bike lane retained, then there is an unnecessary threat to cyclists by cards turning in front of them in order to park (or leave).

Not necessary to have 2 verges - we need more space for car parking.

Not needed - prevents residents on West Beach Road from turning into West Beach Road in both directions - same when returning home.

One way traffic only

Option 3 is best but I would like to see the bike lanes taken off the road and added onto the Service Road. There's already a bike lane on the shared path and we do not have professional cyclist ride along West Beach Road.

Option 3 is my preferred option with the Service Road, however instead of having the cycle tracks on the main road, take them away and use that area to add to the Service Road to make it Two Way. The 3.5 m Shared Path is adequate for the amount of cyclists that use this area.

Perfect
Really only benefits those who live on West Beach Road. You lose the parking near sports fields.

Reduce width of verges to enable parking

remove bike lanes both ways on West Beach Road - seldom see bike riders between Military and Tapleys Hill Road - thus increasing width by 3m bike and walkers will be catered for on shared path. Hundreds of bike riders travel from Henley Beach to Glenelg using Military Road turn left to beach front Seaview Rd and reverse

Remove cycle paths. Cyclists to share with pedestrians. Make service road two way by adding extra width

Remove the OM Road cycle lanes, add 3.0 metres to form bi-directional service road Send all cycle traffic down off road shared path

See landscaping comments above.m

Service road is okay. Some problems as Option 2

Service road may assist northern residents but travel lane and cycle lane still an issue with no barrier between traffic travelling in different directions.

Service road not necessary for shortness of road. Check sporting areas used, mostly weekends, holidays.

Shift trees on right hand side and make both roads 2 cars wide. Needs 2 lanes to pass buses.

Suitable

Suitable only for residents of West Beach Road

The safest option for us please. We have lived on West Beach Road for over 30 years.

The service road is the best option that provides easy access to driveways and most important will provide a safer living environment to everyone. The bad planning not including traffic management cannot be solved entirely, but this Option 3 helps all other proposals and seems to me to be doing things that achieve little. Do things right and don't do things in a cheaper way that will solve nothing.

There have been MANY times when people living on this street have reversed out of their driveways either without looking or with blind spots etc that have nearly caused accidents either involving me or the cars traveling before me (let alone cyclists that are harder again to see - especially depending where they are positioned on the road). If these residents had their own service road I believe would make this section of road safer for all users

This by far achieves ALL criteria....Safety for ALL users, upgrade of the whole road area instead just a "bit" of it. Do it once and do it properly the first time. It also is the best option to "show off" the main thoroughfare to Adelaide Shores facilities in a professional and visually exciting manner. We have almost the best if not the best facilities for tourists & holiday makers as well as the sporting fraternity and this option can only enhance this by making West Beach Rd part of the total showcase of Adelaide Shores

This has to happen because of what West Beach Trust has in store. Preferably with residents and visitors to properties only parking. If West Beach Trust want all this activity they need to provide parking within. Best option for residents.

This is the best option as it ensure the residents can park safely and accordingly in there own driveways and exit in a safe manner as well

This is the best option for residents. Living on West Beach Road put residents rights before soccer club which have already stressed residents and devalued properties in West Beach

this is the best option of the 4 , being that the traffic has been removed from the residents. it is safer for all.

This is the current layout and seems to focus mainly on few residents rather than significant numbers of road users
This is the only option for a safe environment for residents and visitors to our home. We feel that this is our basic right as residents and ratepayers. A service road would achieve this, beyond any other proposal.

This is the only option presented that will slow the traffic speed and allow safe entry/exit to residents’ driveways but there is still a lack of details eg starting and finishing points, location of entry and exits. All options represent an improvement but given what details (or lack of details) has been presented only option 3 can meet the Fore-see-able safety issues for residents by creating a buffer zone for residents. for visitors to the sports grounds by restricting the mixing of parked vehicles and pedestrians wishing to access the sports grounds. forces Adelaide Shores to face their responsibility to provide infrastructure for their developments.

This is the preferred option by all residents on West Beach Road.

This is the preferred option. Removal of the two cycle lanes on the main road in this plan would free up 3 meters of space to allow for a two-way Service Road.

This is the preferred option. It provides a service road for residents and creates far more safety for all concerned. The shared path can be used for walking and cycling. The cycle paths on the road may or may not be needed depending on bike riding. at the moment it is rare however in the future it may increase. The preference would be a 2-way service road.

This is the safest option and the best outcome for residents, cars, bikes and pedestrians. Exit and entry into our properties will be safe. This is what we would expect to happen due to the increased activities and upgrades at Adelaide Shores.

This option covers upgrades which will help all that use the road and should service the requirements of users for some years to come.

This option has too much restriction on road users.

This option is definitely the safest option and the option that must be considered for the safety of all of those who use West Beach Road frequently.

This option is needed and the only one that should be considered.

This suits those living on West Beach road but not residents generally.

Too confusing to road users.

Totally addresses access and safety. Residents only have residents vehicle to negotiate with then leaving driveway.

Traffic volumes would not warrant a separated service road.

Upgrade to verge needed in centre of road with trees (fake lawn OK if this option). Once again - cars for playing fields need to park. Don't need shared path.

We prefer option 3 because it promotes the safest environment for the ratepayers/residents living on West Beach Road. We are currently experiencing heavy traffic and with Adelaide Shores future plans it will be untenable to live peacefully and safely. We need to separate Adelaide Shores sporting events from the residents before a serious accident occurs.

West Beach Road does not really get that busy to warrant a service road but will help those who live on the road I grant that.

What are the speed limits?

With the increased development proposed by West Beach trust this is the only fair option to residents. They will (West Beach Trust) have to use the Golf Course for parking re: development of Woolsheds!
Works on burbridge road

**Option 4 – divided road with central median:**

A central median strip increases road safety. A divided road with central median clearly defines traffic direction. At present drivers travelling east along West Beach Road from Military Road (and who are not familiar with the area) often mistake both lanes as being east bound. Near miss head-on collisions are not uncommon. Signage is inadequate. A central median strip increases pedestrian safety. A divided road with central median provides pedestrians wanting to cross West Beach Road (to catch the bus for example) with a refuge. They only have to negotiate one direction of traffic at a time. A central median strip increases cyclist safety. Similarly, with the addition of a new bike/walking track behind the football field people wanting to connect with the track on the other side of West Beach Road will benefit from the refuge of a central median. These new bike/walking tracks will encourage people, especially families, into the area. Safety measures need to be a priority. A central median strip eliminates hoon behaviour. The intersection of Atlantic Avenue and West Beach Road is adjacent to the recessed bus stop on the southern side of West Beach Road. For years this widened area of road has been a favourite spot for hoons to do 'wheielie burnouts' usually occurring in the early hours of the morning. The noise disrupts sleep to nearby residents and sometimes hooning activities spill over into Atlantic Avenue. By the time police are alerted, activities have ceased. A central median strip adds to streetscape appeal. We strongly suggest extending the median strip all the way to Tapleys Hill Road to ensure continuity of design and safety as outlined above. Including landscaping elements of trees, shrubs, ornamental grasses or other water sensitive plants along the verges and median strip would have an enormous visual impact. Green belts beautify roadways.

A far superior option than 1 & 2 but not as good as option 3. Will provide all those benefits stated above for option 3 EXCEPT the safety issues for All users. The safety issues apply to ALL users of West beach Rd not just the residents

A service road is desired

Again, not in favour, too costs and far too elaborate

Another waste of money. A median strip will not improve anything, just cost money and space

As above

As long as there will be openings in the median to be able to turn into all side streets from West Beach Road (and also turn right out of side streets onto West Beach Road).

Best option to make the area more liveable and as a major thoroughfare it would look a lot better, solves pedestrian, cyclists, vehicular traffic with separation. Must consider any B-Doubles or trucks that may need to use the road.

Best streetscape and better to divide traffic

Better overall balance of roads and surrounding areas

Bike paths too dangerous - not needed, have shared path. Residents still have a problem getting in and out of driveways. Time limit needed on parking of north side road.

Brilliant!

Central median not necessary with park like settings to the South of West Beach Road, although question of parking is an issue considering the soccer ground was put too close to West Beach Road.

Clearly the best option! This is the most aesthetic and functional with a central median strip.

Divided road is a waste of crucial space which could be utilised on a Service Road.

Does not resolve the issues of residents safely exiting properties and be protected from the main traffic flow

Don't need both bike lanes and shared path
Expensive to ratepayers  No shared path required

Excellent Design – looks like it can accommodate the future. Road gets very busy in Holidays & traffic increase + foot traffic to Harbortown.

Great option for crossing. Avoids overtaking and keeps road controlled and safe.

How do people back out of their driveway when cars are parked and if its busy.

I see no benefit to anyone in having such a large median strip & removing the current parking space of the current verge/existing unsealed service road space. From what I can see this option would be detrimental rather than positive in any way.

I think the divided road with median strips was a waste of space although it looks good

If they have a shared path why have bike lanes on road? Too dangerous! Still residents have trouble with leaving their properties with all West Beach Trust cars parked on their side of road - NO!

If you are going to do it, then do it properly and this is that option. With the additional sporting facilities coming on line this is the best option

If you offered us a 2 lane/2 way then I would have reconsidered my current opinion. Given the above looks unjustifiable (economically speaking) I would say" 1. Make it clear its a 2 way road  2. (optional) add a bike lane

Inadequate parking for use of sports grounds in short term. Why are there bicycle tracks + share paths.

Is it necessary to have both cycle lanes and a shared path?

it reduces the traffic flow but the residents still have a hard time using the road ,and so do the people of west beach.

Lack of parking  Cost blow out  Use existing trees  Too many bike ways/paths

Like this the best safer for the residents and those attending sport

Local Council budgets will get badly squeezed in the medium and long term. Sve that money for something better adn less costly to maintain going forward.

Looking like a highway. Will devalue property

Looks aesthetically nice with tall pine trees.

Looks nice, but not sure if this will fix parking problems.

Major negative regarding limiting residents access to both directions

Median should be half width. Shared path access lane for verge parking

Median strip would be better used for sport parking on southern side - same comments as Option 2

Most attractive for residents along West Beach Road and visitors to the area.

New median looks good but not practical. Bicycle lanes not necessary with wide dual/path

No cycle lanes required. No parking on north side of West Beach Road.

Nice looking road option, but twice cost of Option 2.

Not as safe as option 3 but better than the first two options . Not much safety as people may inclined to walk down median strip to avoid cars
Not bad - halves the collision factor because we will only get collisions with vehicles travelling east. Parking on north side reduces our visibility to nil on event days at Holdfast Shores. Our lives are in the hands of the road users - this will not protect us.

Not completely happy with this Option, but it's my second choice. The 4.5 m Median Strip takes up too much area to be worthwhile when safety exiting our properties is the real issue.

Not necessary to have a central median, once again put the extra cost saved towards provision of car parks. Also why not have a shared path only on the north side and no path or shared path on south side?

Not suitable

Not warranted

OK, but not the best solution.

On really busy sporting event days I think this will really slow down for those heading west. For example those trying to pull into parking areas that are busy, there is no room to overtake. You may have to sit until car in front gets into a car park.

One way traffic much safer

Only slightly improves safety. Residents only need to be concerned with east bound traffic.

Preferred option BUT make sure you look at upgrading the lighting to V3 AS 1158 Standard. It should also be LED with a colour temp of 4100K. This should also be done on SAPN Stobies also as that is what we in DPTI are trying to achieve. This will give council long term savings & utilise latest technology rather than ’60s technology. (FYI: I am Planning & Designs Principal Road Lighting & Traffic Signals Tech officer for DPTI)

Promotes concept of the environment - peace, psychological health of the road users and resident needs. Consider the reduction in noise (of the sports) which is in addition to aircraft etc. Could have a different design along the length of the road.

Reduce size of median strip

Remove bike lanes (see Option 3) Reduce Median Strip from 4.5m to 2m

Restricts movement of vehicle traffic (congestion at peak use times). Require access right turn as well as left into Dennis Drive plus other roads off West Beach Road.

Room for the parked cars again (to playing fields) Don’t need shared path

Same as Option 3. Quite appealing but subject to the availability of funds the project would be unachievable.

See landscaping comments above.

See option 1

Still dangerous for people living on West Beach Road getting out of their driveways

Superior option incorporating all key elements of design, safety, amenity and cost effectiveness

Swap the shared path for a service road for the residents and you would probably have a winner there. The central median is a good width separating the 2 way road. People can use the existing footpath to walk on and don’t need a shared path. How will the concept of a shared path work with people entering and exiting Barrett reserve for their sporting events? Surely it will be a hazard for pedestrians. Aren’t they better off using the footpath on the Northern side where residents properties are? They could then cross the road with a road crossing for safety. The bicyclists can use the dedicated bike lanes.

The clearest distinction for traffic. Safest option

The Divided Road is a waste of space and does not solve our problem.
This appears to be the best design in my opinion.

This is by far the best option, provided that there is enough future parking area for vehicles abutting the sports field. However the 4.5m median strip perhaps should be narrowed down allowing more space for both cycle and car movement in both directions.

This is the best option for all West Beach residents, not just those living along West Beach Road. The cycle lane and 0.4 buffer allow for increased safety for West Beach Road residents reversing into West Beach Road.

This is the best option of all 4 options - however, it is very expensive and the Councils may not afford to carry out this option.

This option does address only part of the problem but it will still not address incidents of cars travelling in the opposite direction, in the same lane and it will still be unsafe to exit and enter our properties.

This option is also very good and should be considered.

This option is still not safe for backing out of driveways. Central median makes it impossible to cross one side to the other. i.e. getting into driveways if driving in from the east.

This option requires Council up keep of centre median. How many centre medians look neat and tidy? Being a feeder road at 50kph - this option is overkill and not cost effective.

This option would improve the streetscape but it is not as if this area is lacking open space...

This road is a major access point for visitors either to Harbour Town, the sports ground or Caravan Park. It seems that a functional safe and attractive welcome avenue is very appropriate.

This seems the best and is cheaper that option 3. The median allows room for turning lanes. Safer road and better flow of traffic with separation of flows and turning lanes. Would like to see the power poles removed as well. Would like to see the design go all the way to Tapleys Hill Road. Airport should be pressured into allowing it, through community and political pressure.

This seems the safest option, the current road is narrow enough now with many near misses occurring. Aesthetically looks better to compliment new sporting and recreation facilities that have been built.

This seems to be the most aesthetic and pleasing improvement to the road and an "entrance" into our fantastic suburb. as long as there is parking for the sports parks.

This would not work for me. We would still have parking problems and with the median strip it would be more difficult to get out of my driveway.

Too costly for little gain both in use of land and monetary value.

Too much verge and median strips. Would be much better with a service road. With increases in the amount of traffic, single lanes will create a problem with: cars turning, breaking down. going very slow, etc. Once again the buffer could be a problem between cars backing out of driveways and cars driving along at 50kmh and using the buffer when busses etc. are coming from the other direction.

Trees should be Date Palms as a continuation from upper West Burbridge Road.

Waste of money - as long as road is marked clearly with lines and then unmade road clearly distinguished so that someone doesn't think its a 2 lane road like they sometimes do now & drive on the wrong side.

Waste of money to have a central median.

Waste of money.
We live 200m north of the new soccer fields with major events (Soccer, Cavalier) our court has been used for parking. In all instances, the motorists have displaced courtesy. Makes us wonder if even Option 1 is an overkill.

West Beach Road doesn't deal with alot of traffic so the need for 2 lanes isn't necessary. This option definitely gives a beach and green feel to the area. Love the Norfold Island Pines

Why cant this option run from Tapleys Hill Road to Military Road?

Why waste millions of ratepayer’s money on a venue perhaps only utilised 20-30 days of the year. Use football (Soccer) car park supposedly to be built. Circus for 20 days last year was no problems thanks to parking controls.

Will help to control the traffic, removes the mixing of vehicles and pedestrians but there are no details re parking bays or specific means to limit traffic speed. The 3.5 M shared path plus the additional 2 lanes of 1.5 M of cycle track (total of 6M) is duplication and could be better used to increase the width of parking on the northern side of WBR (eg 2.6 M) and/or allow 2.5 M parking bays on the southern side of the road. For residents driveway access is improved and the division of the road should improve traffic flow both east and west.

With more sport off West Beach Road this would be a safer option

Would look fantastic

WSUD excellent. Median strip is safer for car travel. Why not have the Left Hand cycle land (E) incorporated with the shared path on the Right? Safer for cyclists. Why not make it compulsory ringing cycle bells on shared paths? Added car space for increased car travel. Make sure there is no shortage of trees and ample parking. Activities like the Bay to Birdwood Vintage car run, shortage of car parking every year with increasing problems.

1 lane is good = more trees. Two lanes for speeding “hoons” 😊

1 lane is enough – I don’t like the hoons that constantly use West Bch Rd. 3 rows of trees & bike tracks is more eco friendly for this part of town – lots of kids around!

6. Any further comments?

As part of the landscaping area in front of 66-82 West Beach Road, should not use Council land to expand the car parking already in use on West Beach Trust land. * See further comments from residents attached to survey *

Be bold and proceed with Option 4 straight away. These are no losers with this option

Brilliant!

Car parking - when? there should be no soccer wntil car park is operational.

Car parking is currently an issue. Adequate provision for car parking should be a major priority. An upgrade of this section of the road is of major priority. Safety for all is a major issue. Most people using this road are not locals, they are using the facilities or avoiding the traffic on Tapleys Hill Road - something needs to be done soon.

Concerned with work being carried out right now at eastern end - bitumen being laid will become very soft and pliable in summer almost melt actually so not a good surface to use these days for side of road. Residents nearby need easy access to their homes at all times.

Council should also discuss upgrading Seaview Road as well

Cyclist rarely use West Beach Road, most turn at roundabout and continue to Glenelg

Dislike options 2,3 and 4 because sporting reserve existing carparks will be lost.
Dual travel lanes are not necessary for West Beach Road.

Even though I reside in the Charles Sturt Council, I completed this survey on your website as the Charles Sturt website would not allow me to complete.

For safety reasons why isn't the shared bike / walking track wider instead of having bike tracks along the main road.

Further to the above comments, as well as making the 4.5m median strip narrower as well as the shared path (currently at 3.5m wide) it maybe possible to double the travel lanes for vehicles in both directions - thus allowing for possible overtaking.

Future car parking development (resident of Dennis Drive) - will inadequate parking of options 2,3 & 4 encourage cars to be parked in streets of West Beach Road until car park developed. Bike tracks are a good idea.

Great to see CCS is greening up the suburbs.

I assume that all options are funded from current rates and will not be used to justify rates increases.

I favour the far less expensive Option 1 and it is also the most pleasing to me from an aesthetic point of view, but can't you add a bike path to Option 1 also?

I hope the money is used well, it certainly looks like a good project. Voters don't like money wasted especially in these tough times.

I hope this doesn't come down to the cheapest option, you need to get it right from the start so that all parties are happy with the end result. remembering especially the people that have to live with it everyday.

In these days of rising costs – food, fuel, utilities etc. We must all 'cut our coat according to our cloth' & in this case choose an option that will not necessitate an increase in our rates. Perhaps any money saved could be used to complete the footpath work around West Beach eg. Windsor Tce.

I reside on the western side of Military Road (near the beach) & feel that this section should also have some attention given to it as its appearance is shabby and their median strips need some planting. There is a need for humps in the road due to traffic (particularly motorbikes speeding between this section of the road between Seaview & Military Roads).

I understand the costs involved are large but really, something needs to be done with West Beach Road asap. It is an accident waiting to happen. I have some horrific looking photos taken from my balcony. There is no point in having a bandaid fix done as that money would be better spent on the most suitable road for the future. The West Beach Trust, State and Federal Governments need to be a part of this project. Adelaide Shores is doing great things for the present and the future but, you cannot just keep putting in new wonderful venues and sporting and recreational fixtures for everyone to come and use without FIRST spending money on car parking and roads.

I want my council rates spent wisely. Not looking for unnecessary work. Parking is very important. Road needs resurfacing as it gets big pot holes regularly. Unsealed road if sealed along with landscaping would vastly improve aesthetics.

I would prefer a combination of 3 & 4 where there is a 1.4m verge on the side of the travel lanes and a 1.2m median strip between the travel lanes.

If you do Option 3 lets return it to 60kph road as it use to be!

If you want lighting advice on concepts please feel free to contact me on 84021798. I love to see councils being proactive in this area. Thanks.

If you want to save some cost use 2 coat chip seal instead of pavement for non traffic areas i.e. bike paths, walkways, etc.
In conclusion, a central median strip extending from Tapleys Hill Road to Military Road would improve the safety of motorists, cyclists and pedestrians and have great aesthetic appeal. It would provide a wonderful Gateway to Adelaide Shores, neatly completing the whole project.

It is essential that Adelaide Shores is held accountable for arranging sufficient parking for the sports events on their grounds. Adelaide shores has to make this a priority before any other development is planned. The increased activity caused by the Adelaide Shores developments is severely affecting the safety on West Beach Road.

It is great we have such good sporting facilities on West Beach Road and if they are to be used and appreciated we need a better road as access and sufficient car parking facilities. We need a path or shared path preferably n the north side - not north and south side.

Keep it simple It functions well at present (no need for bike lane - it would go nowhere!) People wouldn’t ride to Tapleys Hill Road

Maintain and mark parking to North and South side  Add footpath on South side  Keep existing trees

More , More large shady trees please. There is proof everywhere along the coast that this can be done.
Council choices in recent decades have not always been as good as our forefathers ie Glenelg, Outer Harbour etc.

My husband was killed on West Beach Road, 4 July 1980. Option 4 shows no other road to be on like Option 1 shows. A car park needs to be incorporated somewhere for the sporting events

No
No

No. 2 is cost effective and answers the users concerns.

None of the plans address car parking and the intersection of West Beach Road and Tapleys - there needs to be 2 right hand turning lanes to go South on Tapleys as traffic after sporting events can be considerably banked up along West Beach Road, an inconvience to residents

Not required - waste of Council money

On Major event days, it is very difficult for us to exit our property due to indiscriminate parking near our entry and exit points. We are always concerned with Bus traffic turning onto and into Rio Vista with cars park both sides of the road. If we have visitors then there are no parking opportunities for them near our property,(event days only) We have no problem with event days we both enjoy the use of the facilities we use them for walking as well. When there are cars parked all around the corners it is very difficult to exit safely from Rio Vista due to being unable to view traffic from either direction clearly, have seen accidents on this corner because of this problem.

One of the largest problems is the fact that Adelaide Shores is a totally unreliable partner. A huge part of the problems is that Adelaide Shores has DONE NOTHING for visitors that need to park their car, although Adelaide Shores has promised to provide car park space. For this reason I would appreciate it if the Council would put pressure on this matter, before signing of on any other requests from Adelaide Shores...

Option 2 - cost effective

Option 3 is really the only acceptable option

Option 4 needed to keep sport and caravan park traffic away from local residents trying to reverse out of their driveways and to keep West Beach Road looking like the premium suburb that it once was before sports took over West Beach Road.

Options 1 & 2 would not solve problem. Road between Military and Tapleys Hill Road is in very, very poor condition
Options 3 & 4 would meet all of the necessary criteria, however it is felt that these options would be subject to high costs and would most likely result in increased council rates with negative views. Alternatively, consideration could be given to proceed with a selected proposal but carrying out the upgrades in a stage by stage program to ease the financial burden.

Overall, we would be pleased with any works that improve the aesthetics and overall safety for all users of the road.

Parking and reversing has become a hazard when visiting.

Parking for the sporting fields on the south side is critical

Parking is used in back streets when big events - West Beach to Birdwood car rally. The parking goes back to the second street back.

Please encourage use of bicycles, public transport and walking. Please plant lots of trees for shade, beauty and air cleansing. More space for pedestrians and cyclists, less for private motor vehicles. More green, less bitumen.

Please use the money on our beach, not a road which works.

Prefer leave alone and resurface only - too much waste of rates on fancy projects Yes, resurface only. I’m worried that the fancy projects will result in our losing the bus service, plant trees on the reserves not the road

Prompt action is required. I cannot remember any improvements being carried out on West Beach Road in the 50 years I have lived in Miami Avenue in spite of considerable traffic increase over the years.

Recent sports events have highlighted the segregation required between residential housing and parking in front of our homes and parking which should be facilitated by Adelaide Shores for their events within their grounds, not on main Council road and off street parking.

Review parking arrangements on both sides - Only Option 1 looks at parking for sport. Very few cyclists use this part of West Beach Road. Why have up to three paths for them? Has a cyclist count ever been done? How do alterations east of creek crossing effect the plans?

See Option 5 (attached diagram)

Service Road needs to be built to solve the problems. Thank you.

Single way service road will inconvenience residents who want to head to Glenelg along Military Road. They have to go one way until there is an opening before changing directions. There were a lot of negative comments made about option 3. A lot of them are immaterial - for example the bus stops issue is not really an issue. Our council already had fixed that at the eastern end and the same could happens with Charles Sturt Council at the western end of West Beach Road. You don't need a bus stop in the middle near Rio Vista.

Something has to be done before a fatal accident particularly while games are on and the parking almost impossible

Something must be done. I have witnessed on two occasions: 1) A camper van drive straight into parked cars 2) Vehicle driving on wrong side of road and thinking its a double lane one way. 3) When grounds are being used turning into West Beach Road blind spots due to so many parked cars.

Spend the money and get it right the first time! There are genuine safety concerns and without the best Option being implemented there are going to be accidents.

Thank you for seeking comments. All options look like an exciting improvement

The area of West Beach seems to have grown and changed and successfully attracted more visitors. West Beach Road is a major access point and should therefore reflect how attractive the area is. The upgrade is an excellent project and important.
The future proposition of a huge high level playground in front of the Woolshed by West Beach Trust will mean the destruction of West Beach. Where will all these cars park? Sardi will be squashed out and they are much more important to SA. Goodbye what’s left of the sand dunes. They are destroying this environment.

The major issue is: appropriate car parking for those using the sports and adjacent areas (Harbour Town). Until this is addressed there is no point in spending money on roadways!!! It would be good if Adelaide Shores would put cycling tracks through the area that connected to current like tracks.

The old saying of ”DO IT ONCE AND DO IT PROPERLY” could not be more relevant and obvious with this upgrade.

The parking area should be at the site where the French Circus Caliver was held. If the Councils together with the Adelaide Airport can upgrade the surface with line marking, it will be an ideal area for car parking. It will certainly solve the traffic and parking problems.

The problem I have with Option 2,3,4 is the invasion of valuable green playing

The road in question is in reasonably good condition and appears to be capable of handling the traffic volumes required. To spend any amount anywhere that wh ich is proposed is a waste of ratepayers monet. Shelve this proposal and save out money!

The Service Road is the only acceptable option. This puts a buffer zone between residents and through traffic. The existing surface of road is noisy and when roads are re-done a surface should be used that absorbs noise. Council should go with this option as it is the only long term decision that recognises the problem.

The western and eastern roundabout need redesign and included in the plans. The western roundabout is failing - it regularly floods and road damage occurs - may cause subsidence for nearby buildings. Parking could be underground (aspects of the road could be underground). Cars should be minimised in the area. Could have an underground tube - improve public transport - less bicycle traffic.

There is no way I can back out of my driveway safely without a service road when events are on. Sometimes I sit in my car for 10mins waiting for an opportunity

Trees to be planted to suit existing trees in and around the area. Norfolk Pines may not be suitable due to dropping leaves/branches.

We are currently experiencing heavy traffic and with Adelaide Shores future plans it will be untenable to live peacefully and safely. We need to separate Adelaide Shores sporting events from the residents before a serious accident occurs.

We avoid driving on this road due to unsafe markings on the road. Many near misses in the last 30 years of living here.

We avoid driving on this road due to unsafe markings on the road. Many near misses in the last 30 years of living here.

We need 2 lane right hand turn at Tapleys Hill Road traffic lights Entrance to petrol station on West Beach Road is too close to Tapleys Hill Road - I have witnessed 1 accident and many dangerous misses

We need to know the West Beach Shores future plans for their proposed exit and entry points to the proposed internal car parks. Also the work done on the stretch of West Beach Road from Atlantic Ave to Tapleys Hill Road appears to have preempted todays consultation. Has the Council already decided on Option 1 or 2?

We use West Beach Road on most days either driving or walking. The cars and parking on sporting days is a mess. The road is too narrow with cars parked on the northern side of the road and the southern side

We would very much welcome a cycle path and off road shared path as my 8 year old son was riding his bike down West Beach Road recently (along the pathway) and was almost hit by a car reversing out of its driveway as some of the fences are higher along that section of road and he did not see my son until the last second.
West Beach Road (WBR) is a SPEED zone and speed is the major issue along with parking. WBR it is about a kilometre long without intersections, has the reserve on the southern side providing the spacious appearance and with many cars entering from the 80 KM zones of Tapley’s Hill Road speeding is very common. WBR does not look like a suburban 50KM zone and unless the issue of speeding vehicles (including motorcycles, trucks, buses and caravans) is addressed the residents’ concerns can not be met and road safety in general will not improve. The current and potential growth in vehicle and pedestrian traffic along WBR the mixing of vehicles and pedestrians is an accident waiting to happen. The lack of specific details about all of the options has limited their value. I would also like to acknowledge the support provided by our local councillors, Garth Palmer and Rosalie Haese and other members of West Torrens Council and express my disgust at Adelaide Shores for their lack of consultation and for pushing the issues onto the councils. What % of the cost will they sustain?

West Beach Road is a service road not a main road. Speed limit is 50kph. It needs to be practical

What about separated bike lanes? Not offered as an option...

What about West Beach Road between Military and Seaview Roads? Are you going to clean up that area?

How are you going to slow traffic down on these roads?

When turning right on Dennis Drive into West Beach Road vision is obstructed by parked cars and becomes very dangerous. You have not indicated where parking for sports area is going to be

While it is possible to comment on the 4 road designs I cannot say which is the best design without knowing what off road parking arrangements will be provided around the sporting fields, especially the new soccer ground which was built without any parking

Why is there upgrade of "Bus Rank" south side, if this upgrade goes ahead, does this fit in with the plans!!

Why aren’t you continuing up to the beach???

Will there be any facilities to conduct public or private functions, such as concerts, open air cinema, park land, BBQ facilities with public convienences, bike racks, shaded / under cover areas?

Will this survey be made public if not why if so when?

With the proposed development of West Beach Trust we need the service road for West Beach residents. If West Beach Trust putting in all this stuff to attract people they must provide parking. Where are they getting all this money? John Rau's pockets. The West Beach Trust need to have a residential representative on their Board!!!

Yes please. A long straight road like this is an invite for people to speed. I can't see any reference to speed inhibitors, things to slow people down. can you please consider that. it is a main road going past sporting grounds used by kids. people need more than simply signs to slow them down on this straight stretch of road.

Yes, Option 1 needs a 'pretty up' Extend footpath already there to Harbour Town Define the 2 roads with bollards - that's good

You have to weigh up safety v's cost. Be a hollow regrettable feeling to have a fatality/injury because a cheap option is selected now. Adelaide Shores pays no council rates, nor adheres to Council by laws, parking restrictions etc. Their input should not be considered until they do