NOTICE OF MEETING
Notice is hereby given that the next ordinary meeting of Council will be held on Tuesday 21 August 2018 in the Council Chambers, 43 – 51 Tanunda Road, Nuriootpa, commencing at 9.00am.

Martin McCarthy
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER
THE BAROSSA COUNCIL
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12. CLOSURE
NOTICE OF MOTION – COUNCIL MEETING TIMES
B7322

PURPOSE
To debate a notice of motion put forward by Cr Boothby to rescind the original motion
to set Council meeting times, days and location and replace it with an alternative
meeting time on the same day of the month in the same location.

RECOMMENDATION 1
That Council rescind the motion 2014-18 /6 of 18 November 2014 being:

“That:

(1) For the term of the Council ordinary meetings of The Barossa Council be held
on the third Tuesday of the month with the exception of the January ordinary
meeting which shall be held on the fourth Tuesday; and

(2) Ordinary Council meetings commence at 9am; and

(3) Ordinary Council meetings shall be held in The Barossa Council Chamber, 43-51
Tanunda Road, Nuriootpa.”

Should Council resolve to rescind the original motion Cr Boothby intends to move the
following motion.

RECOMMENDATION 2
That:

(1) For the remainder of the ordinary meetings of The Barossa Council that
meetings be held on the third Tuesday of the month commencing at 6pm.

(2) The Ordinary meetings of Council shall be held in The Barossa Council
Chamber, 43-51, Tanunda Road, Nuriootpa; and

(3) Council provides notice of this change to the public.

REPORT
Council has received a notice of motion providing the required 5 days clear notice
and it is duly listed for debate. The notice is provided at the Attachment which
articulates the rationale for the notice.

The relevant legislation requires the Council to set Council meeting dates, times and
locations under Section 81 of the Local Government Act. The Act requires Council to
set (except the very first meeting of the Council which is set by the Chief Executive Officer):

1. Time and place of ordinary meetings.
2. Meetings to be held at least monthly.
3. Cannot be held on Sundays or public holiday.
4. Municipal Councils must be held after 5pm unless resolved unanimously.

It is correctly stated that all municipal Councils hold their meetings after 5pm. In undertaking brief research of surrounding and a random sample of other like size regional and rural Councils the following table provides summarised information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council</th>
<th>Meeting Time Commencement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gawler</td>
<td>Tuesdays – 7 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light</td>
<td>Tuesdays – 5 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adelaide Plains</td>
<td>Monday – 6.30 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Murray</td>
<td>Tuesday – 9.30 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wakefield</td>
<td>Wednesday – 6.30 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt Gambier</td>
<td>Tuesday – 6 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorke Peninsula</td>
<td>Wednesday – 7.30 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper Coast</td>
<td>Wednesday – 7 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Lincoln</td>
<td>Monday – 7.30 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renmark Paringa</td>
<td>Tuesday – 7 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wattle Range Council</td>
<td>Tuesday – 5 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naracoorte Lucindale Council</td>
<td>Tuesday – 4.30 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murray Bridge</td>
<td>Monday/Tuesday – 7pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandrina</td>
<td>Monday – 5 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victor Harbour</td>
<td>Monday – 5.30 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wudinna</td>
<td>Tuesday – 1 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatiara</td>
<td>Tuesday – 5 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Pirie</td>
<td>Wednesday – 7.30 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Augusta</td>
<td>Monday – 6 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Council of Robe</td>
<td>Tuesday – 6 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt Barker</td>
<td>Monday – 7 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adelaide Hills</td>
<td>Tuesday – 6.30 pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ATTACHMENTS OR OTHER SUPPORTING REFERENCES**

Notice of Motion

**COMMUNITY PLAN / CORPORATE PLAN / LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS**

Community Plan

- **Community and Culture**

  2.8 Provide opportunities for the community to participate in local decision-making.

- **How We Work – Good Governance**

  6.1 Ensure that the community has access to information regarding the discussions held and decisions made by Elected Members.
Legislation
Section 81 Local Government Act 1999
Regulation 12 Local Government (Meetings and Procedures) Regulations

**FINANCIAL, RESOURCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT CONSIDERATIONS**
Nil impacts - Council officers normally in attendance are senior and are compensated within employment packages for overtime.

**COMMUNITY CONSULTATION**
There is no requirement to consult with the community under policy however notice of any change if so approved will be made through papers circulating in the area, on Facebook and our web site.
Dear Martin

**Motion: Council Meeting Times**

Pursuant to Regulation 12 of the *Local Government (Procedures at Meetings) Regulations* I hereby provide written notice that at the next ordinary meeting of Council I intend to move a motion to rescind motion 2014-18/6 being:

**MOVED** Cr Miller that:
(1) For the term of the Council ordinary meetings of The Barossa Council be held on the **third** Tuesday of the month with the exception of the January ordinary meeting which shall be held on the **fourth** Tuesday; and
(2) Ordinary Council meetings commence at 9am; and
(3) Ordinary Council meetings shall be held in The Barossa Council Chamber, 43-51, Tanunda Road, Nuriootpa.

**Seconded** Cr Milne

CARRIED 2014-18/6

Should the motion to rescind be successful I intend to move the following motion:

- That for the remainder of the ordinary meetings of The Barossa Council that meetings be held on the third Tuesday of the month **commencing at 6pm**
- That the ordinary meetings of Council shall be held in The Barossa Council Chamber, 43-51, Tanunda Road, Nuriootpa; and
- That Council provides notice of this change to the public.

**RATIONALE**

The time, date and location for Council meetings is set by resolution of Council. All municipal Councils are required to meet after 5pm unless the whole Council determines otherwise. Most Councils in South Australia hold meetings at night to maximise accessibility and transparency; and in the interests of good governance.

Having the meeting during traditional business hours and particularly at 9am in the morning means that a large percentage of our community members are not able to attend meetings and therefore would not consider nominating for Council. Increasing diversity of people on council can support the sharing of different ideas, beliefs and perspectives and encourage robust discussion, test ideas and result in better decision making.

Evening meetings can also result in increased public attendance at Council meetings. The benefits of this include greater understanding of the role of Councillors and local government, greater transparency and improved awareness of decisions. Whilst Council meetings continue to be held during the day some members of the community, such as full-time workers or parents of young children, will find it harder to attend Council meetings or to fulfil the duties of Councillors.

Shifting Council meetings to out of traditional business hours will allow the public greater flexibility to attend meetings, allow people to experience Council and the democratic process; and encourage more community members to potentially nominate for Council. Evening meetings will potentially facilitate a greater cross section of community members to consider Council as a way of contributing back to and leading the community.
Whilst amending the start time for only the few remaining ordinary meetings of Council may seem insignificant, it will send a clear message to the community that Council has a desire to make meetings more accessible; and allow members of the public that would otherwise be unable to attend Council meetings at 9am to be present and hear debate.

It is my understanding that you will place this notice, having been received at least 5 clear days prior to the meeting at which I intend to move the motions, on the Council agenda for the meeting of 21 August 2018.

Yours sincerely

Cr Leonie Boothby
Mayors Report to Council
16th June July 2018 to 13th August 2018

JULY 2018
16/07/2018  Meeting with Mayors of Gawler, Light and Adelaide Plains
23/07/2018  Handover of defibrillator from CWA to Council
23/07/2018  Update meeting with CEO
26/07/2018  Welcome to Japanese students at Sandy Creek Primary
27/07/2018  Dinner in Adelaide to welcome Luzhou Laijao Vice President
30/07/2018  Redeemer School, Installation of Youth Parliament members
30/07/2018  Meeting with Community Crèche member

AUGUST 2018
01/08/2018  LG Grants Commission visit
01/08/2018  Special CASC Meeting
01/08/2018  Special Council Meeting
01/08/2018  Council Workshop
01/08/2018  Sir Condor Laucke Oration, Nuriootpa
02/08/2018  The Rex, Photo Op re awards won
02/08/2018  Meet ratepayer re land change of use
02/08/2018  Catch up meeting with CEO
03/08/2018  Kelley Jones election breakfast
06/08/2018  Linke’s Bakery 80th birthday celebrations
07/08/2018  ABC Radio Port Pirie interview re TDU
09/08/2018  FlowFM radio interview
09/08/2018  Karen McColl re suicide prevention initiatives
09/08/2018  BBBfm radio interview
10/08/2018  Safari Tents Launch at Barossa Discovery Park
11/08/2018  Wine Auction Dinner at Faith College
4.2.1 CONSENSUS AGENDA – CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

4.2.1.1 CAR PARKING CONTRIBUTION AGREED WITH NURIOOTPA MEDICAL CENTRE
B3375

Pursuant to Council’s resolution 2014-18/1400 of the ordinary meeting held 15 May 2018 I report back that the outcome of negotiations was a contribution of $20,260 (plus GST) which is within the range of authorisation provided to me to settle the amount. The estimated cost of the reseal, line marking and preparation work was $97,500 and the amount of car parks sought was 8, there are 77 total car parks. Therefore the calculation was based on 8/77th of the reseal cost for two reseals. The amount was agreed and has been paid. Preparation works for the sealing work are underway.

RECOMMENDATION
That report 4.2.1.1 be receive and noted.
4.3.2 CONSENSUS AGENDA - MANAGER COMMUNITY PROJECTS

4.3.2.1 BAROSSA AQUATIC AND FITNESS CENTRE - ANNUAL REPORT
18/1385

Belgravia Leisure have provided an annual report on the activities and key performance indicators of the Barossa Aquatic and Fitness Centre for 2017/18.

Key highlights include:
- Financial key performance indicators
- Membership growth, health club and swim school
- Barossa Swimming Club
- Olympic Gold Medallist visit
- 24/7 gym access
- Pop-up fitness sessions
- Award winner and finalist

Copy attached for information.

RECOMMENDATION:
That report 4.3.2.1 be received and noted.
The Rex Barossa Aquatic and Fitness Centre

Annual Report

Executive Summary

The 2017/18 financial year has seen some great growth through both the Swim School and the Health Club. We have had many successes and improvements that continue to assist in us being able provide the community with a facility that they can be proud of.

The swim school has seen outstanding growth across the last 12 months with increased revenue from $296,445 to $361,568. This is an 18% growth in income over the past 12 months. From the end of June 2017 to the end of June 2018 we have increased our swim school participation from 445 to 592 and for the very first time reached a peak of 615. This is an extra 147 participants and a participation growth of 25%.

In the Health Club we have seen a membership growth of 12.5% with growth in 10 of the 12 month. This comes of the back of the introduction of 24.7 access in February 2018 which had an immediate impact with 54 members signing up within the first week. Currently we sit at 971 members with the aim to get to 1000. Over the 2017/18 year we have seen the introduction of serval new group fitness classes which have positively impacted the growth of our membership base.

Some of the other great highlights and achievements over the past 12 months have been:

- The introduction of the Barossa Swimming Club, which has gone from 20 initial members to over 50 active swimmers
- The introduction of a fulltime Squash Development Officer working from the centre
- The introduction of the new junior basketball carnival, which saw 63 teams from across SA visit the Barossa
- A visit from Olympic Gold Medallist Brooke Hanson
- Recreation SA Watch Around Water award for our continued education around water safety.
- SA Facility of the Year at the Belgravia Leisure awards night
- Finalist for Centre of the Year at the Belgravia Leisure awards night
- Runner up for Swim School of the Year at the Belgravia Leisure awards night
- Finalist for Community program of the year for our educational talks in Schools, Kindys and Childcare centres around water safety.

Overall a very successful year for The Rex Barossa Aquatic and Fitness Centre and something the Barossa Council, in partnership with Belgravia, should be very proud of. With a passionate staff base we look to continue the growth in participation and greater sustainability for the region.
## 2017/2018 Key Performance Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Target 2018</th>
<th>YTD Tracking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>$1,757,962</td>
<td>$1,767,508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td>$2,121,563</td>
<td>$2,052,281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Profit</td>
<td>-$407,854</td>
<td>-$332,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct debit health club weekly yield</td>
<td>$16.35</td>
<td>$17.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct debit Learn to Swim weekly yield</td>
<td>$16.24</td>
<td>$16.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Personal cost % of income</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Club Wage to Income %</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swim School Wage to Income %</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swim School Membership Growth</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Club membership growth</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Program Growth</td>
<td>2 new programs established</td>
<td>Community water safety Education talks Community Pop up Fitness sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Centre Attendance</td>
<td>10% Growth</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6 great moments of the 2017/18 year

1. The visit from Olympic Gold Medallist Brooke Hanson
2. Our Staff getting involved in the community to help at the Barossa Runaway Marathon event

3. International Women’s day lunch

4. The opening of our 24.7 access at The Rex
5. The Education talks we are taking out into our community

6. The pop up fitness sessions introduced to our community.
4.4.1 CONSENSUS AGENDA – DIRECTOR’S REPORT

4.4.1.1 TREES FOR LIFE
B7401 18/51959

Trees for Life have provided Council with Bush for Life site activity reports for the period April - June 2018 which provides details of activities undertaken at various sites and also a Summary of Achievements 2017-2018 for Members’ information – see attached.

RECOMMENDATION:
That the report be received and noted.
Site Code and Name:  BR002  Winters Rd
Owner:  Barossa Council
Coordinator:  Megan Lock
Email/Phone:  meganl@treesforlife.org.au / 0408 878 075

Comments:
Bridal creeper and annual weedy grasses were targeted with herbicide during today’s activity in the eastern half of the site.
Coordinator tasks
✔️ Phytophthora precautions taken ✔️ Map mark-up
✔️ BFL sandwich board signs used ✔️ BFL sign(s) checked
☐ Plant specimens/photos collected for ID ☐ GPS points taken
☐ Species list updated ☐ Work Zone Traffic Management
☐ Photo points taken ☐ Rubbish removed

Volunteer training activities conducted
✔️ Site analysis ✔️ Visitor impact management
✔️ Work strategy and time management ✔️ Plant identification
✔️ Monitoring and photo points ✔️ Communication and team building
✔️ Minimal disturbance bushcare techniques ✔️ Use of tools and equipment
✔️ WHS and hazard identification ✔️ Roadside safety discussed

Site support

This table provides bushcarers with some suggested priorities to work on in between visits from the coordinator. Remember, disturbance of the soil and soil coverings (moss, lichen etc) should be kept to a minimum, and large weeds should be cut into smaller pieces so they break down more quickly when scattered on site. Contact your Regional Coordinator if you have weeds for deep burial (e.g. bridal creeper), to discuss site strategy or issues, or for anything you are unsure of. Happy bushcaring!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Weed/s, suggested actions, locations and timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pussytail grass: is a perennial plant to around 30 cm high, with a dense golden brown panicle. Use a steak knife to cut underneath the tussock. Only work on this weed in areas of valuable vegetation to maximise your efforts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2        | Bridal Creeper. Scattered across the site appearing from June to October. There are a few treatment options when it comes to Bridal Creeper.
- Wipe foliage with 1:5 glyphosate and water using Tongs-of-Death ensuring the entire plant is covered with herbicide for desirable results. Conduct follow-up as required.
- Alternatively manually remove tubers using a two-pronged weeder. Only choose the latter option, if the tubers are small as removal of large tubers creates large soil disturbance. The tubers are required to be bagged and removed from the site. Please do not place the tubers in your household/green bin - I can collect material next visit for disposal in deep burial. If you run out of time to treat this invasive creeper, you can always pull the tendrils from the ground; this will prevent the creeper from setting seed. If the creeper has fruited, the berries will need to be bagged and taken of site.
Hand pull Tendrils at the base. If berries are present the foliage will need to be bagged for removal off site. Again, these can not be placed into a household/ green bin. I will collect the material next visit for disposal in deep burial. If no berries are present it is ok to leave foliage on the ground |

On-ground works completed during site visit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of activity:</th>
<th>Staff only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of vols:</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor:</td>
<td>Megan Lock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start time:</td>
<td>10:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other TFL staff:</td>
<td>PW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End time:</td>
<td>12:15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Work undertaken:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main weed species / tasks</th>
<th>Treatment method (Herbicide, surfactant and rate)</th>
<th>Location of actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual weedy grasses &amp; bridal creeper</td>
<td>See spray report below</td>
<td>Eastern half of site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Upcoming activities:

T.B.A
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spray report:</th>
<th></th>
<th>Weather conditions:</th>
<th>Dry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spraying time:</td>
<td>10:20am to 12:15pm</td>
<td>Wind direction:</td>
<td>ENE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind speed:</td>
<td>Light</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forecast max. temp:</td>
<td>12°C</td>
<td>Actual max temp:</td>
<td>11°C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff engaged in spraying:</td>
<td>1. Peter Watton</td>
<td>Pesticide Licence #:</td>
<td>1. 83889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Megan Lock</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. 84860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical product name + total amount of product used:</td>
<td>Fusilade – 70ml</td>
<td>Total volume of mixed herbicide output:</td>
<td>35 litres Fusilade &amp; water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Met Mac – 0.1g</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 litres Met Mac &amp; water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maxi Wet – 80ml</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Site Code and Name: BR003 Boehm Springs
Owner: Barossa Council
Coordinator: Megan Lock
Email/Phone: meganl@treesforlife.org.au / 0408 878 075

Bushcare volunteers present
Kym Smith
Mick Abberley

Carer on this site?
☑
☐

Mick and Kym Treating Arum Lily under a severely grazed Native Cherry Tree
Kym treating Dog Rose with the cut and swab method
Mick working hard, removing a small isolated Blackberry patch
Arum Lily. Scattered throughout the site.

Comments:
This morning’s activity consisted of treating outlaying Arum Lily and Blackberry. Spraying the main infestation of Blackberry should be considered for 2018-2019.
### Coordinator tasks
- ✓ Phytophthora precautions taken
- ✓ BFL sandwich board signs used
- ✓ Plant specimens/photos collected for ID
- ✓ Species list updated
- ☐ Photo points taken
- ✓ Map mark-up
- ✓ BFL sign(s) checked
- ☐ GPS points taken
- ☐ Work Zone Traffic Management
- ☐ Rubbish removed

### Volunteer training activities conducted
- ✓ Site analysis
- ✓ Work strategy and time management
- ✓ Monitoring and photo points
- ✓ Minimal disturbance bushcare techniques
- ✓ WHS and hazard identification

### Site support
This table provides bushcarers with some suggested priorities to work on in between visits from the coordinator. Remember, disturbance of the soil and soil coverings (moss, lichen etc) should be kept to a minimum, and large weeds should be cut into smaller pieces so they break down more quickly when scattered on site. Contact your Regional Coordinator if you have weeds for deep burial (e.g. bridal creeper), to discuss site strategy or issues, or for anything you are unsure of. Happy bushcaring!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Weed/s, suggested actions, locations and timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Arum lily: Continue to patrol site for Arum lily. Treat by cutting and swabbing with 1:5 glyphosate and water mix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Blackberry: Continue to push the weed front back by removing the crown of the blackberry. You can also cut and swab using 1:5 glyphosate and water.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Dogrose: Cut and swab with 1:5 glyphosate and water mix.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### On-ground works completed during site visit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of activity:</th>
<th>MiniBAT</th>
<th>No. of vols:</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor:</td>
<td>Megan Lock</td>
<td>Start time:</td>
<td>9:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other TFL staff:</td>
<td></td>
<td>End time:</td>
<td>12:30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Work undertaken:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main weed species / tasks</th>
<th>Treatment method (Herbicide, surfactant and rate)</th>
<th>Location of actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blackberry, Arum Lily, Dog Rose</td>
<td>Cut and swabbed with 1:5 Glyphosate &amp; water.</td>
<td>Through out site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Upcoming activities:**

T.B.A
Site Code and Name: BR008 Mount Rd
Owner: Barossa Council
Coordinator: Megan Lock
Email/Phone: meganl@treesforlife.org.au / 0408 878 075

Bushcare volunteers present
Allan Vreugdenburg

Carer on this site? ✔

Core work area- Lots of native grasses, Acacia seedlings and Lilies appearing in this area.

Cranberry Heath- small dense native shrub found in the main core work area

Native Geranium- Will develop pink/white flowers

Hill Raspwort. This is scattered across the site. It is an erect perennial herb, usually to 35cm high. Stems are covered with long stiff hairs. This photo was taken on another BFL site as the plants on Mount Road are only just starting to green up with recent rain.
Comments:
This morning mainly consisted of identifying plants and working on Pussytail Grass in the main core work area. Allan is happy to continue working on Plantain as well as Pussytail Grass in the main core area of the site. Once he is confident with both of these weeds we will slowly add in others than can be targeted.

We discussed the potential to spray for weedy annual grasses with Fusilade in the main core work area, as well as possibly spot spraying plantain. Spot spraying Plantain may be more useful once the core area is under control and we begin to move the weed front outwards.

Remember, when you begin to feel overwhelmed with the site, remind yourself to be native focused not weed focused. Find a native and hand weed around it rather than working in a huge weedy patch. By concentrating your efforts in the main core work area you should begin to feel less overwhelmed with the site.

A few extra visits for plant I.D with Allan will also be useful as he gets to know the site better.

Lots of lilies are beginning to appear on site as well as plenty of Golden Wattle seedlings.

Coordinator tasks
✅ Phytophthora precautions taken
✅ BFL sandwich board signs used
☐ Plant specimens/photos collected for ID
☐ Species list updated
☐ Photo points taken

Map mark-up
✅ BFL sign(s) checked
☐ GPS points taken
☐ Work Zone Traffic Management
☐ Rubbish removed

Volunteer training activities conducted
✅ Site analysis
✅ Work strategy and time management
✅ Monitoring and photo points
✅ Minimal disturbance bushcare techniques
✅ WHS and hazard identification

Visitor impact management
✅ Plant identification
✅ Communication and team building
✅ Use of tools and equipment
✅ Roadside safety discussed

Site support
This table provides bushcarers with some suggested priorities to work on in between visits from the coordinator. Remember, disturbance of the soil and soil coverings (moss, lichen etc) should be kept to a minimum, and large weeds should be cut into smaller pieces so they break down more quickly when scattered on site. Contact your Regional Coordinator if you have weeds for deep burial (e.g. bridal creeper), to discuss site strategy or issues, or for anything you are unsure of. Happy bushcaring!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Weed/s, suggested actions, locations and timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pussytail Grass: is a perennial plant to around 30 cm high, with dense branched flower heads, yellow, bronze or purplish with numerous small, awned florets. Leaves are flat bladed, soft, bright green; ligule a ring of long hairs. It can be often confused with the native Wallaby Grass as it can be difficult to differentiate between them. If in doubt, leave it, take a photo and email me for identification. Use a steak knife to cut underneath the tussock. Only work on this weed in areas of valuable vegetation to maximise your efforts. Continue to work in the main core work area that we established on Friday)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### On-ground works completed during site visit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of activity:</th>
<th>MiniBAT</th>
<th>No. of vols:</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor:</td>
<td>Megan Lock</td>
<td>Start time:</td>
<td>9:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End time:</td>
<td>10:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Work undertaken:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main weed species / tasks</th>
<th>Treatment method (Herbicide, surfactant and rate)</th>
<th>Location of actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pussytail Grass</td>
<td>Cut below the crown with a serrated knife</td>
<td>Main core work area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Upcoming activities:**

T.B.A
Site Code and Name: BR009 Gottwald Rd Reserve
Owner: Barossa Council
Coordinator: Megan Lock
Email/Phone: meganl@treesforlife.org.au / 0408 878 075

Bushcare volunteers present

- Kym Smith
- Yvonne Gravier
- Mick Abberley
- Doug Grey

Carer on this site?

- ✓
- ✓
- 
- 

First Group Photo at Gottwald Road

Kym and Doug inspecting the one Native Violet plant on site

Beautiful sunny day for the first activity held at Gottwald Road.

There are plenty of Olives to treat throughout the site
Today marked the first activity held at Gottwald Road. As this site is new, we all went for a walk to see what the place had to offer. Despite being very dry, the site has a lot of hidden treasures. Two photo point areas were established as well as recognising there are a lot of Olives to be treated throughout the site.

After morning tea, Kym and Mick began to drill and fill Buckthorn while Yvonne, Doug and I treated Blackberry Nightshade, Boneseed, Olive seedlings and Cotton Bush.

Coordinator tasks

- ☑ Phytophthora precautions taken
- ☑ BFL sandwich board signs used
- ☑ Plant specimens/photos collected for ID
- ☑ Species list updated
- ☑ Photo points taken
- ☑ Map mark-up
- ☑ BFL sign(s) checked
- ☑ GPS points taken
- ☑ Work Zone Traffic Management
- ☑ Rubbish removed

Volunteer training activities conducted

- ☑ Site analysis
- ☑ Work strategy and time management
- ☑ Monitoring and photo points
- ☑ Minimal disturbance bushcare techniques
- ☑ WHS and hazard identification
- ☑ Visitor impact management
- ☑ Plant identification
- ☑ Communication and team building
- ☑ Use of tools and equipment
- ☑ Roadside safety discussed

Site support

This table provides bushcarers with some suggested priorities to work on in between visits from the coordinator. Remember, disturbance of the soil and soil coverings (moss, lichen etc) should be kept to a minimum, and large weeds should be cut into smaller pieces so they break down more quickly when scattered on site. Contact your Regional Coordinator if you have weeds for deep burial (e.g. bridal creeper), to discuss site strategy or issues, or for anything you are unsure of. Happy bushcaring!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Weed/s, suggested actions, locations and timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Olive: Drill and fill large trees with 1:5 glyphosate and water. Small seedlings: cut below lignotuber or if soil is damp, carefully hand pull.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Buckthorn: Drill and fill 1:5 glyphosate and water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bridal Creeper: RC to spray dense infestations. For scattered plants hand remove tubers with 2 prong digger, bagging tubers for removal off site or hand pull tendrils at the base, bagging foliage if berries are present for removal off site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Boneseed: Cut and swab with 1:5 glyphosate and water</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On-ground works completed during site visit

- **Type of activity:** MiniBAT
- **No. of vols:** 4
- **Supervisor:** Megan Lock
- **Start time:** 9:00am
- **End time:** 12:30pm

Work undertaken:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main weed species / tasks</th>
<th>Treatment method (Herbicide, surfactant and rate)</th>
<th>Location of actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buckthorn</td>
<td>Drilled and filled with 1:5 Glyphosate &amp; water</td>
<td>Southern end of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackberry Nightshade, Cottonbush, Olive seedling</td>
<td>Cut and swabbed with 1:5 Glyphosate &amp; water.</td>
<td>Through out site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boneseed</td>
<td>Carefully hand pulled</td>
<td>Through out site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Site Code and Name:  BR009  Gottwald Rd Reserve
Owner:  Barossa Council
Coordinator:  Megan Lock
Email/Phone:  meganl@treesforlife.org.au / 0408 878 075

Comments:
Site carer Kym has begun to treat Bridal Creeper on site with a Met Mac mix. Outlaying soursobs and One o'clock have also been sprayed. A number of Olives and Blowfly Bushes have been cut and swabbed or drilled and filled. The site is looking great with a number of flowers emerging, bringing colour to the area.

Coordinator tasks
☑ Phytophthora precautions taken
☑ BFL sandwich board signs used
☐ Plant specimens/photos collected for ID
☐ Species list updated
☐ Photo points taken
☑ Map mark-up
☑ BFL sign(s) checked
☐ GPS points taken
☐ Work Zone Traffic Management
☐ Rubbish removed

Volunteer training activities conducted
☑ Site analysis
☑ Work strategy and time management
☑ Monitoring and photo points
☑ Minimal disturbance bushcare techniques
☑ WHS and hazard identification
☑ Visitor impact management
☑ Plant identification
☑ Communication and team building
☑ Use of tools and equipment
☐ Roadside safety discussed
### Site support

This table provides bushcarers with some suggested priorities to work on in between visits from the coordinator. Remember, disturbance of the soil and soil coverings (moss, lichen etc) should be kept to a minimum, and large weeds should be cut into smaller pieces so they break down more quickly when scattered on site. Contact your Regional Coordinator if you have weeds for deep burial (e.g. bridal creeper), to discuss site strategy or issues, or for anything you are unsure of. Happy bushcaring!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Weed/s, suggested actions, locations and timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Olives- Continue to cut and swab seedlings or drill and fill larger plants with a 1:5 Glyphosate and water mix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Boneseed- Patrol site for seedlings, hand removing if the soil is damp enough and easy to do so. Cut and swab with 1:5 glyphosate and water mix for larger plants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Buckthorn- Cut and swab seedlings or drill and fill larger plants with a 1:5 Glyphosate and water mix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Cottonbush- cut and swab seedlings or drill and fill larger plants with a 1:5 Glyphosate and water mix</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### On-ground works completed during site visit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of activity</th>
<th>Staff only</th>
<th>No. of vols:</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>Megan Lock</td>
<td>Start time:</td>
<td>12:20pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other TFL staff</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>End time:</td>
<td>1:00pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Work undertaken:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main weed species / tasks</th>
<th>Treatment method (Herbicide, surfactant and rate)</th>
<th>Location of actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boneseed</td>
<td>Carefully hand pulled</td>
<td>Throughout site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Upcoming activities:**

25th September 2018
Regional Coordinator Megan Lock and volunteer Mick, on a foggy winter morning at Boehm Reserve

Bush For Life 2017-18 Summary of Achievements

The **Bush For Life** program trains and supports volunteers to care for some of our most intact native vegetation using minimal disturbance bush regeneration techniques.

State-wide Summary

Over the past 12 months through its **Bush For Life** program, Trees For Life:

- managed **311 Bush For Life sites** throughout South Australia
- involved more than **600 ‘adopt-a-site’ bushcarers** who achieved over **32,000 hours** of unsupervised volunteer bush regeneration work on their sites
- protected around **4,200 hectares** of remnant bushland in South Australia
- coordinated **24 training days** for community volunteers, filling **193 places** in our introductory and advanced bush regeneration workshops
- ran **745 site activities** supervised by our professional field officers, involving over 12,300 hours of volunteer bush regeneration work - more than **950 volunteers** are registered for our supervised activities

*delivered 48,540 hours of on-ground bush regeneration work, with a volunteer component valued at $1,790,870*  

* Data from the Australian Bureau of Statistics supports a valuation for volunteer work of approx. $40 per hour

Barossa Council Summary, 2017-18

- **6 Bush For Life sites** on council land  
- **14 ‘adopt-a-site’ volunteers** allocated to these sites  
- An estimated **591 hours** of site-specific bush regeneration work delivered by these volunteers  
- In addition we held:
  - 2 BATs, 10 mini-BATs and **2 support visits** on these sites, during which volunteers contributed **134 hours** of on-ground work
  - Our skilled Field Officers undertook **64 hours** of on-ground work on these sites alongside volunteers

Equivalent to an on-ground work contribution of **$32,520 to the Barossa Council during 2017-18**
4.5.1 CONSENSUS AGENDA – DEVELOPMENT POLICY REPORT

4.5.1.1 CHARACTER PRESERVATION LEGISLATION REVIEW – UPDATE REPORT


The State Government has released a Review Outcomes Report which was tabled in Parliament on 19 June 2018 and forms Attachment 2. Four main recommendations have been made which are summarised below:

1. Retain the legislation.

2. The State Planning Commission investigate the merit of requested boundary amendments in the context of Greater Adelaide’s growth. The report notes this review could be completed in around 12 months and inform the Planning and Design Code and future land supply decisions.

3. Introduce a statutory review process that provides for future boundary changes to follow the same process as reviews of Environment and Food Production Areas.

4. Provide for greater consistency and clarity of policy within the character preservation districts through the Planning and Design Code, in particular to provide further clarity on the envisaged/desired primary production value-adding and tourism activities in the character preservation districts.

The State Government advises that no immediate changes to the Acts will be pursued until the Commission has led a proper review and investigation into boundary adjustments, policy refinements and improved process to make such amendments.

For more information visit the website: Character Preservation review outcomes

RECOMMENDATION:
That report item 4.5.1.1 be received.
The Barossa Council analysis and comments on discussion paper

The Character Preservation Acts aim to protect the character values of the districts. Do you think these values are being adequately protected?

The Barossa Council comments

To an extent there is partial protection. Any failure to adequately protect these values however, is not necessarily the fault of the Acts, but potentially related more to ongoing gaps, inconsistencies, and inadequacies in Development Plan policies. These include the lack of appropriate design criteria and the presence of restrictive policies relating to flexible primary production and value-adding.

As discussed later, there is no evidence that the objects of the Acts are actively given regard or taken into account by decision makers other than Councils, contrary to the requirements of section 6(2) of each Act. This apparent failure potentially leads to future decisions being made that don’t further the objects of the Acts.

Do you think the land division controls restricting the creation of additional allotments are adequate to ensure character within the districts is maintained?

The Barossa Council comments

In the majority of instances land division to create additional allotments for any purpose were non-complying prior to the introduction of the legislation and generally not supported. Such proposals continue to be non-complying however the Acts introduced the obligation to refuse applications which create additional lots for “residential development”, a phrase which it is noted is yet to be tested in case law. To date Council has only received one non-complying land division application within the character preservation district, and as it did not create an additional allotment for residential development, Council was not obliged to refuse the proposal.

While the legislation prevents creation of additional allotments for “residential development” it is silent in respect to proposals which realign existing allotments and which result in allotments more suited for residential development than previous – e.g. realignment of 2 x 32 ha lots into 1 x 63 ha and 1 x 1 ha lots. It is also silent in respect to the development of existing allotments as ‘hobby’ farms or to build a ‘lifestyle’ dwelling with minimal associated primary production. Development policies relating to these situations currently vary across the Council area, however
they do not specially speak against realignment and in a number of zones require a minimum lot size for construction of a dwelling.

Council believes no change is necessary to the legislation in this regard and that proposals to realign existing allotments continue to be assessed against existing local development policies. However, as discussed later, changes to development policies are required to ensure character is maintained as a result of the built form on existing allotments in terms of siting, design and construction materials.

Have changes to the SA Planning Strategy and relevant Council Development Plans in response to these Acts helped to implement them?

The Barossa Council comments

The discussion paper incorrectly notes on page 6 that the Development Plans of all affected councils have been amended with local rules aligning with the Acts and the Planning Strategy. Although the Planning Strategy Addendum (the Addendum) provided more understanding of the special character of the respective districts there have been no subsequent changes to Development Plan policies solely as a result of the Planning Strategy Addendum (the Addendum). The changes introduced to the various Development Plans via the Ministerial DPA in 2013 were high level only with a simple insertion of the Character Preservation Overlay and high level objectives. No detailed policies were introduced at the time and there remains significant policy gaps between the Addendum and Development Plan policies. Accordingly, existing Development Plan policies don’t always support the objects of the Acts.

The Barossa Council was the first council to initiate a review of Development Plan policies following the Addendum (via its Rural Areas and Character Review) initiating a subsequent Rural Areas and Character DPA which has been placed on hold pending the current planning reforms and collaboration between Council and DPTI on the forthcoming Planning and Design Code. In addition to closing the policy gaps, Council’s DPA also proposed to relax restrictions on diversification and value adding.

What do you consider are the family, social, economic and environmental impacts of the Act/s?

The Barossa Council comments

It is not possible to draw any conclusions in terms of the impact of the Acts and changes in development approvals. Although the discussion paper attempts to demonstrate the ‘before and after’ through various charts, it is difficult to measure given that no agreed ‘success’ criteria or baseline measures were put in place when the legislation was introduced. For example, in relation to dwelling approvals and land division a variety of factors would have influenced the change in the number of approvals including demand, availability of allotments, and the availability of land for division in rural living areas.

Demand remains constant for dwellings in rural areas and there has been a perceived increase in tourist accommodation in the form of small bed and breakfast as well as several proposals for larger scale motel and hotel accommodation within
townships and the rural areas. Anecdotally we have seen more small scale wineries and cellar doors, however it is not clear on what conclusions can be drawn from this in terms of correlation with the Acts, or whether it is simply the result of market forces and trends generally.

It is unlikely that the Acts have had any impact on land supply and demand given that land division for residential development was non-complying in the rural areas prior to introduction of the Acts. In other words the Acts have not redirected demand to townships.

A positive outcome from the Barossa Valley legislation was the inclusion of rural living areas adjacent to Tanunda, Lyndoch, Eden Valley and Williamstown within the township boundary. This action has subsequently been incorporated into The 30-Year Plan for Greater Adelaide 2017 Update. This provides scope for those areas to accommodate future higher density residential development to meet any demand. Sufficient zoned supply currently exists within the townships however that supply is not evenly distributed, with Williamstown and Tanunda likely to reach capacity sooner than other towns. However, at some point, when the supply of vacant allotments within townships is exhausted the council and the community will need to consider how to best accommodate future growth – e.g. no more broad-hectare residential development; higher density within townships; or expand township boundaries which would require change to the township boundaries as prescribed by the Act (see further below section regarding changes needed).

No evidence exists of any specific family or social impacts of the legislation. The broader community perhaps still questions the purpose and intent of the character preservation but it essentially has had no discernible impact on the nature of individual ratepayer applications for development.

Anecdotal evidence suggests some primary producers and allied business operators perceive the Act to be restrictive and an impediment to routine farming activities. Those perceptions could be manifesting themselves in different ways – e.g.:

- a farmer not investing in new infrastructure on the basis that the Act does not support future primary production
- a farmer revising their succession planning involving sale of multiple allotments on the basis that dwellings are not possible on those allotments
- a business not investing in new equipment or adopting new practices on the basis that the Act foreshadows potential regulations to prohibit or further restrict the undertaking of a specified activity.

These perceptions can result in lack of business confidence and possible decline in community wellbeing (with associated personal family, social and mental health impacts).

Have these Acts resulted in any positive or negative impacts on farming operations or farm business?

The Barossa Council comments
The Acts themselves have not had any direct impact on farming operations, but as indicated above there appears to be perceptions that the Acts have imposed new restrictions on traditional practices. Instead impediments to farming operations and farm business are generally the result of inflexible and restrictive development policies, State and Federal legislative obligations, market trends, commodity prices, inflation and the like.

**Do you believe any changes are needed in the Act/s?**

_The Barossa Council comments_

Council assumes that “the Acts” comprise the written legislative provisions together with the associated plans deposited in the General Registry Office at Adelaide (i.e. plans numbered GP 3 of 2012 (McLaren Vale) and GP 4 of 2012 (Barossa Valley)), and that both components should be under review. It is therefore disappointing that the discussion paper does not address boundary aspects. Council is also concerned that the discussion paper does not address the requirement for decision makers to have regard to the Acts. These aspects are discussed below together with other aspects.

**Section 6(2) consideration**

It is understood the intent was for section 6(2) (requiring consideration of the Act when making decisions) to apply broadly across all government departments and agencies and was to be included in their strategy and policy formulation, decision making, in addition to assessment and development considerations.

Prior to deciding on any application for Development Plan Consent Council’s decision maker (i.e. either a delegated officer or the Council Assessment Panel) must resolve pursuant to section 6(2) of the _Character Preservation (Barossa Valley) Act 2012_, that the officer or panel has had regard to the objects of the Act and, in determining the application, seeks to further the objects of the Act. To date, there have been no applications that have been determined that do not further the objects.

Unfortunately there appears to be a perception that section 6(2), and the associated powers to require information in section 9, only apply to the affected councils and their decision making relating to development applications. There is no evidence that government departments, including respective Ministers are determining compliance with the objectives of the legislation. This appears to potentially disregard the status of the Act, particularly where referrals of applications are made to government agencies, and the potential interrelationship with other Acts and regulatory frameworks.

Council does not suggest this provision requires change, but suggests an urgent need exists for general awareness training for all government agencies including respective Ministers, together with recommended templates and methodology.

This is consistent with the requirement to consider the Objects and Objectives under the _River Murray Act 2003_ and the _Adelaide Dolphin Sanctuary Act 2005_ when considering related operational Acts, including the Development Act. However, in this instance the Character Preservation Acts do not identify ‘related operational
Acts’ and is dependent on whether an Act requires an approval, consent, licence, permit or other authorisation granted or required under an Act.

**Requested map changes**

- Review inclusion of parts of the Adelaide Hills Council within the Barossa Valley district (i.e. Cromer, Forreston, Humbug Scrub, Kersbrook and Mount Crawford).
- Exclude industrial land on Stockwell Road, Angaston (within the Industry (Barossa Valley Region) Zone) from the ‘rural area’ and either introduce a special ‘designated area’ as was done for certain rural living areas or include this area in a ‘township’.
- Include the identified area west of Nuriootpa within the Nuriootpa township. This area is within Light Regional Council and comprises the Neil Avenue residential enclave and the land between that street and Moppa Road to the east. Neil Avenue properties are connected to The Barossa Council’s Community Wastewater Management System and is an area that has been identified by Light Regional Council for potential future residential development; a concept which The Barossa Council would not oppose.

**Potential legislative changes**

- Remove requirement for State Planning Commission concurrence for land divisions which create additional lots within existing Rural Living Zones. This requirement adds an extra decision point despite those areas being in the Rural Living Zone which specifically envisages additional rural living allotments. This appears to be counter intuitive. To date concurrence has been granted on all requests suggesting that the additional administrative obligation has simply added an additional layer of assessment which elongates due process with no particular benefit. Consequently there is a need to review this requirement.
- The prescribed allotment provisions in the Barossa Valley legislation are confusing and require review.
- Preventing controlled intensification of rural living areas is also questioned – i.e. creating smaller lots in some areas potentially results in more opportunities within existing rural living areas and reduced demand for rural dwellings elsewhere.
- There is a need to review inclusion of the entirety of townships in the preservation district – e.g. new residential estates in Nuriootpa. While the interface of the township with the rural area requires careful management, other township areas (internal development areas) are well separated from the interface of the rural areas and are therefore suitably buffered. These areas are also visually separated from the rural areas and therefore ‘screened’ from view and unlikely to impact on the special character of the districts.
- Section 8(8) indicates that certain development authorisations for land divisions will be taken to be subject to the condition that additional lots created will not be used for residential development. Council is concerned that such an ‘implied’ condition, or an actual condition on the authorisation would not be carried forward to the actual new title(s) and therefore future owners would be unaware of the condition and its limitation. This imposes an obligation on the relevant council to set up and maintain some kind of notation or alert on the respective properties in order to include this ongoing condition on property search certificates issued under the *Land and Business (Sale and Conveyancing) Act 1994*. Council considers an alternative approach would
be for the 'condition' to be included on the new title – in brief, the
development authorisation would contain a condition relating to the use of the
land, but also a condition requiring an associated notation on the associated
title(s) which reflects the other condition.

Other changes

Council also requests a review of how the districts are shown in Development Plans
as the terminology used within the Development Plan differs from Act – i.e.:

- “district” within Act comprises the entire area shown on GRO Plan GP 4 of 2012
  including areas marked “rural area”, “rural living area” and “township”,
  whereas Character Preservation District overlay maps in Development Plan
  show each “township” as “Area Excluded from District”. Presumably this
  exclusion is only for the purpose of the “Character Preservation District Overlay”
  as the Development Plan can’t override or vary the Act
- “rural area” within Act is shown as “Character Preservation District” on Heritage
  and Character Preservation District overlay maps
- “rural living area” within Act is shown as “Designated Area” on Heritage and
  Character Preservation District overlay maps
- "Designated Area" on maps is not referred to in written policies.

The outcome of this approach is that it creates the wrong impression that townships
are excluded from the district.

Potential removal or adjustment of existing provisions

The review should also consider if the following provisions could be removed or
adjusted:

- Remove or adjust the requirement to review the planning strategy. The
  Addendum has been prepared and therefore this provision has been fulfilled
  and arguably is redundant. Alternatively it could be adjusted to require regular
  review or updating of the Addendum.
- Remove or adjust the requirement to review Development Plan policies. This is
  because the six months has been and gone.
- Remove the consequential amendment provisions from the McLaren Vale
  legislation as the Development Act and other Acts have been amended and
  therefore the provisions are redundant.
- The Acts only require a single review which is currently being undertaken.
  Consideration should be given to requiring regular five yearly reviews.

SA’s new planning system is currently being developed. Are there any changes you
would suggest for implementing character preservation in the new system?

The Barossa Council comments

General
The State Planning Policy should be based on/incorporate the policies contained in the Planning Strategy Addendum.

Regional Plans simply need to reflect the SPP (i.e. Addendum) – e.g. not provide for residential development outside designated townships.

In respect to the Planning and Design Code the Overlay approach will be the most appropriate way to identify the districts as it is easily applicable across multiple zones. Some discussion exists about the introduction of a special zone for primary production land within the CPD – e.g. Primary Production (Character Preservation) Zone; however this implies a special zone would be also required for all other zones within a protection district which would result in a complicated suite of zones.

**Major project status**

The *Character Preservation (McLaren Vale) Act 2012* amended section 46 of the Development Act to provide that the Minister could not declare a major project for a development within a character preservation rural area. It is noted that this provision has not been transferred across to the *Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016* which is concerning and arguably is contrary to the intent of the character preservation legislation. This omission needs to be addressed through an amendment to the new legislation.

**Environment and Food Production Areas**

The character preservation districts have a distinctive point of difference to the Environment and Food Production Areas which needs to be maintained. Whereas both tools are de-facto urban growth boundaries, the character protection legislation additionally recognises and seeks to protect and enhance each districts' special character.

The Addendum subsequently expanded on the various character values, and in the case of preserving and enhancing the viticultural, agricultural and associated industries the Addendum seeks to ensure there are positive development policies relating to value adding and flexible farming practices. This point of difference must not be lost through the planning reforms but could potentially be applied to other areas.

**Further questions**

If clarification or additional information is required please contact either Paul Mickan, Principal Planner (8563 8493) or Louis Monteduro, Senior Manager Planning Services (8563 8492).
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1 Introduction and Summary

The Character Preservation (Barossa Valley) Act 2012 and the Character Preservation (McLaren Vale) Act 2012 (the Acts) were introduced to protect the special character of the Barossa Valley and McLaren Vale.

The legislation was supported by changes to the South Australian Planning Strategy and local development plans to provide clarity about special areas that should be protected from residential subdivision. This is important to:

- protect our valuable food producing and rural areas
- conserve our prized natural landscapes, and tourism and environmental resources
- provide more certainty to food and wine producers about their ongoing investment
- make it clear where residential growth should happen.

The legislation has been effective in protecting our vital food and agricultural land and in containing the threat of urban encroachment. A key outcome of the legislation is the long-term protection afforded to these districts through a reduced ability to subdivide land for residential purposes. The evidence shows that the legislation has reduced the number of residential land divisions in sensitive areas while maintaining an appropriate supply of land for housing within townships.

The character legislation specifies that the Minister must undertake a review within five years of its commencement. As such, the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure coordinated this process and a discussion paper was released in October 2017 which included some background and assessment of the affects these Acts following initial conversations with councils and State Government agencies.

The discussion paper was placed on public consultation for a period of four months to allow adequate time for all stakeholders to provide comment. During that time DPTI received 40 submissions from a variety of stakeholders (see Section 7 for more detail).

What We Heard

The submissions received supported the overall intent of the legislation as providing the long-term protection of the special areas of Barossa Valley and McLaren Vale. The legislative protection was seen to be far greater than the protection afforded by local planning policy. There was widespread agreement among respondents that farming lands should not be lost to urban subdivision and a general consensus among respondents that the legislation has not created any major detrimental direct impacts.

A number of the submissions received during the consultation process proposed amendments to the boundary of the character preservation districts (a map of the sites and summary is provided in Appendix B). While many of these proposals have merit, most require additional consultation with the community, further investigation, or in some cases a rezoning prior to any amendment to the legislated boundary.

Many submissions received identified opportunities to improve the planning policies guiding development within the character preservation districts and the need for an ongoing review process.
Review Outcomes

As a result of the review and consultation process, four main recommendations are made. These are:

1. Retain the legislation for the protection for the character preservation districts.

2. The State Planning Commission investigate the merit of the proposed amendments to the character preservation districts in the context of Greater Adelaide’s growth.

3. Introduce a statutory review process that provides for amendments to the boundaries of the character preservation districts.

4. Provide for greater consistency and clarity of policy within the character preservation districts in preparing the Planning and Design Code.

No immediate changes to the Acts will be pursued until the Commission has led a proper review and investigation into boundary adjustments, policy refinements and improved process to make such amendments.

(see Section 8 for more detail)
2 Background

The Barossa Valley and McLaren Vale were among the first places beyond Adelaide to be surveyed after South Australia’s proclamation by European settlers in 1836.

Both of these districts still have much of the character that was established in these early years.

The Barossa still contains a strong sense of its German heritage and McLaren Vale still boasts much of the landscape character that was first farmed by the many English settlers of the region.

Yet so much is different too. The towns have grown – as have the wineries. Things that were once just a part of daily life – food and traditions – have evolved into industries in their own right. But perhaps the biggest change is how close these regions are now to our capital city, Adelaide, both in distance and in time. Once remote enough to be completely separate, modern transport and our growing city have drawn the Barossa Valley and McLaren Vale into the outskirts of our metropolitan area.

While these regions might now be closer to Adelaide, most South Australians would agree that development in these areas must maintain their fundamental values – productive agriculture and viticulture, a strong sense of heritage and culture, scenic beauty and healthy environments.

Enacting Character Preservation legislation

The tourism, agriculture and food production industries are all major employers in our State and contribute billions of dollars into the State economy. The Barossa Valley and McLaren Vale food and wine regions hold particular significance in these industries and are recognised worldwide as iconic South Australian destinations.

Populations are increasing and cities worldwide are losing valuable food production lands to housing placing upward pressures on fresh food prices. In view of these trends, the South Australian Government took action in 2011 to prevent similar consequence here.

In particular, the emergence of inappropriate development within the Barossa Valley and McLaren Vale regions and the ever increasing threat of urban encroachment saw the need to introduce greater protection for the two districts. In November 2011, a Ministerial Development Plan Amendment made changes to zoning to prevent inappropriate development in the districts while legislation was prepared to protect the character of these areas.

The Character Preservation (Barossa Valley) Act 2012 and the Character Preservation (McLaren Vale) Act 2012 (the Acts) came into operation in January 2013 (see Appendix A for map for the districts). These Acts provide further weight to development policy by providing statutory protection from inappropriate urban development (such as development primarily for residential purposes within primary production areas or development which is at odds with the desired character of a town) in the Barossa Valley and McLaren Vale Character Preservation Districts. This legislation was informed by similar legislation protecting the Napa Valley in California.

The core objectives of the legislation is to ensure that the special character of the two districts is recognised, protected and enhanced while also facilitating the economic, physical and social wellbeing of the communities within the districts. The legislation restricts the creation of additional allotments primarily for residential development outside of township boundaries to halt urban encroachment to the north and south of Adelaide’s built-up area, thereby seeking to provide for continued viable farming and primary production activities.
In December 2013 the South Australian Planning Strategy was amended to reinforce and reflect the intention of the Acts. This was done through an Addendum to The 30-Year Plan for Greater Adelaide and Murray and Mallee Region Plan.

To support the implementation of the legislation, local development plans were also amended to include the ‘Character Preservation District Overlay’ which largely reflects the identified character values in the Act.

The character values of the district

The Acts recognise the importance of the following character values of the each district:

(a) the rural and natural landscape and visual amenity of the district;
(b) the heritage attributes of the district;
(c) the built form of the townships as they relate to the district;
(d) the viticultural, agricultural and associated industries of the district;
(e) the scenic and tourism attributes of the district.

These character values, along with the special character of each district, are defined in more detail in the Addendum to the SA Planning Strategy (Greater Adelaide and Murray and Mallee Regions).

Need for a review

Both Acts became operational on 18 January 2013. Section 10 of the Act specifies that the Minister must undertake a review the Act within 5 years of commencement.

The Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure coordinated the review on behalf of the Minister for Planning. This Review Outcomes Report has been provided to the Minister for his consideration before it is tabled in Parliament.

What the review covers

Section 10 of the Acts specifies that a review must be undertaken that includes an assessment of:

- the state of the district, especially taking into account the objects of the Act and any relevant provisions of the SA Planning Strategy;
- the family, social, economic and environmental impacts of the Act;
- the impact of the Act on local government in the district; and
- any steps that have been taken or strategies that have been implemented to address any negative impacts of the Act.

The feedback from councils, government agencies and the community have been key to informing this review.

Implementation of the Acts

While the Character Preservation Acts interact closely with the Development Act 1993, the provisions found in these Acts are additional to those in the Development Act 1993.

The legislation is also recognised in the South Australia Planning Strategy (Greater Adelaide and Murray and Mallee Regions), which provides more detail to the Acts by providing rationale and policies specific to the Objects of the Acts and informs changes to development policies.

Councils should ensure that development plans contain policies that align with the Planning Strategy. The development plans of all affected councils have been amended so that the local rules around planning and development reflect the objectives of the Character Preservation Acts and the Planning...
Strategy. These changes ensure that the ‘rulebooks’ for planning and development in each district seek the achievement of the core preservation objectives of the Acts.

The Character Preservation Acts however, effectively prohibit the creation of additional allotments for residential purposes in that the Acts state that an associated application must be refused and no appeal rights apply. These legislative provisions are much stronger than what can be achieved through local development plan policies.

The Acts and the new planning system

The Development Act 1993 will be replaced by the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016 (PDI Act) in stages over the next few years.

Once fully implemented, the Development Act 1993 will be repealed and the intention is for the PDI Act to streamline the development application process and result in a clearer assessment path for applications within South Australia.

It is envisaged that the Acts will be interpreted in the following way:

The Planning and Design Code is a central piece of the new legislation, which will replace the current 72 local development plans with one Code. The Code will incorporate planning policies for the Character Preservation Districts and other areas to ensure contemporary zoning is in place for South Australia.
3 The state of the districts

The Acts have been successful in ensuring development enhances the special character of the two districts and restricting land division in designated areas. To achieve similar policy outcomes over a wider geographic area, restrictions on land divisions were also extended through the environment and food productions areas in April 2016.

Development within the districts

In the majority of instances, land division to create additional allotments for any purpose were and continue to be non-complying, and the Acts have made it harder for additional lots for ‘lifestyle’ housing to be created. Similarly, development within the districts has been in line with the desired character of the area. Council development plans already contain strong policies in relation to protecting character and the character preservation legislation adds further weight to development assessment. Although the applications received give an indication of what the public feel they are able to gain approval for, it is impossible to know which applications are not received due to the restrictions in place. It is likely that the character preservation legislation is helping to minimise the number of inappropriate applications and is giving potential applicants more certainty in what may or may not be approved.

New dwellings

A variety of factors may have influenced the change in the number of approvals – e.g. demand, availability of allotments, economic forces, but when comparing the five years prior to the introduction of the Acts\(^1\) and five years since, the number of new dwellings built outside townships in the Barossa Valley District has reduced by just over 40% in the rural living areas and just over 10% in the rest of the district. In the McLaren Vale District, the number of new dwellings built outside townships has reduced by around 28%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dwellings built</th>
<th>Barossa Valley District</th>
<th>McLaren Vale District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural Living Areas</td>
<td>Outside Townships &amp; Rural Living Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 2007-11</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 2012-16*</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference pre/post Act</td>
<td>-43%</td>
<td>-12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^*\)January to June 2016 only – Data source: DPTI

\(^1\) restrictions in place as of late 2011 in the interim DPA
Land divisions

Land divisions within the districts have seen a much more significant drop. New allotments created outside of townships halved in the Barossa Valley District and dropped by just over 30% in the McLaren Vale District.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land divisions - new lots by year lodged</th>
<th>Barossa Valley District</th>
<th>McLaren Vale District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural Living Areas</td>
<td>Outside Townships &amp; Rural Living Areas</td>
<td>Outside Townships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 2007-11</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 2012-16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference pre/post Act</td>
<td>-65%</td>
<td>-53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data source: DPTI

Land supply

Providing sufficient land supply is important in driving the economy and maintaining housing prices. The latest DPTI estimates show there is currently in the order of 635 hectares of zoned broadhectare land supply in the Southern Adelaide region and approximately 5,000 hectares in the Northern Adelaide region.

Unemployment

Unemployment rates show the districts* have a lower rate of unemployment when compared to the Greater Adelaide Planning Region (GAPR). The unemployment rate trend has generally been consistent with the GAPR trend over the past 7 years (see below graph).

*Note: as the data is only available at the SA2 level and do not match the Character Preservation District boundaries, the most relevant SA2s have been used to demonstrate the overall trend within the areas. Data source: Australia Bureau of Statistics
4 Family, social, economic and Environmental impacts of the Acts

Family and social impacts

When the Acts were first introduced, there was a perception amongst some people in the community that the Act will prevent or alter development outcomes. However, in most cases, this has been unfounded. In most areas, the Acts did not introduce any further restrictions to those that were already in place in the council Development Plans.

There is limited awareness about the Acts and this could lead to misunderstandings in the community about the intent and reach of the Acts. It is hoped that the broad consultation DPTI has attempted on the discussion paper has helped to dispel some of these misunderstandings.

The objective to preserve scenic and landscape beauty in Acts is in line with already existing Development Plan policies which require such character and amenity considerations and are therefore not adding to the costs of finishes and materials utilised in development.

Economic impacts

There has been no clear upturn or downturn of particular industries since the introduction of the Acts. Development applications and growth have continued in line with market trends.

There has been continued growth in these regions from a tourism perspective. Statistics on the tourism regions of ‘Barossa’ and ‘Fleurieu Peninsula’ provided by the SA Tourism Commission show a steady increase in average nights spent in, day trips to, overseas visitors and expenditure in the regions over the past 10 years (see graphs below). No specific impacts of this legislation have been identified by the SA Tourism Commission.

![Graphs showing annual average nights in and day trips to the Barossa and Fleurieu Peninsula](image)

Note: the data in the graphs is only available by region, which is wider than the Character Preservation District boundaries.
Environmental impacts

No direct environmental impacts were identified.

More generally, interface impacts are seen in primary production areas where there are competing land uses, in particular, the use of rural chemicals in close proximity to townships/dwellings. The Acts restrict the creation of additional allotments for residential purposes outside of township boundaries, therefore helping to minimise the occurrence of these land-use conflicts.

Restricting the creation of additional allotments for residential development outside of township boundaries may minimise the clearing, fragmentation and degradation of remnant native vegetation (e.g. along boundaries and water courses) and the associated impacts on:

- biodiversity
- soils (e.g. erosion and loss of nutrients) and waterways
- essential ecosystem processes such as pollination, seed dispersal and regeneration.
- the resilience of smaller fragments of remnant vegetation to invasive species and fire.
5 Impact of the Acts on local government in the district

The Primary Production Zones, Watershed Protection, Rural Landscape Protection, Rural and Hills Face Zones were in place prior to the introduction of the Acts and provided some protection for these districts from residential land division outside of townships.

The Acts have strengthened the protection of the districts through a legislative framework that protects this for the longer term.

The following issues have been highlighted through meetings with the administration of local councils:

- **Increased administrative procedures**

  The legislation was designed to put additional checks and balances in place for development that could compromise the values of the Barossa and McLaren Vale to occur. A higher level of assessment is therefore required and administrative processes are greater.

- **Requirement for concurrence from the State Commission Assessment Panel**

  There is in some cases requirements for additional levels of decision making through the concurrence of the State Commission Assessment Panel. It is recognised that there may be opportunities to further streamline these processes, however it is intended that the legislation prevent land division for residential development outside of townships that could compromise the values of the region. This process is also consistent with environment and food production provisions.

- **Ongoing policy enhancements**

  Councils identified opportunities to further enhance the policies that are currently in place to protect the regions and further strengthen the assessment process.

  Separate to the Character Preservation Districts, the councils have identified opportunities to further support value adding and tourism activities. The legislation has not placed any restrictions on this type of activity and in fact clearly envisages its development. However, further enhancements to planning policy could be introduced through the new Planning and Design Code to provide a consistent policy framework across the region that supports value adding and tourism.

  The Planning and Design Code may also consider other issues such as boundary realignments and interface between land uses.
6 Steps taken or strategies implemented to address any negative impacts of the Acts

The Planning Strategy and local development plans have been updated to provide greater consistency with the Acts.

As part of this review process a number of policy issues have been raised. These are largely outside of the legislation itself and highlight the need to continuously review and improve planning policy for all areas. The transition to the new planning system will seek to further refine local policy relating to the character preservation districts.

The Planning and Design Code will provide a better avenue to achieve this in the longer term by modernising planning policy and providing improved amendment processes that enable policy to keep pace with community expectations and industry trends (e.g. changes in primary production, tourism and value adding).

To support councils in the transition process, the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure has assigned a ‘transition manger’ to each council to work with them on how the new Planning and Design Code can be implemented in their area. As part of this process, improvements to current policy can be identified.
As required by legislation, the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure began consultation on the existing special character protections of the Barossa Valley and McLaren Vale in September 2017.

A series of discussion forums took place with affected local councils and state government agencies to develop a discussion paper and questions on pertinent matters.

Following this, the discussion paper with questions was published, promoted and open for comments over four months from (Monday 30 October 2017) to (Wednesday 28 February 2018). This ensured that a wide range of people and interested parties were given an opportunity to hear about the review and to have a say.

It was important to listen to the public and a range of local and state government and agencies, peak bodies and industry groups about the impacts of existing legislation - drawing on professional expertise and valuable local knowledge.

What we asked:

Seven questions were asked as below:

- **QUESTION 1** : The Character Preservation Acts aim to protect the character values of the districts. Do you think these values are being adequately protected?

- **QUESTION 2** : Do you think the land division controls restricting the creation of additional allotments are adequate to ensure character within the districts is maintained?

- **QUESTION 3** : Have changes to the SA Planning Strategy and relevant Council Development Plans in response to these Acts helped to implement them?

- **QUESTION 4** : What do you consider are the family, social, economic and environmental impacts of the Act/s?

- **QUESTION 5** : Have these Acts resulted in any positive or negative impacts on farming operations or farm business?

- **QUESTION 6** : Do you believe any changes are needed in the Act/s?

- **QUESTION 7** : SA’s new planning system is currently being developed. Are there any changes you would suggest for implementing character preservation in the new system?

What We Heard

A total of 30 written submissions and 10 online feedback forms were received during the 4-month consultation phase from the local government sector, members of parliament, peak bodies, industry groups and individual community members.
Nearly half of the responses we received (43%) were from land and/or business owners, a quarter (25%) from peak bodies or industry groups, 12% from local government, 7% from government agencies and 3% of responses came from local community groups. (see Figure 1 below).

**Figure 1: Respondent area of interest**

The respondents locations and district of interest are shown in Figure 2 and Figure 3.

**Figure 2: Respondent location**
QUESTION 1: The Character Preservation Acts aim to protect the character values of the districts. Do you think these values are being adequately protected?

There was a general consensus among respondents that the legislation is protecting the character values of the districts. Respondents however pointed to what they say are existing policy gaps and inconsistencies in local council development plans and instances where they say policies can be in conflict with each other. Respondents also said that policies around siting, design and construction materials may need some improvements to ensure character is maintained and to add a requirement for development to be designed in a manner that is site responsive and visually unobtrusive.

Other comments included:
- Legislation should be expanded to include the whole of the Adelaide Hills
- All decision makers, not just councils, must have regard to the legislation and more awareness is needed
- Other regulations place are making farming difficult
- Consideration should be given to tomorrow’s heritage as well as today’s.

QUESTION 2: Do you think the land division controls restricting the creation of additional allotments are adequate to ensure character within the districts is maintained?

Many respondents believed the existing land division controls are adequate. However, a few respondents believe that restrictions on boundary realignments for residential development should also be included as part of the legislation. Respondents also said that they felt that the concept of an “additional allotment” is poorly defined and restricting the new allotment to non-residential uses will be difficult to mandate in perpetuity.

Other comments included:
- Tourism development is impacting on primary producers right to farm
- There needs to be land division restrictions in the Adelaide Hills
- The definition of ‘residential development’ has not yet been tested in case law
- Land in Concordia needs rezoning as it is no longer viable to farm there
Some flexibility is required in the policies to facilitate multigenerational farming
The Watershed (Primary Production) Zone provides greater protection and controls than the Character Preservation Act.
The Act should be altered to exclude golf courses from land division restrictions.

**QUESTION 3: Have changes to the SA Planning Strategy and relevant Council Development Plans in response to these Acts helped to implement them?**

Respondents pointed out that local council development plans have not been amended since the Addendum to the SA Planning Strategy was released and said that they felt that these plans require some policy amendments to address the existing policy gaps, particularly to relax restrictions on diversification and value adding. Respondents also said that they felt that policy enhancements would also reduce the occurrence of policy conflicts occurring.

Other comments included:
- Policies are not allowing farmers to perform farming activities
- More could be done to embrace local strategic visions
- Policies should allow cemeteries in appropriate locations
- The Code must not water down the existing policies
- Development Plans make it unclear if townships are included.

**QUESTION 4: What do you consider are the family, social, economic and environmental impacts of the Act/s?**

There was a general consensus among respondents that the legislation has not created any substantial direct impacts in terms of family, social, economic and environmental - and that the impacts of the Acts have been positive and although negative impacts may be perceived, most are not realised. However, respondents also felt that there is limited awareness of the legislation and more is needed to engage and educate the communities on their worth.

Respondents also said that they felt there is adequate land supply in the townships currently, but this may not be the case in future years. Respondents felt that there is an increasing need and demand for aged care and retirement living and townships may require expansion to cater for this.

**QUESTION 5: Have these Acts resulted in any positive or negative impacts on farming operations or farm business?**

There was widespread agreement among respondents that farming lands should not be lost to housing. Respondents felt that there are some instances where policy conflicts are seen, particularly around tourism developments and the right to farm. Respondents viewed impediments to farming operations and farm business as generally the result of inflexible and restrictive development policies, State and Federal legislative obligations, market trends, commodity prices and inflation.

**QUESTION 6: Do you believe any changes are needed in the Act/s?**

A few respondents requested changes to the district or township boundaries. Many of these were minor in nature but a couple of suggestions were for broad scale changes. It was suggested by multiple respondents that the five year review should be an ongoing five yearly review rather than a once off review. It was also suggested that a mechanism should be considered for future boundary reviews.
Another suggestion was made that Section 6(2)\(^3\) should be deleted or clarified in its operation as it has no operation in the assessment of development applications and simply causes confusion.

Other comments included:
- Remove the need for State Commission Assessment Panel (SCAP) concurrence within rural living areas
- Preventing controlled intensification of rural living is questioned
- ‘prescribed allotment provisions’ is confusing and require review
- Some parts of townships shouldn’t not be included in the district boundary
- Consideration should be given to adding a note on the land title so land cannot be developed for residential development
- The Act should note that the character and heritage attributes are defined in the Addendum and Heritage Places Act 1993 and Development Act 1993/Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016.
- Development within townships should be excluded from the provisions of the Act.

**QUESTION 7: SA’s new planning system is currently being developed. Are there any changes you would suggest for implementing character preservation in the new system?**

Although there was overwhelming agreement from respondents that the legislation must be maintained, it has been suggested that the *Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016* (PDI Act) incorporate the legislation in a similar fashion to the environment and food production areas, but importantly, retaining protection of the ‘special character’ of the districts.

There was concern raised by respondents over the non-inclusion of major project status exclusion within the districts in the PDI Act and a few respondents noted they would like this to be carried into the PDI Act.

It was suggested by respondents that the best approach to the character preservation policies in the Code is an overlay. Respondents said they felt that policies need to remove unnecessary barriers for value adding and expand opportunities for adaptive reuse of heritage buildings, and that finer details cannot be lost in the Code, with more focus on design.

It was noted by respondents that the Watershed (Primary Production) Zone provides significant protections against inappropriate development and having a character preservation overlay is excessive.

Other comments included:
- The policies should go further and seek food and water security
- The issue of buffers needs consideration
- Policy conflicts must be minimised
- Guidance is needed on the tourism activities that are encouraged
- Primary producers need to have early and ongoing input into the development of planning policies.

*The following more general comments received on the review:*

- Consideration should be given to allowing solar farms in appropriate locations
- LGA boundaries require adjustment around the Concordia area
- Right to farm issues remain, such as how to manage the interface between existing farming practices and potential new uses of the land, and a solution is needed to managed these issues

\(^3\) A person or body involved in the administration of an Act must, in exercising powers and functions in relation to the district, have regard to and seek to further the objects of this Act.
- A Practice Direction should be issued to provide a clear and consistent way to assess applications
- More awareness of the legislation is needed – adding information on the SA Planning Portal and providing a standard page for all councils was suggested
- There needs to be better consistency between different authorities
- The supply of industrial land is an issue
- The legislation should be reflected in State Planning Policies
- Broadacre farming in the Barossa Valley should be protected in the legislation
- There is confusion about where some of the district boundaries are. Using local government boundaries would make things clearer.
Following completion of the review, four recommendation are made. These are outlined below.

**Retain the legislation for the protection for the character preservation districts.**

The Character Preservation District legislation provides long-term protection of the special areas of the Barossa Valley and McLaren Vale. The legislative protection is far greater than that which can be provided through local planning policy and requires legislative change through the South Australian Parliament to be amended.

While it is recognised that the legislation provides additional requirements as part of the planning assessment process, this is considered to be warranted to ensure these areas are protected in the long-term.

The legislation applies to any person or body involved in the administration of an Act. More awareness of this legislation is required to ensure all levels of Government, including respective Ministers, are considering the objectives of the Acts when making decisions.

**The State Planning Commission investigate the merit of the proposed amendments to the character preservation districts in the context of Greater Adelaide’s growth.**

A number of the submissions received during the consultation process proposed amendments to the boundary of the character preservation districts (a map of the sites and summary is provided in Appendix B). While many of these proposals have merit, most require additional consultation with the community, further investigation, or in some cases a rezoning prior to any amendment to the legislated boundary.

Any such considerations should also include review of the available zoned land supply, which is currently in the order of 635 hectares in the south and approximately 5,000 hectares in the northern region.

Accordingly, it is recommended that the State Planning Commission review the proposed amendments to the character preservation districts in the context of Greater Adelaide’s growth, while also considering the following:

- Whether adequate provision can be made outside of the character preservation districts and environment and food production areas (EFPA) to accommodate housing and employment growth over the longer term.
- The suitability of land for urban development, taking into account serviceability and infrastructure provision.
- Whether the inclusion of the land is an anomaly for the purposes of the character preservation districts.
- The land is more appropriately located within the EFPA.

It is considered that such a review could be completed in around 12 months and inform the Planning and Design Code and future land supply decisions, as opposed to rezonings through a Development Plan Amendment (DPA) process now.
It should also be noted that any amendments to the boundaries of the protection district would require legislative amendment, in the form of a Bill.

**Boundary amendment proposals showing particular merit**

**Yaroona**

An anomaly exists in the township of Yaroona. Yaroona was not recognised as a town when the district boundaries were set. Yaroona is zoned ‘Township’ in the City of Onkaparinga development plan (see Figure 4) and falls within the Yaroona Policy Area 64. A change to the McLaren Vale District boundary is required to identify Yaroona as a township.
Figure 4: Boundary amendment request, Yaroona
Nuriootpa

A boundary amendment proposal was received for western Nuriootpa which demonstrates particular merit, based on the information provided. This area is within Light Regional Council and comprises the Neil Avenue residential enclave and the land between that street and Moppa Road South to the east (see Figure 5). Moppa Road South forms the local government boundary between Light Regional Council and The Barossa Council.

Neil Avenue properties are connected to The Barossa Council’s Community Wastewater Management System and this area is an area that has been identified by Light Regional Council for potential future residential development. This concept is also supported by The Barossa Council and the registered proponent of the land.

The Neil Avenue properties are not within the township boundary and effectively land locks the primary production land in between residential development. Consequently, the current arrangements do not facilitate effective use of the land for primary industry purposes with day-to-day activities (such as spraying and harvesting) largely constrained by both the residential uses to the west and commercial uses to the south.

This non-inclusion of the Neil Avenue properties and adjacent land in the township boundary appears to have been overlooked in the original township mapping, due to the boundaries being based largely on zoning and the Neil Avenue properties being zoned Primary Production (see Figure 5). An opportunity exists to correct this, provided the proposal is properly investigated and the land is concurrently rezoned.
Figure 5: Boundary amendment proposal received, Nuriootpa
Further investigation areas

Adelaide Hills Council

Adelaide Hills Council’s portion of the Barossa Character Preservation District sits within the Watershed (Primary Production) Zone, which contains strong provisions that restrict land division for residential purposes and protect local character values. Including this area in the Barossa Character Preservation District provided further weight to the existing development plan policies. As the EFPAs have now been introduced, this land may be better suited to be within an EFPA, as protections required in this area are more environment focussed, rather than character. Further areas within Adelaide Hills Council have also been highlighted by The Barossa Council for review, such as Cromer, Forreston, Humbug Scrub, Kersbrook and Mt Crawford. Further investigations are required to determine a recommendation in this area.

City of Onkaparinga

The City of Onkaparinga highlighted the need for some boundary adjustments but did not detail these. More information will be sought from the council during the Commission’s review.

Introduce a statutory review process that provides for amendments to the boundaries of the character preservation districts.

The character preservation districts are defined in both Acts by the plan deposited in the General Registry Office on 26 June 2012. As such, any amendments to the preservation district boundaries require an amendment to the relevant Act.

This is different to the way the (EFPAs) are reviewed under the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016 (PDI Act), where section 7 sets out the following process for amending the EFPA:

- The State Planning Commission conducts an inquiry against a set of criteria (at least every 5 years on upon request).
- The Commission provides a report to the Minister on the outcomes of the inquiry.
- The Commission may vary the EFPA, by notice published in the Gazette and SA Planning Portal.
- The notice is laid before both houses of Parliament, where it may be disallowed.

While such an amendment to the Act is not urgent at this stage, it is considered appropriate that amendments to both the character preservation district boundaries and the EFPA follow the same process. The process outlined above for the EFPA provides a good basis and could be mirrored in the Character Preservation legislation. A Bill could be developed following a completion of a review by the State Planning Commission.

Provide for greater consistency and clarity of policy within the character preservation districts in preparing the Planning and Design Code.

The State Planning Commission is currently preparing the first Planning and Design Code. In preparing the Code, the Commission should seek to provide further clarity on the envisaged/desired primary production value-adding and tourism activities in the character preservation districts.

Other issues raised that will be considered in developing the Code include:

- boundary realignments
- design guidance
• review of the Interface Between Land Uses’ policy within the SA Planning Policy Library.

Consideration will be given to issuing a Practice Direction on land division approvals within the character preservation districts.

There will be opportunities for community members to provide input into the drafting of the Code and when the draft Code is released.

Within the Development Act 1993, a major development or project cannot be declared within the rural area of a character preservation. This has not been reflected in the PDI Act. Although this is the case, any development must further the objects of the Character Preservation Act and therefore, it is not envisaged that this change will have any impact on the character preservation districts.

Summary of outcomes

As a result of the review and consultation process, four main recommendations are made. These are:

1. Retain the legislation for the protection for the character preservation districts.

2. The State Planning Commission investigate the merit of the proposed amendments to the character preservation districts in the context of Greater Adelaide’s growth.

3. Introduce a statutory review process that provides for amendments to the boundaries of the character preservation districts.

4. Provide for greater consistency and clarity of policy within the character preservation districts in preparing the Planning and Design Code.

No immediate changes to the Acts will be pursued until the Commission has lead a proper review and investigation into boundary adjustments, policy refinements and improved process to make such amendments.
9  Contact Details

Development Division

Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure

Street address:
Level 5, 50 Flinders Street
Adelaide

Postal address:
PO Box 1815
Adelaide SA 5001

Tel: 1800 752 664

Email: DPTI.PlanningEngagement@sa.gov.au
Web: www.saplaningportal.sa.gov.au
Appendix A - Map of the Character Preservation Districts
### Appendix B – Summary of all boundary amendment requests and initial assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. shown on maps overleaf</th>
<th>Requested by</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Preliminary merit assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Local resident – name requested to be withheld (supported by 24 local residents)</td>
<td>Include the whole of St Kitts in the character preservation district. Currently only half of St Kitts is included and the other half is EFPA.</td>
<td>The boundary through St Kitts was originally set based on the Barossa wine region, which is why only half of St Kitts is within the district boundary. The land is within the EFPA, which provides adequate protection from inappropriate growth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Light Council, Barossa Council and the registered proprietor</td>
<td>Western Nuriootpa, as shown in report. Proposal to include properties on Neil Ave, primary production and industrial site within the township (current in rural part of the district).</td>
<td>Warrants further investigation. Will need to be rezoned so zoning matches its inclusion in the township.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Barossa Council</td>
<td>Exclude industrial land to the west of Angaston (Stockwell Road).</td>
<td>This area is not adjacent to the township and would require a special designated area. At this stage, no evidence has been put forward which indicates that being part of the district is restricting development on this site. May be a site considered during the Commission’s review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mid Murray Council</td>
<td>Requested the township of Keyneton be extended.</td>
<td>There appears to be adequate land supply in Keyneton at this time. May be a site considered during the Commission’s review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Adelaide Hills Council</td>
<td>Removal of the Adelaide Hills council portion of the character preservation district.</td>
<td>Warrants further investigation. The land may be better suited to be EFPA over character preservation, now that EFPA is in place as the land was put into character preservation predominately for its environmental features, rather than character.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Barossa Council</td>
<td>Review inclusion of parts of the Adelaide Hills Council within the Barossa Valley district.</td>
<td>Warrants further investigation. More information is needed. May be considered during the Commission’s review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Onkaparinga Council</td>
<td>Highlighted Yaroona is not defined as a township.</td>
<td>Supported. This is a recognised anomaly and should be defined as a township.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Botten Levinson Lawyers on behalf of registered proprietor</td>
<td>Requested McLaren Vale township boundary be extended to include their land.</td>
<td>This will be considered during the Commission’s review. The land would require a rezoning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Griffins Lawyers on behalf of registered proprietor</td>
<td>Requested expansion of the McLaren Vale township to allow for aged care and retirement living.</td>
<td>This will be considered during the Commission’s review. The land would require a rezoning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 (not shown on map)</td>
<td>Onkaparinga Council</td>
<td>Highlighted the need for some boundary adjustments but did not detail.</td>
<td>Warrants further investigation. More information needed. This will be considered during the Commission’s review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 (not shown on map)</td>
<td>Resident of Adelaide Hills</td>
<td>Would like Adelaide Hills added to Character Preservation Act.</td>
<td>This area is covered by the EFPA and relevant council policies for character. Protections in place are adequate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Boundary amendment proposals received map – Barossa Character Preservation District
Boundary amendment proposals received map – McLaren Vale Character Preservation District
4.5.2 CONSENSUS AGENDA – ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES REPORT

4.5.2.1 WILLIAMSTOWN, LYNDÖCH LANDCARE GROUP INC.
B2791, 18/48937
Minutes of the Williamstown, Lyndoch Landcare Group Inc. General Meeting held 27 June 2018 are attached for information.

RECOMMENDATION:
That report items 4.5.2.1 be received.
Williamstown, Lyndoch Landcare Group Inc.

Minutes of general meeting held on June 27th 2018

Meeting started 7.30pm

Present Brian Green, Elke & Joerg Wiese, Margaret & Brian Teskey, Anthony Randall, Angus Atkinson, Shirley & Don Wegener, Noreen & Eric Walton, Elizabeth Ninnis.

Apologies Carol Green, Diana Dancer, Pat James

Previous Minutes
Accepted, moved by Brian Green, seconded by Joerg Wiese Carried

Business Arising. NRM Insurance forms received. Joerg moved the forms be accepted and completed. Seconded Eric Walton. Carried

Correspondence Invoice from Austcover. No action to be taken.
Letter from Credit Union for current signatures. refer to AGM
Margaret Teskey moved correspondence be accepted, seconded Brian Teskey. Carried

Chairman’s Report
Dear Members
By now you will all be aware of Carols’ illness and treatment. As a result she can no longer carry on as secretary of the group.
Unfortunately due to the increased workload I have had to take on, it will no longer be possible for me to continue in my roles as Chairperson Publicity Officer and Public Officer. So as a consequence we will both be stepping down from our positions with immediate effect.
We have had a very difficult and traumatic few months which we hope you will all understand has taken a toll on us both. So to preserve our health and sanity we have made this difficult decision.
We both realise the implications for the future of the group and while this has been a major concern to us we feel it is time to put ourselves first.
We will remain members but not take an active part in the group (at least in the short term) It is with sadness and sorrow that we do this and with thanks for your good wishes, care and understanding through a difficult period.
We wish the group well for the future. Thank you, Brian and Carol.

Brian Teskey then took over chairing the meeting.

Joerg Wiese proposed we send a letter of appreciation to Carol and Brian expressing our fond thoughts and sorrow and thanking them for all their help when we needed them seconded Eric. Carried

Treasurers report. Reports for March, April and May were presented.

Bal at end of May 6635.45 comprising of --
Admin 2561.84
C/U share 2,00
Project 2 4071.70
A sum of $1500.00 is left from the grant to go towards our Open Day.
Joerg moved report be accepted. Seconded Brian Teskey carried.

Publicity. N/R
Eric Walton has been invited to give a talk to the Williamstown Garden Club in July.

General Business
Angus Atkinson has a group from the Barossa Bush gardens visiting our Reserve on Thursday July 5th to help us in a working bee. Membership forms to be available in case of need. Letter of thanks to be sent to Northern Tyres for their work on the groups' Ute. Open Day. Signage on the container to advertise ourselves. Flyers in locals shops. Post office etc.
Liz Ninnis discussed possible action to be considered to attract future new members
A working bee on the Saturday following a general meeting, to include a BBQ, all invited. Calendar of forthcoming events to be available
Flyers in local shops/post office/library.
A large permanent sign on the container, about the group.

Meeting closed 8.15pm

Next meeting August 22nd. 2018

Signed....................................................Date...........................................................
Williamstown Lyndoch Landcare Group.

Minutes of Annual general Meeting. Held on June 27th 2018 at Lyndoch Council Rooms.
Meeting started 8.30pm

Apologies. Carol Green, Diana Dancer, Pat James.

Minutes of the 2017 AGM Accepted by Brian Teskey. Seconded Don Wegener. Carried

Business Arising No business

Chairman's report.
Dear Members
By now you will all be aware of Carol’s illness and treatment. As a result she can no longer carry on as secretary of the group.
Unfortunately due to the increased workload I have had to take on, it will no longer be possible for me to continue in my roles as Chairperson, Publicity Officer and Public Officer,
So as a consequence we will both be stepping down from our positions with immediate effect.
We have had a very difficult and traumatic few months which we hope you will all understand had taken a toll on us both. So to preserve our health and sanity we have made this difficult decision.
We both realise the implications for the future of the group and while this has been a major concern to us we feel it is time to put ourselves first.
We will remain members but not take an active part in the group (at least in the short term)
It is with sadness and sorrow that we do this and with thanks for your good wishes, care and understanding through a difficult period.
We wish the group well for the future. Thank you, Brian and Carol

Treasurer
Bal at end of May. $6635.45 comprising of...
Admin 2461.84
C/U share 2.00
Project 2 4071.40

Joerg Wiese moved this report be accepted, seconded Noreen Walton. Carried

Brian Teskey declared all positions vacant. Nomination for Angus Atkinson as Chairman.
Seconded Joerg Wiese, carried.

Chairman Angus Atkinson
Vice Chairman Elke Wiese
Treasurer/Acting secretary Joerg Wiese
Committee Member Shirley Wegener
Don Wegener to carry on as caretaker of the container.
Brian Teskey proposed that as Joerg is Acting secretary until the position can be filled, Margaret Teskey be appointed Minute Secretary. Seconded Eric. Due to circumstances Meeting will no longer be Monthly. Suggest Quarterly.

Angus Atkinson Proposed Shirley Wegener be nominated as 3rd signatory for the cheques and the changes are implemented by treasurer Joerg. Seconded Noreen Walton. Carried.

Signatories now to be
Angus Atkinson
Joerg Wiese
Shirley Wegener

Fees. Brian Teskey proposed fees stay as before, $15 family, $10 single. Seconded Joerg. Carried

Angus Atkinson proposed next General Meeting to be August 22nd 2018 and thereafter every Three months. Seconded by Eric Walton. Carried.

Acting Chairman Brian Teskey thanked everyone for their attendance and said how pleased he was that the group will be able to continue, under our new chairman and committee.

Meeting closed 9m.

Signed..........................................................date...........................
4.5.2 CONSENSUS AGENDA – ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES REPORT

4.5.2.2 SOUTH AUSTRALIA’S NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT - COUNCILS CONTRIBUTION TO THE REGIONAL NRM LEVY
B6823, 18/30884

Members are referred to the attached correspondence from David Speirs MP, Minister for Environment and Water, in relation to proposed council contributions to the regional NRM levy, identified in the NRM board’s approved Business Plan for 2018/19. Recently gazetted NRM information is included as Attachment 2.

Upcoming Legislative Reforms (as outlined in 7.5.2.1 Report to Council on 17 July 2018), will lead to significant changes to the way the NRM system operates in South Australia.

RECOMMENDATION:
That report items 4.5.2.2 be received.
SUPPLEMENTARY GAZETTE

THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN

GOVERNMENT GAZETTE

PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

ADELAIDE, THURSDAY, 21 JUNE 2018

CONTENTS

REGULATIONS

Food Act 2001—(No. 75 of 2018).................................2177
Retirement Villages Act 2016—(No. 76 of 2018)..........2179
South Australian Public Health Act 2011—
(No. 77 of 2018).......................................................2181
Controlled Substances Act 1984—
(No. 78 of 2018).......................................................2187
(Tobacco Products Regulation Act 1997—
(No. 79 of 2018).......................................................2189
Local Government Act 1999—(No. 80 of 2018)........2190
Private Park Areas Act 1986—(No. 81 of 2018)...........2192
Sheriff's Act 1978—(No. 82 of 2018).........................2194
Environment, Resources and Development Court
Act 1993—(No. 83 of 2018)........................................2196
District Court Act 1991—(No. 84 of 2018)...............2200
Supreme Court Act 1935—(No. 85 of 2018)............2205
Magistrates Court Act 1991—(No. 86 of 2018)........2211
Youth Court Act 1993—(No. 87 of 2018)................2215
Coroners Act 2003—(No. 88 of 2018)....................2217
Evidence Act 1929—(No. 89 of 2018).....................2219
Mines and Works Inspection Act 1920—
(No. 90 of 2018).......................................................2221
Mining Act 1971—(No. 91 of 2018).........................2223
Opal Mining Act 1995—(No. 92 of 2018)................2227
Petroleum and Geothermal Energy Act 2000—
(No. 93 of 2018).......................................................2229
Aboriginal Heritage Act 1988—(No. 94 of 2018)........2232
Livestock Act 1997—(No. 95 of 2018)....................2234
Fisheries Management Act 2007—(No. 96 of 2018)....2237
Plant Health Act 2009—(No. 97 of 2018).............2242
Primary Produce (Food Safety Schemes) Act 2004—
(No. 98 of 2018).......................................................2246
(No. 99 of 2018).......................................................2250
(No. 100 of 2018).....................................................2252
(No. 101 of 2018).....................................................2254
(No. 169 of 2018).....................................................2472
Land Tax Act 1936—(No. 103 of 2018)................2258
Petroleum Products Regulation Act 1995—
(No. 104 of 2018).....................................................2259
Fire and Emergency Services Act 2005—
(No. 105 of 2018).....................................................2260
Summary Offences Act 1953—(No. 106 of 2018)......2263
Housing Improvement Act 2016—
(No. 107 of 2018).....................................................2265
(No. 108 of 2018).....................................................2267
Road Traffic Act 1961—
(No. 109 of 2018).....................................................2268
(No. 135 of 2018).....................................................2366
Motor Vehicles Act 1959—
(No. 110 of 2018).....................................................2290
(No. 134 of 2018).....................................................2364
Heavy Vehicle National Law (South Australia) Act 2013—
(No. 111 of 2018).....................................................2295
(No. 136 of 2018).....................................................2370
Children's Protection Act 1993—(No. 112 of 2018)....2306
Disability Services Act 1993—(No. 113 of 2018)........2308
Adoption Act 1988—(No. 114 of 2018)................2310
Environment Protection Act 1993—(No. 115 of 2018)....2313
Radiation Protection and Control Act 1982—
(No. 116 of 2018).....................................................2317
Public Trustee Act 1995—(No. 117 of 2018)............2322
Fees Regulation Act 1927—(No. 118 of 2018)........2324
Botanic Gardens and State Herbarium Act 1978—
(No. 119 of 2018).....................................................2326
Crown Land Management Act 2009—(No. 120 of 2018)....2328
Heritage Places Act 1993—(No. 121 of 2018)........2332
Historic Shipwrecks Act 1981—(No. 122 of 2018)....2334
Marine Parks Act 2007—(No. 123 of 2018)........2335
National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972—
(No. 124 of 2018).....................................................2337
Native Vegetation Act 1991—(No. 125 of 2018)........2342
Natural Resources Management Act 2004—
(No. 126 of 2018).....................................................2343
Pastoral Land Management and Conservation
Act 1989—(No. 127 of 2018)....................................2348
Water Industry Act 2012—(No. 128 of 2018)..........2350
Support Services Act 1992—
(No. 129 of 2018).....................................................2352

REGULATIONS—continued

Summary—(No. 130 of 2018)........................................2354
Corporations Act 1989—(No. 131 of 2018)........2356
Environment Protection and Biodiversity
Conservation Act 1999—(No. 132 of 2018).....2358
Roads Act 1995—(No. 133 of 2018)....................2362
No. 134 of 2018).....................................................2366
No. 135 of 2018).....................................................2366
No. 136 of 2018).....................................................2370
No. 116 of 2018).....................................................2317
No. 117 of 2018).....................................................2322
No. 118 of 2018).....................................................2324
No. 119 of 2018).....................................................2326
No. 120 of 2018).....................................................2328
No. 121 of 2018).....................................................2332
No. 122 of 2018).....................................................2334
No. 123 of 2018).....................................................2335
No. 124 of 2018).....................................................2337
No. 125 of 2018).....................................................2342
No. 126 of 2018).....................................................2343
No. 127 of 2018).....................................................2348
No. 128 of 2018).....................................................2350
No. 129 of 2018).....................................................2352
No. 130 of 2018).....................................................2354
No. 131 of 2018).....................................................2356
No. 132 of 2018).....................................................2358
No. 133 of 2018).....................................................2362
No. 134 of 2018).....................................................2366
No. 135 of 2018).....................................................2366
No. 136 of 2018).....................................................2370
No. 116 of 2018).....................................................2317
No. 117 of 2018).....................................................2322
No. 118 of 2018).....................................................2324
No. 119 of 2018).....................................................2326
No. 120 of 2018).....................................................2328
No. 121 of 2018).....................................................2332
No. 122 of 2018).....................................................2334
No. 123 of 2018).....................................................2335
No. 124 of 2018).....................................................2337
No. 125 of 2018).....................................................2342
No. 126 of 2018).....................................................2343
No. 127 of 2018).....................................................2348
No. 128 of 2018).....................................................2350
No. 129 of 2018).....................................................2352

No. 40

2175

79
South Australia

Natural Resources Management (Fees) Regulations 2018

under the Natural Resources Management Act 2004

Contents

1 Short title
2 Commencement

Schedule 1—Fees under Natural Resources Management Act 2004

Part 1—Preliminary
1 Interpretation

Part 2—General fees for purposes of Act
2 General fees for purposes of Act

Part 3—Fees relating to Natural Resources Management (Financial Provisions) Regulations 2005
3 Fees relating to meters owned by Minister

Schedule 2—Related variations

Part 1—Preliminary
1 Variation provisions

Part 2—Variation of Natural Resources Management (Financial Provisions) Regulations 2005
2 Variation of regulation 12—Meters owned by Minister
3 Revocation of Schedule 1

Part 3—Variation of Natural Resources Management (General) Regulations 2005
4 Revocation of regulation 42
5 Variation of regulation 42A—Tagged interstate water trades
6 Revocation of Schedule 4

1—Short title

These regulations may be cited as the Natural Resources Management (Fees) Regulations 2018.

2—Commencement

These regulations will come into operation on 1 July 2018.
Schedule 1—Fees under Natural Resources Management Act 2004

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Interpretation

(1) In these regulations, unless the contrary intention appears—

Act means the Natural Resources Management Act 2004.

(2) For the purposes of this Schedule, unless the contrary intention appears, words and expressions used in this Schedule have the same respective meanings as in the Act.

Part 2—General fees for purposes of Act

2—General fees for purposes of Act

(1) Subject to this clause, the following fees are payable for the purposes of the Act:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Application for a permit under Chapter 7 of the Act, other than an application for a permit to drill a well or to undertake work on a well</td>
<td>$56.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Application for a permit to drill a well or to undertake work on a well</td>
<td>$89.00 plus a technical assessment fee of an amount not exceeding $152.00 determined by the Minister after taking into account any advice from his or her department about the costs associated with assessing the application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Maximum fee under section 138 of the Act</td>
<td>$1.85 per page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Application for a well driller's licence—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a) for a new licence</td>
<td>$264.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) for the renewal of a licence</td>
<td>$136.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Application for the variation of a well driller's licence</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Application for a water licence</td>
<td>$237.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Maximum fee under section 149 of the Act</td>
<td>$1.85 per page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Application to transfer a water licence</td>
<td>$440.00 plus a technical assessment fee of $296.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Application to vary a water licence on transfer of an allocation, other than in relation to an unbundled prescribed water resource</td>
<td>$440.00 plus a technical assessment fee of $296.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9A</td>
<td>In relation to an unbundled prescribed water resource—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a) application to transfer a water access entitlement</td>
<td>$440.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) application to vary a water allocation</td>
<td>$259.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c) application to transfer a water allocation</td>
<td>$259.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d) application for a water resource works approval</td>
<td>$440.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e) application to vary a water resource works approval</td>
<td>$440.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(f) application for a site use approval</td>
<td>$440.00 plus a technical assessment fee of $296.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(g) application to vary a site use approval</td>
<td>$440.00 plus a technical assessment fee of $296.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additional fee where Minister directs an assessment by an expert under the Act (and the expenses of the assessment are to be paid by the applicant in addition to this fee) $194.00

Application to vary a licence for any other reason $440.00 plus a technical assessment fee of $296.00

Application for a permit under section 188 of the Act—
(a) in relation to a Category 1 or Category 2 animal $369.00
(b) in relation to a Category 1 or Category 2 plant $103.00
(c) in relation to a Category 3 animal or plant $103.00

Application to vary a licence for any other reason $440.00 plus a technical assessment fee of $296.00

Application for a permit under section 188 of the Act—
(a) in relation to a Category 1 or Category 2 animal $369.00
(b) in relation to a Category 1 or Category 2 plant $103.00
(c) in relation to a Category 3 animal or plant $103.00

Application to vary a condition to a forest licence $440.00 plus a technical assessment fee of $296.00

Application to transfer the whole or a part of the water allocation attached to a forest water licence $440.00 plus a technical assessment fee of $296.00

Application to vary a water allocation attached to a forest water licence $440.00 plus a technical assessment fee of $296.00

Application for a forest water licence $237.00

Maximum fee for a copy of an annual report under the Act $1.85 per page

Maximum fee for a copy of a submission under section 42 of the Act $1.85 per page

Maximum fee for a copy of the State NRM Plan or any amendments to the State NRM Plan $1.85 per page

Maximum fee for a copy of a document under section 83 of the Act $1.85 per page

Maximum fee for a copy of an agenda or minutes under Schedule 1 of the Act $1.85 per page

Application for notation on NRM Register or for the removal of a notation $9.15

Fee for providing information required by the Land and Business (Sale and Conveyancing) Act 1994 $26.25

Application to vary a water allocation attached to a forest water licence $440.00 plus a technical assessment fee of $296.00

Application to transfer the whole or a part of the water allocation attached to a forest water licence $440.00 plus a technical assessment fee of $296.00

Application to vary a condition to a forest licence $440.00 plus a technical assessment fee of $296.00

The following are exempt from the fees specified in clause 2:

(a) an application for a water licence that is to be an environmental donations entitlement (where the applicant has already obtained the necessary accreditation from the South Australian Murray Darling Basin Natural Resources Management Board);

(b) an application made by the holder of a water licence or a water allocation, and granted by the Minister, to vary the conditions attached to the licence or water allocation so that the licence or water allocation will become an environmental donations entitlement;

(c) an application to transfer a water licence (either absolutely or for a limited period) where the South Australian Murray Darling Basin Natural Resources Management Board is satisfied that the transfer constitutes the donation of the licence in order to establish an environmental donations entitlement (and where the board is satisfied that an accreditation should be issued);
(d) an application to transfer a water access entitlement, or part of a water access entitlement, under a water licence to the holder of another water licence that is an environmental donations entitlement (for water to be used for environmental purposes);

(e) an application to transfer the whole or a part of a water allocation where the South Australian Murray Darling Basin Natural Resources Management Board is satisfied—

(i) that the transfer constitutes the donation of the water allocation; and

(ii) that the water will be used for environmental purposes under or in connection with an environmental donations entitlement.

(3) The Minister may, on application or on the Minister’s own initiative, in the Minister’s discretion, waive payment of the whole or a part of a fee.

(4) For the purposes of this clause, a prescribed water resource will be taken to be unbundled if water access entitlements have been granted in relation to it pursuant to section 146 of the Act as in force on and from the day on which section 39 of the Natural Resources Management (Water Resources and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2007 came into operation.

Note—
Section 39 of the Natural Resources Management (Water Resources and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2007 came into operation on 1.7.2009.

Part 3—Fees relating to Natural Resources Management (Financial Provisions) Regulations 2005

3—Fees relating to meters owned by Minister

(1) A word or expression used in this clause has the same meaning as in the Natural Resources Management (Financial Provisions) Regulations 2005.

(2) The following fees are payable for the purposes of the Act and regulation 12 of the Natural Resources Management (Financial Provisions) Regulations 2005:

1 Rent for meter for a period of 12 months or less ending on 30 June—

   Nominal size of meter—
   (a) less than 50 mm $217.00
   (b) 50 to 100 mm $313.00
   (c) 150 to 175 mm $463.00
   (d) 200 to 380 mm $529.00
   (e) 407 to 610 mm $634.00

2 Fee for testing meter under section 106(4) of the Act Estimated cost determined by the Minister

3 Fee for reading meter at request of licensee Estimated cost determined by the Minister
Schedule 2—Related variations

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Variation provisions

In this Schedule, a provision under a heading referring to the variation of specified regulations varies the regulations so specified.

Part 2—Variation of Natural Resources Management (Financial Provisions) Regulations 2005

2—Variation of regulation 12—Meters owned by Minister

(1) Regulation 12(1)—delete "at the rate prescribed in Schedule 1" and substitute:

   comprised of the prescribed fee

(2) Regulation 12—after subregulation (2) insert:

   (3) In this regulation—

   prescribed fee means the fee prescribed by regulation under the Act.

3—Revocation of Schedule 1

   Schedule 1—delete the Schedule

Part 3—Variation of Natural Resources Management (General) Regulations 2005

4—Revocation of regulation 42

   Regulation 42—delete the regulation

5—Variation of regulation 42A—Tagged interstate water trades

   Regulation 42A(e)—delete "is payable under Schedule 4" and substitute:

   (being the fee prescribed by regulation under the Act) is payable

6—Revocation of Schedule 4

   Schedule 4—delete the Schedule

Note—

As required by section 10AA(2) of the Subordinate Legislation Act 1978, the Minister has certified that, in the Minister's opinion, it is necessary or appropriate that these regulations come into operation as set out in these regulations.

Made by the Governor

with the advice and consent of the Executive Council

on 21 June 2018
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Sash Colour Blue with White slogan and logo – National Heavy Vehicle

Motor Vehicles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Motor Bikes (except Class 12)</th>
<th>Motor Bikes Class 12</th>
<th>All Other Classes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Height of Figure or Letter</td>
<td>10mm</td>
<td>8mm</td>
<td>8-20mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Width of every line in each figure or letter</td>
<td>2mm</td>
<td>1-2mm</td>
<td>1-3mm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General specifications and design

1. The dimensions of the letters or words ‘SA’, ‘SOUTH AUSTRALIA’, ‘THE FESTIVAL STATE’ or any other slogan approved by the Registrar whether preceding the number or appearing in a central position above or below the registration number on which they are permitted, must be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Height of Figure or Letter</th>
<th>Width of every line in all parts thereof</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class 3</td>
<td>10mm</td>
<td>2mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 4</td>
<td>8mm</td>
<td>1-2mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 4 Motor Bike</td>
<td>8mm</td>
<td>1-3mm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Except Corporate Number Plates which may vary at the discretion of the Registrar).

2. The dimensions of the State Badge (Piping Shrike) appearing on the number plates on which they are permitted, must be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Diameter</th>
<th>Class 3</th>
<th>Class 4</th>
<th>Class 4 Motor Bike</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class 3</td>
<td>24-30mm</td>
<td>50mm</td>
<td>27mm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 4 Motor Bike</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. The dimensions of the slogan “SA BETTER BY BIKE” appearing on the Bike Rack number plate must be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Height of Figure or Letter</th>
<th>Width of every line in all parts thereof</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class 16</td>
<td>13mm</td>
<td>2mm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. A number plate will be taken to comply with the requirements of this notice relating to the size of the plate and the size of letters and figures on the plate if the size of the plate or of any figure or letter on the plate-

(a) does not exceed the size prescribed by this notice by more than 1.0 mm; or

(b) is not more than 1.0 mm less than the size prescribed by this notice.

5. Notwithstanding the prescribed design and specifications for number plates, a number plate (other than a trailer or bike rack plate) may bear a plate and/or label that complies with Australian Standard 1425, if the vehicle to which the number plate is affixed, is equipped to use LP Gas. However, the plate and label on the number plate must be placed in such a position so as not to obscure any letter, figure, logo or slogan appearing on the number plate.

Transitional provision

A number plate that was manufactured before the date of this notice will be taken to comply with this notice if it complies with the notice under section 47A of the Act published in the Gazette on 19 January 2012 (see Gazette 4, 19 January 2012);

SCHEDULE 3

Classes of number plates which may be displayed pursuant to an agreement under s.47A(4)

Class 1 - Numeric
Class 2 - Alpha Numeric (Non-slogan)
Class 3 - Slogan
Class 4 - Personalised
Class 5 - Jubilee
Class 6 - Australian Grand Prix
Class 9 - Name Plates
Class 10 - Custom
Class 15 - Premium
Class 17 - Centenary of Federation
Class 20 - Euro

Dated: 13 June 2018

T. HARKER
Registrar of Motor Vehicles

NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT ACT 2004

Notice of Authorisation to Take Water from the Central Adelaide Prescribed Wells Area

PURSUANT to Section 128 of the Natural Resources Management Act 2004 (the Act), I, David Speirs, Minister for Environment and Water (the Minister) in the State of South Australia and the Minister to whom the Act is committed, hereby authorise the Eastern Regional Alliance (ERA) Water, a water regional subsidiary being a body corporate under clause 18 of Part 2 of Schedule 2 of the Local Government Act, 1999 (‘the water user’) for the taking of water from the Central Adelaide Prescribed Wells Area from the prescribed wells specified in Schedule A, for the purpose set out in Schedule B and subject to the conditions specified in Schedule C.

SCHEDULE A

Prescribed Wells

Well unit numbers 6628-27437, 6628-15439, 6628-26033 and 6628-28698.

SCHEDULE B

Purpose

For the irrigation of reserves, ovals and schools within the three Constituent Councils of the ERA Water Regional Subsidiary and to supply the City of Port Adelaide Enfield and Campbelltown City Council, in association with the Waterproofing Eastern Adelaide Managed Aquifer Recharge and Recovery scheme.
Notice of Authorisation to Take Water from the River Torrens/Karrawirra Parri Prescribed Watercourse
(a Prescribed Watercourse of the Western Mount Lofty Ranges Prescribed Watercourses)

Pursuant to Section 128 of the Natural Resources Management Act 2004 (the Act), I, David Speirs, Minister for Environment and Water (the Minister) in the State of South Australia and the Minister to whom the Act is committed, hereby authorise the City of Charles Sturt to take water from the River Torrens/Karrawirra Parri Prescribed Watercourse under the Natural Resources Management (Western Mount Lofty Ranges—Prescribed Watercourses) Regulations 2005 from the areas specified in Schedule A, for the purpose set out in Schedule B and subject to the conditions specified in Schedule C.

Schedule A

Areas

Allotments 13 and 14 of Deposited Plan 85638 within the Hundred of Adelaide; and Allotment 17 of Deposited Plan 86067 within the Hundred of Yatala.

Schedule B

Purpose

For the purpose of a managed aquifer recharge and recovery scheme, as well as maintaining wetlands located at St Clair, Old Port Road, West Lakes Golf Course and Cooke Reserve and for irrigating land used for recreation within the boundary of the City of Charles Sturt.

Schedule C

Conditions

1. Water may only be taken from the date of publication of this notice until 30 June 2020.
2. A maximum volume of 2,400 megalitres of surface water each water use year may be taken from the River Torrens/Karrawirra Parri Prescribed Watercourse, from the area specified in Schedule A for the purpose specified in Schedule B during the period referred to in Condition 1 above.

Ref: 291770

Dated: 13 June 2018

David Speirs MP
Minister for Environment and Water
3. Structures associated with the purpose must be consistent with the objectives and principles of Section 8 (in particular section 8.5) of the Western Mount Lofty Ranges Prescribed Water Resources Area Water Allocation Plan and standards and guidelines as approved by the Minister or his representative.

4. The authorised water user must not take water from the River Torrens/Karrawirra Parri Prescribed Watercourse during the months October to November (inclusive) and April to May (inclusive) unless the flow rate of the river at the point of extraction is greater than 1,000 litres per second or a flow depth of at least 100 mm.

5. The authorised water user must not take water from the River Torrens/Karrawirra Parri Prescribed Watercourse during all months except for October to November (inclusive) and April to May (inclusive), unless the flow rate of the river at the point of extraction is greater than 200 litres per second.

6. The authorised water user must record the flow rate and flow depth at the point of extraction, immediately prior to commencing each extraction of water from the River Torrens/Karrawirra Parri Prescribed Watercourse.

7. The authorised water user must monitor and record timing and volumes of extraction and water quality associated with the purpose, and must be consistent with the monitoring requirements of the approved Risk Management and Monitoring Plan.

8. The authorised water user must not take water except through a meter(s) supplied, installed and maintained in accordance with the South Australian Licensed Water Use Meter Specification approved by the Minister as may be amended from time to time.

9. The authorised water user must take meter readings(s) from each meter through which water is taken pursuant to this authorisation. Meter reading(s) must be taken within the first fourteen days of the date of this authorisation, during the first fourteen calendar days of July each year and within the first fourteen days of the expiry date of this authorisation.

10. The authorised water user must provide all monitoring data collected in accordance with the approved Risk Management and Monitoring Plan and specified in conditions 6, 7 and 9, on an annual basis during the first 14 calendar days of each month of July in each water use year, in the form of an annual report.

11. The authorised water user must notify the Minister’s representative immediately if a meter fails to measure or record any quantity of water taken under this authorisation or if there is any reason to suspect that a meter may be defective.

12. The authorised water user must comply with the provisions applying to meters set out in Regulation 14 of the Natural Resources Management (Financial Provisions) Regulations 2005. It is an offence to contravene or fail to comply with those provisions.

For the purposes of this authorisation:

‘Authorised water user’ means a person who is authorised to take water pursuant to this notice.

‘Water use year’ means a period of 12 months commencing on 1 July and ending 30 June the following calendar year.

‘River’ means the River Torrens/Karrawirra Parri Prescribed Watercourse.

Words used in this authorisation that are defined in the Act shall have the meanings as set out in the Act.

This authorisation will commence on the date below and will remain in effect until 30 June 2020 unless earlier varied or revoked.

Dated: 13 June 2018

DAVID SPEIRS

Minister for Environment and Water

Ref.255827

NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT ACT 2004

Notice of Authorisation to Take Water from the River Torrens/Karrawirra Parri Prescribed Watercourse
(a Prescribed Watercourse of the Western Mount Lofty Ranges Prescribed Water Resources Area)

Pursuant to section 128 of the Natural Resources Management Act 2004 (the Act), I, David Speirs, Minister for Environment and Water (the Minister) and Minister to whom the Act is committed, hereby authorise the City of Charles Sturt to take water from the River Torrens/Karrawirra Parri Prescribed Watercourse prescribed under the Natural Resources Management (Western Mount Lofty Ranges—Prescribed Watercourses) Regulations 2005 from the areas specified in Schedule A, for the purpose set out in Schedule B and subject to the conditions specified in Schedule C.

Schedule A

Areas

1. Location of initial extraction – The River Torrens/Karrawirra Parri within the reserve at Allotment 64 of Deposited Plan 6278 within the Hundred of Yatala.

Schedule B

Purpose

For the purpose of replenishing and maintaining the Grange Lakes system meaning the Grange Lakes artificial waterway and surrounding linear reserve extending from Grange Road (south) to Trimmer Parade (north), in the metropolitan suburb of Grange, in Adelaide, South Australia.

Schedule C

Conditions

1. A maximum volume of 350,000 kilolitres of water per water use year may be taken from the River Torrens/Karrawirra Parri Prescribed Watercourse, from the area specified in Schedule A for the purpose specified in Schedule B.

2. The water user must only take water in conjunction with a released flow of water to the Torrens Lake.

3. The water user must take water from the River Torrens/Karrawirra Parri Prescribed Watercourse, monitor and report as per the approved ‘Dilution Flow Extraction Trial risk management plan’.

4. The water user must not take water except through a meter supplied, installed and maintained in accordance with the South Australian Licensed Water Use Meter Specification approved by the Minister as may be amended from time to time.

5. Meter readings must be used to determine the quantity of water taken.
6. The water user must supply a meter reading(s) to the Minister or the Minister’s agent during the first fourteen calendar days of July for each water use year.

7. The water user must notify the Minister or the Minister’s agent immediately if a meter fails to measure or record any quantity of water taken under this authorisation or if there is any reason to suspect that a meter may be defective.

8. The water user must comply with the provisions applying to meters set out in Regulation 14 of the *Natural Resources Management (Financial Provisions) Regulations 2005*. It is an offence to contravene or fail to comply with those provisions.

For the purposes of this authorisation:

‘Water use year’ means a period of 12 months commencing on 1 July and ending 30 June the following calendar year.

Words used in this authorisation that are defined in the Act shall have the meanings as set out in the Act.

This authorisation will commence on 1 July 2018 and will remain in effect until 30 June 2020 unless earlier varied or revoked.

Dated: 13 June 2018

DAVID SPEIRS MP
Minister for Environment and Water

Ref. 257403

---

**SCHEDULE A**

Areas

Allotment 13 and 14 of Deposited Plan 85638 and Allotment 17 of Deposited Plan 86067 within the Hundred of Yatala.

**SCHEDULE B**

Purpose

For the purpose of maintaining wetlands located at the following geographic decimal coordinates:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Longitude</th>
<th>Latitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St Clair Wetland start</td>
<td>138.534525</td>
<td>-34.870969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Clair Wetland middle</td>
<td>138.533369</td>
<td>-34.869572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Clair Wetland end</td>
<td>138.530194</td>
<td>-34.864459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Port Road Wetland middle</td>
<td>138.509570</td>
<td>-34.863788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Port Road Wetland end</td>
<td>138.503810</td>
<td>-34.859941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Lakes Golf Course Wetland</td>
<td>138.502908</td>
<td>-34.869778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooke Reserve Wetland</td>
<td>138.505467</td>
<td>-34.869414</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SCHEDULE C**

Conditions

1. A maximum volume of 350,000 kilolitres of water per water use year may be taken from the River Torrens/Karrawirra Parri Prescribed Watercourse, from the area specified in Schedule A for the purpose specified in Schedule B.

2. The water user must only take water in conjunction with a released flow of water to the Torrens Lake.

3. The water user must take water from the River Torrens/Karrawirra Parri Prescribed Watercourse, monitor and report as per the approved ‘Dilution Flow Extraction Trial risk management plan’.

4. The water user must not take water except through a meter supplied, installed and maintained in accordance with the South Australian Licensed Water Use Meter Specification approved by the Minister as may be amended from time to time.

5. Meter readings must be used to determine the quantity of water taken.

6. The water user must supply a meter reading(s) to the Minister or the Minister’s agent during the first fourteen calendar days of July for each water use year.

7. The water user must notify the Minister or the Minister’s agent immediately if a meter fails to measure or record any quantity of water taken under this authorisation or if there is any reason to suspect that a meter may be defective.

8. The water user must comply with the provisions applying to meters set out in Regulation 14 of the *Natural Resources Management (Financial Provisions) Regulations 2005*. It is an offence to contravene or fail to comply with those provisions.

For the purposes of this authorisation:

‘Water use year’ means a period of 12 months commencing on 1 July and ending 30 June the following calendar year.

Words used in this authorisation that are defined in the Act shall have the meanings as set out in the Act.

This authorisation will commence on 1 July 2018 and will remain in effect until 30 June 2020 unless earlier varied or revoked.

Dated: 13 June 2018

DAVID SPEIRS MP
Minister for Environment and Water

Ref. 257400
Dear Mr McCarthy

I write to advise that I have recently given approval for South Australia’s natural resources management (NRM) boards to consult on my behalf with constituent councils regarding the proposed council contributions to the regional NRM levy, identified in the NRM boards’ approved business plans for 2018-19.

I would like to take the opportunity to acknowledge the ongoing efforts of local government in collecting the NRM levy on behalf of the NRM boards. I recognise that the levy collection process is an imposition on councils but it remains the most cost efficient and transparent method of collecting the NRM levy. I understand that councils are able to recover costs associated with the levy collection process.

While NRM levies for 2018-19 were established before the government I am part of was elected, my intention is that as part of the changes to natural resources management across the state, we will introduce caps on levies as of 2019-20. This will reduce cost pressures on landowners, part of the Marshall Liberal Government’s commitment to lower costs for households and businesses.

The legislative reforms we will introduce to parliament over the coming year, I believe, will lead to significant improvements in the way that the NRM system operates in South Australia. I want to simplify the processes in managing natural resources, which has become overly complicated and expensive. As part of working through these important reforms, there will be an extensive consultation process with local councils, landowners, NRM boards and other key stakeholders.

Once established, I want the Landscape boards to develop simple, publically accessible plans that focus the environmentally sustainable management of our land, water, soils and biodiversity. I envision the Landscape boards will work closely with key stakeholder groups and will outsource much of the work that will need to be undertaken to help manage these priorities. I encourage you and your council to be pivotal in helping to drive investment in NRM activities across the State.
I believe that the best way to achieve successful and ongoing environmental outcomes is to forge strong partnerships with the community and key stakeholders such as you and your council who have the capacity and experience to help achieve genuine community driven NRM reform in South Australia.

I look forward to working closely with you and your council in bringing about real change in natural resources management across the state.

Yours sincerely

DAVID SPEIRS MP
Minister for Environment and Water

May 2018
COUNCIL
DEVELOPMENT AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES
ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES REPORT
21 AUGUST 2018

4.5.2 CONSENSUS AGENDA – ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES REPORT

4.5.2.3 GAWLER RIVER FLOODPLAIN MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY
B7490
Minutes of the Gawler River Floodplain Management Authority meeting held 5 July 2018 are attached for information.

RECOMMENDATION:
That report items 4.5.2.3 be received.
Mr Ian Baldwin formally welcomed Board Members, Deputy Board Members and Observers and opened the 105th meeting of the Board.

Present

Mr Ian Baldwin, Independent Board Member, Chair
Mr Marc Salver, Adelaide Hills Council, Deputy Board Member
Cr Malcolm Herrmann, Adelaide Hills Council, Board Member
Mayor Bob Sloane, The Barossa Council, Board Member
Mr Gary Mavrinac, The Barossa Council, Board Member
Mr Sam Dilena, Town of Gawler Council, Board Member
Cr Denis Davey, City of Playford Council, Board Member
Mr James Miller, Adelaide Plains Council, Board Member
Cr Mel Lawrence, Adelaide Plains Council, Board Member
Mr Andrew Philpott, Light Regional Council, Deputy Board Member
Cr William Close, Light Regional Council, Board Member

Apologies

Mr Mal Hemmerling, City of Playford Council
Mr Greg Pattison, City of Playford Council
Mr Adrian Shackley, Town of Gawler Council (*Possible late attendance)
Mr David Hitchcock, GRFMA Executive Officer (Leave)

GRB 18/48 Observers

Moved: Mayor B Sloane Seconded: Mr S Dilena

That Cr Terry-Anne Keen (Deputy Board Member - Adelaide Plains Council) and Cr. Paul Koch (Deputy Board Member - Town of Gawler) be appointed as Observers.

CARRIED

The Chair advised that the intent of the meeting was to consider the progression of the Northern Floodway Project following confirmation of support being received from all six constituent councils, viz:-

The Chair advised that the intent of the meeting was to consider the progression of the Northern Floodway Project following confirmation of support being received from all six constituent councils, viz:-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNCIL</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>RESOLUTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Playford Council</td>
<td>22.05.18</td>
<td>Council endorses the Gawler River Floodplain Management Authority to progress the Northern Floodway project as a priority: 1. Subject to the Federal and State Government to confirm in writing a commitment to fund in totality all capital costs including the further design and development costs associated with the Northern Floodway Project. 2. Council acknowledging the GRFMA contribution will be the responsibility for the ongoing maintenance of the Northern Floodway Project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Regional Council</td>
<td>12.06.18</td>
<td>1. Receive and endorse the report titled 'Northern Floodway Project Prospectus' (April 2018) prepared by Tonkin Consulting on behalf of the Gawler River Floodplain Management Authority; 2. Notes the actions outlined in the 'Northern Floodway Project Prospectus' (April 2018) which describe a number of proposed measures to be considered to provide additional flood protection measures to the lower reaches of the Gawler River, subject to the development of a mutually acceptable funding and role sharing model. These recommendations include: a) The establishment of a single management authority for the purpose of river and levee maintenance that has the necessary resources and access rights to maintain the river in good condition from a flood conveyance as well as a biodiversity maintenance perspective; b) The undertaking of river condition and levee maintenance repair work as a matter of high priority noting that there are three (3) “no regrets” actions that would provide immediate benefits in terms of reducing flood risk, including: i) The sensitive removal of pest and nuisance plants and revegetation as necessary, with appropriate native plants species that will not unnecessarily impede flood flows; ii) Undertaking repairs to the damaged levees and those sections of levees considered to be most vulnerable to failure during the next flood; iii) Sensitively remove accumulated sediment around key structures such as the Railway Bridge, Baker Road crossing, Old Port Wakefield Road Bridge and the Port Wakefield Road highway bridges that is impairing the capacity of these crossings to convey flow through them; c) The development of concept designs for the establishment of a Northern Floodway, in addition to the construction of a new river levee system so that consultation with affected landholders can proceed;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Support the Gawler River Floodplain Management Authority to develop an equitable funding and land management model for the activities proposed in the Northern Floodway Report. It is proposed that the entire upfront funding of the project is to be sought from the State and Commonwealth Governments with the ongoing maintenance of the project being funded by the Authority via subscriptions from member Councils.

**The Barossa Council** 19.06.18  
That Council support and commit to the Gawler River Floodplain Management Authority’s Northern Floodway Project and Prospectus as circulated to the Constituent Councils.

**Adelaide Hills Council** 19.06.18  
1. That the report be received and noted.  
2. That the Gawler River Flood Management Authority is advised that Council is committed to and supports the progression of the Northern Floodway Project subject to the planning, design and construction being funded entirely by the Federal and State Governments, with the ongoing maintenance of the Project being funded by the GRFMA via subscriptions from Constituent Councils.

**Adelaide Plains Council** 19.06.18  
1. Receives and notes the minutes of the Special Meeting of the Gawler River Floodplain Management Authority dated 17 May 2018;  
2. Endorses the Gawler River Floodplain Management Authority resolution number GRB 18/34 Northern Floodway Project; and  
3. Gives “in principle” support to the Northern Floodway Project subject to the planning, design and construction being funded entirely by Federal and State Governments.

**Town of Gawler Council** 26.06.18  
2. Supports the progression of the Northern Floodway Project on the basis that: a. The Federal and State Governments confirm in writing a commitment to fund in totality all capital costs, including the further design and development costs associated with the Northern Floodway Project. b. Formal commitment is provided by all Constituent Council’s within the GRFMA on progressing the Northern Floodway Project on this funding principle. c. Funding the ongoing costs associated with maintaining the Northern Floodway’s delivered works will be the GRFMA’s, hence the constituent Councils, contribution to the project.  
3. Notes that further reports be presented to the Council on this project at key junctures.
Discussion ensued.

**GRB 18/49 Elevation of Cr Paul Koch**

Moved: Mr S Dilena  
Seconded: Mr A Philpott

That in the absence of Cr A Shackley that Cr P Koch be identified as Member of the Board for this meeting.

CARRIED

**GRB 18/50 Northern Floodway Project – Funding Support**

Moved: Mr J Miller  
Seconded: Cr D Davey

That the Gawler River Floodplain Management Authority write to the relevant Federal and State government Senators and Ministers requesting formal funding support to carry out all further planning, consultation, detailed design and capital works associated with the Northern Floodway Project, estimated at a value of $27 million; the funding model to account for the fact that the Gawler River Floodplain Management Authority constituent councils will take on the subsequent maintenance of the Floodway. This policy position has been formally ratified by all constituent councils.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

**GRB 18/51 Northern Floodway Project – Letters of Support**

Moved: Mayor B Sloane  
Seconded: Mr M Salver

That the Gawler River Floodplain Management Authority seeks letters of support (where possible) for the project from RDA Barossa - Light and Gawler and Adelaide Plains, Adelaide and Mount Lofty Ranges Natural Resources Management Board and the Stormwater Management Authority as well as relevant Senators and Ministers presiding over aligned portfolios.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

**GRB 18/51 Northern Floodway Project – Public Relations**

Moved: Cr M Herrmann  
Seconded: Mr A Philpott

That the Executive Officer seek to engage the services of a public relations firm to prepare a preliminary communication strategy and media release to detail the current decision of the Board and constituent councils, and proposed strategy moving forward by the August 2018 meeting.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY
Closure of meeting

The Chairperson thanked the Town of Gawler Council for hospitality as host and noted the next Ordinary Board Meeting will be held 9.45 am, Thursday, 16th August 2018 at the Town of Gawler Council.

Meeting closed 10.44 am.

Confirmed Chairperson ..................................................
Enforcement agencies including local councils have an essential role in the administration of the Safe Drinking Water Act 2011 (the ‘Act’). Subsequently the information provided by these agencies contributes significantly to the required Annual Report to Parliament each year prepared by the Minister.

Section 52 of the Act requires that enforcement agencies provide an annual report on activities performed under Act. The attached report is created from the template supplied (and required) by SA Health and was forwarded to their Water Quality Unit prior to July 31 (to comply with their requested deadline).

The Act and Regulations came into operation on 1 March 2013 and were followed by a 12 month transitional period (24 months for audits). The Act applies to all drinking water providers who supply water to the public, it does not apply to domestic use of rainwater tanks or supplies in private use.

Although SA Health take primary responsibility in administering the legislation (including registration and auditing of large suppliers like SA Water, hospitals etc), local government maintain inspection and enforcement powers for small drinking water providers in their area eg water carters, B&B’s, food premises. Council’s Environmental Health Officers are responsible for regulating these premises under the Food Act 2001, thus the safe drinking water inspection and enforcement requirements were intended as an adjunct to Councils role in administering the food hygiene legislation.

Council has three separate drinking water providers registered with SA Health. Of these, two are inspected by Council and one is audited by SA Health.

Both providers were inspected in accordance with SA Health requirements and both were found to be compliant in all aspects.
SA Health expects that any Council that receives a complaint in relation to drinking water will investigate, in a similar fashion to their current role under the *Food Act 2001*. No complaints have been received by The Barossa Council in this regard during this reporting period.

**RECOMMENDATION:**
That report items 4.5.2.4 be received.
Activities under the Act

1  Appointment of authorised officers under the Safe Drinking Water Act

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of authorised officer &amp; qualifications (including auditing qualifications)</th>
<th>Position Title</th>
<th>Does the authorised officer work for more than one council? Provide details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gary Mavrinac  Planning qualifications</td>
<td>Director Development &amp; Environmental Services</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Carroll  Associate Diploma in Health Surveying, SA Health Approved Food Safety Auditor (National).</td>
<td>Manager Health Services</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Watson  Bachelor of Applied Science (Env. Health)  Flinders University</td>
<td>Environmental Health Officer</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joel Bray  Bachelor of Science University of Adelaide, Graduate Diploma  Environmental Health Queensland University of Technology</td>
<td>Environmental Health Officer</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2  Audits and inspections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trading name of drinking water provider</th>
<th>Date of audit/inspection</th>
<th>Name of auditor/inspector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Booth Transport</td>
<td>21 June 2018</td>
<td>Steve Carroll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley Wine Tankers</td>
<td>22 June 2018</td>
<td>Steve Carroll</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3  Fees for audits and inspections

$118.00

4  Enforcement activities
No enforcement activities during the reporting period.

5  Drinking water related complaints

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trading name of drinking water provider</th>
<th>Date complaint received</th>
<th>Details of follow-up /investigation, etc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6  Consultation and Education

7  Other activities
4.5.3 CONSENSUS AGENDA – HEALTH SERVICES REPORT

4.5.3.1 FOOD ACT ANNUAL REPORT 2017-18

Section 93 of the Food Act 2001 requires that Council provide a summary of activities related to the administration of the Food Act. The attached report is created from the template supplied (and required) by SA Health and was forwarded to their Food Standards Surveillance Branch prior to July 31 (to comply with their requested deadline).

Local Councils in their roles as enforcement agencies have an essential role in the administration of this Act. The information provided by local government contributes an essential part of the required Annual Food Act Report to Parliament each year by the Minister.

Traditionally food businesses in The Barossa Council area are inspected using the Australian Food Safety Assessment (AFSA) system. Developed in SA, food businesses were given an overall risk classification (ie low, medium, high) and routine inspection frequencies vary from six to twenty four months (according to risk) to ensure compliance with the National Food Safety Standards.

Recently SA Councils have been obliged to also adopt the new ‘South Australian Food Business Risk Classification System’ developed by SA Health and introduced through a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between SA Health and the SA Local Government Association (LGA). The MOU also introduces Inspection Principles which are designed to bring about improved consistency across the State.

The SA Food Business Risk Classification System requires an in depth assessment of the types of foods being provided, the food processes undertaken, determining the highest food risk, and categorising the business sector to arrive at an inspection priority (ie P1, P2, P3 and P4 with P1 being the highest risk category). A consequence of this priority system is the disclosure of many premises identified as being of high risk requiring more frequent and longer inspections and, thus, more resourcing.

The reporting proforma is also now more detailed in recent years to adopt the new system, which aligns SA with Federal Government requirements for a risk profiling framework for the food business sector. This also means that the reporting template involves considerable manual collation of information to collate (as the granular information requested is beyond the usual software capability).
Food businesses which cater for vulnerable populations (eg child care centres, hospitals or nursing homes) are required to have Food Safety Plans (FSP). Such premises are required to have their FSP independently audited (by external third party auditors, from other councils, or SA Health) and reports on these audits are then forwarded to the local Council by the auditor. Council currently has an approved Food Safety Auditor on staff (Council’s Manager Health Services) auditing premises within the Council area. A fee is charged per audit. Hospital FSP’s are audited by SA Health.

In summary, the broader Food Act outcomes in The Barossa Council area for 2017/18 are;

- Adoption and implementation and promotion of online food safety training (I’m Alert) available to all businesses within the Council area free of charge to the business resulting in a significant increase in exposure of food handlers to updated training, uptake of which has been encouraging.
- Maintaining the FSP auditing service to six local food businesses (catering to vulnerable populations).
- Food Safety Week implementation of a display at the Nuriootpa office counter detailing food hygiene principles and information for interested parties.

**RECOMMENDATION:**
That the report items 4.5.3.1 be received.
Information on Local Government Administration of the Food Act for the period 1st July 2017 to 30th June 2018

Council Name: The Barossa Council

### 1. Authorised Officers

An authorised officer (AO) is defined as “a person appointed under Part 9, Division 3 of the Food Act 2001”. Under Division 3 a council is required to maintain a list of AOs appointed under the Act. Please provide the following advice on persons who were listed as an AO for your council, under this provision, on the 30th June 2018.

The purpose of this question is to update the current list of authorised officers working in South Australia. Where part time staff are employed by more than one council, please indicate the name of all other councils in the table below.

If on the 30th of June 2018 the council did not have an AO under the Food Act please provide a nil return.

<p>| Authorised Officers | | |
|---------------------|----------------|
| The Barossa Council | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Authorised Officer</th>
<th>Position Title</th>
<th>Contact Details (phone, fax, mobile, email)</th>
<th>Full time or Part Time appointment</th>
<th><strong>If Part Times . Record the FTE (Full time Equivalent)</strong></th>
<th>Does the authorised officer work for more than one council?</th>
<th>Name the other councils</th>
<th>Percentage of time spent on food related matters (including routine, follow-up and complaints)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Carroll</td>
<td>Manager Health Services</td>
<td>8563 8491, <a href="mailto:scarroll@barossa.sa.gov.au">scarroll@barossa.sa.gov.au</a></td>
<td>Full Time</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35.00% 100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Watson</td>
<td>Environmental Health Officer</td>
<td>8563 8419, <a href="mailto:kwatson@barossa.sa.gov.au">kwatson@barossa.sa.gov.au</a></td>
<td>Full Time</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50.00% 0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joel Bray</td>
<td>Environmental Health Officer</td>
<td>8563 8435, <a href="mailto:jbray@barossa.sa.gov.au">jbray@barossa.sa.gov.au</a></td>
<td>Full Time</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15.00% 0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL %</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33.33% 33.33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** FTE = Part time working hrs per week/ Full time working hours per week
For example: Officer working 15 hrs a week. Fulltime hours for the week = 37.5. FTE= 15/37.5 which is 0.4 FTE

2. Audits & Inspections of Food Premises

2A. Food Audits

The Food Act requires businesses that process food for service to “Vulnerable Populations” to have implemented a documented Food Safety Program and are subject to an audit in order to verify compliance with Standard 3.2.1. Please complete the following table with respect to your council area only (if you audit outside your council area, these details will be captured by the respective council). If these businesses were also inspected by your council during the financial year, please provide this information as well.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business Type-Vulnerable Population</th>
<th>No. of Businesses</th>
<th>Routine Audits (Standard 3.2.1, 3.2.2 &amp; 3.2.3)</th>
<th>Routine Inspections (Standard 3.2.2 &amp; 3.2.3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No. of audits conducted by your council</td>
<td>No. of audits conducted by other councils (In your area)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care Centres</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged Care Facilities</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Hospitals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others-Commercial Meals on wheels, Central production kitchen for vulnerable pops</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* "Vulnerable Populations" are those types of businesses as defined in Standard 3.3.1 and are required to be audited.
2B. Food Inspections

All food businesses in South Australia are required to comply with the Food Act 2001, Regulations and Food Safety Standards. Please complete the following table with respect to your Council; however EXCLUDE businesses that service “Vulnerable Populations” which were reported in section 2A of this report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Classification</th>
<th>Number of Businesses</th>
<th>Routine Inspections Conducted</th>
<th>Follow up Inspections</th>
<th>No. of Inspection resulting from complaints</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1 (please exclude businesses that service “Vulnerable Populations”)</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Food Audit and Inspection Fees

3A. Food Audit fees
Councils are able to charge for audits conducted by Authorised Officers.

Does your council conduct Food Audits? Yes
If you answered NO to the above question go to Q3B.
Does your council charge fees for conducting Food Audits? Yes
If you answered NO to the above question go to Q3B.

Please advise the fees currently charged by your council for auditing purposes and clearly specify whether this is an hourly rate or flat fee structure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Audit Type/parameters</th>
<th>Audit Charge ($)/unit* (if no fees are charged please write N/A)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Desktop Audit (offsite)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routine Audit (onsite)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow up Audit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Cost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$521 in 2017-2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3B. Food Inspection fees

Councils are able to charge for inspections conducted by Authorised Officers.

Does your council charge fees for conducting food premises inspections? Yes

If you answered NO to the above question go to Q4.

Please advise the fees currently charged by your council for inspection purposes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inspection Type</th>
<th>Inspection Charge ($)/unit* (if no fees are charged please write N/A)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Routine Inspection</td>
<td>118 (sml food business), 294 (lge food business)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow up Inspection</td>
<td>No charge on first follow up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaint Inspection</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Activity Inspection</td>
<td>59 (or 50% of current sml food business inspection)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Farmers market stalls 25% of sml business fee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Unit - please specify in your response, for example "per inspection" OR "per hour"

4. Food Act Enforcement

4A Enforcement Activities

Please complete the following table indicating the enforcement activities undertaken by your councils during financial year 2017-2018.

Table 4A
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business Sector</th>
<th>Risk Level</th>
<th>No. of Business</th>
<th>No. of business Inspected</th>
<th>No. of business requiring enforceme nt action</th>
<th>No. of written warnings issued</th>
<th>No. of improvement notices issued</th>
<th>No. of prohibition orders issued</th>
<th>No. of expiations issued</th>
<th>Body Corporate</th>
<th>Natural person</th>
<th>No. of prosecutions</th>
<th>Percent Compliance - Inspected Businesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alcoholic beverages packaged</td>
<td>P4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakery products</td>
<td>P3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakery products Perishable fillings</td>
<td>P2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continental Type Delicatessen food Perishable</td>
<td>P2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perishable</td>
<td>P2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low risk packaged food</td>
<td>P4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium risk food - perishable</td>
<td>P3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raw Meat &amp; Poultry</td>
<td>P2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seafood(excludes Processing of Bivalve mollusc)</td>
<td>P2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others- see comments</td>
<td>P1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others- see comments</td>
<td>P2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others- see comments</td>
<td>P3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others- see comments</td>
<td>P4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
## Food Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>P1</th>
<th>P2</th>
<th>P3</th>
<th>P4</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catering offsite activity</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catering onsite</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium risk foods perishable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurants and takeaway RTE Food</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepared in advance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurants and takeaway RTE Food</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Express order</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurants and takeaway RTE Food</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No raw preparation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others- see comments</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others- see comments</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others- see comments</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others- see comments</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others- see comments</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

## Processor/ Manufacturer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Food Product</th>
<th>P1</th>
<th>P2</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bakery products</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perishable fillings processing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Food processing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Tier 1</td>
<td>Tier 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverage processing</td>
<td>P3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canned food processing</td>
<td>P2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canned food processing very small producer &amp; high acid food</td>
<td>P3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chocolate processing</td>
<td>P2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chocolate processing small producer</td>
<td>P3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cereal processing</td>
<td>P3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>processing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shelf-life processing</td>
<td>P2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>extended shelf life</td>
<td>P2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>including soft cheese</td>
<td>P2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cheese processing</td>
<td>P1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egg Processing</td>
<td>P2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruit and Vegetables processing</td>
<td>P1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruit and vegetable processing frozen</td>
<td>P2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruit and vegetable processing frozen Blanch/small producer</td>
<td>P3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruit and vegetable Juice Unpasteurises processing</td>
<td>P1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruit juice, Pasteurisation processing, Shelf stable processing</td>
<td>P2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruit Juice Pasteurisation processing, Shelf stable processing Small producer</td>
<td>P3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant formula product processing</td>
<td>P1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meat Processing, Abattoir/ Boning Room</td>
<td>P2</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meat Processing, Fermented meat Processing</td>
<td>P1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meat Processing, Small Goods Processing</td>
<td>P2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oils and fats processing</td>
<td>P3</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peanut Butter processing</td>
<td>P2</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peanut Butter processing Small Producer</td>
<td>P2</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poultry processing</td>
<td>P1</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepared not ready to eat food processing</td>
<td>P2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepared ready to eat food processing</td>
<td>P1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seafood processing</td>
<td>P2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seafood processing RTE and shelf stable</td>
<td>P2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seafood processing - Mollusc processing</td>
<td>P1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snack chips processing</td>
<td>P3</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spices and dried herbs processing</td>
<td>P2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spices and dried herbs processing small producer</td>
<td>P3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sprout processing</td>
<td>P1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sushi processing</td>
<td>P1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetables in oil processing</td>
<td>P1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Others- see comments</th>
<th>P1</th>
<th>#DIV/0!</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Others- see comments</td>
<td>P2</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others- see comments</td>
<td>P3</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others- see comments</td>
<td>P4</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Food Transporter</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bulk flour storage distributor</td>
<td>P3</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulk milk collection distributor</td>
<td>P2</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy produce distributor</td>
<td>P2</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dry goods and beverages distributor</td>
<td>P3</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frozen food distributor</td>
<td>P3</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruit and vegetables distributor</td>
<td>P3</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perishable ready to eat, packaged, medium risk food distributor</td>
<td>P3</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perishable, ready to eat, packaged, high risk food distributor</td>
<td>P2</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processed meat distributor</td>
<td>P2</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seafood distributor</td>
<td>P2</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for enforcement activity</th>
<th>Written warnings</th>
<th>Improvement notices</th>
<th>Prohibition Orders</th>
<th>Expiations</th>
<th>Prosecutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard 3.2.1 (Food Safety Program)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSP not prepared, implemented, maintained and monitored</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSP not audited at the frequency determined by the auditor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSP not revised so as to comply with the regulations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSP audit report not retained by business for four years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Food related complaints

5A. Food Complaints
Please complete the following table indicating the complaints received and actioned by your councils during financial year 2017-2018.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complaint Type</th>
<th>Total No. received</th>
<th>No. Justified/ Confirmed</th>
<th>% Overall Justified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food unsuitable/unsafe due to foreign matter</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food unsuitable/unsafe due to microbial contamination / growth</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food unsuitable/unsafe due to presence of unapproved or excessive chemical residues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alleged food poisoning</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclean premises</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor personal hygiene or poor food handling practices</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermin / insects / pests observed in premises</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refuse storage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labelling Issues</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other ( please state)</td>
<td>2 (unsuitable taste, animals)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>#VALUE!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>56.25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Proactive projects, surveys and sampling programs

It is requested the report uses the following general format:

- What was the project and why was it done
- A précis of what and how it was done.
- Results/Outcomes

Please keep summaries brief and ½ page in length as a maximum.

A survey was created and distributed to B&Bs in the Council area to confirm/clarify Food Act activities, as well as Drinking Water and Public Swimming Pool & Spa activities. This project was carried out to capture businesses that Council did not have food business notifications for under the Food Act and improve the accuracy of Council’s B&B database.

Investigative research was undertaken to identify B&B businesses/premises in the area and survey sent to business owners. Business owners are currently responding to the survey and database/spreadsheet being updated accordingly.

It is anticipated that higher risk activities are to be followed up with businesses in due course.
4.5.3 CONSENSUS AGENDA – HEALTH SERVICES REPORT

4.5.3.2 FOOD PREMISES INSPECTIONS
B4573

During the month of July 2018 the following food businesses were inspected for their compliance with the Food Act 2001.

- Williamstown General Store
- Aldi Nuriootpa
- The Company Kitchen Angaston
- The Rex
- Barossa Bowland
- Orlando Wines
- Subway Nuriootpa
- Blond Coffee Angaston
- Linke’s Bakery Nuriootpa
- Oanh Kitchen Angaston
- Red Door Espresso Tanunda
- Musque Food and Wine Tanunda
- Williamstown Hotel
- Soul With Zest Angaston
- Vintners Restaurant
- Cockatoo Valley General Store
- Tanunda Bakery

FOOD SAFETY AUDITS

None conducted.

FOOD RECALLS

- Loving Earth Coconut Chocolate Butter
- Aldi Frozen Vegetables
- Serendipity Vanilla Bean Ice Cream
- Vili’s Lamb Mint And Rosemary Pies
- Lactose Free Whole Milk Powder

RECOMMENDATION:
That report items 4.5.3.2 be received.
7.2.1 DEBATE AGENDA – CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

7.2.1.1 PETITION – TELECOMMUNICATIONS IN SPRINGTON
B411

PURPOSE
To present a petition to Council on telecommunication services in Springton

RECOMMENDATION
That Council note the petition and that the Chief Executive Officer inform the lead petitioner Mr Bowden that:

1. Council shall write to Telstra seeking formal response noting Telstra has indicated that it is currently establishing arrangements for a new base station in Springton and further details will be conformed once a formal response from Telstra has been received.

REPORT
Discussion
A petition has been received on behalf of residents in the Springton area to improve mobile telecommunications.

Officers have made enquiries with Telstra and they have indicated that they have advanced plans for a new base station and are hopeful of resolving the matter by the end of the calendar year.

I have contacted the lead petition and informed him:

- That the petition, in full, will go to the August meeting of Council.
- Council is not responsible for telecommunication services but consistent with the Community Plan will advocate for improved services.
- Further response will be provided once Council has considered the petition.

ATTACHMENTS OR OTHER SUPPORTING REFERENCES
Petition

COMMUNITY PLAN / CORPORATE PLAN / LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS
Community Plan

Infrastructure

3.2 Collaborate with private and public utilities providers to ensure infrastructure is adequate to support the community both now and into the future.
3.3 Advocate for telecommunication infrastructure to meet personal and commercial needs of residents and businesses.

**FINANCIAL, RESOURCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT CONSIDERATIONS**

Nil

**COMMUNITY CONSULTATION**

Response will be provided as per Council practice and policy to the lead petitioner. Any additional infrastructure is likely to require a development application and any community consultation required by the Development Act will be undertaken at the appropriate time.
Springton General Store  
3 Miller Street  
SPRINTON  
SA 5235  

Tel: (08) 8568 2211  

9 July 2018  

Barossa council  
43-57 Tanunda Rd  
Nuriootpa  
SA 5355  

Please find attached a petition for Telstra Mobile Telephone reception in the Springton area, SA 5235. Springton is a small town located in the Barossa Valley, South Australia.

This petition was prompted by repeated requests from people living in our community as well as visitors to the area and tradesmen working locally who regularly miss work related telephone calls from potential clients. This may also affect emergency services.

Recently two primary school students, after being dropped off from the school bus, were waiting outside the general store to be picked up by their father. Their father did not arrive on time. The family uses Telstra Mobile Telephones and were unable to contact one another.

This is unacceptable whereby young children are left without the ability to contact their family.

Regards,

J BOWDEN

[Signature]
TELSTRA MOBILE PHONE RECEPTION

We, the undersigned petitioners, request that urgent action be taken to provide Telstra mobile phone reception for the township of Springton S.A. 5235 and its environs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20/6/18</td>
<td>Jessica</td>
<td>SPRINGTON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/6/18</td>
<td>Malcolm</td>
<td>SPRINGTON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/6/18</td>
<td>Chantelle</td>
<td>SPRINGTON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/6/18</td>
<td>Jo Slaney</td>
<td>SPRINGTON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/6/18</td>
<td>Tim Bownett</td>
<td>SPRINGTON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/6/18</td>
<td>Danielle Beggs</td>
<td>SPRINGTON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/6/18</td>
<td>TK Heale</td>
<td>SPRINGTON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/6/18</td>
<td>Graeme</td>
<td>SPRINGTON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/6/18</td>
<td>Marie Zik</td>
<td>SPRINGTON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/6/18</td>
<td>Virginia Cecily</td>
<td>SPRINGTON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/6/18</td>
<td>Roy Berrington</td>
<td>SPRINGTON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/6/18</td>
<td>Barb Fuller</td>
<td>SPRINGTON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/6/18</td>
<td>David Herbig</td>
<td>SPRINGTON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/6/18</td>
<td>Deb</td>
<td>SPRINGTON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/6/18</td>
<td>Sarah Courtny</td>
<td>SPRINGTON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/6/18</td>
<td>Steve Debettie</td>
<td>SPRINGTON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/6/18</td>
<td>Lyn Stephens</td>
<td>SPRINGTON - Main St.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/6/18</td>
<td>John Tesoror</td>
<td>SPRINGTON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/6/18</td>
<td>Tim Eyrus</td>
<td>SPRINGTON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/6/18</td>
<td>Tim Stale</td>
<td>SPRINGTON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/6/18</td>
<td>Jenna McGilton</td>
<td>SPRINGTON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/6/18</td>
<td>Chisato</td>
<td>SPRINGTON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/6/18</td>
<td>Brett Graham</td>
<td>SPRINGTON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/6/18</td>
<td>Pat</td>
<td>SPRINGTON - Eden</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/6/18</td>
<td>Cassie</td>
<td>SPRINGTON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/6/18</td>
<td>Ebony</td>
<td>SPRINGTON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/6/18</td>
<td>Chassiy Jones</td>
<td>SPRINGTON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/6/18</td>
<td>Kimberly Yata</td>
<td>SPRINGTON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/6/18</td>
<td>Cherrie Sartiner</td>
<td>SPRINGTON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/6/18</td>
<td>Jo Power</td>
<td>SPRINGTON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/6/18</td>
<td>Stuart Woodman</td>
<td>SPRINGTON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TELSTRA MOBILE PHONE RECEPTION

We, the undersigned petitioners, request that urgent action be taken to provide Telstra mobile phone reception for the township of Springton S.A. 5235 and its environs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20/6/18</td>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/6/18</td>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/6/18</td>
<td>Jeff</td>
<td>Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/6/18</td>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/6/18</td>
<td>Jodie</td>
<td>Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/6/18</td>
<td>Elisa</td>
<td>Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/6/18</td>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/6/18</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/6/18</td>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>Williamstown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/6/18</td>
<td>Mario</td>
<td>Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/6/18</td>
<td>Lynette</td>
<td>Brookton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/6/18</td>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Traralgon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/6/18</td>
<td>Ben</td>
<td>Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/6/18</td>
<td>Kyle</td>
<td>Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/6/18</td>
<td>Elly Jane</td>
<td>Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/6/18</td>
<td>Lyn Carter</td>
<td>Sprinttng</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/6/18</td>
<td>Tracey Fabian</td>
<td>Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/6/18</td>
<td>Rosh</td>
<td>Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/6/18</td>
<td>Sally</td>
<td>Springford Valley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/6/18</td>
<td>Mick</td>
<td>EVEN VALLEY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/6/18</td>
<td>Anna Glynn</td>
<td>SPRINGTON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/6/18</td>
<td>Bev Jenkins</td>
<td>SPRINGTON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/6/18</td>
<td>S. Greene</td>
<td>SPRINGTON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/6/18</td>
<td>Jennifer Holbrock</td>
<td>SPRINGTON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/6/18</td>
<td>Amanda Clark</td>
<td>SPRINGTON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/6/18</td>
<td>Tracey</td>
<td>NOROCOON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/6/18</td>
<td>Jacki</td>
<td>SPRINGTON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/6/18</td>
<td>Lesley Harrison</td>
<td>SPRINGTNN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/6/18</td>
<td>O' Hanlon</td>
<td>SPRINGTON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/6/18</td>
<td>S. Davey</td>
<td>SPRINGTON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/6/18</td>
<td>M. Holt</td>
<td>SPRINGTON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/6/18</td>
<td>S. Jones</td>
<td>SPRINGTON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We, the undersigned petitioners, request that urgent action be taken to provide Telstra mobile phone reception for the township of Springton S.A. 5235 and its environs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21-6-18</td>
<td>P. AISTROPE</td>
<td>HOSMITH RD ELLZ GLEN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-6-18</td>
<td>S. MUNROE</td>
<td>WILLIAMSFT SPRINGTON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-6-18</td>
<td>JAMES</td>
<td>MILK CAMERON MT PLEAS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-6-18</td>
<td>JOHN STANLEY</td>
<td>SPRINGTON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-6-18</td>
<td>CLIVE THOMAS</td>
<td>101 FLAMINGO RD MURLI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-6-18</td>
<td>GAY DEWALD</td>
<td>PO BOX 16 MOUNTBELL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-6-18</td>
<td>PETERS</td>
<td>SPRINGTON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-6-18</td>
<td>MUMMERTON</td>
<td>SPRINGTON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-6-18</td>
<td>JOHN HOLLAND</td>
<td>SPRINGTON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-6-18</td>
<td>R. JACQUES</td>
<td>SPRINGTON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-6-18</td>
<td>D. TAYLOR</td>
<td>SPRINGTON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-6-18</td>
<td>J. CLARKS</td>
<td>MOUNTBELL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-6-18</td>
<td>J. WAGNER</td>
<td>MOUNTBELL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-6-18</td>
<td>D. HOWARD</td>
<td>SPRINGTON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-6-18</td>
<td>S.T. WYNNMAN</td>
<td>SPRINGTON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-6-18</td>
<td>M.W. WINTER</td>
<td>SPRINGTON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-6-18</td>
<td>M. MURPHY</td>
<td>SPRINGTON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-6-18</td>
<td>C. MARSHALL</td>
<td>SPRINGTON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-6-18</td>
<td>M. ROBBINS</td>
<td>SPRINGTON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-6-18</td>
<td>C. CAVANAGH</td>
<td>SPRINGTON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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TELSTRA MOBILE PHONE RECEPTION

We, the undersigned petitioners, request that urgent action be taken to provide Telstra mobile phone reception for the township of Springton S.A. 5235 and its environs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21/4/18</td>
<td>Teraza Cross</td>
<td>8 William St, Springton, SA 5235</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/6/18</td>
<td>John Smith</td>
<td>132 Chedeb Road, Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/6/18</td>
<td>James Kelly</td>
<td>132 Chedeb Road, Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/6/18</td>
<td>Linda Kelly</td>
<td>132 Chedeb Road, Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/6/18</td>
<td>Grant Kelly</td>
<td>132 Chedeb Road, Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/6/18</td>
<td>Wally Biret</td>
<td>132 Chedeb Road, Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/6/18</td>
<td>Marina Turner</td>
<td>950359 Eola Valley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/6/18</td>
<td>Deb Ames</td>
<td>216 Hamilton Rd, Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/6/18</td>
<td>Sarah Potney</td>
<td>300 Rohnes Spring Rd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/6/18</td>
<td>George Gibson</td>
<td>72 Lavois Rd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/6/18</td>
<td>Sue Radwell</td>
<td>994 Orange Gumpl Rd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/6/18</td>
<td>Zac Thomas</td>
<td>1 Ferdinand St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/6/18</td>
<td>John McVeay</td>
<td>507-8570 Rd Sprincoat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/6/18</td>
<td>Tom Fitzgerald</td>
<td>6 Jacob St Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/6/18</td>
<td>James Reeves</td>
<td>608 Justin Rd Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/6/18</td>
<td>Kirstie Grodell</td>
<td>10 Edwards St Sprin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/6/18</td>
<td>David Grodell</td>
<td>10 Edwards St Sprin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/6/18</td>
<td>Fiona Davies</td>
<td>12 William St Sprin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/6/18</td>
<td>Marlee Sully</td>
<td>20 Williamstown Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/6/18</td>
<td>Anne Kloska</td>
<td>1 Gilbert Tce Sprin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/6/18</td>
<td>Damien Paice</td>
<td>15 Miller St Sprin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/6/18</td>
<td>Luke Mueller</td>
<td>23 Melrose St Mt Pleasant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/6/18</td>
<td>Cherie O'Dea</td>
<td>22 William St Sprin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/6/18</td>
<td>Stuart Winton</td>
<td>125 Moore Smith Rd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/6/18</td>
<td>Chad Zareftes</td>
<td>13 Hamilton Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/6/18</td>
<td>Steven Khastal</td>
<td>90 Lamoys Rd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/6/18</td>
<td>Melissa Smirks</td>
<td>7 Dale St, Sprin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/6/18</td>
<td>Matt Mercie</td>
<td>13 Mount Pleasant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/6/18</td>
<td>Leon King</td>
<td>20 Edwards ST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/6/18</td>
<td>Tessa Mclnty</td>
<td>20 Edwards ST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/6/18</td>
<td>Craig Mcveay</td>
<td>20 Edwards ST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/6/18</td>
<td>Randy Tymphi</td>
<td>69 Chedeb Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/6/18</td>
<td>N Stone</td>
<td>69 Chedeb Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TELSTRA MOBILE PHONE RECEPTION

We, the undersigned petitioners, request that urgent action be taken to provide Telstra mobile phone reception for the township of Springton S.A. 5235 and its environs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22/6/18</td>
<td>Megan Wilson</td>
<td>Lot 100 Kemp Rd, Eden Valley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/6/18</td>
<td>Maxine Keest</td>
<td>145 Kempton Rd, EV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/6/18</td>
<td>David Stretzer</td>
<td>Nairne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/6/18</td>
<td>Darren Ewicott</td>
<td>SPRINGTON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/6/18</td>
<td>Gary Hepp</td>
<td>12 Williamstown Rd, Spr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/6/18</td>
<td>Lorene Steele</td>
<td>12 Clifford Dr, Pin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/6/18</td>
<td>Martin Spencer</td>
<td>SPRINGTON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/6/18</td>
<td>Chelsea Kemp</td>
<td>SPRINGTON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/6/18</td>
<td>Shawn Carnett</td>
<td>SPRINGTON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/6/18</td>
<td>Barry McDow</td>
<td>3/4 Cookes Mill, Rm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/6/18</td>
<td>Glenn Lane</td>
<td>Hamiltons Road, Spr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/6/18</td>
<td>Sarah Volatier</td>
<td>8 William St, Spr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/6/18</td>
<td>Matthew Van Duieel</td>
<td>1 Daly St, Spr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/6/18</td>
<td>W MacKay</td>
<td>700 Hill Rd, PA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/6/18</td>
<td>Tony McLean</td>
<td>144 5th Ave, Spr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/6/18</td>
<td>Mark King</td>
<td>Crows Nest Rd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/6/18</td>
<td>Lee Mclean</td>
<td>mt Pleasant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/6/18</td>
<td>Lynn Benson</td>
<td>Lot 3 Williams Rd, Spr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/6/18</td>
<td>Brooke Gross</td>
<td>8 William St, Spr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/6/18</td>
<td>Lee Johnson</td>
<td>324 Princes Park Rd, Ev</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/6/18</td>
<td>Ada Borow</td>
<td>P.O. Box 68, Mt Martha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/6/18</td>
<td>Edan Borow</td>
<td>Flaxman Valley Rd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/6/18</td>
<td>Sharnie Gray</td>
<td>SPRINGTON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/6/18</td>
<td>Brett Huest</td>
<td>NAIRNE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/6/18</td>
<td>Marlene Bocah</td>
<td>SPRINGTON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/6/18</td>
<td>Matt Speakman</td>
<td>NAIRNE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/6/18</td>
<td>Phil Speakman</td>
<td>SPRINGTON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/6/18</td>
<td>Rob Walker</td>
<td>Daly St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AND EMERGENCY SERVICES
TELSTRA MOBILE PHONE RECEPTION

We, the undersigned petitioners, request that urgent action be taken to provide Telstra mobile phone reception for the township of Springton S.A. 5235, its environs and also for use by the Emergency Service and Businesses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22/6/18</td>
<td>C. Bourke</td>
<td>25 Amherst St,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/6/18</td>
<td>D. Rossell</td>
<td>Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/6/18</td>
<td>P. Archer</td>
<td>Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/6/18</td>
<td>C. Hecker</td>
<td>Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/6/18</td>
<td>L. Lord</td>
<td>Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/6/18</td>
<td>D. Husband</td>
<td>Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/6/18</td>
<td>B. Liddicock</td>
<td>Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/6/18</td>
<td>Lynette Mckee</td>
<td>Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/6/18</td>
<td>Beaugard</td>
<td>Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/6/18</td>
<td>Wilma McKean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23/6/18</td>
<td>Marley Hynan</td>
<td>Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23/6/18</td>
<td>Andrew Brodie</td>
<td>Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/6/18</td>
<td>Dane Smale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/6/18</td>
<td>K. White</td>
<td>Eden Valley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23/6/18</td>
<td>M. Stieck</td>
<td>Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/6/18</td>
<td>B. Liddicock</td>
<td>Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/6/18</td>
<td>Todd Reesler</td>
<td>Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/6/18</td>
<td>Sheree Ellis</td>
<td>Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/6/18</td>
<td>John Hentschel</td>
<td>Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/6/18</td>
<td>Daniel Draper</td>
<td>MAINE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/6/18</td>
<td>Michael Elliott</td>
<td>Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/6/18</td>
<td>Jennifer Pinnock</td>
<td>Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/6/18</td>
<td>Colin Forbes</td>
<td>Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/6/18</td>
<td>Matt Monte</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/6/18</td>
<td>Kevin McAlpine</td>
<td>Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/6/18</td>
<td>R. Croser</td>
<td>Eden Valley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/6/18</td>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/6/18</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Edithdale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/6/18</td>
<td>Frangois</td>
<td>Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TELSTRA MOBILE PHONE RECEPTION

We, the undersigned petitioners, request that urgent action be taken to provide Telstra mobile phone reception for the township of Springton S.A. 5235, its environs and also for use by the Emergency Service and Businesses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23-6-18</td>
<td>Ken Emery</td>
<td>9 Albert Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-6-18</td>
<td>Wendy Walker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-6-18</td>
<td>Claire Hay</td>
<td>Mt Crawford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-6-18</td>
<td>David Timm</td>
<td>Eden Valley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-6-18</td>
<td>Peter Kuzman</td>
<td>Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-6-18</td>
<td>Tan Penny</td>
<td>Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-6-18</td>
<td>Jan Ricketts</td>
<td>Williamstown Rd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-6-18</td>
<td>Chris Baker</td>
<td>3 O'g B. MSS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-6-18</td>
<td>Melody Hucson</td>
<td>362 Rhine Road Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-6-18</td>
<td>Laura Dunn</td>
<td>7 Ferdinand St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-6-18</td>
<td>Tom Scary</td>
<td>24 Akes St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-6-18</td>
<td>Troy Pender</td>
<td>423 Mann</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-6-18</td>
<td>David Thomas</td>
<td>1147 Springton Rd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-6-18</td>
<td>Trevor Cooling</td>
<td>12 Hamilton Rd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-6-18</td>
<td>Jami Hooten</td>
<td>52 Miller Rd Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-6-18</td>
<td>Melissa Hylton</td>
<td>27 Daly St Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-6-18</td>
<td>Kim Pope</td>
<td>180 Kepp Creek Rd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-6-18</td>
<td>Mark Joneski</td>
<td>38 Akes St Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-6-18</td>
<td>Jordan Jantke</td>
<td>35 Akes St Sprt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-6-18</td>
<td>M. Adams</td>
<td>Eden Valley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-6-18</td>
<td>M. Crawford</td>
<td>Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-6-18</td>
<td>D. Rosado</td>
<td>40 Williamstown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-6-18</td>
<td>L. Taylor</td>
<td>2 William St Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-6-18</td>
<td>M. Coleman</td>
<td>1 Miller St Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-6-18</td>
<td>Kwandusse</td>
<td>Miller Rd Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-6-18</td>
<td>Jane Brown</td>
<td>Williams Town Rd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-6-18</td>
<td>Janet Dijisman</td>
<td>4 William St Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-6-18</td>
<td>Kylie Gray</td>
<td>17 Hocknell Pl MTP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-6-18</td>
<td>Gail Martin</td>
<td>36 Miller St Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-6-18</td>
<td>Kanya Copeland</td>
<td>Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TELSTRA MOBILE PHONE RECEPTION**

We, the undersigned petitioners, request that urgent action be taken to provide Telstra mobile phone reception for the township of Springton S.A. 5235, its environs and also for use by the Emergency Service and Businesses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25.6.2018</td>
<td>Clifford Bell</td>
<td>7 Rushen Rd Eden Valley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.6.2018</td>
<td>Rea Cullen</td>
<td>Melbe Rd Mt Pleasant</td>
<td>Reg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.6.2018</td>
<td>M.S. Keeler</td>
<td>Keyneton Rd Eden Valley</td>
<td>He</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/6/2018</td>
<td>T. Sutcliffe</td>
<td>13 W. Davies Rd Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/6/2018</td>
<td>Vanessa Trevor</td>
<td>360 Jutland Rd, Qld Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/6/2018</td>
<td>Sal and Jana Dodds</td>
<td>2112 Eden Valley Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/6/2018</td>
<td>Lopa Parks</td>
<td>112 Eden Valley Rd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/6/2018</td>
<td>James Parks</td>
<td>Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/6/2018</td>
<td>Chloe Dunn</td>
<td>Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/6/2018</td>
<td>Jack Cavuck</td>
<td>Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/6/2018</td>
<td>Henry Camo</td>
<td>Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/6/2018</td>
<td>Jye Frisby</td>
<td>Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/6/2018</td>
<td>N Rogers</td>
<td>UG Rogers Road, Eden Valley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/6/2018</td>
<td>Andrew Huke</td>
<td>Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/6/2018</td>
<td>John Rosset</td>
<td>Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/6/2018</td>
<td>Kyle Brechey</td>
<td>Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/6/2018</td>
<td>Aaron Nugent</td>
<td>Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/6/2018</td>
<td>Judy Shearer</td>
<td>357 Shearer Rd Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/6/2018</td>
<td>Kevin Harrap</td>
<td>999 Jutland Rd, Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/6/2018</td>
<td>Gavin Lenon</td>
<td>Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/6/2018</td>
<td>Dale Martin &amp; Moira Kellett</td>
<td>Ballarat, VIC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/6/2018</td>
<td>Tahlia Green</td>
<td>Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/6/2018</td>
<td>Colin Rose</td>
<td>Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/6/2018</td>
<td>Travis McBee</td>
<td>Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/6/2018</td>
<td>Ivan Vea</td>
<td>Springton Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/6/2018</td>
<td>Affholder Timms</td>
<td>Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/6/2018</td>
<td>Robert Johnson</td>
<td>Eden Valley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/6/2018</td>
<td>Rex Forsyth</td>
<td>Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/6/2018</td>
<td>Marie Burk</td>
<td>Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/6/2018</td>
<td>Kyle Rainsford</td>
<td>Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/6/2018</td>
<td>Pamela Tannen</td>
<td>Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TELSTRA MOBILE PHONE RECEPTION

We, the undersigned petitioners, request that urgent action be taken to provide Telstra mobile phone reception for the township of Springton S.A. 5235, its environs and also for use by the Emergency Service and Businesses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21/6/18</td>
<td>R. Lannan</td>
<td>289 Rose Ave, Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/6/18</td>
<td>R. Black</td>
<td>Charles St, Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/6/18</td>
<td>L. Amery</td>
<td>193 Mount Rd, Mt Crawford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/6/18</td>
<td>H. A. Collins</td>
<td>31 Miller St, Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/6/18</td>
<td>C. P. Hunt</td>
<td>31 Miller St, Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/6/18</td>
<td>J. N. Macquill</td>
<td>115 Lons Rd, Mt Bony</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/6/18</td>
<td>K. Hartman</td>
<td>119 Woolford Rd, Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/6/18</td>
<td>S. Ferguson</td>
<td>Rushley Rd, Eden Valley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/6/18</td>
<td>F. Machin</td>
<td>178 Jutland Rd, Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/6/18</td>
<td>C. Alderton</td>
<td>180 Keep Creek Rd, Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/6/18</td>
<td>T. Pope</td>
<td>544 Springton Rd, Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/6/18</td>
<td>S. Hucksburg</td>
<td>155 Vicars Rd, Forestville</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/6/18</td>
<td>J. Houney</td>
<td>315 Vicars Rd, Forestville</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/6/18</td>
<td>J. H. Emms</td>
<td>178 Jutland Rd, Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/6/18</td>
<td>A. Gay</td>
<td>180 Keep Creek Rd, Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/6/18</td>
<td>S. Rathje</td>
<td>544 Springton Rd, Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/6/18</td>
<td>R. Pollitt</td>
<td>155 Vicars Rd, Forestville</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/6/18</td>
<td>K. Swanks</td>
<td>315 Vicars Rd, Forestville</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/6/18</td>
<td>A. Baylo</td>
<td>180 Keep Creek Rd, Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/6/18</td>
<td>L. Macmillan</td>
<td>544 Springton Rd, Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/6/18</td>
<td>Leonie Hall</td>
<td>Flaxmill Valley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/6/18</td>
<td>R. Hentschko</td>
<td>23 Day St, Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/7/2018</td>
<td>R. Shaktis</td>
<td>Hiller St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/7/2018</td>
<td>P. O'Donnell</td>
<td>3 Angas, Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/7/2018</td>
<td>G. Hnglass</td>
<td>4 Moores St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/7/2018</td>
<td>P. O`Keefe</td>
<td>3 Annes St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/7/2018</td>
<td>G. Macgregor</td>
<td>49 Caracks Rd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/7/2018</td>
<td>A. Johnson</td>
<td>324 Rhine Park Rd, Dev</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/7/2018</td>
<td>D. Wolford</td>
<td>60 Grenfell Rd, Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/7/2018</td>
<td>T. Jankunas</td>
<td>5 Sydenham Rd, Nth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/7/18</td>
<td>H. M. Rogers</td>
<td>510 Springton 5235</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TELSTRA MOBILE PHONE RECEPTION

We, the undersigned petitioners, request that urgent action be taken to provide Telstra mobile phone reception for the township of Springton S.A. 5235, its environs and also for use by the Emergency Service and Businesses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3/6/18</td>
<td>M. H. Stephens</td>
<td>Box 131, Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/6/18</td>
<td>S. Webb</td>
<td>Craigmore</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/6/18</td>
<td>M. Conforti</td>
<td>Newton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/7/18</td>
<td>R. Langley-Am</td>
<td>Hardmond Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/7/18</td>
<td>J. Desse</td>
<td>4 Miller St Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/7/18</td>
<td>J. Langan-Lammi</td>
<td>36 Church St Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/7/18</td>
<td>T. Oke</td>
<td>26 William St Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/7/18</td>
<td>R. Schmudd,</td>
<td>64 William St Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/7/18</td>
<td>S. Ballanakis, K.</td>
<td>64 William St Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/7/18</td>
<td>D. C. Shipley</td>
<td>3 Church St Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/7/18</td>
<td>S. Lawton</td>
<td>4 Miller St Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/7/18</td>
<td>R. O. Godfrey</td>
<td>20 Williams St Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/7/18</td>
<td>M. J. O. Jong</td>
<td>Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/7/18</td>
<td>C. Berny</td>
<td>Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/7/18</td>
<td>N. M. Kathisk</td>
<td>Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/7/18</td>
<td>R. Keighley-Ward</td>
<td>Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/7/18</td>
<td>R. Spear</td>
<td>Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/7/18</td>
<td>Louise Press</td>
<td>Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/7/18</td>
<td>Kate Reed</td>
<td>Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/7/18</td>
<td>P. Crow</td>
<td>Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/7/18</td>
<td>H. Rogers</td>
<td>Springton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/7/18</td>
<td>S. Devine</td>
<td>Kapunda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COUNCIL
EXECUTIVE SERVICES
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER REPORT
21 AUGUST 2018

7.2.1 DEBATE AGENDA – CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

7.2.1.2
REQUEST FOR INTERNAL REVIEW OF COUNCIL DECISION
B8388

Author: Governance Advisor

**PURPOSE**

Council’s Internal Review Contact Officer has received a request to conduct an internal review of Council’s decision of 27 June 2018 to receive the outcome of the community consultation regarding the Barossa Regional Culture Hub, and to proceed with the next stages of the project, as outlined in the Minutes of the meeting.

**RECOMMENDATION**

1. That in accordance with Council’s Internal Review of Council Decision Policy and Process and pursuant to section 58(1)(b) of the Local Government Act, Council approves the appointment of Ms Felice D’Agostino of Norman Waterhouse Lawyers to act as the external party to conduct the review of the Council decision made at its Special Meeting on 27 June 2018 as regards Debate Agenda Item 2.1.2 “Barossa Culture Hub – Outcome of Community Consultation Process”.

2. That Ms D’Agostino’s estimate of costs for this review in the amount of $3,000 ex GST be approved as a budget adjustment.

3. That the Chief Executive Officer and Governance Advisor be delegated authority to liaise with Ms D’Agostino as necessary to the review and that following Ms D’Agostino’s investigation, to provide Ms D’Agostino’s recommendation to the Elected Body for consideration at the next available Council meeting.

**REPORT**

*Background*

The Barossa Council, which includes its Elected Body, committees, officers and contractors, makes decisions which impact on members of the community – so it is imperative that these decisions are fair, objective and subject to review.

Council is committed to open, responsive and accountable government in accordance with section 270 of the Local Government Act and so has in place the Internal Review of Council Decision Policy and supporting Process by which those who
believe they have been adversely affected by a Council decision can have their complaint considered.

Introduction
Following the community consultation from 30 April to 21 May 2018 (inclusive) regarding the draft Barossa Regional Culture Hub Master Plan (the Plan), at the Special Meeting on Wednesday 27 June 2018, Council resolved the following:

MOVED Cr Boothby that Council

(1) Receives and notes the report containing the outcome of community consultation on the Draft Master Plan for the Barossa Regional Culture Hub (the Hub) ref: 18/6574

(2) Endorses the Draft Master Plan (the plan) for the Hub noting that it may be subject to future amendment and budget considerations as required. In particular (but not limited to), the external façade of the building as represented in the Plan is noted as requiring complete review; parking and internal configuration to be subject to detailed design processes.

(3) Receives and notes the cost estimate report on the Hub Draft Master Plan produced by Rider Levett Bucknall dated 18/24423 for inclusion in the future The Big Project Feasibility Report and grant funding applications.

(4) Business case development to be ongoing as part of The Big Project Feasibility Report and grant funding applications.

(5) Requires Officer to work with the Working Group and Architects to develop detailed design and documentation of the Hub to support current and future grant funding applications.

(6) Requires Officers to provide an update on the outcome of consultation to people that provided written, formal feedback and where email contact information has been provided.

Seconded Cr Angas CARRIED 2014-18/1440

On 12 July 2018, Council administration received a request from applicant, Ms Helen Szuty, to conduct an internal review of this decision, exercising their right to do so under Council’s Internal Review of Council Decision process (“the process”). The letter of request is attachment 1.

Ms Szuty provided written feedback during Council’s community consultation process regarding the Draft Master Plan for the Hub, which was submitted to Council for consideration as part of the summary report detailing the outcome of the community consultation, at the Special Council meeting held on 27 June 2018 the December Council meeting for consideration.

Discussion
Once the request to review the decision of 27 June 2018 (“the decision”) was received, in accordance with Council’s process the Chief Executive Officer and the Internal Review Contact Officer (who is the Governance Advisor) discussed and determined who is best placed to conduct the review, taking into account all the circumstances surrounding the decision.
It was decided that a review by an external party would be most appropriate to maintain community trust in Council’s process - as the decision was one made by the Elected Body and there has been significant public and media interest in its outcome. Accordingly, the Elected Body should not be reviewing its own decision in these circumstances.

In carrying out the review, the external party will consider the merits of the materials and information that were before the Elected Body at the time the decision was made and any additional relevant information or material provided by the applicant or which has become available during the course of the review.

The reviewer will consider whether the decision is legally and procedurally correct having regard to the following, that the Elected Body:

- had the power to make the decision
- considered all the matters which were relevant to the making of the decision at the time and did not take into account matters which were not relevant
- did not act for improper purpose or under the influence of another
- had no conflict of interest, bias or perceived bias
- ensured that the findings of fact were based on evidence
- considered relevant legislations, policies or processes

and that the decision was reasonable.

To trigger the review by an external party, Council’s process requires that the Elected Body formally resolve that an expert party external to Council should be appointed and that their estimated costs can be approved to conduct a review of the Council decision.

Relevant officers are then able to brief the external party to conduct the review, and then, at the conclusion of the external party’s investigation, will provide the external party’s recommendation to the Elected Body for consideration as to whether the decision should be confirmed, varied or revoked. It is important to note that an external party cannot vary or revoke a decision made by or on behalf of Council – but only make a recommendation for consideration by the Council.

Council’s Process requires that officers use their best efforts to finalise an internal review within 21 business days. In order to meet this requirement, pursuant to section 58(1)(b) of the Local Government Act, the CEO sought the advice of the Mayor to engage and instruct Ms Felice D’Agostino of Norman Waterhouse Lawyers to commence the review as soon as possible. With the Mayor’s advice the CEO appointed, to ensure the matter is at least commenced within the 21 day period,  Ms D’Agostino who has accordingly commenced her review of the decision.

On 18 July 2018, as per Council’s Process, the CEO confirmed in writing to the applicant the receipt of the request for review. He considered that it was more appropriate that the task usually undertaken by the Internal Review Contact Officer – ie to conduct a preliminary investigation as to how the matter might be resolved – should be outsourced due to any potential perceived bias should it be otherwise be undertaken by internal staff. Accordingly, the CEO notified the applicant of his intention to consult
with the Mayor with respect to the appointment of Ms Felice D’Agostino to conduct the preliminary review, and accordingly, the external review.

It is recommended that Council now ratify the decision to appoint Ms Felice D’Agostino of Norman Waterhouse Lawyers as the external party to review the decision of Council as she is familiar with Council’s policies and processes, having been previously engaged to review a Council decision, and so is seen as a more cost-effective and efficient appointment.

Ms D’Agostino’s quote to conduct this review is $3,000 ex GST.

Summary and Conclusion
That Council consider the approval of an external party to conduct this review in accordance with Council’s process, appoint Ms Felice D’Agostino and approve the expenditure of Ms D’Agostino’s fees for this purpose.

ATTACHMENTS OR OTHER SUPPORTING REFERENCES
Attachment 1: Request for Internal Review of Council Decision from Ms Helen Szuty dated 12 July 2018 and received on the same date.

COMMUNITY PLAN / CORPORATE PLAN / LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS

Corporate Plan
6.1 Ensure that the community has access to information regarding the discussions held and decisions made by Elected Members.
6.2 Ensure that Council’s policy and process frameworks are based on principles of sound governance and meet legislative requirements.
6.7 Implement strategies for the community to be actively engaged in Council decision-making through sound information and communication.

Legislation – Local Government Act 1999: Section 270

Policy
Internal Review of Council Decisions Policy
Internal Review of Council Decisions Process

FINANCIAL, RESOURCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT CONSIDERATIONS
A budget adjustment of $3000 plus GST is required to cover the anticipated costs of a review as facilitated by Felice D’Agostino of Norman Waterhouse Lawyers.

COMMUNITY CONSULTATION
There is no community consultation required under legislation for this matter.

Community consultation regarding the draft Barossa Regional Culture Hub Master Plan (the Plan), which was the subject matter of Council’s decision at the Special Council meeting on Wednesday 27 June 2018, was undertaken from 30 April to 21 May 2018 (inclusive).
The community will be made aware of the recommendation of the review as it will be referred back to the next available Council meeting for consideration by the Elected Body as to whether they should confirm, revoke or vary the relevant
To whom it may concern,

I am applying for a review of a council decision in accordance with The Barossa Council’s Internal Review of Council Decision Process under Section 270 – Procedures for review of decisions and requests for services under the Local Government Act 1999.

The decision I am seeking to review is the decision taken by the Elected Body at the Special Council Meeting of the 27th of June 2018 to support the recommendation contained in the Debate Agenda – Chief Executive Officer 2.1.2 Barossa Culture Hub – Outcome of Community Consultation Process B8073:

“RECOMMENDATION

That Council

(1) Receives and notes the report containing the outcome of community consultation on the Draft Master Plan for the Barossa Regional Culture Hub (the Hub) ref: 18/6574.

(2) Endorses the Draft Master Plan (the Plan) for the Hub noting that it may be subject to future amendment and budget considerations as required. In particular (but not limited to), the external façade of the building as represented in the Plan is noted as requiring complete review; parking and internal configuration to be subject to detailed design processes.
(3) Receives and notes the cost estimate report on the Hub Draft Master Plan produced by Rider Levett Bucknall dated 18/24423 for inclusion in the future The Big Project Feasibility Report and grant funding applications.

(4) Business case development to be ongoing as part of The Big Project Feasibility Report and grant funding applications.

(5) Requires Officer to work with the Working Group and Architects to develop detailed design and documentation of the Hub to support current and future grant funding applications.

(6) Requires Officers to provide an update on the outcome of the consultation to people that provided written, formal feedback and where email contact information has been provided.”

I note the following:

(a) Community consultation was not carried out in accordance with the Approved Consultation Plan;

(b) Barossa Council Officers have acknowledged with regard to “concerns with external design/visual appearance of concept plan and place making considerations: in hindsight this should have either been made clearer in the documentation or the external visual removed to avoid detracting from the merits or otherwise of the concept”;

(c) Evidence can be provided that one Barossa Council ratepayer who voiced her opposition to the proposal at The Barossa Council Office in Nuriootpa did not have her views recorded or responded to by Officers as part of the consultation process;

(d) There has been an inadequate response by Officers to my considered submission;

(e) Barossa Council Officers have referred to Working Group and Stakeholder Session discussions which are not in the public arena;

(f) Where are the expected supporting submissions from Stakeholder Groups: the Barossa Grape and Wine Association, RDA Barossa, Gawler, Light & Adelaide Plains, Tourism Barossa and Food Barossa?;

(g) Despite the community consultation process used only 42 formal submissions were received from a Barossa Council population of over 23,000 residents;

(h) Barossa Council Officers have stated that: “The capacity of a Hub to generate and activate across a wider region is the central premise of the proposal with documentation to illustrate and demonstrate the model provided in previous Council Reports. Council will need to determine if it is a model that is supported”;
(i) Insufficient regard and consideration has been given by Elected Members to the potential impact on Barossa Council ratepayers paying for this Project over many years;

(j) There was limited discussion and debate of the Recommendation by Elected Members at the Special Council Meeting of the 27th of June 2018 (approximately 5 minutes);

(k) The Barossa Regional Culture Hub was in the public arena in 2013, prior to The Barossa Council's consideration of a Proposed Community Land Swap with Chateau Tanunda. Elected Members should have been aware of the incompatibility between proposed car parking facilities at the Barossa Regional Culture Hub and the expectations of the executors of the Estate of Elma Linda Keil and the Indenture Deed that the adjacent land would be preserved for parklands;

(l) The Barossa Council Section 270 Review Report regarding the Proposed Community Land Swap between The Barossa Council and Chateau Tanunda is expected to be debated on Tuesday the 17th of July 2018 at the Barossa Council Meeting.

I do not believe that the decision by the Elected Members to agree to the recommendation in the agenda has been fully considered and is reasonable in the circumstances at this time. I request that no further action be taken to implement the recommendation at this time.

I look forward to hearing from you and can be contacted on my mobile phone number listed below.

Yours sincerely,

Helen Szuty.

[Signature] (mobile).
7.2.1 DEBATE AGENDA – CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

7.2.1.3 UPDATE TO INTERNAL REVIEW OF COUNCIL DECISION PROCESS

B1485

Author: Governance Advisor

PURPOSE

Council is asked to receive, consider and approve the updated Internal Review of Council Decision Process.

RECOMMENDATION

That Council, having considered the report and process amendments approves the updated Internal Review of Council Decision Process.

REPORT

Background

Section 270 (1) of the Local Government Act 1999 (the “Act”) states that Council must establish procedures for the review of decisions of Council, employees of Council and other persons acting on behalf of Council.

Council’s Internal Review of Council Decisions Policy and Process (the “Policy” and the “Process”) were last updated on 17 October 2017.

As a result of recent applications pursuant to section 270 of the Act made by members of the public to review Council decisions, procedural impracticalities in the Process which could lead to delays, have been identified. The updated Policy (with track changes), which addresses these procedural impracticalities is provided at attachment 1.

Introduction

Council’s Process allows for the review of decisions by:

(1) CEO, Director or Manager as reviewer, where the decision was made by an Employee of the Council (excluding the CEO);

(2) Elected Body as reviewer, where the decision:
  • Was made by the Council, Council committee or CEO
  • relates to civic and ceremonial matters and/or;
Discussion
In the event that it is most appropriate to engage an external party / panel to conduct the review, the Internal Review Contact Officer (the “IRCO”), who is the Governance Advisor is required to make a recommendation to the CEO and then to the Elected Body to refer the application to an external party / panel together with an estimate of costs. The Elected Body is required to formally resolve that an expert party external to Council should be appointed and that their estimated costs can be approved to conduct a review of the Council decision.

Relevant officers are then able to brief the external party to conduct the review, and then, at the conclusion of the external party’s investigation, will provide the external party’s recommendation to the Elected Body for consideration as to whether the decision should be confirmed, varied or revoked. It is important to note that an external party cannot vary or revoke a decision made by or on behalf of Council – but only make a recommendation for consideration by the Council.

In practice, once an application is received and the CEO deems it appropriate for an external party to conduct the review, there is a delay from the time cost estimates are received to the approval of appointment by the Elected Body at the next Council meeting. As a result, the IRCO and reviewer may not be able to comply with clause 4.4.2 of the Process, which requires the IRCO and the reviewer to use their best efforts to finalise the internal review within 21 business days.

It is recommended that Council approve the amendment to the Process, allowing the CEO to decide, at his discretion to determine whether it is appropriate in the circumstances to appoint an external party / panel as reviewer, and approve the estimate of costs in accordance with Council’s procurement Policy and supporting processes. Once the CEO has provided this approval, the amendment to the Process will further allow the IRCO to brief the external party / panel to conduct the review.

Summary and Conclusion

ATTACHMENTS OR OTHER SUPPORTING REFERENCES
Attachment 1: Updated draft – Internal Review of Council Decision Process

COMMUNITY PLAN / CORPORATE PLAN / LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS
How We Work – Good Governance
Corporate Plan
6.2 Ensure that Council’s policy and process frameworks are based on principles of sound governance and meet legislative requirements.

Legislation – Local Government Act 1999: Section 270(1)

Policy
Internal Review of Council Decisions Policy
Internal Review of Council Decisions Process

FINANCIAL, RESOURCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT CONSIDERATIONS
Except where an external reviewer is appointed, there is no financial or resource implications in finalising and implementing this policy and process as same will be absorbed as part of officers’ existing duties. Risk is mitigated by ensuring that Council’s Procurement Policies and supporting processes are followed when appointing an external reviewer.

COMMUNITY CONSULTATION
There is no community consultation required under legislation for this matter.

The community will be made aware of the recommendation of any review conducted by an external party as it will be referred back to the next available Council meeting for consideration by the Elected Body as to whether they should confirm, revoke or vary the relevant decision.

The community will also be made aware of all internal review applications through the internal review annual report, which is considered by Council annually, as prescribed under section 270 (8) of the Act.
THE BAROSSA COUNCIL
INTERNAL REVIEW OF COUNCIL DECISION PROCESS

Policy Link: Internal Review of Council Decision Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process Owner:</th>
<th>Chief Executive Officer</th>
<th>Previous Approval Date(s):</th>
<th>17/09/2013 21/10/2015 17/10/2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document Control Officer:</td>
<td>Governance Advisor</td>
<td>Current Approval Date:</td>
<td>XXXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPE Content Manager Ref:</td>
<td>15/42710</td>
<td>Next Review Date:</td>
<td>XXXX</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Overview

This Process specifically outlines:

- how and when an applicant can request an internal review of a Council decision; and
- the roles and responsibilities of the Council administration, the Internal Review Contact Officer, the Reviewer and the Elected Members to affect a fair, consistent and structured approach in dealing with each request.

2. Core Components

Complaints Handling Framework and when to use the Internal Review Process
Applying for an Internal Review
Acknowledging an Internal Review Application
Commencing the Preliminary Investigation
Assignment of Application to Reviewer
Review Considerations
After the Review

3. Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Dispute Resolution</td>
<td>Includes mediation, conciliation or neutral evaluation as defined in Section 271 of the Local Government Act.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>The party lodging the request for Internal Review. Examples include residents, ratepayers, members of a community group, users of Council facilities and visitors to the Council area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Day</td>
<td>A day when the Council is normally open for business, i.e. Monday to Friday, excluding public holidays.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council</td>
<td>The Barossa Council comprising the Mayor, Elected Members and Administration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>A position adopted by Council or its delegate after consideration of relevant information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-maker</td>
<td>Council or its Delegate responsible for the decision under Internal Review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegate</td>
<td>A person or committee who has been given power by the Elected Body in an Instrument of Delegation to make a decision on behalf of the Elected Body.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Electronic Document and Records Management System (EDRMS). An automated system used to manage the creation and management of physical and electronic documents and records, improving work-flow, and providing evidence of business activities. Council’s EDRMS is HPE Content Manager.

| Elected Body | The Mayor and Elected Members meeting in their decision-making capacity. |
| Employee | Includes a person employed directly by Council in a full time, part time or casual capacity (whether that position is permanent, voluntary or contractual). |
| External Review | A merits and/or process review by a person or entity outside of The Barossa Council, eg the Ombudsman, of a decision that was made by the Elected Body or its delegate. |
| Internal Review | A merits and/or process review by a person or entity that is part of The Barossa Council, of a decision that was made by the Elected Body or its Delegate. |
| Internal Review Contact Officer (IRCO) | The initial point of contact for applicants seeking an internal review. |
| Merits Review | A process by which a person or body, other than the primary decision maker, reconsiders the facts, law and policy aspects of the original decision and determines the correct or preferable decision. |
| Process Review | A review of the correctness of the processes followed in making a decision. |
| Procedural Fairness | Is concerned with the procedures used by a decision-maker to reach the decision, rather than the actual outcome reached. It requires a fair and proper process be used when making a decision and due regard to a fair approach to those involved/impacted by a decision. The rules of procedural fairness require:  
  - a hearing appropriate to the circumstances;  
  - lack of bias;  
  - evidence to support a decision; and  
  - inquiry into matters in dispute. |
| Reviewer | The delegate responsible for conducting a review of a Council decision. |

4. Process

4.1 Complaints Handling Framework and when to use this Internal Review Process

Wherever practicable, customer complaints regarding a Council decision should be referred for immediate resolution to Council’s Complaint Handling Policy and Process.

The Complaint Handling Process consists of three tiers to manage and resolve complaints:

4.1.1 Immediate response to resolve the complaint
All staff are empowered to handle complaints in the first instance and it is preferable that a complaint is dealt with promptly at the initial point of contact and at the appropriate officer level.

4.1.2 Complaint escalated to a more senior officer
A complaint will be directed to a senior officer in the Council, where the complaint would be better handled at that level. This may occur, for example, where an officer has been involved in the matter that is the subject of the complaint, where the complaint is about an issue that requires a decision to be made at a more senior
level, or where a complaint concerns a matter that ranges across more than one Council team.

4.1.3 Internal review of a Council decision

An internal review will generally apply when matters cannot be resolved under the other two tiers.

Internal review of a Council decision enables the Council to reconsider all the evidence relied on to make the original decision, and additional available evidence if relevant.

However, a referral directly to this third tier will occur when a decision was:

- made by the CEO or Elected Body; or
- referred by the applicant directly to the Ombudsman and the Ombudsman has referred the decision back to the Council for an internal review under Section 270 of the Local Government Act 1999 (“the Act”).

In such cases, the complaint must be dealt with in accordance with this Process.

4.2 Applying for a review

4.2.1 Who can apply for a review

A person with a sufficient interest in a decision of Council, or its delegate, may make a written application for a review of that decision.

A person who is not the direct subject of a decision may still have a sufficient interest in the decision to seek a review under this Process. For example, a person may have a sufficient interest in a Council decision regarding the number of dogs which may be kept within a neighbour’s property.

4.2.2 Timeframe to apply

An application for a review of a decision must be made within 6 months of that original decision being made.

However, in exceptional circumstances an application for internal review which is lodged outside of this 6 months may still be considered for internal review by the Council or CEO, as the case may be.

4.2.3 Assistance for the applicant – Internal Review Contact Officer

It is essential that no one is excluded from lodging an application for internal review because of difficulties they may have representing themselves.

An Internal Review Contact Officer (IRCO) is appointed by the CEO as the initial point of contact for applicants. The IRCO will be the Governance Advisor or in their absence, a delegate appointed by the CEO.

The IRCO may assist an applicant document their reasons for seeking an internal review, in addition to arranging access to interpreters, aids or advocates to ensure that an applicant is treated equitably.

A person seeking review of a Council decision who attends at the Council’s offices personally or by telephone call, and all written applications for review should be immediately referred to the IRCO.
The role of the IRCO is to:

- explain the process to the applicant and explore alternative options to resolve the matter, such as mediation or conciliation prior to an application for review where possible;
- acknowledge the receipt of an application for review;
- maintain a register of all applications for review received and the outcomes of the applications;
- outline the timeframes involved and the action to be taken in the first instance;
- undertake a preliminary investigation to determine what actions have already been taken to try to resolve the matter;
- keep the applicant informed of progress;
- ensure adequate records are maintained; and
- report to Council at prescribed intervals on all applications lodged for review.

4.2.4 How to apply for a review

While there is no standard template that the applicant needs to use, he or she should set out in writing the reasons why they believe the decision is wrong, what outcome is sought and their daytime contact details. Although Council can be expected to have information relevant to the matter under internal review, an application may also include new evidence to support the application.

Applications must be made in writing and addressed to the Internal Review Contact Officer and forwarded via:

- post to: The Barossa Council, PO Box 867, Nuriootpa SA 5355
- email to: barossa@barossa.sa.gov.au
- fax to: 8563 8461
- in person at the Nuriootpa Office at 48-51 Tanunda Road, Nuriootpa SA 5355 or any of the Council branches at Angaston, Lyndoch, Mount Pleasant and Tanunda.

4.2.4 Cost to apply for a review

There is no fee charged to apply for an internal review.

4.3 Acknowledging an Application for Review

The IRCO will confirm receipt of the internal review application within 5 business days and also advise the applicant of the expected timeframe for processing the matter where possible.

4.4 Commencing the Preliminary Investigation

4.4.1 Within 5 business days of receipt of the internal review application, the IRCO will:

- establish a Content Manager container with agreed restricted access.
• meet with the CEO to determine a reviewer or if the decision under review was made by the CEO, then with the Mayor or in his/her absence, the Deputy Mayor, to advise of the process (see paragraph 4.5 below);
• create a summary report using the Section 270 Review Record of Investigation template to provide to the appointed reviewer; and
• outline the resources expended to date within the Section 270 Assessment of Resources Schedule.

4.4.2 The IRCO and reviewer will use their best efforts to finalise an internal review within 21 business days. However if the decision is to be reviewed by the Elected Body, a committee, or an external panel or party there may be delays caused by meeting cycle timelines. In more complex cases, an internal review may take longer.

4.4.3 The IRCO will regularly inform the applicant of progress, either by email, letter or telephone. The IRCO will record all such contact in the Section 270 Review Record of Investigation and Assessment of Resources templates.

4.5 Assignment of Application to Reviewer

4.5.1 CEO, Director or Manager as reviewer
Where the decision was made by an Employee of Council (excluding the CEO), the IRCO and CEO will together determine who will be the reviewer. In this case, the reviewer will generally be one of the Directors who have no conflict or previous dealings with the complaint. If this is not possible, a member of the Organisational Management Group will be appointed as the reviewer.

Alternatively but not ordinarily, the CEO may be the reviewer, however, the CEO cannot review a decision he or she has made and such would be referred to the Elected Body.

Also see special circumstances at paragraph 4.5.3 below where an external party would be appropriate.

The IRCO will meet with the reviewer as soon as possible after his or her appointment to discuss the initial investigation, completion of the Assessment of Resources Schedule and Summary Investigation Report and Findings and refer the reviewer to the overarching Policy and this Process.

4.5.2 Elected Body as reviewer
The Elected Body will be the reviewer when the decision being reviewed:

• was made by the Council, a Council Committee or the CEO and;
• relates to civic and ceremonial matters and/or;
• can potentially impact a significant proportion of people and/or stated policy positions of Council and/or;
• would be assigned for internal review to an entity or person who would be otherwise conflicted and/or;
• in other circumstances as determined by the CEO or resolution of Council.

In this situation, the IRCO will undertake the practical steps of the internal review regarding facilitation and investigation and complete the supporting documentation outlined in paragraph 4.4 above, to present to the Elected Body for its consideration and decision as reviewer. Where the original decision was made by the Council or a Council Committee, the IRCO will do this in conjunction with the CEO.
Where a request for review has been referred to Council, the applicant will be
advised of the date that the report will be presented to the Council and will be
given the opportunity to provide a written or verbal submission in relation to the
report for Council’s consideration.

4.5.3 External Party as reviewer
Where the decision:

- is a decision of the Elected Body; and/or
- has industry-wide policy impact; and/or
- requires specialist knowledge but Employees with the specialist knowledge
  have an identified conflict of interest in the matter; and/or
- has significant political controversy

the IRCO will make recommendation to the CEO to refer the application to an
expert party / panel together with an estimate of costs. The CEO at his or her
discretion will determine whether it is appropriate in the circumstances to appoint
an external party / panel as reviewer, and approve the estimate of costs in
accordance with Council’s Procurement Policy and supporting processes. Once the
CEO has determined that this should occur, and confirmed the IRCO is authorised
the necessary expenditure to brief the experts, the IRCO can provide the necessary
documentation to brief the expert party / panel.

The IRCO will be seeking a recommendation(s) from the expert party / panel which
will then be referred back to the Elected Body for a final determination on the
review.

The IRCO may consult with the Local Government Association to obtain the name
or names of a recommended expert party or expert parties or panel and refer such
for approval by the CEO or Elected Body.

The budget line to fund the expert party / panel will be paid from the budget of the
Directorate which made the decision under review and where necessary, a budget
adjustment made to cover unbudgeted costs.

4.6 Review Considerations

4.6.1 In carrying out an internal review of a decision, the reviewer will consider the merits
of all the materials and information that were before the original decision-maker at
the time of the decision and any additional relevant information or material
provided by the applicant or which has become available during the course of the
review.

4.6.2 The reviewer will consider whether the original decision is legally and procedurally
correct having regard to the following, that the original:

- decision maker had the power to make the decision;
- decision maker considered all the matters which were relevant to the
  making of the decision at the time and did not take into account matters
  which were not relevant;
- decision maker did not exercise a discretion or power in bad faith, for an
  improper purpose or while subject to duress or the influence of another
  person;
- decision maker had no conflict of interest, bias or perceived bias;
- decision maker ensured that the findings of fact were based on evidence;
- decision was reasonable; and
decision maker considered any relevant legislation, policies or processes.

The reviewer will also consider whether a different decision based on the evidence available or new evidence provided or found provides an improved outcome.

4.6.3 Refusal to consider an application
In addition to those matters which fall out of the scope of the overarching Internal Review of Council Decision Policy, Council or the CEO as the case may be is entitled under the Local Government Act to refuse to consider an application for review if:

a) the application is made by a Council Employee and relates to an issue concerning his or her employment;

b) it appears that the application is frivolous or vexatious; or

(Note that where a matter has been referred to the Local Government Association Mutual Liability Scheme (LGAMLS) in respect to a claim or potential claim against the Council or in response to a threat of legal action against the Council, an application for review of a decision in connection with that claim or action (including the decision to refer the matter to the LGAMLS) will be vexatious).

c) the applicant does not have a sufficient interest in the matter; or

d) the application for an internal review has been made later than 6 months from when the applicant was advised of the original decision - unless there are exceptional circumstances for Council, or the CEO as the case may be, to allow an internal review process.

Refusing an application for review will not be done lightly and reasons for the refusal will document the evidence on which a refusal is based.

4.6.4 Providing Procedural Fairness
The reviewer will observe the principles of procedural fairness when undertaking the review so that:

- an applicant is entitled to put forward information and materials in support of the application for review;

- an applicant is informed of the proposed outcome of the review, has the opportunity to make submissions to the reviewer on the outcome and have these submissions taken into account; and

- the reviewer must not have a bias or perceived bias when undertaking the review.

4.6.5 Determination of review
When the reviewer is:

- the Elected Body – it should determine whether to affirm, vary or revoke the original decision;

- a Council Employee - they may determine whether to affirm, vary or revoke the original decision if authority to make the decision has been delegated to them. If the reviewer does not have a delegation enabling the making of
the decision, then the reviewer should report the outcome of the review to the Elected Body (or delegate) for a determination as to whether the decision should be affirmed, varied or revoked;

- an external person or body - then they should report their recommendation(s) from the review to the Elected Body for a determination as to whether the decision should be affirmed, varied or revoked.
  Note: an external reviewer cannot vary or revoke a decision made by or on behalf of Council.

### 4.6.6 Remedies

Remedies are available to the reviewer, in terms of one or more as follows:

- an explanation
- an admission of fault and, where reasonably practicable, a change of decision
- a recommended change to policy, process or practice*
  *note: any changes are ultimately a decision for the Council or CEO, depending on the relevant delegations. The reviewer should liaise with the CEO and/or CMT at the earliest opportunity to make them aware of any potential recommendation and discuss the impact on Council resources should the change be implemented.
- a correction of misleading records
- financial compensation including a refund of any fees**
  **note: only the Elected Body and the CEO are authorised to offer financial compensation in cases where there is a loss that is considered substantial. This will only occur after consultation by the IRCO with the Local Government Association Mutual Liability Scheme at the earliest possible opportunity in the investigation.
- the waiving of a debt
- the remission of a penalty
- disciplinary action under the relevant Code of Conduct, where appropriate
- referral of a matter to an external agency for further investigation or prosecution if it involves allegations of fraud / corruption
- apology***
  ***note: where circumstances are such that it is not reasonably practicable to return the applicant to his/her original situation, or to rectify the outcome of the decision through application of the above remedies, it may only be possible for the reviewer to recommend that an apology be offered.

If an apology is required and then approved in a resolution by the Elected Body (as reviewer) or by the CEO (if a Director or Manager is the reviewer), it will be included within the determination letter and the applicant will be advised that appropriate action will be taken to prevent the problem from being repeated.

To support development of a potential remedy, the reviewer may recommend mediation, conciliation or neutral evaluation.

### 4.6.7 Reporting decision of review to the applicant

Where the Elected Body is the reviewer, the IRCO on its behalf will:

- prepare the Summary Investigation Report and Findings and determination letter to reflect the resolution and forward it to the applicant within 5 days of the Council meeting and
• provide information about alternative remedies, including any rights of appeal, the right to seek an external review by the Ombudsman or to make a complaint to the Office for Public Integrity.

Where an Employee, including the CEO is the reviewer:

• the reviewer will use the relevant content of the Summary investigation Report and Findings to draft a provisional determination letter and provide this to the IRCO to forward to the applicant with a request for a response for further feedback / new information within 10 business days; and

• if the applicant provides no further information within that time, the IRCO will advise the reviewer so that they can confirm the provisional determination in writing, along with information about alternative remedies, including any rights of appeal, the right to seek an external review by the Ombudsman or to make a complaint to the Office for Public Integrity.

4.7 After the Review

4.7.1 Updating the Register
The IRCO will update the Register of Section 270 Internal Reviews in Council’s EDRMS to include details of the application and the outcome of the review.

4.7.2 Reporting to the Corporate Management Team
Any recommendations for service improvement agreed by the Council or CEO arising from an internal review process will be actioned by the IRCO to the relevant Director or CEO for implementation.

4.7.3 Reporting to the Elected Body
The Governance Advisor or delegate will prepare and submit to the Elected Body an annual report each July which includes the following information about internal review applications requested within the previous 12 months:

a) the number of applications for review made;
b) the kinds of matters to which the applications relate;
c) the outcome of applications;
d) a statement to quantify the resources used for each review and associated costs with an attached Assessment of Resources Schedule;
e) a summary of how the outcomes have been used to improve Council’s customer service, policies and processes; and
f) such other matters as may be prescribed by the Regulations.

4.7.4 Reporting to the Community
The information outlined in paragraph 4.7.3 above will also be included in Council’s Annual Report as required under the Local Government Act.
5. **Training**

5.1 Elected Members, Directors and Managers will receive training in this process during their induction and on a refresher basis.

6. **Documents to Implement Process**

- Written application to request an Internal Review
- Letter to applicant confirming receipt of application
- Section 270 Review of Investigation Template (B3812)
- Section 270 Assessment of Resources Schedule (B3812)
- Section 270 Summary Investigation Report and Findings (B3812)
- Determination letter (B3812)
- Annual report compiling Section 270 applications and determinations

7. **Legislation and References**

Local Government Act Section 270

8. **Review**

8.1 This Process will be reviewed by the Document Control Officer in consultation with the relevant stakeholders, within four (4) years or more frequently if legislation or Council’s need changes.

SIGNED: ........................................... DATE: ...........................................

Mayor Bob Sloane
COUNCIL
EXECUTIVE SERVICES
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER REPORT
21 AUGUST 2018

7.2.1 DEBATE AGENDA – CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

7.2.1.4 UPDATE TO DELEGATIONS REGISTER
B7510

Author: Governance Advisor

PURPOSE
Council is asked to delegate those amended powers to the Chief Executive Officer which are now available under the Development Regulations 2008, the Local Government Act 1999 and the Dog and Cat Management Act 1995.

RECOMMENDATION

(1) Revocation of Delegations
The Council hereby revokes delegations to the Chief Executive Officer of those powers and functions under the:

(a) Development Regulations 2008 at Regulation 32(5) and which is specified in an extract contained in Attachment 1 of this report; and

(b) Local Government Act 1999 at section 136D.2 and which is specified in an extract contained in Attachment 2 of this report.

(c) Dog and Cat Management Act at Local Government Act 1999 at 64(2)(c) and which is specified in an extract contained in Attachment 3 of this report.

(2) Delegations made under the Development Act 1993

(a) In exercise of the powers contained in Section 20 and 34(23) of the Development Act 1993, the Council hereby delegates to the person occupying the office of Chief Executive Officer of the Council the powers and functions contained in Development Regulations 2008 at Regulation 32(5) and which is specified in an extract contained in Attachment 1 of this report.

(b) Such powers and functions may be further delegated by the Chief Executive Officer as the Chief Executive Officer sees fits and in
accordance with the relevant legislation.

(3) **Delegations made under the Local Government Act 1999**

(a) In exercise of the power contained in Section 44 of the Local Government Act 1999, the Council hereby delegates to the person occupying the office of Chief Executive Officer of the Council the powers and functions under the Local Government Act 1999 at section 136D.2 and which is specified in an extract contained in *Attachment 2* of this report.

(b) Such powers and functions may be further delegated by the Chief Executive Officer in accordance with Sections 44 and 101 of the Local Government Act 1999 as the Chief Executive Officer sees fit and in accordance with the relevant legislation.

(4) **Delegations made under the Dog and Cat Management Act 1995**

(a) In exercise of the powers contained in Section 44 of the Local Government Act 1999, the Council hereby delegates to the person occupying the office of Chief Executive Officer of the Council the powers and functions contained in the Dog and Cat Management Act 1995 at Section 64(2)(c) and which is specified in an extract contained in *Attachment 3* of this report.

(b) Such powers and functions may be further delegated by the Chief Executive Officer as the Chief Executive Officer sees fit and in accordance with the relevant legislation.

(5) That the Instruments of Delegation under these Acts and Council’s Delegations Register be amended in accordance with this resolution.

**Background**
Council may only exercise those powers and functions which are conferred on it by legislation. The ways in which Council may exercise its powers and functions are:

- when the Elected Body itself exercises the power or function at a formally constituted meeting; and
- when the legislation enables it, a power or function may be delegated pursuant to an Instrument of Delegation and exercised in the name of a delegate.

Used well, delegations greatly assist Council by enabling the Elected Body to progress with the strategic element of local government and leave the day-to-day operations and administration to the staff who have the relevant expertise and experience to deal with such matters - thus improving effectiveness and efficiency.

**Introduction**
Council utilises the Advent Delegations Module software to update its Instruments of Delegation and Delegations Register in accordance with Section 44 of the Local Government Act 1999. From time to time, Council is notified of various amendments...
to delegations that are as a result of typographical errors, or updates to the Local Government Association delegation templates, on which the Advent Delegations Module delegation templates are based.

Council has been made aware of three such updates to the Advent Delegations Module, namely to delegations pursuant to:

- the Development Regulations 2008
- the Local Government Act 1999
- the Dog and Cat Management Act 1995

Officers recommend that Council delegate all available powers to the Chief Executive officer as are described in these proposed Instruments.

Discussion

1. Development Regulations 2008

The proposed amendment to delegations pursuant to the Development Regulations 2008 corrects the reference to sub-section 32(5) referred to in the provision. The amendment has been brought for Council’s consideration upon notification of the same by the managers of the Advent Delegations Module. Amendments are provided by way of track-changes in attachment 1.

2. Local Government Act 1999

The proposed amendment to delegations pursuant to the Local Government Act 1999 deletes delegations pursuant to s136D.2, which was intentionally left blank. The amendment has been brought for Council’s consideration upon notification of the same by the managers of the Advent Delegations Module, and in order to ensure that it is in-line with the delegations templates prepared by the Local Government Association. Amendments are provided by way of track-changes in attachment 2.

3. Dog and Cat Management Act 1995

The proposed amendment to delegations pursuant to the Dog and Cat Management Act 1995 corrects a typographical error. The amended provision allows the delegate to nominate a facility at which cats may be detained (previously destroyed). The amendment has been brought for Council’s consideration upon notification of the same by the managers of the Advent Delegations Module. Amendments are provided by way of track-changes in attachment 3.

Summary and Conclusion

Council is now asked to approve the new and amended powers for delegation to the CEO.

**ATTACHMENTS OR OTHER SUPPORTING REFERENCES**

**Attachment 1**: Proposed amendments to Instrument of Delegation under the Development Regulations 2008
**Attachment 2:** Proposed amendments to Instrument of Delegation under the Local Government Act 1999

**Attachment 3:** Proposed amendments to Instrument of Delegation under the Dog and Cat Management Act 1995

---

**COMMUNITY PLAN / CORPORATE PLAN / LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS**

*How We Work – Good Governance*

**Corporate Plan**

How we work – Good Governance:

6.2 Ensure that Council’s policy and process frameworks are based on principles of sound governance and meet legislative requirements.

**Legislation**

- Local Government Act 1999: Sections 44(6), 224, 225, 225A
- Development Act 1993: Sections 20 and 34(23)
- Development Regulations 2008
- Dog and Cat Management Act 1995

---

**FINANCIAL, RESOURCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT CONSIDERATIONS**

*Financial*

There are no financial considerations.

*Resource*

Facilitation of these delegations to the CEO will be undertaken according to officer’s existing duties.

*Risk*

The risk of having ineffective or invalid delegations is minimised as the delegations being considered are in-line with the delegations templates produced by the Local Government Association, and have been recommended by Norman Waterhouse Lawyers (which prepared the Instruments for the LGA). It is imperative that delegations are validly made as consequences of ineffective or invalid delegations include:

- the exercise of power may fail – i.e. the decision made may be liable to being overturned by a court
- the cost of a successful challenge to a decision made without lawful delegation will likely be borne by the Council
- where the unlawful exercise of the power has caused loss or damage the Council may be liable for such loss or damage.

---

**COMMUNITY CONSULTATION**

There is no legislative requirement to consult the community in this situation, nor, in officers’ opinions, do the particular circumstances require it as the delegations themselves are based on prescribed LGA templates where there is no option for amendment through community feedback.

For transparency, the community has access to the delegations register on Council’s website so is made aware of the powers of the CEO as delegated by the Council, and also the powers of officers as sub-delegated by the CEO.
## Development Act 1993 and Development Regulations 2008

### CHANGED Provisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Delegation Source</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Item Delegated / Authorisation</th>
<th>Conditions and Limitations</th>
<th>Delegate / Authorised Officer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 142414 | Development Regulations 2008 | 32(5)   | 71A. Public Notice Categories  
71A.1 The power pursuant to Regulation 32(2)(5) of the Regulations to determine that a form of development comprises 2 or more elements. |                             | AC-P, AO-P, DDES, MDS, PP    |
## Local Government Act 1999

### DELETED Provisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Delegation Source</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Item Delegated / Authorisation</th>
<th>Conditions and Limitations</th>
<th>Delegate / Authorised Officer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12592</td>
<td>Local Government Act 1999</td>
<td>136D.2</td>
<td>136D. Deliberately left blank 136D.2 Deliberately left blank</td>
<td>This power remains with Council - delegation does not apply.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Dog and Cat Management Act 1995

#### CHANGED Provisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Delegation Source</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Item Delegated / Authorisation</th>
<th>Conditions and Limitations</th>
<th>Delegate / Authorised Officer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>156858</td>
<td>Dog and Cat Management Act 1995</td>
<td>s64(2)(c)</td>
<td>14. Power to Seize and Detain Cats</td>
<td></td>
<td>DDES, GI, MRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14.1 The power pursuant to Section 64(2)(c) of the Act to nominate a facility at which cats may be destroyed detained.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.2.1 DEBATE AGENDA

7.2.1.5
DRAFT MEDIA AND COMMUNICATIONS POLICY

Author: Communication and Engagement Officers
B1485

PURPOSE
The Media and Communications Policy ensures interactions between Council and the media portray a consistent, accurate and positive image of Council in the community.

RECOMMENDATION
That Council receives, considers and approves the draft Media and Communications Policy which is provided as attachment 1 to this report.

REPORT

Background
Guidelines for staff interactions with the media have previously been contained in memos from the Chief Executive Officer. The Media and Communications Policy formalises this approach.

Introduction
Council communicates and engages with our community and stakeholders using various digital and traditional channels. It is important to manage these to ensure Council’s messaging is consistent, accurate and appropriate to the target audience, and that our corporate brand principles are upheld.

The Policy pertains to employees of Council and also references the role of the Mayor as principal spokesperson for the Barossa Council.

Discussion
In order to mitigate reputational risk and ensure consistency of messaging, it is important that employees understand their roles and responsibilities in relation to interaction with the media. The Policy gives consideration to authorised and delegated spokespersons, how media relations are coordinated and professional standards that are expected when making comments to the media.

It also provides guidelines for personal statements made to the media to ensure Council’s processes, decisions, employees and elected members are respected.
Summary and Conclusion

Members are asked to review and approve the draft Policy to provide clarity and consistency for employees liaising with the media.

ATTACHMENTS OR OTHER SUPPORTING REFERENCES

Attachment 1: Draft Media and Communications Policy

COMMUNITY PLAN / CORPORATE PLAN / LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS

Corporate Plan

  How We Work – Good Governance

6.2 Ensure that Council’s policy and process frameworks are based on principles of sound governance and meet legislative requirements.

Legislative Requirements
Section 58 of the Local Government Act 1999

FINANCIAL, RESOURCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT CONSIDERATIONS

There are no new risk or resource considerations arising from implementation of this Policy.

COMMUNITY CONSULTATION

There is no legislative requirement to consult the community.
THE BAROSSA COUNCIL
MEDIA AND COMMUNICATIONS POLICY

Corporate Plan Link: 6.7 Implement strategies for the community to be actively engaged in Council decision making through sound information and communication

Policy Owner: Chief Executive Officer  Previous Approval Date(s):

Document Control Officer: Communications and Engagement Officers  Current Approval Date: 21/8/2018

HPE Content Manager Ref: 18/35510  Next Review Date: 21/8/2020

1. Purpose

1.1 The purpose of this Policy is to ensure interactions between The Barossa Council and the Media portray a consistent, accurate and positive image of Council in the community.

2. Scope

2.1 This policy sets out the responsibilities of Employees in relation to interactions with the Media. It also references the role of the Mayor as the principal spokesperson for The Barossa Council.

3. Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee</td>
<td>All full-time, part-time and casual employees of The Barossa Council including trainees, apprentices, and on-hire employees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO</td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer of The Barossa Council or someone Acting in the position of CEO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Any Employee appointed to the position of Director or Acting in the position of Director.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td>Organisations utilising traditional and/or digital platforms for media communication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Member</td>
<td>Mayor of The Barossa Council or in their absence the Deputy Mayor or in their absence an Elected Member appointed to the position.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected Member</td>
<td>Any person elected to a position as a Member of The Barossa Council but not the Principal Member.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Policy Statement

The Barossa Council communicates and engages with our community and stakeholders utilising various digital and traditional channels. It is important to manage these to ensure Council’s messaging is consistent, accurate and appropriate to the target audience, and that our corporate brand principles are upheld.

4.1 Spokespersons

4.1.1 The Principal Member (the Mayor), as per the Act, is the principal spokesperson, authorised to speak publicly on behalf of Council.

4.1.2 Where the Mayor is absent the Deputy Mayor is authorised to be the principal spokesperson, authorised to speak publicly on behalf of Council, or, the Mayor may authorise on a case by case basis another member of Council to be the principal spokesperson on that matter.

4.1.3 The Chief Executive Officer is authorised as a Spokesperson of Council and shall consult with the Mayor where deemed necessary.

4.1.4 The Directors are authorised as Spokespersons of Council on matters related to their technical expertise and directorate services, and shall consult with the Mayor or CEO where deemed necessary.

4.1.5 If the Mayor, CEO or Directors are contacted directly by the Media they have the authority to respond and it is recommended that the Communications and Engagement Officers are made aware of the enquiry.

4.2 Employee Roles and Responsibilities

4.2.1 The Communications and Engagement Officers are responsible for managing and initiating Council’s media relations. All media contact should be coordinated via the Communications and Engagement Officers. This does not mean media cannot make contact directly with CEO/Directors who shall inform, or as necessary, consult with the Communications and Engagement Officers.

4.2.2 CEO/Directors, via the Communications and Engagement Officers, may provide and approve responses to the media as well as authorise media statements or other information releases. CEO/Directors, via the Communications and Engagement Officers, may delegate authority to comment to Employees who have specific technical or subject matter expertise where appropriate.

4.2.3 An Employee authorised to speak on behalf of The Barossa Council will do so in a constructive and professional manner, will not disclose information that is confidential and will not make personal comment on any issue. Where Council has reached a decision on a matter, official comments must support Council’s endorsed position.

4.3 Personal Comments

Elected Members and Employees, as members of the community, have the right to state their personal views publicly. Any such comments must be acknowledged as their
personal views and should not disrespect Council, its decisions, decision-making process, Elected Members or other Employees, and not use Council resources.

4.4 Emergency Management
In the event of emergency the Chief Executive Officer or any Director is authorised to circumvent the Media and Communications Policy in the interest of community safety.

4.5 Records Management
Authorised Council commentary appearing in print or online should be managed in accordance with Council’s Records Management Policy.

4.6 Policy Breaches
Breaches to the Policy will be managed in accordance with Council’s Human Resource Management Policy or Elected Members Code of Conduct and related supporting processes.

5. Supporting Process

The Barossa Council Social Media Process

6. Related Policies

Social Media Policy
Human Resource Management Policy
Records Management Policy

7. Legislation and References

Section 58 of the Local Government Act 1999

8. Review

This policy will be reviewed by the Communications and Engagement Officers in consultation with the relevant stakeholders within two years or more frequently if Council’s need changes.

9. Further Information

9.1 This Policy is available on Council’s website at www.barossa.sa.gov.au. It can also be viewed electronically at Council’s principal office at 43-51 Tanunda Road, Nuriootpa and all Council branches, during ordinary business hours. A copy of this Policy can be obtained at those venues upon payment of a fixed fee.

9.2 Complaints regarding this Policy or its application can be made to the Customer Service team on 8563 8444 or barossa@barossa.sa.gov.au at first instance, who will refer you to the most appropriate officer according to Council’s Complaints Handling Policy (see clause 9.1 above for availability).
10. Policy Version History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Version No:</th>
<th>Approval Date:</th>
<th>Description of Change:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>21/8/18</td>
<td>New Policy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.2.1 EXECUTIVE SERVICES – DEBATE

7.2.1.6 THE BAROSSA COUNCIL QUARTER 2 – 2017/18 PERFORMANCE & ACTIVITY REPORT 18/55594

Author: Manager Strategic Projects

PURPOSE

RECOMMENDATION

REPORT
Background
Since November 2016, Council has been presented with Quarterly Performance Reports on measures adopted within the Corporate Plan.

Introduction
The Barossa Council Quarter 3 – 2017/18 Performance & Activity Report provides performance results against Corporate Plan measures as at 30 June 2018. The report also includes a suite of activity measures, providing a snapshot of activity undertaken over the quarter in the delivery of key internal and external Council services under each Community Plan Theme.

Discussion
During the fourth quarter, operational use of Council’s holistic enterprise level strategic planning and reporting software (Magiq) has continued. The solution has allowed better access to a broader range of data and improved the efficiency and effectiveness of data analysis in preparing reports during 2017/18.

With the ongoing implementation of Magiq Software, officers are continuing to refine counting rules and formulas for the extraction and analysis of data, which may result in the revision of previously reported results where the data has been refined or cleansed. Where this is the case, the report will include a disclaimer regarding the nature of any changes implemented and its impact on the data.

Additionally, where justification exists, performance targets may be amended to reflect a more realistic figure. As above, where this is the case, the report will include an explanation of the nature of and justification for any changes implemented and its impact on the data.
Overall, it is anticipated that comparison data reported will become more longitudinal as the reporting system grows and allow the representation of trends over time. It is anticipated that this will facilitate an increase in evidence based strategic policy decision making by Council and the executive team.

Summary and Conclusion
The Barossa Council Quarter 4 – 2017/18 Performance & Activity Report is presented for Council consideration.

ATTACHMENTS OR OTHER SUPPORTING REFERENCES

COMMUNITY PLAN / CORPORATE PLAN / LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS
Community Plan

How We Work – Good Governance

Corporate Plan
A6.3 Align operational strategy to strategic objectives and measure organisational performance to demonstrate progress towards achieving our goals.

Legislative Requirements
Nil

FINANCIAL, RESOURCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT CONSIDERATIONS
Current resources are sufficient to provide ongoing quarterly reporting.

COMMUNITY CONSULTATION
Community consultation is not required under the Act or Council’s Public Consultation Policy.
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Theme 1 - Natural & Built Heritage

Building Rules Consent Processing

The percentage of Building Rules Consent Applications completed within three months of lodgement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESULTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quarter 4 target not met with 75.41% of building rules consents due completed on time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INTERPRETATION**

As a result of Council’s ongoing commitment to refining data analysis methodology and increasing the accuracy and reliability of performance data, the counting rules for this measure have been modified during quarter four, and backdated over the 2017/18 financial year, to provide an accurate assessment of performance data relating to the timeliness of consent assessment.

Specifically, this measure is a lag indicator, with performance measured only on those consents due within the current quarter based on lodgment date within the previous quarter. This measure does not include additional consents completed during the period that are overdue or not yet due, therefore it is a reflection of Council’s achievement of its
designated service level for Building Rules Consent assessment (within 3 months of lodgement) for that period rather than overall rate of effort during the period.

The activity data presented on page 9 of this report provides a snapshot of actual Building Rules Consent applications approved, both on time and overdue during the fourth quarter.

The June quarter result shows that 75.41% of Building Rules Consents lodged in the third quarter were completed within three months of lodgment and overall, 72.2% of applications due in the 2017/18 were completed within three months of lodgement. These results fall well short of the targeted 90% completion rate.

**RESPONSE**

During 2018/19, the Development Services team will participate in a key project under Council’s Change Program to review policy, information, processes and systems within the development assessment area with a view to improving assessment processing turnaround times, increasing end to end electronic processing and an improving our customers experience.
Planning Consent Processing

The percentage of Planning Consent Applications completed within three months of lodgement

Quarter 4 target not met with 71.93% of planning consents due completed on time.

RESULTS

INTERPRETATION

As per the previous measure, as a result of Council’s ongoing commitment to refining data analysis methodology and increasing the accuracy and reliability of performance data, the counting rules for this measure have been modified during quarter four, and backdated over the 2017/18 financial year, to provide an accurate assessment of performance data relating to the timeliness of consent assessment.

Specifically, this measure is a lag indicator, with performance measured only on those consents due within the current quarter based on lodgment date within the previous quarter. This measure does not include additional consents completed during the period that are overdue or not yet due, therefore it is a reflection of Council’s achievement of its designated service level for Development Plan Consent assessment (within 3 months of lodgement) for that period rather than overall rate of effort during the period.
The activity data presented on page 9 of this report provides a snapshot of actual Development Plan Consent applications approved, both on time and overdue during the fourth quarter.

The June quarter result shows that 71.93% of Development Plan Consents lodged in the third quarter were completed within three months of lodgment and overall, 74.26% of applications due in the 2017/18 were completed within three months of lodgement. These results fall well short of the targeted 90% completion rate.

**RESPONSE**

During 2018/19, the Development Services team will participate in a key project under Council’s Change Program to review policy, information, processes and systems within the development assessment area with a view to improving assessment processing turnaround times, increasing end to end electronic processing and an improving our customers experience.
Activity Snapshot

Development Applications

Development Applications Activity - Quarter 4

- **203 (786 - Full Year Result)**
  Applications lodged
- **117 (597 - Full Year Result)**
  Applications approved
- **141 (575 - Full Year Result)**
  Planning consents issued
- **177 (701 YTD)**
  Building Rules Consents Issued
- **$26,968,562**
  ($103,313,505 YTD)
  Aggregated estimated value of applications lodged

Number of Development Applications Lodged by Category - Quarter 4

Number of Applications Approved by Category - Quarter 4

Applications Approved Per Development Type - Quarter 4

Est. Value of Applications Approved Per Development Type - Quarter 4

Median Number of Days for Applications to be Approved
Building Rules Consent Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Building Rules Consent Applications Approved</th>
<th>Building Rules Consents Received From Private Certifiers</th>
<th>Total Building Rules Consent Applications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jul-Sep 2016</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct-Dec 2016</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan-Mar 2017</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-Jun 2017</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul-Sep 2017</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct-Dec 2017</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan-Mar 2018</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-Jun 2018</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage of Building Rules Consents Received from Private Certifiers - Full Year 2017-18

45%
Theme 2 - Community & Culture

Library Visits

The number of library visits and participation within the Barossa Council Area

| Target exceeded |

RESULTS

Library Visits Per Capita

INTERPRETATION

Annual Measure - Library visits (159,635 during 2017/18) continue to exceed the target of 5 visits per capita due to the diverse range of activities and uses of the library including regular borrowing (235,042 items), internet and Wifi access for homework, job seekers, printing and family history. Regular events increase library visitor numbers, with 723 library events held during 2017/18 with 9,976 participants. Events included author talks, story times and children’s programs, health events, book clubs, book week activities, scrabble, mah-jong, chess, writers groups, craft, art and writing groups.

RESPONSE

No response required.
**Mutual Liability Claims**

Number of successful Mutual Liability Claims against Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target not met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**RESULTS**

**Mutual Liability Claims**

![Bar chart showing Mutual Liability Claims](Image)

**INTERPRETATION**

Annual Measure - Effective reporting and claims management over the 2017/18 year resulted in the closeout of 15 Mutual Liability Claims with four successful claims costing Council $31,283, with one claim accounting for $24,579 of that total.

Over the past year Council has seen more issues being claimed through the scheme due to an increase in the scope of claims being managed. As a result, there is now a greater focus of reporting insurance claims through to the Corporate Management Team and the Audit Committee.

**RESPONSE**

No response required.
Activity Snapshot

**Community Assistance Grants**

Grants Activity - Quarter 4 Results

- 10 (52 - Full Year Result) Applications Received
- 9 (48 - Full Year Result) Applications Approved
- $10,150 ($34,190 - Full Year Result) Grant Funds Approved

**Value of Grant Funds Approved**

Volunteer Management

Volunteer Activity - Quarter 4

- 347 Registered Council Volunteers as at 30 June 2018
- 5144 (18,520 Full Year Result) Council Volunteer Hours
- 150 (609 Full Year Result) Flyers Provided to Prospective Volunteers
- 55 (199 Full Year Result) Visitors to Volunteer Resource Centre
- 88 (219 YTD) Phone Calls to Volunteer Resource Centre

**Regional Gallery**

Gallery Activity - Quarter 4

- 5 Community Events (15 - Full Year Result)
- 2959 Visitors (7135 - Full Year Result)
- $12,489 Value of Items Sold ($40,258 - Full Year Result)
*The above charts do not represent Council’s full volunteering profile, with additional volunteers currently contributing to the community committees and other programs which don’t currently formally collect volunteer data.

**Youth Activity - Quarter 4**

- **12** Number of young people on Youth Advisory Committee
- **3** (11 Full Year Result) Youth Advisory Committee meetings held
- **5** (22 Full Year Result) Youth Events held
- **337** (598 YTD) Young people attended events

**Library Activity - Quarter 4**

- **39,545 Library Visits**
  159,635 - 2017/18 Full Year Result
- **58,628 Items Loaned**
  235,042 - 2017/18 Full Year Result
- **10,747 eResource Loans**
  37,752 - 2017/18 Full Year Result
- **51,762 Collection Items**
- **8,704 Active Library Members**
- **191 Library Events Held**
  723 - 2017/18 Full Year Result
- **2,805 Participants in Library Events**
  5,976 - 2017/18 Full Year Result
Theme 3 - Infrastructure

Asset Sustainability

Ratio of Capital expenditure on renewal or replacement of assets for a period compared to the optimal level of such expenditure proposed in a Council’s Infrastructure and Asset Management Plan.

Target not met for 2017/18.

RESULTS

Asset Sustainability Ratio

![Graph showing Asset Sustainability Ratio]

INTERPRETATION

Annual Measure – The Asset Sustainability Ratio uses planned expenditure data from the Councils Infrastructure and Asset Management Plans (IAMP).

The Financial data reports as at 30 June 2018 is based on preliminary figures and is subject to change based on the finalisation of Council’s end of financial year calculations. Updated figures will be reported in Council’s Quarter 1 – 2018/19 Performance & Activity Report.

The 2017/18 preliminary result was $7,928K/$7,518K or a ratio of 105% which is within the target range. The rolling three year average stands at 67%, which is still below the target.
range of 80% to 110%. The favorable result for the 2017/18 ratio is the direct result of strong expenditure on renewal/replacement during the year compared to 2015/16 and 2016/17.

**RESPONSE**

The 2018/19 capital program includes $2.1M in carry-overs from the 2017/18 capital program. It is anticipated that the delivery of these carryovers, along with the base 2018/19 capital program, will result in an asset sustainability ratio within the target range for 2018/19, along with improving the rolling three year average.
Asset Spending Ratio

Ratio of asset expenditure on renewal, replacement and upgraded assets and maintenance on assets.

2016/17 target achieved.

RESULTS

Asset Spending (Renewal & Upgrade) Compared to Depreciation and Target Maintenance

INTERPRETATION

Annual Measure – As a result of Council’s ongoing commitment to refining data analysis methodology and increasing the accuracy and reliability of performance data, the counting rules for this measure have been modified during 2017/18 and applied across the last three financial years to include financial data from Council’s caravan parks.

The Financial data reports as at 30 June 2018 is based on preliminary figures and is subject to change based on the finalisation of Council’s end of financial year calculations. Updated figures will be reported in Council’s Quarter 1 – 2018/19 Performance & Activity Report.

The 2017/18 result shows the ratio of expenditure on renewal, replacement and upgraded assets plus maintenance expenditure on assets within the target range. Analysis of expenditure over a three year period also shows performance within the target range. The asset spending ratio is however on a downward trend, which is directly linked to capital project performance.
The downward trend in the asset spending ratio is being addressed primarily by the Works and Engineering Services Directorate via better forward planning and it is expected improved performance in the delivery of capital projects will see this trend addressed. IT also reflects a low anticipated spend on maintenance activities and this has been accounted for in future budgets, especially as capital expenditure programs deliver renewed and upgraded assets maintenance expenditure (especially reactive) is expected to be lower than long term trend.
Activity Snapshot

Traffic, Road & Footpath Management

Footpath Maintenance Activity - Quarter 4

- 6 Reports Relating to Trip Hazards on Footpaths
  A total of 23 during 2017/18 compared to 22 in 2016/17

- 27 Reports Regarding Footpath Maintenance
  A total of 154 during 2017/18 compared to 115 in 2016/17

- 2 Reports of Injuries Sustained on Footpaths
  A total of 10 during 2017/18 compared to 14 in 2016/17

Traffic & Road Management - Customer Requests

Traffic & Road Activity - Quarter 4

- 31 Requests for Street Sweeping
  84 in 2017/18 - which is 23 less than 2016/17

- 6 Requests for Repairs to Unsealed Roads
  31 in 2017/18 - which is a 58% reduction compared to 2016/17

- 3 Requests for Repairs to Sealed Roads
  23 in 2017/18 - which is 1 less than 2016/17

- 4 Requests for Repairs to Road Shoulders & Edges
  17 in 2017/18 - There has been a 68% reduction YTD compared to 2016/17

- 29 Requests for Grading of Council Roads
  94 in 2017/18 - compared to 122 in 2016/17

- 15 Reports Regarding Potholes
  71 in 2017/18 - which is 8 more than 2016/17

- 18 Reports Regarding Township Drain Cleaning

Cemetery Management

Cemetery Enquiries
Parks, Gardens & Reserves Maintenance

Requests for Parks, Gardens & Reserves Maintenance - Quarter 4

- **22 Requests for Parks, Gardens or Reserves Maintenance**
  - 101 in 2017/18 - A 19% reduction compared to the full year result 2016/17

- **9 Requests for Playground Maintenance**
  - 49 in 2017/18 - which is 7 more than 2016/17

Community Facility Management

Community Facility Lease & Licensing - Quarter 4

*The above data does not represent Council’s full lease and licensing obligations as it only includes those leases and licenses currently managed within Pathway.*

Rex Usage - Quarter 4

- **47,817**
  - Centre Attendances

- **1**
  - Pool Closure

- **$470,036**
  - Centre Revenue
Theme 4 - Health & Wellbeing

Nuisance and Environmental Complaint Resolution Rate

Percentage resolved within due date.

**Target not met for Quarter 4.**

**RESULTS**

Nuisance & Environmental Complaint Resolution

---

**INTERPRETATION**

The fourth quarter saw a significant reduction in both the percentage of nuisance and environmental requests completed within the nominated due date (43.28%) and the overall number of requests completed both on time and overdue (63.18%), with these results falling well below the nominated target.

In addition to the increasing demand for these services; Council will be impacted by the introduction of two new functions.

As part of the agreement to develop the Warren Reservoir into a recreational fishing, kayaking and tourist destination; staff identified an initial increase in workload and requests for service in relation to the agreed compliance and regulatory functions as well as necessary inspections. Ongoing compliance work and inspections will need to be undertaken, predominate after hours.

The State Government has also introduced legislative changes which requires Council to develop guidelines, issue approvals and undertake necessary compliance inspections in relation to the operation of mobile food vendors or ‘Food Trucks’. This will see a further
increase in workload and requests for service. The impacts of these additional functions will need to be monitored closely.

The ongoing inability to meet the nominated target is an indicator of the increasing demand for these services and can largely be attributed to the introduction of the Local Nuisance and Litter Control Act 2016, which saw Councils take on a new regulatory role in littering from 1 February 2017 and a new role in regulating local nuisances from 1 July 2017. During 2017/18, there were a total of 209 requests across the Local Nuisance and Litter Control request types.

In addition to these new requests, Council data shows an increase in the number of Animal request types compared to the same period in the previous two financial years, as seen below. This is likely due to a change in processing methodology to accurately capture customer requests, such as change of dog ownership details directly into the Customer Request Management system (Pathway) for accurate record keeping.

RESPONSE

It is expected that increasing implementation of smart mobile applications will streamline and improve the customer service resolution process for staff. These processing efficiencies will need to be realised to improve both service delivery and the ability for staff to updated actions and customer requests, to ensure the future achievement of complaint resolution targets despite growing request numbers.

With a focus on continuous improvement, administrative processes will continue to be monitored, refined and improved. The work being undertaken as part of the review of services levels will be important in the context of this report.
Waste Disposal Rate

Percentage of waste disposed to landfill

Progressing towards target of <60.8% with a total of 65% of waste disposed to landfill during the 4th Quarter and 63% overall for 2017/18.

RESULTS

Waste Disposal Rate

During May and June 2017 the community was consulted on a number of new options for waste collection service to encourage diversion of rubbish from landfill to composting and recycling. Feedback received from the community indicated a strong preference for the continuation of current waste collection arrangements and on this basis Council resolved to maintain existing service levels. As a result of this clarification of community commitment to diversion of waste from landfill, the previous target of a maximum of 54% waste disposed to landfill (based on the state average) has been amended to a more realistic target of a 10% improvement against the previous year’s result for 2017/18 (ie a target of 60.8%).

During the fourth quarter for 2017/18, Council recorded a waste to landfill rate of 65%, falling 4.2% short of the 2017/18 target.

During 2017/18, 5,319 tonnes of rubbish (landfill waste) was collected, representing an overall reduction of 289 tonnes of rubbish compared to 2016/17 and an overall improvement in the annual percentage of waste disposed to landfill to 63% (a 1% reduction compared to 2016/17). So despite falling short of the targeted waste disposal rate, the actual tonnes of waste being diverted to landfill has reduced marginally.
Council’s waste and recycling collection service contract expired in June 2018. In the first half of 2017/18 Council participated in a regional tender for disposal services via the Barossa Regional Procurement Group and selected Solo Resource Recovery to deliver waste management services from July 2018. Under the new agreement, Council will continue to offer rubbish, recycling and green waste collection services and will promote the ongoing diversion of waste from landfill to recycling and recovery.

Council is also currently developing a Waste Management Strategy to guide its approach in offering alternative waste management options for other waste streams including e-waste and soft plastic, and for encouraging a reduction of waste disposed to landfill and increase in recycling and organics disposal.

Council endorsed a new Waste Management Services Policy on 26 April 2018, which defines Council’s role as a waste and recycling service provider.

As part of the roll out of the new service, Council also commenced a campaign to encourage residents to take the challenge to Waste Less, Recycle More. This message was featured strongly in the lead up to the new contract and will continue during 2018/19. The new trucks and bins will also display the message. Over time, it is hoped that this campaign will result in a reduction in the amount of waste put to landfill.

Council had also budgeted for a part time Waste Management Officer to commence in 2018-19. The primary objectives of this role include: ensuring all licensing, environmental and contractual requirements / conditions are adhered to by the Waste Management Contractors; managing issues relating to waste management; and developing the strategic direction and an education program for waste management across Council.
Recycling Rate

Percentage of waste recycled

Progressing towards target of >39.2% with 35% of waste recycled during Quarter 4 and 37% overall for 2017/18.

RESULTS

Recycling statistics consist of both co-mingled recycling collected via Council’s yellow lidded bins and organic material collected via the currently voluntary green lidded bin green waste collection service.

During the fourth quarter for 2017/18, Council recorded a recycling rate of 35% (24% yellow lidded waste and 11% green waste) which is 4.2% short of the 2017/18 target.

During 2017/18, 2,129 tonnes of yellow lidded recycling and 1,037 tonnes of green waste were collected, which represents a slight increase in recycling and decrease in green waste compared to 2016/17 (yellow – 2,089 and green – 1,044). The net result is that Council saw an overall increase in co-mingled recycling (green and yellow-lidded waste)
by 33 tonnes during 2017/18 and overall improvement in the annual percentage of waste recycled to 37% (a 2% improvement compared to 2016/17).

RESPONSE

Council’s waste and recycling collection service contract expired in June 2018. In the first half of 2017/18 Council participated in a regional tender for disposal services via the Barossa Regional Procurement Group and selected Solo to deliver waste management services from July 2018. Under the new agreement, Council will continue to offer rubbish, recycling and green waste collection services and will promote the ongoing diversion of waste from landfill to recycling and recovery.

Council is also currently developing a Waste Management Strategy to guide its approach in offering alternative waste management options for other waste streams including e-waste and soft plastic and for encouraging a reduction of waste disposed to landfill and increase in recycling and organics disposal.

Council endorsed a new Waste Management Services Policy on 26 April 2018, which defines Council’s role as a waste and recycling service provider.

As part of the roll out of the new service, Council also commenced a campaign to encourage residents to take the challenge to Waste Less, Recycle More. This message featured strongly in the lead up to the new contract and will continue during 2018/19. The new trucks and bins will also display the message. Over time, it is hoped that this campaign will result in a reduction in the amount of waste put to landfill.

At the beginning of January, China banned foreign waste imports, including waste paper, textiles, plastics and certain types of metals. This ban is likely to force waste companies to stockpile recycling waste, or send it to landfill. There are strong calls on both Federal and State Governments to assist in creating new markets for recycled waste in Australia, and provide a ‘relief package’ for local government to offset potential increases in recycling costs. While NAWMA have already increased the recycling sorting charge, the new waste contract has provided Council with a buffer to this initial increase.

Notwithstanding the China situation, Council should continue to promote recycling, including green organics. The average garbage bin contains 60% organic material waste. The bulk of which is food (40%) and garden waste (20%). The introduction of green organic bins as part of the new waste service will go a long way to achieving our target to reduce waste to landfill in the household sector.

Council has also budgeted for a part time Waste Management Officer to commence in 2018-19. The primary objectives of this role include: ensuring all licensing, environmental and contractual requirements / conditions are adhered to by the Waste Management Contractors; managing issues relating to waste management; and developing the strategic direction and an education program for waste management across Council.
Activity Snapshot

Animal Management

Dog Management Activity

*Note – large increase in Jan-Mar 2018 was due to 66 reports relating to wasps.

Waste Management

Waste Activity - Quarter 4

1,354 Tonnes of Landfill Waste
During 2017/18 64% of all waste collected was landfill waste showing no improvement since 2016/17 where the same % was recorded.

499 Tonnes of Recycling
During 2017/18 an additional 49 tonnes of recycling was collected compared to 2016/17

234 Tonnes of Organic Waste
During 2017/18 there was only 7 tonnes less of green waste collected compared to 2016/17

2087 Total Tonnes of Waste (All Three Streams) Collected
During 2017/18 8788 tonnes of waste was collected across all three streams, representing an increase of 47 tonnes compared to 2016/17.

*Note – overall recycling rate reported on page 24 includes both recycling and green waste as recyclable materials diverted from landfill.
Community Transport Activity - Quarter 4

- 309 Individual Clients Provided with Car Transport
  - 665 - Full Year Result. Equal to an Average of 99 Clients Per Month
- 1,264 One Way Client Trips
  - 4,757 - Full Year Result. Equals approx 19 Trips Per Business Day
- 364 One Way Carer Trips
  - 1,253 - Full Year Result. Equal to 26 Carer Trips Per Week
- 352 Car Trips
  - 1,414 - Full Year Result. Equal to approximately 29 Trips Per Week
- 71,853 Kilometers Travelled
  - 265,148 - Full Year Result. Equivalent to 6.5 Laps of the Earth
- 135 Disability Access Cab Trips
  - 424 - Full Year Result. Equal to just under 9 Trips Per Week
- 316 Shopping Bus Client Trips
  - Delivered over 24 Occasions, 1,388 Clients Trips Over 96 Occasions - Full Year Result

Home Assist Activity

- 1,554 Total Hours of Support
  - 6,277 - 2017/18 Full Year Result
- 357 Clients Assisted
  - With an average of 4 hours of assistance provided per client
- 761 Domestic Assistance Hours
  - 2,756 - 2017/18 Full Year Result
- 746 Home Maintenance Hours
  - 3,305 - 2017/18 Full Year Result
- 42 Shopping & Individual Social Support Hours
  - 204 - 2017/18 Full Year Result

Home Assist Services Breakdown

Community Transport Volunteer Hours

Tree Management

Quarter 4 Results

- 56 Tree Inspections Requested
  - (224 2017/18)
  - A reduction of 16 in 2017/18 compared to 2016/17
- 24 Reports Relating to Fallen Trees & Limbs
  - (130 2017/18)
  - A reduction of 60% in 2017/18 (198 less reports) compared to 2016/17
Tree Management Cont.

Fuel Reduction Inspections

2017/18 Activity

- 100 Rural Inspections
- 434 Township Inspections
- 87 Follow Up Rural Inspections
- 289 Follow Up Township Inspections

Note – the above inspections do not reflect the full number of inspections undertaken – only those property inspections of compliance interest due to a previous or current inspection failure are recorded within Council’s inspection system.

Parking Complaints

Pool Safety

Private Pool Inspections

Waste Water

Quarter 4 Result

- 75 Waste Water Applications Received
- 292 - Full Year Result
- 49 Waste Water Inspections Undertaken
- 384 - Full Year Result
Theme 5 - Business & Employment

Tourism Customer Satisfaction with Visitor Information Services

Average Customer Satisfaction Rating

Target met for Quarter 4 with an average rating of very good.

RESULTS

Tourism Customer Satisfaction with Visitor Information Services

INTERPRETATION

Whilst the results show that the target rating of 4 continues to be achieved, demonstrating that on average customers rate the customer service at the Visitor Information Centre as very good, it should be noted that these averages are drawn from a relatively low number of ratings (31 in 2017/18 and 52 across 2016/17) compared to the total number of customers served – there were 72,139 visitors to the Tanunda Visitor Center during 2017/18. On this basis, the data is not considered representative of the customer base and should be interpreted conservatively.
The Tourism Services team will continue to explore opportunities to encourage customers to provide feedback on their satisfaction with services provided. A range of web-based and social media tools will be utilised to engage customers.
Visitor Information Centre Bookings

Annual Booking Revenue (Accommodation/Tours/Tickets)

Quarter 4 revenue collected showed an improvement from the second and third quarters and the annual revenue result showed growth of approximately $30k compared to 2016/17.

RESULTS

Visitor Information Centre Booking Revenue for Accommodation/Tickets & Tours

INTERPRETATION

The Barossa Visitor Centre reported very strong growth following the release of the ‘Barossa Be Consumed’ Campaign in May 2013 with enquiries and sales growing strongly year on year. The ‘Barossa Be Consumed’ campaign began to wind down at the end of 2015 and was completed by 30 June 2016.

Enquiries and sales have slowed down since January 2016, but remain strong when compared to results prior to the ‘be consumed’ campaign. Total booking revenue for 2017/18 equaled $728,289, showing growth of approximately $30,000 compared to the annual revenue figure for 2016/17.

Overall a number of external factors continue to impact sales performance. These include strong and aggressive competition for our booking site from Air BnB, Bookings.com, wotif, Expedia, stayz, Trip Advisor etc. Many of these international companies spend billions of dollars in google advertising and digital marketing to ensure their websites are within the top 3 search results. Barossa.com has in fact seen an overall decline in visitation as a result.

RESPONSE

No response required.
Cycle Hub - Bike Hire Revenue

Annual Sales Revenue

The 2017/18 result shows a plateau in bike hire revenue following strong growth in 2015/16 and 2016/17, however results are still favourable overall.

RESULTS

During 2017/18 bike hire revenue plateaued compared to strong growth over the previous three financial years following the introduction of bike hire during the Christmas period 2014 and the opening of the Barossa Cycle Hub in January 2015.

During 2017/18, 359 bikes were hired compared to 873 in 2015/16 and 884 in 2016/17. The overall reduction in bikes hired translated to a reduction in revenue during 2017/18 to $29,033 compared to $30,505 in 2015/16 and $32,460 in 2016/17, despite an increase in the price of bike hire over the same period.

In addition to the revenue being generated by this initiative, Council’s ongoing investment and service delivery in cycling creates strong destination awareness of the Barossa leading to greater visitor yield and length of stay.

RESPONSE

No response required.
Activity Snapshot

Visitor Information Centre & Cycle Hub

Cycle Hub & Visitor Information Centre Activity - Quarter 4

- **14,833 (72,143 Full Year Result)**
  Visitors to the Tanunda Visitor Information Centre
- **1,503 (9,095 Full Year Result)**
  Interstate Visitors
- **633 (2018 Full Year Result)**
  International Visitors
- **9,130 (48,946 Full Year Result)**
  Visitor Enquiries
- **373 (3,498 Full Year Result)**
  Tour, Accommodation & Ticket Bookings
- **979 (4,361 Full Year Result)**
  Merchandise Sales Transactions
- **67 (359 Full Year Result)**
  Bikes Hired
- **133 (1,871 Full Year Result)**
  Cycle Hub - Bike Enquiries

Value of Visitor Information Centre Sales - Quarter 4

![Graph showing sales distribution]
How We Work - Good Governance

LGA KPI Audit Action Plan

Percentage of KPI Audit Actions Complete

| 2017/18 Target Met |

RESULTS

LGA KPI Audit Action Plan Completion

INTERPRETATION

Annual Measure - In 2016/17, due to staff turnover and associated resource impacts, Council only completed 5 of the 10 actions required, resulting in a KPI completion rate of just 50% which is well below the 90% target. An extension was sought and granted by the LGA for the completion of the KPI actions by 31 October 2017.

As anticipated, the KPI Audit Action Plan completion rate improved to 91% for 2017/18 following verification of completed actions as at the end of October.

RESPONSE

No response required.
**LGA Risk Review**

Percentage risk review conformance

---

**Biennial Measure - 2016/17 result deferred to July 2018.**

---

**RESULTS**

**LGA Risk Review Outcome**

---

**INTERPRETATION**

Biennial Measure – Due to a change in assessment methodology, the LGAWCS/LGAMLS Risk Evaluation process will now combine corporate risk and work health safety. This Risk Evaluation shall occur yearly but for only 50% of Councils. The Barossa Council is scheduled for 2018. In the meantime, The Barossa Council is continuing to develop its corporate risk profile including closing out its outstanding Risk Review actions.

---

**RESPONSE**

Council will continue to work on overall risk based conformance and implementation of the Risk Review Action Plan.
Operating Surplus/(Deficit) Ratio

Operating surplus (deficit) expressed as a percentage of operating income

Result within target range for 2017/18.

RESULTS

Operating Surplus/(Deficit) Ratio

INTERPRETATION

Annual Measure – The Financial data reports as at 30 June 2018 is based on preliminary figures and is subject to change based on the finalisation of Council’s end of financial year calculations. Updated figures will be reported in Council’s Quarter 1 – 2018/19 Performance & Activity Report.

It is anticipated that the improved budget performance, budget estimations and improvements to processes in the organisation are containing expenditure growth to less than budgeted. The estimated 2017/18 actual operating surplus is estimated to be in the order of $2M. Coupled with containing expenditure, Council received $0.6M advance grant payment (from the 2018/19 expected grant allocation) from the Commonwealth the week prior to end of financial year which distorts the operating result for 2017/18 and 2018/19. The 2018/19 budget was based on a zero base calculation and the performance over the past two years is reflected in the operating budget for the 2018/19 financial year.

RESPONSE

No response required.
Net Financial Liabilities Ratio

Net financial liabilities at the end of the financial year as a percentage of operating income for the year

Result exceeded target for 2017/18.

RESULTS

Net Financial Liabilities Ratio

INTERPRETATION

Annual Measure – The Financial data reports as at 30 June 2018 is based on preliminary figures and is subject to change based on the finalisation of Council’s end of financial year calculations. Updated figures will be reported in Council’s Quarter 1 – 2018/19 Performance & Activity Report.

The Actual Net Liabilities for 2017/18 exceeded the targeted range and was well below budgeted Net Financial Liabilities due to holding more cash at the end of the financial year than originally expected. The greater cash balances are a combination of the improved operating position, advanced cash payments of grants including the Angaston Railway station project funds and Financial Assistance Grants, and lower capital expenditure than anticipated. It is stressed however that the better than budget result, other than the anticipated true operating surplus (ignoring the advanced grant payments) does not give rise to additional spending capacity as these funds are committed to capital or other projects.

RESPONSE

No response required.
Customer Request Completion Rate

Percentage of Customer Requests Completed (On Time and Overdue)

Quarter 4 target exceeded.

RESULTS

The Fourth Quarter of 2017/18 saw a 100.05% request completion rate, exceeding the target of 85%. This measure is calculated using the number of requests completed year to date (regardless of when they were logged or due) versus the number of requests due for the same period. As a result, as seen in the first and final quarters, it is possible for the number of requests completed during the period to exceed the number logged.

RESPONSE

During 2017/18 Council has focused on the improvement of customer request response times, particularly in relation to analysing duplication of effort both within and across directorates and focusing on administrative process optimisation within the customer service supply chain. The implementation of Pathway Smart Mobile applications under Council’s Change Program will be a key strategy in improving the customer request completion rate by introducing greater mobility to Council’s customer request management system and allowing officers to complete requests in real time out in the field.
**Customer Request Resolution Rate**

Percentage of Customer Requests Resolved on Time

Quarter 4 target not met.

**RESULTS**

Customer Request Resolution Rate

[Graph showing resolution rate and target over time]

Customer Request Resolution Rate - Adjusted to Remove Waste Management Requests

[Graph showing adjusted resolution rate and target over time]
The targeted resolution rate was not met again for the third quarter, with only 52.2% of requests completed by the due date. This result represents a significant downturn compared to the first three quarters and can be largely attributed to the influx of waste related customer requests as a result of the rollout of the new Waste Management Contract.

As demonstrated in the chart below, the number of requests received during the fourth quarter increased by 45% (2,170 requests) compared to the third quarter. A total of 2,008 requests during the fourth quarter related to waste management. The mass influx of waste management requests had a direct impact on the resolution rate, with the standard response time unachievable within existing resources.

When the impact of the waste management requests is removed from the fourth quarter Customer Request data, the resolution rate improves from 52.2% to 65.3% (see the second chart on page 39).

Even accounting for the impact of the Waste Management Contract rollout, Council has continued to see a much higher number of requests received per quarter compared to 2016/17. This increase is a direct reflection of a change in Council’s customer request processing methodology and use of supporting corporate systems, whereby the organisation is transitioning to all requests being managed end to end in Council’s customer request management system rather than multiple systems. This has meant that whilst request numbers appear to have increased significantly, workload has not necessarily increased across some key request types, it is now just recorded and measured in a central location. Previously a significant portion of the organisation’s work was unable to be measured or quantified. The impact of this change can be seen in increased activity associated with processing of Council rates and dog registrations and requests for changes to Council’s name and address register.

A refresh of request completion data as part of Council’s holistic reporting project has shown that the number of requests completed or being closed out each quarter has also risen in the past year (rising from approximately 1700 per quarter throughout 2015 to in
excess of 2500 per quarter since June 2017). It is understood that the above results are likely due to sustained effort to address the non-close out of customer requests in Council’s Electronic Customer Request Management System even though they have been completed outside of the electronic system.

**RESPONSE**

As identified in the previous measure, key strategic projects currently being implemented to address customer request close out issues, to identify system and administrative process improvements and the review of customer service methodologies more broadly, and the implementation of Pathway Smart Mobile applications will result in continued progress towards achieving the nominated target.
Operational Expenditure Against Budget

Actual Operating Expenditure as a % of Budgeted Operating Expenditure

Quarter 4 target not met.

RESULTS

The Financial data reports as at 30 June 2018 is based on preliminary figures and is subject to change based on the finalisation of Council’s end of financial year calculations. Updated figures will be reported in Council’s Quarter 1 – 2018/19 Performance & Activity Report.

As at 30 June, 92.13% of the quarterly operational budget had been spent.

Once the annuals statements are completed a full reconciliation of the budget to results will be provided, and the variations will be explained.

RESPONSE

Officers will continue to monitor operational budget and service performance during 2018/19.
**Capital Expenditure Against Budget**

Actual Capital Expenditure as a percentage of Budgeted Capital Expenditure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESULTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quarter 4 target not met.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RESULTS**

The Financial data reports as at 30 June 2018 is based on preliminary figures and is subject to change based on the finalisation of Council’s end of financial year calculations. Updated figures will be reported in Council’s Quarter 1 – 2018/19 Performance & Activity Report.

As at 30 June 2018, 65.24% of the $12,152,000 adjusted capital budget had been spent resulting in the carry forward of $2.1M across approximately 30 projects.

A large portion of the adjusted capital budget carry overs were works in progress such as the region wide footpath program, Springton roads acceleration works and drainage works.

**INTERPRETATION**

The Works capital program is of a scale much larger than previous years, this has been the case for several years. In response to the increased program, which predominately sits with Works and Engineering, an additional, temporary delivery resource has been in place for the last half of 2017/2018 and will continue for the full 2018/2019 program year. Internal
resources have also been restructured to better position the Works and Engineering directorate to deliver the breadth of projects. Also, procurement for larger projects has been better planned during 2017/2018 Q4 to enable better first quarter capital works performance.
Organisational Culture Improvement

Percentage percentile shift in the culture survey results to an organisation of progressively improving achievement and self-actualising styles of operation

Primarily a constructive result from the October 2016 OCI/OEI Employee survey. All Defensive styles are below the 50th percentile ring, and two Constructive styles are at or above the 50th percentile ring, which is desirable.

RESULTS

INTERPRETATION

Biennial Measure - Whilst the results from the 2016 Culture survey are steady, with some improvements in causal factor results (from the Organisational Effectiveness Inventory (OEI)), the most striking difference between the 2014 survey and the 2016 survey is the increased response rate, at around 25%. This is a very positive indicator as it demonstrates an increased willingness to engage in organisational improvement.

RESPONSE

Each directorate has reviewed their individual results and formulated an action plan to address areas of improvement identified.
Staff Development - Training

Percentage of staff with an approved training needs analysis

Target met for 2017/18.

RESULTS

Staff Development - Performance Partnering

INTERPRETATION

Annual Measure - All employees have an individual training plan which is scheduled for review on a 12-month cycle.

During 2017/18 Council implemented an online system (Skytrust) for managing staff competencies, TNA’s and training records. As a result, during the first quarter for 2017/18, 132 TNA’s were completed and an additional 18 were completed during quarter 2, resulting in an improvement in the rate of staff with an approved Training Needs Analysis to 91% as at 30 June 2018.

RESPONSE

No response required.
Staff Development - Performance Partnering

Percentage of staff who have completed performance partnering

Target not met for 2017/18.

RESULTS

Staff Development - Performance Partnering

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Performance Partnering % Complete</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/16</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/17</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017/18</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INTERPRETATION

Annual Measure – Council achieved a performance partnering completion rate of 87.4% for 2017/18. Performance partnering workbooks were due to be completed by the end of March 2018.

A new workbook was rolled out during the 2017/18 performance partnering review cycle and resulted in a slight improvement in the completion rate within the nominated due date, however there were still a significant percentage of outstanding workbooks which managers were working to address by 30 June 2018.

A significant improvement was recorded during 2017/18, with 118 of 135 eligible employees completing Performance Partnering. During 2017/18 there were 17.28% (28) employees that were not required to complete Performance Partnering as they were absent due to long term illness, were casual or still within their probation period.

RESPONSE

No response required.
Staff Retention

Percentage of employees retained

Target not met, falling short by 1% with 89% of employees retained during 2017/18.

RESULTS

Employee Retention Rate

INTERPRETATION

Annual Measure – During 2017/18, Council recorded a retention rate of 89%, falling just short of the targeted 90% which equates to only 1 additional vacancy. This result is identical to the retention rate recorded in 2016/17.

Turnover in 2017/18 occurred due to natural attrition, retirements and cessation of fixed term contracts. We have also seen increasing competition for skilled workers in the planning and building fields, resulting in the movement of staff within the industry.

RESPONSE

Council continues to support the retention of staff through the development and implementation of contemporary organisational development and human resource management practices.
Activity Snapshot

Rate Management

Rate Activity - 2017/18

- 13,491
  Number of Rateable Properties - compared to 13,380 in 2016/17
- $5,181,170,200
  Value of Rateable Properties - compared to 5,034,901,652 in 2016/17
- 0.47%
  Rate Enquiry & Adjustment Request Rate - compared to 0.69% in 2016/17

Rate Enquiries

Search Process Turnaround Time

- Average Turnaround Time = 3 Days

Council Decision Making

Council Decisions - Quarter 4

- 81
  Decisions made at Council meetings
- 3.7%
  Decisions made at meetings closed to the public

Local Government Records Searches

Local Government Search Requests Vs Completions

Elected Member Attendance - Quarter 4

- 91.6%
  Elected Member Council Meeting Attendance Rate

Procurement

Procurement Activity as at 30 June 2018
Customer Requests

Customer Request Activity

Help Desk Resolution Rate - Quarter 4

Human Resources & Payroll

Workforce Demographics

Knowledge & Technology Services

Knowledge & Technology - Quarter 4

1,509
Helpdesk Requests Logged - 5948 Full Year Result - A 37% increase compared to 2016/17.

1,524
Helpdesk Requests Resolved - 5947 Full Year Result - A 36% increase compared to 2016/17.

37
Outstanding Requests as at 30 June 2018

49,033
Documents registered in Council’s Record Management System by all staff - 53,123 Full Year Result

4,530
Documents registered in Council’s Record Management System by Records Staff - 16,011 Full Year Result

HR Activity - Quarter 4

12 Positions Vacant

4 New Starters
22 New Starters During 2017/18

9 Inductions Completed
30 Inductions Completed during 2017/18

8 Probation Periods Completed
16 Probation Periods Completed during 2017/18

3 Staff Exits
17 Exits during 2017/18
Payroll Activity - Quarter 4

- 1,370 Hours of Sick Leave Taken
  An average of 14 hours taken per FTE

- 3,937 Annual Leave Hours Taken
  An average of 49 hours per FTE

- 22,585 Hours Annual Leave Liability
  An average leave liability of per FTE of 173 hours

- 40,850 Hours Long Service Leave Liability

- 2,722 Hours RDO Liability

- 392 Hours TOIL Liability

Risk Management Activity - Quarter 4

- 288
  Active Corrective and Preventative Action Items in Council’s Risk Register - Reduced from 1398 in Q3.

- 2,338
  Completed Corrective and Preventative Action Items as at 30 June 2018.

- 2
  Hazard/Near Miss Reports Submitted this quarter

- 5
  Injuries Reported this quarter

- 1
  Lost Time Injuries this quarter
7.2.2 DEBATE AGENDA – FINANCE

7.2.2.1 MONTHLY FINANCE REPORT (AS AT 31 JULY 2018)

B411
Author: Senior Accountant

PURPOSE
The Uniform Presentation of Finances report provides information as to the financial position of Council, including notes on material financial trends and transactions.

RECOMMENDATION
That the Monthly Finance Report as at 31 July 2018 be received and noted.

REPORT
Discussion
The Monthly Finance Report (as at 31 July 2018) is attached. The report has been prepared comparing actuals to the Original adopted budget 2018/9.

ATTACHMENTS OR OTHER SUPPORTING REFERENCES
Attachment 1: Monthly Finance Report 31 July 2018

Policy
Budget & Business Plan and Review Policy

COMMUNITY PLAN / CORPORATE PLAN / LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS

6.2 Ensure that Council’s policy and process frameworks are based on principles of sound governance and meet legislative requirements.

6.3 Align operational strategy to strategic objectives and measure organisational performance to demonstrate progress towards achieving our goals.

6.4 Ensure that decisions regarding expenditure of Council’s budget are based on an assessment of whole of life costs, risks associated with the activity and advice contained within supporting plans.

6.9 Provide access to Council’s plans, policies and processes and communicate with the community in plain English.

6.16 Provide contemporary internal administrative and business support services in accordance with mandated legislative standards and good practice principles.

Legislative Requirements
Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 2011 - Reg 9(1)(b)
LGA Information paper no. 25 – Monitoring Council Budget Performance
FINANCIAL, RESOURCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT CONSIDERATIONS

Financial

To enable Council to make effective and strategic financial decisions, a regular up to date high level financial report is provided.

COMMUNITY CONSULTATION

Community Consultation was part of the original budget adoption process in June 2018, as per legislation. This report is advising Council of the monthly finance position compared to that budget.
### Uniform Presentation of Finances

#### OPERATING ACTIVITIES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>% Actual Expenditure to Original Budget</th>
<th>Original Budget (Full-Year)</th>
<th>Actual Result (Year-to-Date)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | Operating |             |                  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1)</td>
<td>Operating Income</td>
<td>37,188</td>
<td>30,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td>Less Operating Expenses</td>
<td>5.61%</td>
<td>37,106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Operating Surplus / (Deficit) (a) | 82 | 28,310 |

#### CAPITAL ACTIVITIES:

**Net Outlays on Existing Assets**

| Capital Expenditure on Renewal and Replacement of Existing Assets | 0.94% | 4,472 | 42 |
| Less Depreciation, Amortisation & Impairment | 7,362 | 614 |
| Less Proceeds from Sale of Replaced Assets | 346 | 0 |

**Net Outlays on Existing Assets (b)**

| (b) | (3,236) | (572) |

**Net Outlays on New and Upgraded Assets**

| Capital Expenditure on New and Upgraded Assets | 0.66% | 14,977 | 99 |
| Less Amounts Received Specifically for New and Upgraded Assets | 3,345 | 0 |
| Less Proceeds from Sale of Surplus Assets | 389 | 0 |

**Net Outlays on New and Upgraded Assets (c)**

| (c) | 11,243 | 99 |

**Net Lending/(Borrowing) for the Financial Year (a)-(b)-(c)**

| (a)-(b)-(c) | (7,925) | 28,783 |

| Total % Capital Budget Spent | 0.72% |

**NOTES**

1) Rates income generated in July

2) 2018/19 Capital Expenditure spent to end of July includes:
   - Angaston Railway Precinct - The Big Project $14k
   - CWMS $3k
   - Depot Plant Shed $39k
   - Footpaths $2k
   - Road Resheeting $1k
   - Sealed Roads $43k
7.3.1  DEBATE AGENDA - DIRECTOR CORPORATE AND COMMUNITY SERVICES

7.3.1.1  THE BIG PROJECT (GENERATIONAL COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECT) - QUARTERLY UPDATE REPORT - QUARTER 7 - MAY TO JULY 2018

PURPOSE
To provide a progress update to Council following completion of Quarter 7 (May to July 2018) of the implementation of “The Big Project” – Generational Community Infrastructure Project.

RECOMMENDATION
That Council receive and note the Quarter 7 Report: May to July 2018 inclusive in respect of progress on “The Big Project” – Generational Community Infrastructure Project (the Project) and incorporating summary of work completed Ref: 18/50553.

REPORT

Background
At its Meeting on the 15 May 2018, Council resolved that:

MOVED Cr de Vries that Council receive and note the Quarter 6 Report: February to April 2018 inclusive in respect of progress on “The Big Project” – Generational Community Infrastructure Project (the Project) and incorporating summary of work completed Ref: 18/29165.

Seconded Cr Milne  CARRIED 2014-18/1390

Introduction
As part of the governance arrangements for The Big Project (as referenced in item 2.4 of the February 2017 Council resolution), a quarterly update to report on progress to Council is required.

Discussion
A report on the progress items actioned during the Quarter 7 report period is provided as Attachment 1.

Summary and Conclusion
Highlight items for the Quarter include:

- Master planning – Consultation on the Barossa Culture Hub and adoption of the master plan and costs has been concluded during the reporting period. Cost estimates for Talunga Park, Murray Recreation Park and Nuriootpa Centennial Park / Coulthard Reserve have been adopted. Master planning for Stockwell Recreation Park has continued and will be presented during the next Quarter. Springton Recreation Park remains to be undertaken.

- Prudential management report. An interim report was produced for inclusion to evidence the Regional Growth Fund Expression of Interest (RGF EOI)
submission. Since the interim report, UHY Haines Norton has continued to develop the full report. Further information has been provided by officers to finalise and clarify the development assessment processes that will be required to support the prioritised project elements and the management of these processes. Final financial models as adopted by Council in April have been provided; however, further work is proceeding on refining the models to take account of asset replacement values and impacts relating to the prioritised works. The current model assumes all assets are new when in fact some of the prioritised works will be replacements. This will improve the overall financial outcomes and will be reflected in the models for UHY Haines Norton to consider and to replace the preliminary figures in the interim report and EOI.

- Detailed design. To support the development of a detailed business case (and on the assumption that the EOI is supported by the Federal Government or alternative large scale funding is sought from other sources if the EOI is unsuccessful), officers have undertaken procurement processes for detailed design for all the prioritised 1 and 2 elements of the 8 projects as identified in the RGF related Council report on the 26 April 2018. As a result, Architects have been appointed to all projects with the exception of the Barossa Culture Hub where specification development for a request for quotation process is almost complete. The detailed designs will in turn enable any necessary development application processes to be commenced. These are all requirements of the continued work on a detailed business case being procured via grant consultants, Section 51. Working groups made up of representatives involved in the various master planning development work for each site, have been established and are meeting. Terms of Reference are provided in a separate agenda item to ensure a consistent approach with governance arrangements for other Big Project initiatives.

- Regional Growth Fund – Expression of Interest. Prior to the end of June 2018, Regional Development Australia advised that the indication from the Federal Government to them was that over 300 EOIs had been submitted and determination of EOIs would take place in the second half of the calendar year. No further communication has been received in connection with the timing of the grant application outcome.

- Angaston Railway Station Precinct. Refer to the attachment for detail but implementation is progressing in line with grant and project planning requirements.

- Regional cycle trail. A full update was provided in the consensus section of the 15 May 2018 Council Agenda. Project Planning to get the initiative investment ready continues, including detailed route planning across all sections. A branding, marketing and governance development workshop will take place during the next reporting period.

- Skate parks. Work has concluded on the pump track at Nuriootpa; work on Williamstown has commenced. Officers are preparing a strategy report for Council review during the next reporting period.

**ATTACHMENTS OR OTHER SUPPORTING REFERENCES**

Attachment 1: The Big Project – Quarterly Update Report – Q7 (May to August 2018) Ref: 18/50553
# Community Plan

- Natural Environment and Built Heritage
- Community and Culture
- Infrastructure
- Health and Wellbeing
- Business and Employment
- How We Work – Good Governance

## Corporate Plan

3.3 Ensure Council’s sporting, recreational and leisure grounds and playing arena and associated programs meet the current need of the community to an agreed level of service.

3.9 Ensure Council facilities and assets are accessible, safe and maintained to an agreed level of service.

## Legislative Requirements

Local Government Act 1999

### Financial, Resource and Risk Management Considerations

**Financial**

No financial impacts; all expenditure is within allocated budget.

**Resource**

The Director Community Projects returned to the substantive role of Director, Corporate and Community Services (DCCS) effective 1 July 2018. Big Project Work is now being resourced jointly between DCCS and Manager, Community Projects.

**Risk Management**

Ongoing risk assessments continue to be prepared / updated as Officers work as necessary through phases of The Big Project development and project specific implementation.

### Community Consultation

A Communication plan and Community Consultation plan for the Project have been documented and are reviewed periodically with Communication and Marketing Officers, the Chief Executive Officer and periodically with The Big Project Working Party.

A Consultation plan for each individual component project is also developed and reviewed for approval as part of the Agenda reporting process to Council.

Regular updates are provided to the community via press releases, d’Vine adverts and newsletters, radio interviews, website and social media content.
Consultation on the Barossa Regional Culture Hub Masterplan has taken place during the reporting period.

In the forthcoming quarter consultation on the Stockwell Recreation Park master plans will occur.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>May 2018</th>
<th>June 2018</th>
<th>July 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Southern Barossa Sporting Hub | • RFQ evaluation – site survey and service locations | • Williamstown and Lyndoch – Complete service location and site surveys  
• Site Briefing Session for Architects – Request for Quote process – 8.6.18 | • Completed procurement process for detailed design and engaged architects for Williamstown (Birdseye Studios) and Lyndoch (Environarc) (Priority 1 detailed design and construction documentation, and Priority 2 detailed design only)  
• 16 July - Williamstown - First detailed design meeting with key stakeholders (Cr Lange, Simon Taylor, John Kassebaum, MCP, Lead Architect and design team)  
• 24 July - Williamstown – Meet local community mountain bike enthusiasts to discuss design ideas for mountain bike trail.  
• 26 July - Williamstown – Met with neighbouring landowner to discuss opportunity for lease extension.  
• Generic detailed user requirements now submitted to architects |
| Tanunda Rugby Precinct | • RFQ evaluation – site survey and service locations | • Tanunda Rugby relocation – Complete service location and site surveys  
• Site Briefing Session for Architects – Request for Quote process – 6.6.18 | • Completed procurement process for detailed design and engaged architects for Tanunda Rugby relocation – Dash/Wax Architects  
• 16 July - First detailed design meeting with key stakeholders (Barossa Rams MCP, Lead Architect and design team)  
• 26 July – Initial draft concept design received |
| Talunga Park / Old Talunga Park Master Plan Update | • 15.5.18 Council Report – cost estimate  
• RFQ evaluation – site survey and service locations | Site Briefing Session for Architects – Request for Quote process – 8.6.18 | • Completed procurement process for detailed design and engaged architect – Birdseye Studios. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nuriootpa Centennial Park and Coulthard Reserve Master Plan</th>
<th>Site Briefing Session for Architects – Request for Quote process – 6.6.18</th>
<th>6.7.18 Completed procurement process for detailed design and engaged architects for NCP (Dash / Wax) (Priority 1 detailed design and construction documentation, and Priority 2 detailed design only)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• 6.6.18 Request for Quote process – NCP (Dash / Wax) (Priority 1 detailed design and construction documentation, and Priority 2 detailed design only)</td>
<td>12.7.18 meeting Chris Smith – Barossa Soccer Club</td>
<td>6.7.18 Completed procurement process for detailed design and engaged architects for NCP (Dash / Wax) (Priority 1 detailed design and construction documentation, and Priority 2 detailed design only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.7.18 – Council Report – NCP and Coulthard Reserve Master Plan – Cost Assessment Report</td>
<td>18.7.18 site visits – Architects detailed design.</td>
<td>12.7.18 meeting Chris Smith – Barossa Soccer Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.7.18 Working Group detailed design meeting #1</td>
<td>23.7.18 award of contract Architectural Detailed Design RGF Priority 1 and Priority 2 works – JBG Architects</td>
<td>6.7.18 Completed procurement process for detailed design and engaged architects for NCP (Dash / Wax) (Priority 1 detailed design and construction documentation, and Priority 2 detailed design only)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tanunda Recreation Park Master Plan</th>
<th>Meeting Department Environment and Water – discussion re Crown Land status of park</th>
<th>16.7.18 Request for quote closes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Update meeting – electrical upgrade specification – Bestec 16.5.18</td>
<td>20.7.18 site visit – Bestec – electrical capacity upgrade</td>
<td>16.7.18 Request for quote closes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Attendance Tanunda Rec Park Committee meeting 23.5.18 – request for update re RGF process and next steps.</td>
<td>23.7.18 award of contract Architectural Detailed Design RGF Priority 1 and Priority 2 works – JBG Architects</td>
<td>16.7.18 Request for quote closes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.6.18 Council Report - Ownership of Tanunda Recreation Park – request for Crown Condition Agreement</td>
<td>20.7.18 site visit – Bestec – electrical capacity upgrade</td>
<td>16.7.18 Request for quote closes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.6.18 Request for Quote issued Detailed Architectural Design</td>
<td>23.7.18 award of contract Architectural Detailed Design RGF Priority 1 and Priority 2 works – JBG Architects</td>
<td>16.7.18 Request for quote closes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Update meeting re RGF – footy Association and Tanunda Football club – 22.6.18</td>
<td>25.6.18 -RFQ briefing session</td>
<td>16.7.18 Request for quote closes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 25.6.18 -RFQ briefing session</td>
<td>16.7.18 Request for quote closes</td>
<td>16.7.18 Request for quote closes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Stockwell Recreation Park Master Plan | • Draft masterplan concept received | • 13 June – Meeting with Stockwell Community Association – The Big Project status update and progression of masterplan concept ideas | • Revised Draft Masterplan received
Stockwell Community Association meeting 13 August to finalise masterplan and vision / principles / objectives for the plan to be presented to Council in September. |
| Angas Recreation Park Master Plan | • RFQ evaluation – site survey and service locations | • Site Briefing Session for Architects – Request for Quote process – 6.6.18 | • 6.7.18 Completed procurement process for detailed design and engaged architects for Angas Rec Park (Dash/Wax) (Priority 1 detailed design and construction documentation, and Priority 2 detailed design only)
• 18.7.18 site visits – Architects detailed design.
• 23.7.18 Working Group detailed design meeting #1 |
| Murray Recreation Park Master Plan | • 15.5.18 Council Report – Cost Estimate | | |
| SACA / SANFL / CA MOU | • Meeting SACA – 16.5.18 | | Participation in Project Reference Group – SA Cricket Infrastructure Strategy (CEO / DCCS) |
| Arts Culture Heritage Tourism | | | |
| Barossa Culture Hub | • Community Consultation 30 April to 21 May inclusive
• Discussion – Manager Tanunda ClubHouse – logistics and operational considerations proposed masterplan
• Public consultation session – History Month Event – Coulthard House 5.5.18
• Public consultation session – Regional Gallery – Exhibition Opening – 6.5.18 | • Meeting Liedertafel representatives – at Regional Gallery (Ken Shuster, Phil)
• 27.6.18 - Council Report on outcomes of community consultation and adoption of master plan | • Mapping chronology – Former Tanunda Primary School Site
• Meeting Helen Szuty – 4.7.18
• Meeting Margaret Lehmann – 4.7.18
• Development RFQ specification – Detailed Design Architectural Services
• Progress business case development
• 27.7.18 Barossa Music Project – RDA Barossa |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Follow-up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public consultation session - Colonist Corner, Williamstown</td>
<td>8.5.18 (combined with skate park consultation event)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public consultation session - Mount Pleasent Farmers’ Market</td>
<td>19.5.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public consultation session - Colonist Corner, Williamstown</td>
<td>19.5.18 (combined with skate park consultation event)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briefing discussion – Tanunda Kindergarten Acting Principal.</td>
<td>21.5.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research / Info trip Mount Gambier Gallery complex</td>
<td>28.5.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Jan Angas - 30.5.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Project Management Procurement</td>
<td></td>
<td>Technical Project Manager engaged and start up meetings commenced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research / Info trip Mount Gambier Railway Precinct Project and</td>
<td></td>
<td>Station Building Restoration - Detailed design underway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discussion with Council on project learnings 28.5.18</td>
<td></td>
<td>Soil reassessment undertaken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Project Manager engaged and start up meetings commenced</td>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental soil recommendations received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station Building Restoration - Detailed design underway</td>
<td></td>
<td>Detailed Architectural Design Procurement RFQ released.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil reassessment undertaken</td>
<td></td>
<td>Expression of Interest process – Station Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental soil recommendations received</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detailed Architectural Design Procurement RFQ released.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expression of Interest process – Station Building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Tourism Trails</td>
<td>Refer Regional cycle path</td>
<td>Refer regional cycle path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle / Leisure Tourism</td>
<td>Refer Regional cycle path</td>
<td>Refer regional cycle path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren Reservoir</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skate Park Strategy</td>
<td>Public consultation session – Colonist Corner, Williamstown 8.5.18</td>
<td>Pump track development – Williamstown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(combined with Culture Hub consultation event)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public consultation session – Colonist Corner, Williamstown 19.5.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(combined with Culture Hub consultation event)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pump track development – Williamstown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>WQVJP Outdoor Activity Centre</strong></th>
<th><strong>As per Williamstown update in Southern Barossa Sporting Hub</strong></th>
<th><strong>As per Williamstown update in Southern Barossa Sporting Hub</strong></th>
<th><strong>As per Williamstown update in Southern Barossa Sporting Hub</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Regional Cycle Paths**         | • Project Lead and Project Officer planning – route and market segmentation review with Section 51 consultants – project planning development  
                                 | • Project planning documentation development commenced – Section 51  
                                 | • Working Group meeting 7.6.18 – Barossa Council Team  
                                 | • Stakeholder Working Group Session 14.6.18  
                                 | • Mount Barker DC project contribution received.  
                                 | • Tourism product mapping  
                                 | • Market segmentation development  
                                 | • 12.7.18 Project Planning meeting – Stakeholders Group and Section 51  
                                 | • Communication strategy - draft |
| **Events**                       |                                                               |                                                               |                                                               |
| **Equestrian and Walking Trails Network** |                                                               |                                                               |                                                               |
| **Aquatic Strategy**             |                                                               |                                                               |                                                               |
| **Strategy Development**         | 2.5.18 Workshop Presentation – current status                |                                                               |                                                               |
| **Nuriootpa Pool**               | 2.5.18 Workshop Presentation – current status                |                                                               |                                                               |
| **WQVJP Pool**                   |                                                               | 27.6.18 inclusions of sand filtration upgrade in 2018/19 adopted Budget |                                                               |
| **The Rex**                      |                                                               |                                                               |                                                               |
| **Other**                        |                                                               |                                                               |                                                               |
| **Workshops / Council reports general** | • 2.5.18 Workshop – Aquatics see above  
<pre><code>                              | • 15.5.18 Council Report – Quarterly Update – Report #6 – Feb to April 2018 | • 6.6.18 Workshop - Ownership of Tanunda Recreation Park – request for transfer from Crown Land status |
</code></pre>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RDA Barossa</th>
<th>Secondment for Regional Cycle Trail project continues</th>
<th>Secondment for Regional Cycle Trail project continues</th>
<th>Secondment for Regional Cycle Trail project continues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>• Presentation – DCP – Barossa Probus club – the Vine Inn</td>
<td>• 1.6.18 Request for Quote – Architectural Services – Detailed Design released for: - Angas Rec park - Nuriootpa Centennial Park/Coulthard Reserve - Lyndoch Rec Park - WQVJP - Rugby at Tanunda - Tanunda Rec Park</td>
<td>• Leader Newspaper Big Project Update report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO governance / briefing</td>
<td>• Briefing The Big Project – Alexandrina Council – CEO/DCP</td>
<td>• Asset review of RGF prioritised project impacts to inform financials and Prudential Management Report – CEO / Coordinator Asset Management</td>
<td>• fortnightly progress phone hook ups – Chateau Tanunda – RGF planning and development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding / Lobbying</td>
<td>• Planning for ongoing development work during EOI determination/assessment process x 2 sessions</td>
<td>• RFQ development – Architectural services</td>
<td>• 11.7.18 Business Case Planning Session – RGF application – Section 51.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Procurement planning – Request for Quote processes for detailed Architectural Design – RGF prioritisation</td>
<td>• negotiation to contract into Council Solutions Architectural Panel Arrangements</td>
<td>• Final Version Prudential Management Plan – RGF consultant work in progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Planning Meeting – Section 51 – Next Step RGF development work</td>
<td>• fortnightly progress phone hook ups – Chateau Tanunda – RGF planning and development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• RFQ development – Architectural services</td>
<td>• Meeting John Geber – 7.6.18</td>
<td>• Meeting John Geber – 7.6.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Working Group Meeting – 15.5.18</td>
<td>• Annual Version Prudential Management Plan – RGF consultant work in progress</td>
<td>• Final Version Prudential Management Plan – RGF consultant work in progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Big Project Working Group &amp; Council Governance / Meetings</td>
<td>• Final Version Prudential Management Plan – RGF consultant work in progress</td>
<td>• fortnightly progress phone hook ups – Chateau Tanunda – RGF planning and development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>• Working Group Meeting – 15.5.18</td>
<td>• meeting to discuss Big Project opportunities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jo Thomas – Director Corporate & Community Services – DCCS
Rebecca Tappert – Manager Community Projects - MCP
7.3.1 DEBATE AGENDA - DIRECTOR CORPORATE AND COMMUNITY SERVICES

7.3.1.2 TERMS OF REFERENCE - DETAILED DESIGN WORKING GROUPS - THE BIG PROJECT AND FEDERAL REGIONAL GROWTH FUND PRIORITISED ELEMENTS

B8029 18/54621

PURPOSE
To provide Council with the draft Terms of Reference for Working Groups established to support detailed design work required for the prioritised elements of eight sub-projects of The Big Project comprising Council’s Federal Regional Growth Fund expression of interest.

RECOMMENDATION 1

and

RECOMMENDATION 2

and

RECOMMENDATION 3

and

RECOMMENDATION 4
RECOMMENDATION 5

and

RECOMMENDATION 6

and

RECOMMENDATION 7

and

RECOMMENDATION 8

REPORT

Background and Introduction
Council has been working on the Generational Community Infrastructure Project (The Big Project) since November 2016 to provide a strategic plan for sustainable development of community infrastructure assets across a 30 to 50 year intergenerational investment period.

The planning phase of that work is nearing a conclusion. An Expression of Interest (EOI) has been submitted to the Federal Government Regional Growth Fund (RGF), which may present the chance for funding major components of The Big Project to be implemented within the timeframe of the next 4 financial years.

If the EOI is successful, a detailed Business Case must be prepared within a 3 month timeframe. This will require detailed design processes to be completed to support the progression of development applications and further detailed costings. If the EOI is unsuccessful, the bid may either be parked and the Commonwealth may seek a detailed Business Case in due course (ie if other projects do not proceed or drop out through the detailed Business Case phase), or the information will be required to support alternative, future funding applications at a detailed Business Case level.

Discussion
The purpose of the Working Groups is to support Council and Council Officers with the
development of detailed architectural design work associated with the prioritised
components of the Federal RGF application (the priority 1 elements) and priority
2 elements (where applicable). Priority 2 elements are not included in the current RGF
application as they do not deliver the RGF criteria but may be subject of alternative
or future applications by Council or user groups. The design work will facilitate future
development applications where necessary and the associated development of
future Detailed Business Cases for existing and subsequent grant applications.

This approach and the adoption by Council of Terms of Reference, is consistent with
the process completed for other Big Project initiatives ie: Angaston Railway Station
Precinct; Tanunda Recreation Park Accelerated Works.

The Working Groups comprise:
- Representatives of user groups associated with the facility;
- Elected Member representation from Councillors involved in the previous master
  plan development stage where possible;
- External architects and their subcontractors engaged via a Request for
  Quotation process in accordance with Council’s procurement processes;
- Director Corporate and Community Services or Manager Community Projects
  and other officers as required.

Terms of Reference documents that define the role and responsibility of the following
Working Groups are presented to Council for approval.

1. Angas Recreation Park – Detailed Design Working Group (Priority 1 Federal
   Regional Growth Fund and Priority 2 Work) (Attachment 1)
   Group (Priority 1 Federal Regional Growth Fund and Priority 2 Works) (Attachment 2)
3. Tanunda Recreation Park – Detailed Design Working Group (Priority 1 Federal
   Regional Growth Fund and Priority 2 Works) (Attachment 3)
   (Priority 1 Federal Regional Growth Fund and Priority 2 Works) (Attachment 4)
5. Lyndoch Recreation Park – Detailed Design Working Group (Priority 1 Federal
   Regional Growth Fund) (Attachment 5)
6. Rugby at Tanunda Relocation – Detailed Design Working Group (Priority 1 Federal
   Regional Growth Fund) (Attachment 6)
7. Talunga Park – Detailed Design Working Group (Priority 1 Federal Regional
   Growth Fund) (Attachment 7)
8. Barossa Regional Culture Hub – Detailed Design Working Group (Priority 1
   Federal Regional Growth Fund) (Attachment 8)

Associated Project activity updates are included in The Big Project quarterly update
reports.

Summary and Conclusion
The work undertaken by the Working Groups is necessary to support the current RGF
application. Adoption of Terms of Reference is consistent with other Big Project
working group governance processes.
Attachment 5: Lyndoch Recreation Park – Detailed Design Working Group (Priority 1 Federal Regional Growth Fund)
Attachment 6: Rugby at Tanunda Relocation – Detailed Design Working Group (Priority 1 Federal Regional Growth Fund)
Attachment 7: Talunga Park – Detailed Design Working Group (Priority 1 Federal Regional Growth Fund)
Attachment 8: Barossa Regional Culture Hub – Detailed Design Working Group (Priority 1 Federal Regional Growth Fund)

**COMMUNITY PLAN / CORPORATE PLAN / LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS**

**Community Plan**

- Natural Environment and Built Heritage
- Community and Culture - 2.1, 2.3, 2.9.
- Infrastructure - 3.6
- Health and Wellbeing - 4.2, 4.6
- How We Work – Good Governance

**Corporate Plan**

1.2 work toward developing township, streetscapes, entrances and open spaces that are attractive, welcoming and maintained to an agreed level of service
2.6 Provide, promote and support community arts and cultural events, programs, attractions and services.
3.1 provide regional and local walking and cycling connections between open spaces.
3.2 ensure Council’s parks, gardens and playgrounds are accessible, relevant and safe and maintained to an agreed level of service.
3.3 Ensure Council’s sporting, recreational and leisure grounds and playing areas and associated programs meet the current need of the community to an agreed level of service.
3.9 Ensure Council facilities and assets are accessible, safe and maintained to an agreed level of service.
3.11 advocate for the allocation of State and Federal funding to maintain and invest in infrastructure within our region.
4.1 Deliver and promote health and wellbeing initiatives in line with the Public Health Plan
6.4 Ensure that decisions regarding expenditure of Council’s budget are based on an assessment of whole of life cost, risks associated with the activity and advice contained within supporting plans.

**Legislative Requirements**

Local Government Act 1999
**FINANCIAL, RESOURCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT CONSIDERATIONS**

Financial Management Considerations
The Working Groups will not have any financial delegation. All project delegations will be responsibility of officers.

Resource Considerations
Officers, Elected Members and community representatives assigned to the Working Groups as defined in the Terms of Reference for each group.

Risk Management Considerations
The governance provided by the Working Groups are a risk mitigation strategy for the success of project delivery on time and in budget.

**COMMUNITY CONSULTATION**

Community consultation was undertaken on the Masterplans during the development and adoption process completed by Council.

There is community representation on the Working Groups.

Communication on the Big Project is reviewed on an ongoing basis.
THE BAROSSA COUNCIL

TERMS OF REFERENCE OF THE
Angas Recreation Park
Detailed Design Working Group

Community Plan Link:
Natural Environment and Built Heritage
Community and Culture
Infrastructure
Health and Wellbeing
How We Work – Good Governance

Document Owner: Director, Corporate and Community Services
Previous Approval Date(s): DD/MM/YYYY

Document Control Officer: Director, Corporate and Community Services
Current Approval Date: DD/MM/YYYY

HPE Content Manager Ref: 18/54712
Next Review Date: DD/MM/YYYY

1. ESTABLISHMENT

1.1 A master plan for the Angas Recreation Park was adopted by Council in November 2017 and on 26 April 2018 Council approved the prioritisation of components of the master plan to form part of an application for Federal Regional Growth Funding.

1.2 To support the development of detailed architectural design (‘the Works’) of the prioritised elements of the master plan. Representatives of user groups have been included in a Working Group and terms of reference will guide input.

2. OBJECTIVE

2.1 The purpose of the Working Group is to support Council and Council Officers with the Works associated with the prioritised components of the Federal Regional Growth Fund application (priority 1 elements) and priority 2 elements (where applicable).

2.2 Priority 1 elements are:

(a) Stage 4 – Multifunctional Clubroom Redevelopment

(b) Stage 5 – Multifunctional Shelter Expansion and Outbuilding Consolidation to replace existing end of life Show Hall. Show Hall demolition and repurposing of materials as practicable.

(c) Stage 6 – New Main Entry, Car-parking and Landscaped Pedestrian Link
2.3 Priority 2 elements are:
   (a) Stage 3 – Second recreational area / Junior Oval and Recreational Landscape
   (b) Stage 7 – Tennis / Netball Court Amenities Expansion

3. ROLE OF THE WORKING GROUP

3.1 Support Council to develop the Works for the prioritised works to facilitate future development applications where necessary and the associated development of a future Detailed Business Case for exiting and subsequent grant applications.

3.2 Work collaboratively to achieve the objectives of the adopted master plan in respect of the prioritised works.

3.3 Monitor any identified and emerging issues in the implementation of the Works and advise and provide input on resolution.

3.4 Monitor any identified and emerging risks in the implementation of the Works and advise and provide input on prevention, mitigation and management options.

3.5 Working Group representatives provide a communication role to update their respective stakeholders, seek input where appropriate and provide feedback to the Working Group.

3.6 Support and provide input to any promotional and communication activities (including but not limited to linking stakeholders to Council’s social media activities).

3.7 Provide updates to Council via the Director Corporate and Community Services as required or via existing Big Project quarterly reports.

4. MEMBERSHIP

4.1 The Working Group will comprise of:
   (a) Representatives of user groups associated with the facility;
   (b) Elected Member representation from Councillors involved in the previous master plan development stage where possible;
   (c) External architects and their subcontractors engaged via a Request for Quotation process in accordance with Council’s procurement processes;
   (d) The Director Corporate and Community Services or Manager Community Projects and other officers as required.

5. DELEGATED POWERS

5.1 The Working Group will act in an advisory capacity to Council only and does not have specific delegated powers.

5.2 The Chief Executive Officer has delegation and the Director Corporate and Community Services has sub-delegation in respect of budgeted expenditure for the Works.
6. **GOVERNANCE**

6.1 Meets as necessary dependent on master plan implementation requirements and available Council Officer Resources

6.2 Provides a written update to Council at least once every quarter via the Director Corporate and Community Services.

6.3 Project Budget Lines: 601574-841-969 or Q003

6.4 Implementation of designs is subject to funding.

7. **ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES**

7.1 Working Group members, who are not Barossa Council staff, or Elected Members, or undertaking membership of the Working Group as part of their paid work, must be appropriately registered as a Volunteer of The Barossa Council.

8. **MEETINGS**

8.1 Meetings will be held at times agreed by the Working Group.

8.2 The Working Group shall keep a record of all meetings, and forward a copy to the Working Group members.

8.3 Members can discuss and make recommendations. Agreed recommendations can be submitted to Council Officers and/or Elected Members as appropriate for further consideration.

9. **RESOURCES**

9.1 Working Group supported by Council resources for meeting purposes and as detailed in any agreed, specific Project scopes and plans and in accordance with any approved budget.

10. **TRAINING**

10.1 None identified. Any future requirements to be addressed to Council.

Signed ………………………………………………………          Dated: ……………………………………………

Mayor Bob Sloane
The Barossa Council

Terms of Reference of the Nuriootpa Centennial Park & Coulthard Reserve Detailed Design Working Group

Community Plan Link: Natural Environment and Built Heritage
Community and Culture
Infrastructure
Health and Wellbeing
How We Work – Good Governance

Document Owner: Director Corporate and Community Services
Previous Approval Date(s): DD/MM/YYYY

Document Control Officer: Director Corporate and Community Services
Current Approval Date: DD/MM/YYYY

HPE Content Manager Ref: 18/54768
Next Review Date: DD/MM/YYYY

1. ESTABLISHMENT

1.1 A master plan for the Nuriootpa Centennial Park and Coulthard Reserve was adopted by Council in March 2018 and on 26 April 2018 Council approved the prioritisation of components of the master plan to form part of an application for Federal Regional Growth Funding.

1.2 To support the development of detailed architectural design (‘the Works’) of the prioritised elements of the master plan. Representatives of user groups have been included in a Working Group and terms of reference will guide input.

2. OBJECTIVE

2.1 The purpose of the Working Group is to support Council and Council Officers with the Works associated with the prioritised components of the Federal Regional Growth Fund application (priority 1 elements) and priority 2 elements (where applicable).

2.2 Priority 1 elements are:

(a) New Clubroom and changing room Building

(b) Upgraded Toilets/Change Rooms etc

(c) Landscaping, Civil, Road, Electrical and Drainage
(d) Soccer Pitch realignment /Scouts relocation to Coulthard Reserve

(e) Cricket Practice Infrastructure

2.3 Priority 2 elements are:

(a) Coulthard Reserve – lake reconfiguration and reinstatement

3. ROLE OF THE WORKING GROUP

3.1 Support Council to develop the Works for the prioritised works to facilitate future development applications where necessary and the associated development of a future Detailed Business Case for exiting and subsequent grant applications.

3.2 Work collaboratively to achieve the objectives of the adopted master plans in respect of the prioritised works.

3.3 Monitor any identified and emerging issues in the implementation of the Works and advise and provide input on resolution.

3.4 Monitor any identified and emerging risks in the implementation of the Works and advise and provide input on prevention, mitigation and management options.

3.5 Working Group representatives provide a communication role to update their respective stakeholders, seek input where appropriate and provide feedback to the Working Group.

3.6 Support and provide input to any promotional and communication activities (including but not limited to linking stakeholders to Council’s social media activities).

3.7 Provide updates to Council via the Director of Corporate and Community Services as required or via existing Big Project quarterly reporting.

4. MEMBERSHIP

4.1 The Working Group will comprise of:

(a) Representatives of user groups associated with the facility

(b) Elected Member representation from Councillor’s involved in the previous master plan development stage where possible.

(c) External architects and their subcontractors engaged via a Request for Quotation process in accordance with Council’s procurement processes.

(d) The Director Corporate and Community Services or Manager Community Projects and other officers as required.

5. DELEGATED POWERS

5.1 The Working Group will act in an advisory capacity to Council only and does not have specific delegated powers.
5.2 The Chief Executive Officer has delegation and the Director Corporate and Community Services has sub-delegation in respect of budgeted expenditure for the Works.

6. GOVERNANCE

6.1 Meets as necessary dependent on master plan implementation requirements and available Council Officer Resources

6.2 Provides a written update to Council at least once every quarter via the Director Corporate and Community Services.

6.3 Project Budget Lines: 601574-841-969 or Q003

6.4 Implementation of designs is subject to funding.

7. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

7.1 Working Group members, who are not Barossa Council staff, or Elected Members, or undertaking membership of the Working Group as part of their paid work, must be appropriately registered as a Volunteer of The Barossa Council.

8. MEETINGS

8.1 Meetings will be held at times agreed by the Working Group.

8.2 The Working Group shall keep a record of all meetings, and forward a copy to the Working Group members.

8.3 Members can discuss and make recommendations. Agreed recommendations can be submitted to Council Officers and/or Elected Members as appropriate for further consideration.

9. RESOURCES

9.1 Working Group supported by Council resources for meeting purposes and as detailed in any agreed, specific Project scopes and plans and in accordance with any approved budget.

10. TRAINING

10.1 None identified. Any future requirements to be addressed to Council.

Signed: ................................................................. Dated: ..............................................................
Mayor Bob Sloane
1. ESTABLISHMENT

1.1 A master plan for the Tanunda Recreation Park was adopted by Council in May 2017 and on 26 April 2018 Council approved the prioritisation of components of the master plan to form part of an application for Federal Regional Growth Funding.

1.2 To support the development of detailed architectural design (‘the Works’) of the prioritised elements of the master plan. Representatives of user groups have been included in a Working Group and terms of reference will guide input.

2. OBJECTIVE

2.1 The purpose of the Working Group is to support Council and Council Officers with the Works associated with the prioritised components of the Federal Regional Growth Fund application (priority 1 elements) and priority 2 elements (where applicable).

2.2 Priority 1 elements are:

(a) Stage 1 – Early Works (part works – Oval widening and associated landscaping
(b) Stage 2 – Electrical Upgrade and Oval Lighting Towers
(c) Stage 3 – Show Hall extension and upgrade
(d) Stage 7 – General Site works, Carparks and Parklands
(e) Stage 8 – Clubrooms and Terrace Seating

NB: items (a), (b) and (c) form part of the accelerated works approved by Council in December 2017. Working Groups already exist with Terms of Reference.

2.3 Priority 2 elements are:

(a) Stage 4 – New Entrance and Playground – Bilyara Road

(b) Stage 5 – Cricket and Bowls Storage

(c) Stage 6 – Second recreational area / Junior Sports Field

3. ROLE OF THE WORKING GROUP

3.1 Support Council to develop the Works for the prioritised elements to facilitate future development applications where necessary and the associated development of a future Detailed Business Case for exiting and subsequent grant applications.

3.2 Work collaboratively to achieve the objectives of the adopted master plans in respect of the prioritised works and in conjunction with representatives of other associated working groups as necessary.

3.3 Monitor any identified and emerging issues in the implementation of the Works and advise and provide input on resolution.

3.4 Monitor any identified and emerging risks in the implementation of the Works and advise and provide input on prevention, mitigation and management options.

3.5 Working Group representatives provide a communication role to update their respective stakeholders, seek input where appropriate and provide feedback to the Working Group.

3.6 Support and provide input to any promotional and communication activities (including but not limited to linking stakeholders to Council’s social media activities).

3.7 Provide updates to Council via the Director Corporate and Community Services as required or via existing Big Project quarterly reporting.

4. MEMBERSHIP

4.1 The Working Group will comprise of:

(a) Representatives of user groups associated with the facility

(b) Elected Member representation from Councillors involved in the previous master plan development stage where possible.

(c) External architects and their subcontractors engaged via a Request for Quotation process in accordance with Council’s procurement processes.

(d) The Director Corporate and Community Services or Manager Community Projects and other officers as required.
5. **DELEGATED POWERS**

5.1 The Working Group will act in an advisory capacity to Council only and does not have specific delegated powers.

5.2 The Chief Executive Officer has delegation and the Director Corporate and Community Services has sub-delegation in respect of budgeted expenditure for the Works.

6. **GOVERNANCE**

6.1 Meets as necessary dependent on master plan implementation requirements and available Council Officer Resources

6.2 Provides a written update to Council at least once every quarter via the Director Corporate and Community Services.

6.3 Project Budget Lines: 601574-841-969 or Q003

6.4 Implementation of designs is subject to funding.

7. **ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES**

7.1 Working Group members, who are not Barossa Council staff, or Elected Members, or undertaking membership of the Working Group as part of their paid work, must be appropriately registered as a Volunteer of The Barossa Council.

8. **MEETINGS**

8.1 Meetings will be held at times agreed by the Working Group.

8.2 The Working Group shall keep a record of all meetings, and forward a copy to the Working Group members.

8.3 Members can discuss and make recommendations. Agreed recommendations can be submitted to Council Officers and/or Elected Members as appropriate for further consideration.

9. **RESOURCES**

9.1 Working Group supported by Council resources for meeting purposes and as detailed in any agreed, specific Project scopes and plans and in accordance with any approved budget.

10. **TRAINING**

10.1 None identified. Any future requirements to be addressed to Council.

Signed ………………………………………………………          Dated: ……………………………………………

Mayor Bob Sloane
1. ESTABLISHMENT

1.1 A master plan for the Williamstown Queen Victoria Jubilee Park forms part of the Feasibility Report for the Southern Barossa Hub. On 26 April 2018 Council approved the prioritisation of components of the master plan to form part of an application for Federal Regional Growth Funding (RGF).

1.2 To support the development of detailed architectural design (‘the Works’) of the prioritised elements of the master plan. Representatives of user groups have been included in a Working Group and terms of reference will guide input.

2. OBJECTIVE

2.1 The purpose of the Working Group is to support Council and Council Officers with the Works associated with the prioritised components of the Federal Regional Growth Fund application (priority 1 elements) and priority 2 elements (where applicable).

2.2 Priority 1 elements are:

(a) Repurposing of the facility to develop an outdoor adventure activity focus (mountain biking, trails network, trailhead etc.)

(b) Stage 4b – Accommodation development to support repurposing concept
NB: Bridge upgrade works are included in the RGF submission but detailed designs have already been completed

2.3 Priority 2 elements are:

(a) Stage 4a – Caravan Park Expansion – upgrade component (as resources allow)

3. ROLE OF THE WORKING GROUP

3.1 Support Council to develop the Works for the prioritised elements to facilitate future development applications where necessary and the associated development of a future Detailed Business Case for exiting and subsequent grant applications.

3.2 Work collaboratively to achieve the objectives of the adopted master plans in respect of the prioritised works.

3.3 Monitor any identified and emerging issues in the implementation of the Works and advise and provide input on resolution.

3.4 Monitor any identified and emerging risks in the implementation of the Works and advise and provide input on prevention, mitigation and management options.

3.5 Working Group representatives provide a communication role to update their respective stakeholders, seek input where appropriate and provide feedback to the Working Group.

3.6 Support and provide input to any promotional and communication activities (including but not limited to linking stakeholders to Council’s social media activities).

3.7 Provide updates to Council via the Director Corporate and Community Services as required or via existing Big Project quarterly reporting.

4. MEMBERSHIP

4.1 The Working Group will comprise of:

(a) Representatives of user groups associated with the facility

(b) Elected Member representation from Councillor’s involved in the previous master plan development stage where possible.

(c) External architects and their subcontractors engaged via a Request for Quotation process in accordance with Council’s procurement processes.

(d) The Director Corporate and Community Services or Manager Community Projects and other officers as required.

5. DELEGATED POWERS

5.1 The Working Group will act in an advisory capacity to Council only and does not have specific delegated powers.
5.2 The Chief Executive Officer has delegation and the Director Corporate and Community Services has sub-delegation in respect of budgeted expenditure for the Works.

6. GOVERNANCE

6.1 Meets as necessary dependent on Feasibility Report implementation requirements and available Council Officer Resources

6.2 Provides a written update to Council at least once every quarter via the Director Corporate and Community Services.

6.3 Project Budget Lines: 601574-841-969 or Q003

6.4 Implementation of designs is subject to funding.

7. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

7.1 Working Group members, who are not Barossa Council staff, or Elected Members, or undertaking membership of the group as part of their paid work, must be appropriately registered as a Volunteer of The Barossa Council.

8. MEETINGS

8.1 Meetings will be held at times agreed by the Working Group.

8.2 The Working Group shall keep a record of all meetings, and forward a copy to the Working Group members.

8.3 Members can discuss and make recommendations. Agreed recommendations can be submitted to Council Officers and/or Elected Members as appropriate for further consideration.

9. RESOURCES

9.1 Working Group supported by Council resources for meeting purposes and as detailed in any agreed, specific Project scopes and plans and in accordance with any approved budget.

10. TRAINING

10.1 None identified. Any future requirements to be addressed to Council

Signed: ……………………………………………………… Dated: ……………………………………………
Mayor Bob Sloane
THE BAROSSA COUNCIL

TERMS OF REFERENCE OF THE
Lyndoch Recreation Park
Detailed Design Working Group

Community Plan Link:

- Natural Environment and Built Heritage
- Community and Culture
- Infrastructure
- Health and Wellbeing
- How We Work – Good Governance

Document Owner: Director Corporate and Community Services

Previous Approval Date(s): DD/MM/YYYY

Document Control Officer: Director Corporate and Community Services

Current Approval Date: DD/MM/YYYY

HPE Content Manager Ref: 18/54799

Next Review Date: DD/MM/YYYY

1. ESTABLISHMENT

1.1 A master plan for the Lyndoch Recreation Park forms part of the Feasibility Report for the Southern Barossa Hub. On 26 April 2018 Council approved the prioritisation of components of the master plan to form part of an application for Federal Regional Growth Funding.

1.2 To support the development of detailed architectural design (“the Works”) of the prioritised elements of the master plan. Representatives of user groups have been included in a Working Group and terms of reference will guide input.

2. OBJECTIVE

2.1 The purpose of the Working Group is to support Council and Council Officers with the Works associated with the prioritised components of the Federal Regional Growth Fund application (priority 1 elements) and priority 2 elements (where applicable).

2.2 Priority 1 elements are:
   
(a) Recreation Park Facility and associated infrastructure upgrade

2.3 Priority 2 elements: Not applicable

3. ROLE OF THE WORKING GROUP

3.1 Support Council to develop the Works for the prioritised elements to facilitate future development applications where necessary and the associated development of a future Detailed Business Case for exiting and subsequent grant applications.
3.2 Work collaboratively to achieve the objectives of the adopted master plans in respect of the prioritised works.

3.3 Monitor any identified and emerging issues in the implementation of the Works and advise and provide input on resolution.

3.4 Monitor any identified and emerging risks in the implementation of the Works and advise and provide input on prevention, mitigation and management options.

3.5 Working Group representatives provide a communication role to update their respective stakeholders, seek input where appropriate and provide feedback to the Working Group.

3.6 Support and provide input to any promotional and communication activities (including but not limited to linking stakeholders to Council’s social media activities).

3.7 Provide updates to Council via the Director Corporate and Community Services as required or via existing Big Project quarterly reporting.

4. MEMBERSHIP

4.1 The Working Group will comprise of:

(a) Representatives of user groups associated with the facility.

(b) Elected Member representation from Councillor’s involved in the previous master plan development stage where possible.

(c) External architects and their subcontractors engaged via a Request for Quotation process in accordance with Council’s procurement processes.

(d) The Director Corporate and Community Services or Manager Community Projects and other officers as required.

5. DELEGATED POWERS

5.1 The Working Group will act in an advisory capacity to Council only and does not have specific delegated powers.

5.2 The Chief Executive Officer has delegation and the Director Corporate and Community Services has sub-delegation in respect of budgeted expenditure for the Works.

6. GOVERNANCE

6.1 Meets as necessary dependent on Feasibility Report implementation requirements and available Council Officer Resources

6.2 Provides a written update to Council at least once every quarter via the Director Corporate and Community Services.

6.3 Project Budget Lines: 601574-841-969 or Q003

6.4 Implementation of designs is subject to funding.
7. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

7.1 Working Group members, who are not Barossa Council staff, or Elected Members, or undertaking membership of the group as part of their paid work, must be appropriately registered as a Volunteer of The Barossa Council.

8. MEETINGS

8.1 Meetings will be held at times agreed by the Working Group.

8.2 The Working Group shall keep a record of all meetings, and forward a copy to the Working Group members.

8.3 Members can discuss and make recommendations. Agreed recommendations can be submitted to Council Officers and/or Elected Members as appropriate for further consideration.

9. RESOURCES

9.1 Working Group supported by Council resources for meeting purposes and as detailed in any agreed, specific Project scopes and plans and in accordance with any approved budget.

10. TRAINING

10.1 None identified. Any future requirements to be addressed to Council.

Signed: …………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

Dated: ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

Mayor Bob Sloane

Terms of Reference of Lyndoch Recreation Park Detailed Design Working Group approved on [day] of [month] 2018
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THE BAROSSA COUNCIL
TERMS OF REFERENCE OF THE
Tanunda Rugby Site
Detailed Design Working Group

Community Plan Link:

- Natural Environment and Built Heritage
- Community and Culture
- Infrastructure
- Health and Wellbeing
- How We Work – Good Governance

Document Owner: Director Corporate and Community Services
Previous Approval Date(s): DD/MM/YYYY

Document Control Officer: Director Corporate and Community Services
Current Approval Date: DD/MM/YYYY

HPE Content Manager Ref: 18/54810
Next Review Date: DD/MM/YYYY

1. ESTABLISHMENT

1.1 A master plan for the Tanunda Rugby Site forms part of the Feasibility Report for the Southern Barossa Hub. On 26 April 2018 Council approved the prioritisation of components of the master plan to form part of an application for Federal Regional Growth Funding.

1.2 To support the development of detailed architectural design (‘the Works’) of the prioritised elements of the Feasibility Report. Representatives of user groups have been included in a Working Group and terms of reference will guide input.

2. OBJECTIVE

2.1 The purpose of the Working Group is to support Council and Council Officers with the Works associated with the prioritised components of the Federal Regional Growth Fund application (priority 1 elements) and priority 2 elements (where applicable).

2.2 Priority 1 elements are:

(a) Stage 1 – Rugby Relocation Facility and associated infrastructure

2.3 Priority 2 elements: not applicable.
3. **ROLE OF THE WORKING GROUP**

3.1 Support Council to develop the Works for the prioritised works to facilitate future development applications where necessary and the associated development of a future Detailed Business Case for exiting and subsequent grant applications.

3.2 Work collaboratively to achieve the objectives of the Feasibility Report in respect of the prioritised works.

3.3 Monitor any identified and emerging issues in the implementation of the Works and advise and provide input on resolution.

3.4 Monitor any identified and emerging risks in the implementation of the Works and advise and provide input on prevention, mitigation and management options.

3.5 Working Group representatives provide a communication role to update their respective stakeholders, seek input where appropriate and provide feedback to the Working Group.

3.6 Support and provide input to any promotional and communication activities (including but not limited to linking stakeholders to Council’s social media activities).

3.7 Provide updates to Council via the Director Corporate and Community Services as required or via existing Big Project quarterly reporting.

4. **MEMBERSHIP**

4.1 The Working Group will comprise of:

   (a) Representatives of user groups associated with the facility

   (b) Elected Member representation from Councillor’s involved in the previous master plan development stage where possible.

   (c) External architects and their subcontractors engaged via a Request for Quotation process in accordance with Council’s procurement processes.

   (d) The Director Corporate and Community Services or Manager Community Projects and other officers as required.

5. **DELEGATED POWERS**

5.1 The Working Group will act in an advisory capacity to Council only and does not have specific delegated powers.

5.2 The Chief Executive Officer has delegation and the Director Corporate and Community Services has sub-delegation in respect of budgeted expenditure for the Works.

6. **GOVERNANCE**

6.1 Meets as necessary dependent on Feasibility Report implementation requirements and available Council Officer Resources
6.2 Provides a written update to Council at least once every quarter via the Director Corporate and Community Services.

6.3 Project Budget Lines: 601574-841-969 or Q003

6.4 Implementation of designs is subject to funding.

7. **ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES**

7.1 Working Group members, who are not Barossa Council staff, or Elected Members, or undertaking membership of the Working Group as part of their paid work, must be appropriately registered as a Volunteer of The Barossa Council.

8. **MEETINGS**

8.1 Meetings will be held at times agreed by the Working Group.

8.2 The Working Group shall keep a record of all meetings, and forward a copy to the Working Group members.

8.3 Members can discuss and make recommendations. Agreed recommendations can be submitted to Council Officers and/or Elected Members as appropriate for further consideration.

9. **RESOURCES**

9.1 Working Group supported by Council resources for meeting purposes and as detailed in any agreed, specific Project scopes and plans and in accordance with any approved budget.

10. **TRAINING**

10.1 None identified. Any future requirements to be addressed to Council.

Signed: .............................................................. Dated: ..............................................................

Mayor Bob Sloane
The Barossa Council

Terms of Reference of the Talunga Recreation Park
Detailed Design Working Group

1. Establishment

1.1 A master plan for the Talunga Recreation Park was adopted by Council on 17 April 2018 and on 26 April 2018 Council approved the prioritisation of components of the master plan to form part of an application for Federal Regional Growth Funding.

1.2 To support the development of detailed architectural design (‘the Works’) of the prioritised elements of the master plan. Representatives of user groups have been included in a Working Group and terms of reference will guide input.

2. Objective

2.1 The purpose of the Working Group is to support Council and Council Officers with the Works associated with the prioritised components of the Federal Growth Fund application (priority 1 elements) and priority 2 elements (where applicable).

2.2 Priority 1 elements are:

(a) Caravan Park upgrade and associated infrastructure

(b) Temporary stabling to support development of equestrian events and activities; access path from stables to oval

2.3 Priority 2 elements: not applicable
3. ROLE OF THE WORKING GROUP

3.1 Support Council to develop the Works for the prioritised elements to facilitate future development applications where necessary and the associated development of a future Detailed Business Case for exiting and subsequent grant applications.

3.2 Work collaboratively to achieve the objectives of the adopted master plans in respect of the prioritised works.

3.3 Monitor any identified and emerging issues in the implementation of the Works and advise and provide input on resolution.

3.4 Monitor any identified and emerging risks in the implementation of the Works and advise and provide input on prevention, mitigation and management options.

3.5 Working Group representatives provide a communication role to update their respective stakeholders, seek input where appropriate and provide feedback to the Working Group.

3.6 Support and provide input to any promotional and communication activities (including but not limited to linking stakeholders to Council’s social media activities).

3.7 Provide updates to Council via the Director of Corporate and Community Services as required or via existing Big Project quarterly reporting.

4. MEMBERSHIP

4.1 The Working Group will comprise of:

(a) Representatives of user groups associated with the facility

(b) Elected Member representation from Councillor’s involved in the previous master plan development stage where possible.

(c) External architects and their subcontractors engaged via a Request for Quotation process in accordance with Council’s procurement processes.

(d) The Director Corporate and Community Services or Manager Community Projects and other officers as required.

5. DELEGATED POWERS

5.1 The Working Group will act in an advisory capacity to Council only and does not have specific delegated powers.

5.2 The Chief Executive Officer has delegation and the Director Corporate and Community Services has sub-delegation in respect of budgeted expenditure for the Works.

6. GOVERNANCE

6.1 Meets as necessary dependent on master plan implementation requirements and available Council Officer Resources.
6.2 Provides a written update to Council at least once every quarter via the Director Corporate and Community Services.

6.3 Project Budget Lines: 601574-841-969 or Q003

6.4 Implementation of designs is subject to funding.

7. **ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES**

7.1 Working Group members, who are not Barossa Council staff, or Elected Members, or undertaking membership of the group as part of their paid work, must be appropriately registered as a Volunteer of The Barossa Council.

8. **MEETINGS**

8.1 Meetings will be held at times agreed by the Working Group.

8.2 The Working Group shall keep a record of all meetings, and forward a copy to the Working Group members.

8.3 Members can discuss and make recommendations. Agreed recommendations can be submitted to Council Officers and/or Elected Members as appropriate for further consideration.

9. **RESOURCES**

9.1 Working Group supported by Council resources for meeting purposes and as detailed in any agreed, specific Project scopes and plans and in accordance with any approved budget.

10. **TRAINING**

10.1 None identified. Any future requirements to be addressed to Council

Signed ………………………………………………………          Dated: ……………………………………………

Mayor Bob Sloane
### 1. ESTABLISHMENT

1.1 A master plan for the Barossa Regional Culture Hub was adopted by Council in June 2018. Prior to that on 26 April 2018, Council approved the prioritisation of a Barossa Regional Culture hub to form part of an application for Federal Regional Growth Funding.

1.2 To support the development of detailed architectural design ('the Works') of the master plan, Representatives of user groups are included in a Working Group and terms of reference will guide input.

### 2. OBJECTIVE

2.1 The purpose of the Working Group is to support Council and Council Officers with the Works associated with the prioritised components of the Federal Growth Fund application (priority 1 elements) and priority 2 elements (where applicable).

2.2 Priority 1 elements are:

(a) Barossa Regional Culture Hub facility and associated internal and external infrastructure.

2.3 Priority 2 elements are: Not applicable
3. ROLE OF THE WORKING GROUP

3.1 Support Council to develop the Works for the prioritised elements to facilitate future development applications where necessary and the associated development of a future Detailed Business Case for exiting and subsequent grant applications.

3.2 Work collaboratively to achieve the objectives of the adopted master plan in respect of the prioritised works.

3.3 Monitor any identified and emerging issues in the implementation of the Works and advise and provide input on resolution.

3.4 Monitor any identified and emerging risks in the implementation of the Works and advise and provide input on prevention, mitigation and management options.

3.5 Working Group representatives provide a communication role to update their respective stakeholders, seek input where appropriate and provide feedback to the Working Group.

3.6 Support and provide input to any promotional and communication activities (including but not limited to linking stakeholders to Council’s social media activities).

3.7 Provide updates to Council via the Director Corporate and Community Services as required or via existing Big Project quarterly reporting.

4. MEMBERSHIP

4.1 The Working Group will comprise of:

(a) Representatives of user groups associated with the facility.

(b) Elected Member representation from Councillors involved in the previous master plan development stage where possible.

(c) External architects and their subcontractors engaged via a Request for Quotation process in accordance with Council’s procurement processes.

(d) The Director Corporate and Community Services or Manager Community Projects and other officers as required.

5. DELEGATED POWERS

5.1 The Working Group will act in an advisory capacity to Council only and does not have specific delegated powers.

5.2 The Chief Executive Officer has delegation and the Director Corporate and Community Services has sub-delegation in respect of budgeted expenditure for the Works.

6. GOVERNANCE

6.1 Meets as necessary dependent on master plan implementation requirements and available Council Officer Resources.
6.2 Provides a written update to Council at least once every quarter via the Director Corporate and Community Services.

6.3 Project Budget Lines: 601574-841-969 or Q003

6.4 Implementation of designs is subject to funding.

7. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

7.1 Working Group members, who are not Barossa Council staff, or Elected Members, or undertaking membership of the group as part of their paid work, must be appropriately registered as a Volunteer of The Barossa Council.

8. MEETINGS

8.1 Meetings will be held at times agreed by the Working Group.

8.2 The Working Group shall keep a record of all meetings, and forward a copy to the Working Group members.

8.3 Members can discuss and make recommendations. Agreed recommendations can be submitted to Council Officers and/or Elected Members as appropriate for further consideration.

9. RESOURCES

9.1 Working Group supported by Council resources for meeting purposes and as detailed in any agreed, specific Project scopes and plans and in accordance with any approved budget.

10. TRAINING

10.1 None identified. Any future requirements to be addressed to Council.

Signed: ………………………………………………………… Dated: …………………………………………………
Mayor Bob Sloane
7.3.2 DEBATE AGENDA – MANAGER COMMUNITY PROJECTS

7.3.2.1 CONSIDERATION AND ADOPTION OF COMMUNITY ASSISTANCE SCHEME COMMITTEE RESOLUTIONS  
B7322

PURPOSE
The Minutes of the Community Assistance Scheme Committee Special Meeting held 1 August 2018 are presented for the consideration and adoption of Council.

RECOMMENDATION
That Council, having reviewed the Minutes of the Community Assistance Scheme Committee Special Meeting held 1 August 2018, adopt the Resolutions contained therein.

REPORT
The consideration and adoption of recommendations of Council committees requires assessment by Council to ensure compliance with Council obligations under section 6(a) of the Local Government Act.

ATTACHMENTS OR OTHER SUPPORTING REFERENCES
Attachment: Minutes of the Community Assistance Scheme Committee Special Meeting held 1 August 2018

COMMUNITY PLAN / CORPORATE PLAN / LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS
Community Plan

Corporate Plan
How We Work – Good Governance

6.2 Ensure that Council’s policy and process frameworks are based on principles of sound governance and meet legislative requirements.

6.9 Provide access to Council’s plans, policies and processes and communicate with the community in plain English.

Legislative Requirements
Local Government Act 1999

FINANCIAL, RESOURCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT CONSIDERATIONS
The consideration and adoption of recommendations of Council committees is a risk management tool.

COMMUNITY CONSULTATION
Not required under legislation or Council’s Public Consultation Policy.
MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL MEETING
OF THE BAROSSA COUNCIL COMMUNITY ASSISTANCE SCHEME COMMITTEE
held in the Elected Members’ Office at The Barossa Council, 43-51 Tanunda Road, Nuriootpa on Wednesday 1 August 2018 commencing at 4.45pm

WELCOME
In the absence of the Chair, Mayor Sloane welcomed everyone and declared the meeting open at 4.45pm.

1. PRESENT
Mayor Bob Sloane, Cr John Angas, Cr Scotty Milne, Cr Mark Grossman, Rebecca Tappert (CASC Executive Officer), Annette Randall (CASC Administration Officer)

2. APOLOGIES
Cr Bim Lange

MOVED Cr Milne that the Apology for non-attendance from Cr Bim Lange be accepted.
Seconded Cr Grossman
CARRIED

3. CONSENSUS AGENDA

MOVED Cr Milne that Report 3.1 Update on Community Grant Application – Tanunda Lutheran Home Inc (TLH), be received and noted and a funding decision be deferred until the next meeting, pending TLH advice regarding their funding application to Country Arts SA.
Seconded Cr Grossman
CARRIED

MOVED Cr Milne that Report 3.2 Update on Community Grant Application – South Australian Road Runners Club Inc (SARRC) – Barossa Marathon Festival, be received and noted and a funding decision be deferred until the next meeting, pending receipt of additional information as requested 28 May 2018 ie clarification of event budget, required financial information and quotes.
Seconded Cr Angas
CARRIED

4. DEBATE AGENDA

4.1 COMMUNITY GRANT APPLICATION DEFERRED FROM 6 JUNE 2018 MEETING

4.1.1 SIT DOWN SHUT UP AND WATCH FILM AND NEW MEDIA FESTIVAL
B3342
Ms Randall tabled late information received in relation to the outcome of other funding applications made by Sit Down Shutup and Watch group.

MOVED Cr Angas that the Community Assistance Scheme Committee;
(1) approves a Community Grant of $3,000 (excl GST) specifically for the Digital Workshops at the Sit Down Shutup and Watch Film and New Media Festival to be held at Angaston on 19-20 October 2018
(2) endorses proposed waiver of the hire fee for Angaston Town Hall for the event.
Seconded Cr Grossman
CARRIED
INTERNAL 5

PURPOSE
To consider a Community Grant Application from Sit Down Shutup and Watch (SDSW) group for $3,000 towards the SDSW Film and New Media Festival to be held at Angaston in October 2018.

REPORT
Introduction
The Community Assistance Scheme Committee (CASC), at its meeting held 6 June 2018, resolved the following:

“MOVED Cr Milne that the Community Assistance Scheme Committee:
(1) supports in principle, the Sit Down Shutup and Watch Film and New Media Festival to be held at Angaston on 19-20 October 2018;
2) defers the funding decision until the 2018/19 financial year.

Seconded Mayor Sloane

CARRIED”

Discussion
A copy of the Report to the 6 June 2018 CASC meeting is provided in Attachment 1. Late information was also tabled at that meeting in relation to the budget for the Digital Workshops to be held as part of the SDSW Film and New Media Festival (refer Attachment 2).

ATTACHMENTS OR OTHER SUPPORTING REFERENCES
Attachment 1: Report to the 6 June 2018 CASC meeting
Attachment 2: Late information tabled at the 6 June 2018 CASC meeting

Policy
Community Assistance Scheme Policy
Community Grant Guidelines

COMMUNITY PLAN / CORPORATE PLAN / LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS

Community Plan

Community and Culture
Health and Wellbeing
Business and Employment
How We Work – Good Governance

Corporate Plan
2.4 Foster volunteering opportunities that are responsive to the needs of the Community.
2.6 Provide, promote and support community arts and cultural events, programs, attractions and services.
2.8 Offer opportunities for young people to develop leadership skills and have input into decision making that affects them.
2.9 Collaborate, initiate, develop and/or support activities and facilities for youth in our community.
5.4 Participate in initiatives, or advocate for, investment in creative industries and cultural tourism.
6.4 Ensure that decisions regarding expenditure of Council’s budget are based on an assessment of whole of life costs, risks associated with the activity and advice contained within supporting plans.

Legislative Requirements
Nil

FINANCIAL, RESOURCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT CONSIDERATIONS

Financial
The adopted Budget for the Community Grants and Youth Grants for 2018/19 is $25,500 (excl GST).
TOTAL CURRENT FUNDS AVAILABLE $25,500

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>August 2018:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requested Community Grants deferred from 6 June 2018</td>
<td>2 Applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1 x $3k; 1 x $5k)</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FUNDS REMAINING IF APPLICATIONS GRANTED $17,500

COMMUNITY CONSULTATION
Community Consultation is not required under legislation or Council Policy.

4.2 TIMING OF FUTURE MEETINGS
As noted in the Minutes, at the 6 June 2018 CASC meeting, “Members discussed the difficulties of making funding decisions in June, particularly if the Community Grant and Youth Grant Budget is becoming depleted. Often the applications received are for activities being undertaken in the following financial year.” Ms Tappert proposed that future meetings be held in the first month of each Quarter rather than in the last month. Members preferred that meetings be held prior to the Council Workshop on the first Wednesday of the month. A report will be presented to the next CASC meeting, following consultation with relevant officers.

5. NEXT MEETING
Ordinary Committee Meeting – 5 September 2018 commencing at 4.30pm.

6. CLOSE
Mayor Sloane declared the meeting closed at 5.15pm.

Confirmed at Community Assistance Scheme Committee Meeting held 5 September 2018.

Date:...................................... Chair:......................................
7.3.2 DEBATE AGENDA - MANAGER COMMUNITY PROJECTS

7.3.2.2 DOG PARKS - OUTCOME OF COMMUNITY CONSULTATION
B7915

PURPOSE
To summarise feedback received from the community following Council’s resolution at the 20 February 2018 meeting regarding the petition received from Mr Stephan Knoll, Member for Schubert, calling on Council to “create dog parks across towns in the Barossa” and provide recommendations for action.

RECOMMENDATION
That Council:

(1) Receives and notes report 7.3.2.2 containing the outcome of community consultation on the benefits of Dog Parks in the Barossa Region.

(2) Based on the level of responses received in support of a Dog Park in comparison to those not in support, requires officers to further engage with the key community stakeholders to determine preferred location, size, design and associated infrastructure (including costings) and return a report to a future Council meeting.

(3) Requires Offices to develop a media release and email response to respondents where email addresses are provided outlining the outcome of the Dog Park Survey.

REPORT

Background
At its meeting on the 20 February 2018, Council resolved that:

MOVED Cr Lange that Council;
(1) Receive and note the petition requesting dog park infrastructure, and
(2) Agree to undertake a preliminary project to consider the need for dog parks in the community with the lead petitioner and other nominated parties and utilising the Dog and Cat Management Board guidelines potentially develop some concepts for consideration in future budgets and that the lead petitioner be informed of this recommendation seeking him to nominate the community representatives to work with Council on the assessment.

Seconded Cr Hum

CARRIED 2014-18/1311

The community consultation process ran from 18 July 2018 to 8 August 2018 inclusive.

A Community Consultation Plan was prepared to guide the actions and timing for activity during the consultation period (Attachment 1). A mix of methods was adopted to spread the message as wide through the region as possible:
• Meeting with key community stakeholders
• Council website home page news items
• Our Better Barossa; consultation website - survey
• Facebook
• Media Release to highlight process undertaken and to be implemented, all local newspapers
• Advertisements in The Leader and Herald
• Feature in D’Vine Council newsletter
• Posters delivered around the region to community noticeboards
• 2 x pop up sessions; Coop Nuriootpa, Thursday 26 July (2pm – 4pm); Williamstown Colonist Corner, Saturday 21 July (2.30 – 4pm)
• Media Release to notify media of current activity post consultation close and next stage being report to Council
• Close the loop – we will deliver results to media and to email addresses provided after the Council meeting.

Discussion
All data and comments received are included in full within the following attachments with the exception of any personal addresses/contact details, which have been removed:

Attachment 2 – Survey Responses full data
Attachment 3 – Survey Responses Report
Attachment 4 – Survey Responses Additional Comments
Attachment 5 – Survey Responses No Comments

The data collected through the community consultation period on dog parks has resulted in the vast majority of those that completed the survey, indicating that they believe the Barossa community will benefit from dog park/s in our region. A total of 435 responses were received with 92.87% of responses indicating that they believe the Barossa community would benefit from a dog park and 7.13% of responses indicating that the community would not benefit. The results indicate that from those completing the survey, that they believe the benefits outweigh the costs.

The key themes discussed through comments are regarding safe environment for dogs, dog socialisation, meeting place for our community and increased sense of wellbeing, spaces for large dogs and small dogs, and ideas for locations. Of the comments regarding location, there is a good number of responses indicating support for a north and south park, and support to formalise Heinemann Park in Tanunda as this is a popular existing meeting place for people and dogs.

The top priorities for inclusions in a dog park include fencing, water availability, bins and doggie bags; shelter and seating to a lesser extent and multi-surfaces are important to only few.

Most people have indicated that a medium sized (around 3000m2) park is preferred with safe spaces for larger dogs, separate from smaller dogs.

From those who responded, most people indicate they will use a dog park 2 – 5 times a week.

Comments from those not in favour of dog parks discuss concerns around applied resources including funding to other priorities, that there is ample open space...
available to run dogs and concerns regarding dogs not under effective control and how that can lead to dog attacks and fights.

The following graphs outline the results from each of the survey questions asked:

Q1 Do you think the Barossa community would benefit from a dog park?

The following graph shows further analysis of the split of responses by township:

(NB: it is noted that 29 or 6.6% of submissions received supporting the benefits of Dog Parks were from respondents outside The Barossa Council area albeit that this does not materially affect the balance of responses).
Q3 If 'Yes', do you think the benefits outweigh the costs? As well as construction costs, ongoing costs will need to be funded from general rates as dog registration fees do not cover the existing costs of providing current services for animal management. Ongoing costs may include maintenance, renewal and replacement, cleaning, waste disposal and compliance.

Answered: 411  Skipped: 24

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANSWER CHOICES</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>94.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>5.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>411</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q4 What would be your top five priorities in a dog park?

Answered: 412  Skipped: 23

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANSWER CHOICES</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doggie Bags</td>
<td>78.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bins</td>
<td>90.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>90.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td>55.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seating</td>
<td>49.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-surfaces</td>
<td>23.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fencing</td>
<td>96.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Respondents</td>
<td>412</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q5 What size dog park do you think the community needs? The size of existing dog parks throughout South Australia range from small (100m2), medium (average 3000m2) and the largest (17,000m2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANSWER CHOICES</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>3.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>70.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>25.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q7 How often would you use a dog park?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANSWER CHOICES</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>20.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5 times a week</td>
<td>67.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>12.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment is provided on the main recurring themes from the feedback received as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories of Responses not in favour</th>
<th>Categories of Responses in favour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total does not equal total responses or comments, only summarises issues raised.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other open space available 9</td>
<td>Safe environment 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog attacks and fights 6</td>
<td>Dog socialisation 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog training and dogs under control 9</td>
<td>Community meeting place 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other priorities 11</td>
<td>Infrastructure - large dogs, small dogs 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost 6</td>
<td>Infrastructure - fence 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog poo 2</td>
<td>Infrastructure - lighting 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location 1</td>
<td>Infrastructure - water 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other 15</td>
<td>Infrastructure - bins 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Infrastructure - seating 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Infrastructure - shelter or trees 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Infrastructure - equipment 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Infrastructure - gates 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Location 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tourism 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Signage 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at expense of other off-lead areas 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Car parking 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>wellbeing 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Registration fees / cost 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>User pays 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other 37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conclusion**
From the 435 responses from the Dog Park survey, 92.87% people believe that the Barossa Community will benefit from a dog park. The comments indicate that a simple fenced area with separation for large and small dogs, with water, bins and doggie bags would be well used, multiple times a week, by those that responded. There is support for two parks of around 3000m², one in our northern region, and one southern.
FINANCIAL, RESOURCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT CONSIDERATIONS

**Financial**
Should Council support the installation of dog parks, a location and design will be formalised, the installation costs as well as whole of life cost will be assessed to include provision in future budgets for mowing, weed control, waste control, cleaning, renewal and replacement, and potential for increased complaint handling and compliance matters. A report will be brought back to Council in the future. As noted in the survey, the cost of current service levels in respect of Council’s Dog and Cat Management legislated activities is not fully funded from registration revenue and so provision and maintenance of additional services will necessitate unbudgeted upfront capital and ongoing operational expenditure.

**Resource**
Should Council support the installation of dog parks, officer resources required will include, Manager Community Projects, Manager Regulatory Services and Coordinator Operations and assessment of the impact on Depot teams and potentially mowing and waste contractors. To mow around fence lines and collect waste not directly on the roadside will add additional resource costs.

**Risk Management**
A detailed risk assessment will be completed as part of the future potential design process.

**COMMUNITY CONSULTATION**
Officers implemented in full the Community Consultation Plan (Attachment 1).
DOG PARK COMMUNICATIONS PLAN

Consultation dates – 18 July to 8 August

Outcomes

- Provide the community with a voice and an opportunity to provide feedback, views and ideas on dog parks
- To establish if there is a need in the community for a dog park
- Results to inform Council’s future decision making on a dog park

Remember to set clear parameters and expectations re data capture. Only data from surveys submitted via ourbetterbarossa, or at the community pop ups will be captured along with comments on The Barossa Council Facebook page.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative</th>
<th>Communication Method</th>
<th>Responsible Officer</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Tone/Content/Message</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td>Council website</td>
<td>CMOs</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unleash your voice and have your say about dog parks. Council is seeking feedback from the community to help inform future decision on the need for dog parks in the Barossa community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Our Better Barossa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Include link to dog and cat management plan guidelines for dog parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facebook</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*all online posts to drive people to survey on ourbetterbarossa.com.au with a disclaimer that only feedback via the survey will be collected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key questions:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Do you think the Barossa community will benefit from a dog park?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. If no, why not?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. If yes, do you think the benefits outweigh the costs? As well as</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>construction costs, ongoing costs may include:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Renewal and replacement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Cleaning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Waste disposal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Compliance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. What would be your top five priorities in a dog park?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Doggie bags</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Bins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Shelter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Seating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Multi-surfaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Fencing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. What size dog park do you think the community needs? The size of existing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dog parks throughout South Australia range from small (100m2), medium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(average 3000m2) and the largest (17,000m2).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Small</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Medium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Large</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Would you use a dog park?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. How often would you use it?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Release</td>
<td>The Leader • Herald • Bunyip</td>
<td>CMOs</td>
<td>July 18 editions</td>
<td>Key messaging: Council currently has 4892 dogs registered. Process to date – highlight Council resolution undertake a preliminary project to consider the needs for a dog park in the community. Council has met with key stakeholders (Carla and Kelly). Important for the community to participate and fill in our survey sharing their views. Feedback will be collected and presented to Council. Highlight pop up dates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertisement</td>
<td>Leader • Herald</td>
<td></td>
<td>July 25 editions</td>
<td>Promote survey on ourbetterbarossa. Encourage people to submit their feedback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Tools/Displays</td>
<td>Posters in front foyer/library visitor centre, tanunda foodland, Angaston foodland, community noticeboards</td>
<td>CMO design Admin assistants to distribute</td>
<td>From 18 July</td>
<td>Let’s talk dog parks! Unleash your voice and have your say on the community’s need for a dog park.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Pop Ups** | **Accessible community pop up session** | **Rebecca Tappert** | **Nuriootpa Coop**  
26 July (2pm – 4pm)  
Callie to confirm  
Williamstown  
Colonist Corner  
21 July (2.30pm – 4pm) | **Enable community to provide feedback face-to-face or fill in a hard copy version of the survey or via ipad  
Promote via Facebook, website and through Council newsletters/media release** |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brief customer service/Barossa Visitor Centre staff</strong></td>
<td><strong>Email</strong></td>
<td><strong>CMOs</strong></td>
<td><strong>18 July</strong></td>
<td><strong>Call to action – fill out the survey via ourbetterbarossa.com.au</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brief Elected Members</strong></td>
<td><strong>Email/Memorandum</strong></td>
<td><strong>Rebecca Tappert</strong></td>
<td><strong>18 July</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CLOSE THE LOOP**

<p>| <strong>Online</strong> | <strong>Facebook</strong> | <strong>CMOS</strong> | <strong>End of consultation</strong> | <strong>Highlight # of people engaged with and provide overview of the feedback as well as highlighting next steps (Council decision)</strong> |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City/Town</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Angaston</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambrai</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cockatoo Valley</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concordia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craigmore</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ebenezer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eden Valley</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flaxman Valley</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gawler</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gawler Belt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gawler East</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gawler West</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenock</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwith</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapunda</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keyneton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Pass</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyndoch</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moculta</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt Pleasant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuriootpa</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuriootpa light</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penrice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reid</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosedale</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seppeltsfield</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockport</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockwell</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanunda</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truro</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vine vale</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williamstown</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grand Total**: 31 403 434
Q1 Do you think the Barossa community would benefit from a dog park?

Answered: 435   Skipped: 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANSWER CHOICES</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>92.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>7.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q2 If 'No', why not?

Answered: 33  Skipped: 402
Q3 If 'Yes', do you think the benefits outweigh the costs? As well as construction costs, ongoing costs will need to be funded from general rates as dog registration fees do not cover the existing costs of providing current services for animal management. Ongoing costs may include maintenance, renewal and replacement, cleaning, waste disposal and compliance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANSWER CHOICES</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>94.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>5.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q4 What would be your top five priorities in a dog park?

Answered: 412  Skipped: 23

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANSWER CHOICES</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doggie Bags</td>
<td>78.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bins</td>
<td>90.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>90.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td>55.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seating</td>
<td>49.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-surfaces</td>
<td>23.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fencing</td>
<td>96.12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Respondents: 412
Q5 What size dog park do you think the community needs? The size of existing dog parks throughout South Australia range from small (100m2), medium (average 3000m2) and the largest (17,000m2).

Answered: 410  Skipped: 25

**ANSWER CHOICES** | **RESPONSES**
--- | ---
Small | 3.90%  16
Medium | 70.73%  290
Large | 25.37%  104
TOTAL | 410
Q6 Would you use a dog park?

Answered: 425  Skipped: 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANSWER CHOICES</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>91.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>8.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q7 How often would you use a dog park?

Answered: 392  Skipped: 43

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANSWER CHOICES</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>20.66% 81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5 times a week</td>
<td>67.09% 263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>12.24% 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>392</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q8 Do you have any other comments in relation to dog parks?

Answered: 212  Skipped: 223
Q9 Please provide your contact details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANSWER CHOICES</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>100.00% 435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company</td>
<td>0.00% 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>0.00% 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address 2</td>
<td>0.00% 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/Town</td>
<td>100.00% 435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State/Province</td>
<td>0.00% 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZIP/Postal Code</td>
<td>0.00% 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>0.00% 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email Address</td>
<td>100.00% 435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone Number</td>
<td>0.00% 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q8 Do you have any other comments in relation to dog parks?

Answered: 212  Skipped: 223

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Two sets of gates so dogs can’t get out when other dogs are coming into dog park.</td>
<td>8/8/2018 9:50 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I think that a dog park would be an excellent place for dogs to socialize and to run freely and play off leash. We do not have any areas at the moment where owners can have their dogs off leash in a safe environment. Having had dogs for 40 + years I know how important it is for dogs to interact with other dogs and people in a safe environment, I have also been involved with the Kapunda dog training club and I know that people need to train their dogs off lead as they get into higher classes. Once again we do not have anywhere that they can do this safely.</td>
<td>8/8/2018 7:51 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I will not use dog parks.</td>
<td>8/8/2018 7:36 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>May use more depending on location</td>
<td>8/8/2018 6:01 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A fenced dog park in our community would be of great benefit.</td>
<td>8/8/2018 5:35 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>This is an absolute need for our community. There are no LOCAL areas for us to take our dogs and let run off lead. A barossa dog park would give us responsible dog owners an opportunity to socialise our dogs, without the risk of being hit by cars, endangering livestock etc.</td>
<td>8/8/2018 5:27 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>A local dog park would benefit our dog who is young and needs to interact with other dogs and have ample running space, currently I need to travel to other council dog parks as there are non in the Barossa.</td>
<td>8/8/2018 5:19 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I currently take my dog from Tanunda to city dog parks as there is no safe fenced area closer, and find the interaction between dog owners is of great benefit, as well as the chance for the dogs to run and interact together safely. When returning home my dog is happy and content. PLEASE accept the offer of the funds and create a dog park asap in the Barossa area.</td>
<td>8/8/2018 5:16 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>The Williamstown Action Group submitted initiatives for the Fund My Neighbourhood Funding and Barossa Council New Initiatives to have a park in Williamstown on behalf of the local community members. It would give people a safe area to allow their dogs off a leash while protecting other people and dogs</td>
<td>8/8/2018 5:14 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I feel that a park should be divided into two parks, one for off lead obedient dogs and another for smaller, more timid dogs to enable them to get used to socialising, or are becoming to old to be around more boisterous dogs. I have bought a pram so my fur baby can get around when he is unable to walk any distance and would be willing to take other older dogs so they can be let free without the worry of being harassed. A dog park is a necessity with the restrictions that have being made I would definitely be interested in being involved if it is within walking distance of my home as I do not drive.</td>
<td>8/8/2018 2:16 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>These dog parks are great in other towns, however I think there needs to be a fence in between for small and large dogs, or to seperate more anxious dogs.</td>
<td>8/8/2018 12:44 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I think a dog park would be a great meeting place for our community.</td>
<td>8/8/2018 9:46 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>I dog sit for a friend, would use it daily.</td>
<td>8/8/2018 9:10 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Just moved into the area. Don't have email address using families.</td>
<td>8/8/2018 9:09 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>People love dogs!! Even as a tourist I would visit a dog park because they’re timeless creatures that never fail to make me happy. It would be a great way for our community to come together as well, providing a safe outdoor space to socialise both the pets and the people. It would also encourage the community to spend time outdoors and have some exercise without having to play a sport, which is often stressful and inconvenient. I would consider implicating leash/vaccination rules, but also having communal events such as dress ups or walks for charity.</td>
<td>8/8/2018 7:39 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Having lots of seating and some shelter helps as people can utilise these whilst in the park. The one at tanunda (5355) is great. Its a big park with seating and tables so we can bring food and sit for and relax a bit, while the dogs play. (under supervision)</td>
<td>8/8/2018 1:57 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Who picks up all the Dog pooh? The owners dont so it now so why would a dog park change that. Who pays for the bag that I see taken by dog owners that take heaps not just one for use there but to take home and use.</td>
<td>8/7/2018 11:21 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Long overdue the city has multiple it's a shock we don't have anything here. This is rural our
dogs need to run

Excellent place to be social with family and friends and educate puppies/dogs to interact with
other dogs in a safe environment.

Having a dedicated park would be great for not just the dogs but like-minded owners- socialising
on different levels.

Yes, I think a dog park is a win win. Dogs need to be socialised & it happening in a safe
environment is a very positive thing for the community. Dogs bring a common bond to people &
this can only bring our community together. Win win

We have plenty of space in the Barossa might as well use it for something functional.

I would hope it has things to climb on, tunnels to run through and things like that. And an "off
lead" area for dogs to just roam or mingle together

A space to exercise dogs off lead will reduce the dogs boredom, potentially reducing its
destructive behaviours at home.

Support the tourist who visit to spend, shop, dine and holiday here. As well as the locals

There are many dog owners in the barossa who would benefit from socialising with other dog
owners and also the dogs would get better interaction with other dogs in a safe environment.

Long overdue, needs to be implemented ASAP. The Barossa has a large number of registered
dogs, so having the ability to exercise and socialise them in a safe and controlled environment
is a given.

The barossa needs to get up with the times and give us a dog park, there are so many people
here with dogs. Long overdue!

Long overdue and a friends of the Barossa dog park group could be created to help

Please just a nice fenced area, nothing too expensive just an enclosed area where dogs can
run and play.

Dog parks need a dedicated space for both small and large dogs.

Have two dog park, within one like at Port Adelaide, one for small dogs and one for big dogs

Ideally the Heineman park area would be fantastic with just fencing so dogs do not run up to the
roadway. Nothing else is required as far as I am concerned. Anything else would be luxury for
me.

It would be useful if Dog Parks were introduced for that section of the community who want to
use them. My concern is that the introduction of Dog Parks could inadvertently lead to the
reduction in currently available off leash areas for exercising dogs and this would be a very poor
outcome for dogs and their owners in the Barossa. Some dogs and dog owners would benefit
from a Dog Park but it must be recognized that it is not the panacea for all of them. Rather than
listing the reasons here - please do a simple Google search on "Are Dog Parks safe". This will
provide much information on the myriad of reasons why Dog Parks do not suit all dogs and their
owners and why some owners choose never to use them. An important priority of any Dog Park
is signage on "Etiquette" and "Rules for use of the Park". A safe area for small and tiny and
young dogs would be good.

The benefits of having a dog park are only positive. Socially for both humans and the animals, it
serves as a wonderful community asset. The most important thing is to have the proper fencing
in place for dogs who can escape, but even more so for owners of dogs who will not be able to
chase after their dog if they were to escape.

I lived on the Riverland for three years. Every single town now has a dog park. I used the Berri
one every single day. At night, there was always in excess of fifteen registers and it became a
social catch up that got me out and about. My dogs are Beagles and cannot be off leash in an
unfenced area. It is the only time I can run the freely and the health benefits were noticeable.

Plenty of dog owners travelling love to call into a town with a dog park. It’s a great asset and
facility for locals. When we lived in broad view we used one regularly. There isn’t any nearby
at all. Any where in the barossa would be good

Point 3... why does it always come down to money? This is something that will fully utilised so in
my opinion money well spent. I do not have a dog but support the concept fully. Would actually
love to see this in the Southern Barossa...lots of space on the Village Green in Lyndoch..

Population is getting bigger. Block sizes are getting smaller. It makes sense to provide a facility.
It adds another dimension to the community and could be beneficial for tourists travelling with
dogs.
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>It would be a great place for my dog to meet other dogs, and spend time playing</td>
<td>8/2/2018 7:43 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Freeling is a growing community, and there is no off leash area</td>
<td>8/2/2018 6:18 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>We currently travel out of the Barossa area to use a dog park and therefore spend money in that area by eating out or shopping. It would be great if we could do this at home. Also our dog lives out on a property and doesn’t see any other dogs day to day so it would be great to be able to socialise her closer to home.</td>
<td>8/2/2018 4:21 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Would be great to have a safe fenced area for my dog to run off lead.</td>
<td>8/2/2018 10:41 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Just not required</td>
<td>8/1/2018 6:25 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Stupid and ill-considered idea that should only really be discussed within the context of a range of other priorities and some transparency around the long term cost to the community in relation to up-keep and maintenance. I happily walk my dog - who is safe to go off lead in the parks and green spaces - every day. I clean up after him, he socialises with other friendly dogs and it is more than suitable for our needs - not sure why others can't do this and they need a specially designated “dog park”. Complete waste of time, effort and expense.</td>
<td>8/1/2018 5:29 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Nuriootpa definitely needs a dog park and given that Nuri is the largest settlement in the north, then this should be an obvious choice. Dog registration numbers need to be considered in the location of the dog park. Like other projects in the Barossa, a community support group needs to be established to assist with the ongoing operation of the park. I got one would be delighted to become involved with this project.</td>
<td>8/1/2018 5:20 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>I would not support a dog park as it's your choice to own an animal and if you can't take it for a daily walk then don't have one at all!</td>
<td>8/1/2018 11:08 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>How can the council not cover costs from dog registration? The Barossa council charges a fortune and delivers very little</td>
<td>7/31/2018 5:23 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Provision of trees for shade important. Separate areas for large dogs only. Grassed areas with out prickles, 3 corner jacks and burns. Very Large Signage re picking up dog poo. Adequate parking for cars as most people drive to parks. No alcohol area.</td>
<td>7/31/2018 12:02 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>This would secure the well-being of pet owners and non pet owners as there would be a designated area as the housing blocks are reducing in size there is a need for open space for our pets and the demand will only increase.</td>
<td>7/30/2018 9:48 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Park already exists behind barossa valley brewing, all that is needed is referring; bags and bin already there; fencing in middle would need to be removed and communication with archery club required to arrange non use time due to danger of flying arrows.</td>
<td>7/30/2018 7:19 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>In addition to improving the lives of dogs and reducing annoyance to non-dog owners in other public spaces, they would encourage social interaction amongst owners and thus strengthen community.</td>
<td>7/29/2018 3:52 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Dogs are important companions and their value is well documented as to all aspects of health. The money spent will enhance the wellbeing of the community generally. It is also an important consideration for tourists when planning journeys. Dogs are much better behaved when they have space exercised. The park would also provide a means of socialization for dogs and owners.</td>
<td>7/29/2018 10:08 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>I would be worried that if there was a dog park then other off lead areas in the Barossa would be taken away.</td>
<td>7/29/2018 9:49 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>I don't personally have a dog at the moment but I have in the past and can see how it would absolutely benefit our community.</td>
<td>7/29/2018 9:27 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>We have heinemann park in tanunda which could easily be fully fenced and turned into a dog park. It is a lovely spot and is already attracting dog owners, but with the current insufficient fencing is quite unsafe to let dogs off leash.</td>
<td>7/29/2018 8:58 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>We need this! Our dogs need to learn how to socialise. Not all owners can physically walk their dogs especially elderly or disabled so a place to let them off the leash is important</td>
<td>7/29/2018 8:52 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>The Barossa Valley a d visitors need a place where dogs have the freedom to run off lead. We walk our dogs daily and see other people walking their dogs OFF lead.....even when signs say 'Dogs must be on leads at all times’...a recipe for disaster. Please let our community and visitors have a place to go to let mans best friend run free.</td>
<td>7/29/2018 8:30 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>We have one but its too small for my dog to run around in. I am moving to Nuri and would love to see a big one near the bush gardens</td>
<td>7/29/2018 8:18 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>There is an area in Tanunda across from the Caravan Park that is used now for dogs. All it needs is some extra fencing along the creek and next to the road.</td>
<td>7/28/2018 8:51 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>If you are building 2 separate them. Don't put 1 in Nuriootpa then 1 in Tanunda. 1 in Nuriootpa and 1 in Mt Pleasant to cover the entire council area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>I know so many people and dogs that this will benefit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>As a greyhound owner I would appreciate consideration of greyhound only days, where greys can run freely</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Given the size of the Council area. There should be at least two locations. One in the northern end say Nuriootpa and the other in the southern end perhaps Lyndoch or Williamstown.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>The one at golden grove /wynn vale is a good example, with double safety gates each end. has a divider fence along the centre, creating an elongated U-shaped enclosure, enabling more effective owner management of their dogs ie two sides</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>This would be a wonderful facility for our community. People can gather and not only socialise and exercise dogs but also connect with like-minded people.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>There is already a park been used regularly by dogs and there owners. Fencing just needs to be upgraded to keep little dogs in.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Dog parks can be enjoyed by young and old people- as well as the dogs. It is a good way for people to meet other people who like dogs. It would be good for the community. Tourists and their dogs who come to the Barossa for the day would use the park. There needs to be a separate fenced area for small dogs and large dogs. Once built I can't see that the park would be that expensive to maintain. It is important to cater for all people in a community- dog owners would really enjoy being able to run their dogs off the leash. A dog park would be enjoyed by the dogs, but also people. What current services do the Council provide for dogs? There are doggie bags at the Tanunda oval- is that it? What do our dogs registration fees pay for?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>I think Wolf Noack reserve in Tanunda would be the perfect place for a dog park. The playground has just been done up and is looked after by Council already so a fenced dog park could go next to it. At the moment it seems to be a useless piece of land with lots of prickles in summer.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>I would have loved this when I had my dog. Somewhere safe for them to exercise and be socialized with other dogs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>I think it's unfair for non pet owners to pay for a facility for someone else's dog to take a shit. Who is going to police large dangerous breeds and non compliant owners, lets face it there are some in every crowd!!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Great way to keep fit with your dog</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Obviously depending on the location due to where we live but would try and use dog park regularly, at least more than monthly.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Don't turn this into a cash grab reason to further increase what are already significantly high council rates. If the rest of the country and the state of SA can create safe dog friendly spaces then surely the Barossa can come up with something with all the free space here. I’d have thought you'd want to bring people into the area and potentially increase business, bringing visitors to use a park for a purpose. Dogs are part of people’s families now and huge social outlets. Having a safe space to exercise our dogs and meet new people is a good thing. It’s incredibly frustrating that council is so narrow minded, behind the times with the rest of the country and money hungry! Trying to sway peoples opinion by indicating you’ll hike up rates is pathetic really.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>People could safely let their dogs off in comfort knowing people who dislike dogs will not be offended</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Lights would also be needed for those who can't get to the park during daylight (during winter particularly). I would use a dog park weekly, but wasn't given that option in the survey responses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>It would be great to have biodegradable poo bags, and green bins. So all the organic matter could be composted rather than go to landfill.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>When living in Playford council we visited multiple dog parks regularly. It offers a chance for socialisation for both pet and person. Council rates are high enough that it could fund this service quite easily, upkeep is not a large task realistically, and all users should be cleaning up after themselves</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Good place to let your dogs run off lead, meet other dogs and like minded owners.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Small dogs need a separate section from the big dogs for safety reasons. North Adelaide dog park is an excellent example of this and the soon to be opened dog park at Gawler Clonlea reserve is divided into two sections.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
81 Would rather have more off leash areas in current recreational areas and conservation parks

82 Hard to say if benefit outweighs cost seeing as I don't know of the cost involved. I'd be happy if part of the Angaston Oval could be sectioned off. Seems cheap to me.

83 Dogs need at least 30 min off lead time per day. Is a great thing for socialisation and behaviour. A lot of the time aggression towards other dogs is caused by not socialising the dog therefore aggression starts by guarding the resource that they know.

84 A safe fenced dog park would be used most days by us

85 Dog parks enable dogs (and their owners) to engage socially in a safe, enclosed space. Great for both species.

86 To me it doesn't need to be anything to fancy. Just a fenced area the dogs can run without fear of them running off into traffic

87 People need to be responsible and clean up after their dogs. Currently in the Barossa parks a lot don't. They also need to be supervising their dogs and not sitting in a shelter chatting and leaving their dogs to their own devices. The reason I don't think there needs to be seating.

88 I believe something like this would benefit the community massively! Most people you know these days have a dog, we have playgrounds for children, so why not one for our fur babies!

89 I am not a dog owner but strongly feel a fenced, off leash dog park would help reduce the incidence of dogs off lead in our general parks. Dogs off leads in general parks and play areas are a nuisance at best, danger at worst.

90 Safety first. I think having separate sections for smaller & larger dogs. Soil health: parvo lives can live in dirt

91 Lots of people travel with animals so it would just be another fantastic facility that the Barossa would have to offer.

92 Well yes, apart from that this survey could lead to rather misleading results...but I digress. The current costs quoted to build a dog park are excessive to say the least. Yes a dog park is a great idea and no doubt would be used by many. Why not contact Local service clubs to assist in building, Mens Shed, either High school in the Tech education programmes to assist in the building. I trust that from this "consult" a full proposal will be presented for further consult, showing the what, where and how (both costs and design)

93 I don’t think dog parks need be as expensive as Council is estimating. They only really need fencing, water and bins

94 currently i walk my dog in couthard park where cars drive through exceeding the 20 ks speed limit with no regards to the walkers plus some dog owners are knot picking up there dogs poops with a park it would be safe to walk the dog and monitor owners to pick up after there dog.

95 Shameful that has taken this long- the council only prioritizes bikes. need a safe space for dog community to exercise and socialize

96 A dog park is going to provide a safe place for residents to "unleash" their dogs. I've always utilized dog parks and off leash venues and was disappointed when I moved to the Barossa to find there was nothing here for my dogs. It's great way to socialise young dogs aswell. I'd hope there would be separate off lead areas for large dogs and small dogs and puppies etc

97 Housing blocks are getting smaller which council are approving. This is impacting on the free space for dogs to run free

98 This is not an investment. Our rates should NOT be used. User pays system, dog owners have to be prepared to pay up for the ongoing costs including policing cleaning up the dog poo, fining lazy dog owners, and legal liability when their pooch attacks another dog or person etc. Total waste of money. If you have to spend it, use it on bringing dog owners to account- there are far too many dogs roaming the streets and far too many barking all day long because of lazy owners. There is plenty of room in the Barossa to walk your dog. A dog park will be similar to a kid's playground- adults sitting on their butts on their phones while their "fur babies" run uncontrolled.

99 Would use if located at Williamstown

100 The one I saw at Aldinga had two sections one for small dogs and one for large I thought this was a fantastic idea

101 We need a dog park so our dogs can socialise in a safe environment.

102 My dog cannot be let off the lead without fences so tis would be fantastic
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>It’s the community responsibility to make these parks available. Young dogs grow up to be sociable adults. This makes a safer environment for people (children) and dogs. A small park is needed for small dogs. Large park for larger dogs. With the population growing and moving forward, this future planning is needed and important.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>It would be nice if there was a way to separate more socially challenged dogs from other dogs so that they have a chance to become used to other dogs and people in a safe way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>I would use it, if it was in Williamstown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Barossa desperately needs one for sure!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>I WOULD BE PREPARED TO DONATE SEATS. The dog park at Port Elliot would be a good one to copy. People donate and have plaques with their dogs name on as a memorial. People would also volunteer to keep the parks in good condition. I was charged a levy for the Rex Centre but have never used it. Give something back to the elderly people so they can spend quality time with their pets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>Good clear signage that owners take responsibility of their dogs and any mess they create.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>With the development of Tanunda Oval/Recreation Park, there are many times when it is already not suitable to use for dog exercise/socialisation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Much needed for locals &amp; visitors!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Goyder Council established a great doggy park in Burra... The Barossa needs and deserves the same... many tourists also travel with pet dog.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>All major towns in the Barossa would benefit from a dog park. Nuriootpa, Angaston and Tanunda all need this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Dog parks are so much more than an outlet for dogs, they bring the dog-loving community together in mutual enjoyment of our furry family members. Our dogs are just as important to us as our children are, and giving dogs and their owners a safe space to exercise them may actually help problems attributed to canine frustration (excessive barking, escaping yards, etc).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>Safe roads are a necessity. A dog park is not.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Dog parks should be located within close walking distance to a larger population (ie entrance to Tanunda Oval, corner of Hoffmann Avenue and Aughey Street). Good fencing is critical and should also be made a priority. North Adelaide dog park should be looked at as a prime example as it also has separate areas for small and large dogs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>Good fencing is most important, followed by water. I think dog parks help bring the community together and allows for better socialization of dogs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>An option of even two connected dog parks for small and large dogs works well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>The old brickworks in Nuriootpa land site on Murray Street would be an idea location. It will attract people driving into the Barossa. Plenty of shade and parking. Ideal spot for dogs, to unused land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>I think you have screwed this survey with the question above. It looks like the massive gap between the timelines means that people would be hesitant to say monthly in case the survey shows that not enough visitation to warrant it, and if they up it to the next option 2-5 times a week, and you don’t get that level of measured visitation, you will be able to say not enough people are attending it and close it down.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>I believe that they are a really safe way for owners and dogs to socialise with one another, therefore bringing more members of the community closer together and supporting one another.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>I think a designated dog park with secure fencing will allow dog owners to exercise their dogs safely off lead and provide an area where they won't be able to disrupt other community members or activities. It could also provide a venue for possible community events such as dog shows or dog training/obedience classes - which could only benefit the community in future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>A great way for community to connect and meet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>Suggestion: Installation of a coin operated dog wash with the money utilised to subsidise the dog park. Also Getting in touch with local job active providers to get work for the dole activity set up with participants to assist in the cleanup and maintenance of the dog parks with funding from government to offset costs to upskill local unemployed thus reducing the impact to rate payers and income and increased community participation and involvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>Although I believe in dog parks, I do not think enormous amounts of money should be spent considering many other worthwhile projects for the people in the Barossa. I am willing to personally discuss this matter further.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
perhaps a area like hienman into two areas one for bigger dogs and an area for smaller would be ideal......gates that stop dogs going under towards traffic and people

Dogs need socializing, happier dogs are less aggressive, also provides rest areas for travelling dogs

It would be good to create a smaller area for small dogs. Larger dogs can have their own space.

There must be on and off leash areas. I’m sure the cost of purchase and maintaining will be far less than the contribution to the expansion of the Angaston Football Club, and the transformation of the Angas Recreation Park to a sports hub. Residents have complained about cars speeding around the oval on training nights and the complete lack of consideration by drivers at all other times, including the disregard for speed bumps. On top of all of that the football club committee/parks committee put up no dogs allowed on oval signs that were not approved by Council and despite several requests these remain in place.

I use Angaston Recreational park everyday. So I would like to keep using this facility because it is close to my house & I can take my dog there before work because it's within walking distance.

Secure fencing for off leash play so can interact with other dogs safely

Yes...would be ideal to have something near Lyndon and Williamstown not just the inner towns We dip out on so much maybe have two smaller pls one in Tanunda and one in Lyndon or Williamstown

On our recent travels interstate many of the country towns provided dog parks or unleashed areas. Pets are important. I was also stopped one day in our main street as a tourist asked if there was a dog park. I think it’s time to look after and consider the pets.

There should be a dog park in each town. Nuri,Tanunda and Angaston

it is not required, so many other more important things that could be funded. We live in the country and have lots of large open spaces available for free.

Large dogs allowed to run untethered in the current multi-purpose areas are can be distressing to young children and not all owners pick up their dog's droppings.

They are great places to stop and have a breather while walking the dog. Meet up with others for a chat while our dogs socialise and run unrestricted. Win/win

Do not wish for our rates to be wasted on a minority of dog owners in the council area.Very strongly object to this proposal

Dog parks cater for dog owners only. General open space caters for all.

We need a dedicated dog park please!!!! It would be so greatly appreciated and supported.

The initial fencing should be mostly covered by the government grant. I see little evidence of good animal management currently utilising our dog registration fees and would wonder if that could be administered more efficiently.

This is a long time coming. There are many many dog parks in the city yet we dont have one in the barossa. It is a great way for dogs to socialize and play. I have 2 very active dogs so a place they can be off lead and run freely would be a life saver

Fantastic idea and would encourage exercise and cimmunity interaction.

They can be added to and improved over time. Initially all that is needed is land and a fence. It's quite amazing that the Barossa doesn’t have a dog park yet.

I believe that dog parks will encourage more tourists to the area as they can bring their dogs and know there is somewhere for them to exercise in a safe space. I would potentially use it more often depending on where in the barossa it is. I have been to other parks in SA and it is a good social place for dog owners too.

we will travel to other council areas that have dog parks in order to access them often in excess of an hours drive. It would add to the tourism of the area especially if the local cafe's etc promoted themselves as dog friendly and accommodation was pet friendly like the South coast. We will pay a premium to be able to take our dogs with us and will not go back to places that are not dog friendly e.g. Banrock station been once Jacobs creek multiple visits

Dog parks are essential for socialisation, exercise and for human companionship. It is imperative that the council provides a safe space for dogs to run off lead.

need a small and a large dog park will help with issues between dogs

Small dog park and large dogs park stop some issues
A dog park allows you to socialise your dog within a safe enclosed area. It is imperative to have separate fenced areas for small and large dogs. Providing one area for all dogs is not ideal as small dogs are easily frightened by even big friendly dogs. Allowing dogs to socialise in an enclosed area helps them be better behaved within the community. As a rate payer it is unfair for me to have to constantly travel outside our region to access dog parks. Blakeview is one of the closest but often is not recommended to go to due to outbreaks of parvo virus so it's then down to Mawson Lakes or North Adelaide dog parks. We are regularly go to Melbourne and regional areas of Victoria and the dog parks are plentiful and amazing!

A long overdue proposal which will benefit a large number of people, dog-owners and non-dog owners alike.

I am not a dog owner but think dog parks are great for exercise, socialising etc for both dog and owner. Great to have obedience training as well.

Not a dog owner but think dog parks are great for the community.

Not a dog owner but think dog parks are great for the community.

A fully closed secure dog park where small dogs can be contained and run free.

User donation appropriate.

How often I use the park would strongly depend on where it is situated. Nuri location it would be monthly but southern Barossa location it would be a lot more.

The problems will be if you have irresponsible owners bringing a offload dog who they have no control over and potentially could be aggressive towards other dogs and people.

Just do it and keep it simple, don't over-complicate the project.

Effective control.

It needs to be located next to an existing "people" area, so it can be utilised by families eg adjacent Lyndoch oval playground or next to Rotunda. IT HAS TO BE FENCED, as despite what owners think, not all dogs are friendly. IT HAS TO HAVE SECURITY CAMERAS, to film the lazy dog owners who do not clean up after their pooch, which is all too common all over the town walkways and current reserves. It has to cost the ratepayers NOTHING - increase dog registration to cover costs if need be. It has to be were there is existing vacant land that is not necessarily being utilised by people. DO NOT TAKE FROM US ONE OF OUR EXISTING, small reserves of which we do not have enough for people to enjoy without animals running loose. Seriously though, is it really needed? This is a rural / regional area - take your dog for a walk or run around the area and TAKE YOUR DOG SHIT HOME.

Heinemann park would be perfect. Just needs some water access. It is currently used by so many dog families and is basically an unofficial dog park given its mostly fenced.

Small dogs and big dogs.

Heinemann park. Shared space. John dallwitz reserve.

Involved with people who trial and train working sheep dogs they travel and would certainly use a dog park for resting dogs while traveling The dog park would need to be separated into two sections to allow separate areas for smaller breeds and larger breeds Would be beneficial for tourists.

Seperate areas for small and large dogs Costs subsidised by users.

Location to each town - more than one park (north and south option) a based on population ratio Small park for smaller dogs and a larger park for larger breeds.

Having areas for big dogs and another for small dogs would be good as not all big dogs tolerate small dogs.

It is such an important aspect of shared community connections for people to have well socialised dogs, to feel safe around other people’s dogs and to be able to meet with other “dog lovers”. Loneliness is a terrible experience for all sorts of people (elderly, ill, unemployed, single) and a pet dog provides wonderful companionship and improves mental and physical health. I think we should encourage positive dog-ownership and a dog park provides a venue for community connections.

The Dog park near the Police Training Barracks in Adelaide has an area for smaller dogs and a separate area for larger dogs. Great idea for those breeds that feel intimidated by big, bouncy breeds. Also more user friendly for the elderly people who have smaller dogs and want them to be safe in a dog park environment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Until you’ve had your pet attacked you just don’t think it will happen-it so does!! It only takes one dickhead with a big dog to rip apart a small dog &amp; you’re all there for a lovely walk off the lead aren’t you? …… then if you are on your own &amp; have no car with you, how do you get help for your pet (&amp; possibly for yourself from getting in the middle of it) ASAP?! You can harp on about not letting your dog run up to another dog but people Do Not Listen or Heed the warnings &amp; Advice. I dread the first incident.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dog parks are quite hazardous to people and dogs. Untrained dogs, naive owners who think socialisation means dogs need other dogs. An option to support this would be off leash areas in every town.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>they are a place for owners to let their dogs run free without the worry of them being attacked or frightened away. consideration could be given to sectioning between small and large dogs. great initiaite also for tourists to let their dogs exercise and run free.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since moving to the Barossa I have established a Rescue Greyhound Walking Group Called Barossa Greys. We meet monthly and alternate the Tanunda-Angaston-Nuriootpa, since establishing the group in Feb 2018 we have 18 Greyhounds recorded in our Group. A number of our members meet daily and would utilise an official Dog Park.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog parks are quite hazardous to people and dogs. Untrained dogs, naive owners who think socialisation means dogs need other dogs. An option to support this would be off leash areas in every town.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not many fenced areas dogs can run these days.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heinamann Park would make a great park. Needs a bit more fencing, some weed control and a water tap. The costs would be minimal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heinamann Park would make a great park. Needs a bit more fencing, some weed control and a water tap. The costs would be minimal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since moving to the Barossa I have established a Rescue Greyhound Walking Group Called Barossa Greys. We meet monthly and alternate the Tanunda-Angaston-Nuriootpa, since establishing the group in Feb 2018 we have 18 Greyhounds recorded in our Group. A number of our members meet daily and would utilise an official Dog Park.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get it done. It’s essential these days to have a dog park. I can’t believe we need to go to these measures to get a dog park. Such a basic community facility.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our dogs need space to run free. It benefits the dog to socialise. There is space at Tanunda and Angaston for one.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I currently take our two dogs Heinmann park to exercise them. Having a dedicated dog park would be a wonderful place to take them to exercise and socialise them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not many fenced areas dogs can run these days.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have nuce family parks so why not nice dog parks. Owners should be responsible for their dogs behaviour. Grey hound owners should also have an opportunity to have a safe place for their own kind to run free.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’d prefer a large dog park split into two sections, one for larger dogs and for smaller dogs. They sides can be rotated so there is even wear and tear on the surfaces (note North Adelaide Dog Park Robe Terrace for example). A secure boundary fence is the top priority, there currently is no safe and secure fenced area to allow dogs to run off leash.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I really think the barossa community would benefit from a park, as at present we are travelling to Munno para each time just to use the dog park facilities. Once at the park the feeling of satisfaction to see my dog interacting and playing with others is so rewarding, and really brings other dog owners and families together to provide a great atmosphere. Please, let barossa have a dog park, and let's treat our pups to a happy place.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heinamann Park would make a great park. Needs a bit more fencing, some weed control and a water tap. The costs would be minimal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every other council has at least one dog park and we need a safe area to exercise our dogs. There needs to be an area for small dogs and an area for all dogs. Perfect example is the West Torrens dog park. Well thought out. We don’t need tunnels and agility equipment. That’s a waste of money. Visitors to the Barossa with dogs will also benefit from a dog park. The council has to recognise the need for a dog park and give us one. We have waited long enough.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seperate areas for small dogs are a good idea. Parking close to the dog parks should be considered. Approach dog service providers for advertising funds to ease the pressure on cost. Rally dog schools to run puppy and obedience classes to increase usage. Encourage all dog owners to bring their pets along to open days.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to have rules chart and people pick up own manure,well behaved dogs only,we come in to Barossa a few times per week and would be great,in Nuriootpa preferably</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those who wish to own dogs should not be subsidised by those who don’t. Each owner should be responsible for their own animal's welfare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog parks also attract visitors to the Barossa.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog parks provide a great opportunity for the community to engage and for dogs to exercise without being restrained by a dog lead or harness. Current registration rates for dogs should provide more than enough funds for the maintenance of more dog parks if managed effectively and efficiently.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>Dog parks are important for the socialisation of dogs and are a great place for the community to meet. They are a social hub for many different people. Socialisation and exercise of dogs in a safe environment contributes greatly to the well-being of the dog and creates a more harmonious dog community. Being unable to exercise and/or socialise your dog in a suitable safe environment may increase stress in animals, increase in barking and other anti-social behaviour.</td>
<td>7/18/2018 3:42 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>Important o have signage about aggression/ behaviour and body language to look out for.</td>
<td>7/18/2018 12:39 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>Please, we need somewhere safe to run our dogs off the lead!</td>
<td>7/18/2018 12:25 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td>Awesome idea!</td>
<td>7/18/2018 11:59 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>Dog parks are not only great for a dog's health but are also a great place for people to meet socially with their pets and an effective stress reliever for the pet owners who use them.</td>
<td>7/18/2018 11:57 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>For well-being and health and happiness of many residents (human and canine) a dog park would be a wonderful asset to the Barossa. Personally I would have not issue paying extra dog rego to cover costs. Maybe you could add a surcharge to people who say they will use it so as not to penalise non-users (honesty system I guess)</td>
<td>7/18/2018 11:39 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>When thinking of the position of the park be reasonable where you decide also why not think of 2 small parks instead of 1 large park plus think of car parking spaces for the dog users</td>
<td>7/18/2018 11:37 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>Separation of small dogs from larger breeds.</td>
<td>7/18/2018 11:35 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>It would be helpful to a park that has a number of areas so that larger and smaller dogs could be separated for off-lead activity - that is the reason I have selected Large for the size. Whilst the initial land needs to be allocated by the council, I am certain there would be local businesses who would sponsor the park providing materials and labor to assist with its construction. There are people within the community who would volunteer to assist with construction etc.</td>
<td>7/18/2018 11:31 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>It will have to be placed away from homes and nearby properties would have to be informed before it went ahead. Not everyone is a dog lover</td>
<td>7/18/2018 11:08 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>7/18/2018 10:21 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>With a young dog that is still learning to recall off lead it is vital that we have access to a fenced area at the very least that dogs can safely run, play and socialise as currently there isnst anywhere I can safely take her off lead. Having moved here from Adelaide where there were a number of fenced areas we could take our old dog it is something we are really missing here in the Barossa.</td>
<td>7/18/2018 10:17 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>ease take the time to visit the Burra Dog Park - all up cost $26K - check with Goyder Council - all funded from registration fees - you don't need to spend hundreds of thousands</td>
<td>7/18/2018 9:18 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>7/18/2018 7:42 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>agasdsdfa</td>
<td>7/17/2018 8:28 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>Dogs need to have space to run free for their mental health as well as physical health. With housing blocks becoming smaller dogs need somewhere to run in safety.</td>
<td>7/16/2018 8:26 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>So long as the deadly toxicariation is monitored and the dog mess and bins regularly disinfected by professionals then the park will be safe.</td>
<td>7/16/2018 7:10 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>Plenty of unused space along William Dyer Drv in Williamstown, including next to the existing park. Just pop up a fence and high five yourself over a job well done :)</td>
<td>7/16/2018 4:04 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>Question: why do we not already have a secure off-leash facility, like most other councils in SA? While I appreciate this facility may not cater to the entire community - just like many other council projects, such as the $7m cultural hub - it is a vital piece of infrastructure which promotes a happy, healthy lifestyle. The social benefits also can not be ignored. According to council, the total revenue from dog registration fees in 2017-18 was $217,851. I am sure this would cover any required ongoing maintenance costs which were not covered by any surplus from the state government's $100,000 commitment.</td>
<td>7/16/2018 2:48 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>Dog parks provide opportunities for residents to off leash their dogs in a safe environment which is good for dogs and residents well being. As there are regularly roaming dogs in Williamstown it may also go some way to providing a place for people to excercise their dogs in a more appropriate space. Dog parks are also useful spaces to preserve parkland areas with multi use benefits. We could also look at community support to maintain the facilities, perhaps a dog groups could co-ordinate care efforts to help reduce the costs.</td>
<td>7/16/2018 12:53 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In order to keep costs down I'm sure here in Williamstown it would not be too difficult to organise a "Friends of the dog park" group to help with maintenance. With the number of main roads in our town the dog park would offer a safer alternative for many people than walking the streets. This is especially so if you are elderly or have young children.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>There are so many places to walk dogs both on leash and off leash in the Barossa, that the money can be better used in the community. Please contact councils that have dog parks and ask what problems they have had eg Mildura. There have been dog attacks with people (grey nomads) placing non socialized dogs into the parks which cause fights. Contact dog trainers in the Stirling area to see what they think of dog parks. Dog says &quot;that's my ball and I'm not sharing with you&quot; hence a dog fight. Stirling Council has apparently now removed some off lead areas, so people won't take their dogs to the park for fear of little Fido being attacked. Please talk to dog trainers in both these areas, Mildura and Birdwood areas before making any decisions.</td>
<td>8/8/2018 7:36 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>We have lots of parks and open spaces already. If you cant control your dog in a open space then I see these dog getting in to trouble with other dog in this proposed park as their owners have no control.</td>
<td>8/7/2018 11:21 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Because we wouldn't take our border collie to a dog park.</td>
<td>8/7/2018 6:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>There are better things to spend money on. Like more lighting in Tanunda streets, or upgrade playgrounds for children, creating a Hub for the youth.</td>
<td>8/3/2018 7:28 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>We have a lot of areas in the Barossa to walk our dogs, also with dogs running around off lead can attack other dogs and humans, there is a lot more important items on the list that are more important, eg new hospital</td>
<td>8/1/2018 6:25 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>There are plenty of green spaces you can walk your dog in the Barossa - an separate park is an unnecessary expense.</td>
<td>8/1/2018 5:29 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Not needed in this semi rural area. Council would have to bare the ongoing costs to maintain. I have a dog but do not support my financial contribution through my rates payments be used for this project. This is an expense that Barossa Council should not be initiating.</td>
<td>8/1/2018 5:16 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Definitely not as I don't have a problem with dogs, it's the disobedient dog owners that are the problem! If dog owners can't control their pets inside their yards how are they going to control them outside. And I can't see the Council wasting time on controlling them!</td>
<td>8/1/2018 1:29 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>There's no reason dogs can't be integral with our everyday life if dog owners are responsible with how their dogs are handled.</td>
<td>8/1/2018 12:32 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Dog owners will become complacent and not take ownership for the upkeep of such parks - then all ratepayers wear the burden!</td>
<td>8/1/2018 11:08 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Because that is where most dog fights are. People think there dog is in a safe environment and do not pay any attention to there dogs. They take no responsibility for what there dogs are doing. Also people take non immunised dogs into dog parks so spread diseases like parvovirus. There have been cases in Adelaide where the dog parks have to be closed because the area is infected. I would never take my dog into one.</td>
<td>7/29/2018 9:49 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Plenty of places to walk your dog on and off a lead already</td>
<td>7/28/2018 5:08 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Interaction of untrained dogs can be dangerous and lead to injury and litigation.</td>
<td>7/27/2018 11:29 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Only a minority get the benefit while the majority pay for it. If you buy a tiny house block don't buy a massive dog.</td>
<td>7/27/2018 11:01 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7/27/2018 10:02 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Cost of maintenance with limited funds which could be better utilised. Will only benefit residents living in the main centres as rural landholders have their own land for their dogs. Rural residents already support town residents to a large extent as most live on dirt roads &amp; do not utilise town facilities. Money would be better spent on a hospital for the area.</td>
<td>7/27/2018 10:52 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Rural area where there is plenty of room to put your dog on a leash, take a bag for poo and go for a walk or run. Too many lazy dog owners who don't clean up, just check out any roadsides, parks and streets in the Barossa at the moment. Unleashed untrained dogs running free and not under owner control should not be acceptable and dangerous.</td>
<td>7/27/2018 7:39 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>The cost. Money should be spent on necessities for rate payers.</td>
<td>7/26/2018 7:36 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
19 We have enough open spaces already, it's not like we are in the city. I'd rather funds were spent in other areas.

7/23/2018 12:41 PM

20 I believe there are much higher priorities for spending our rates. Like footpaths for example - or public transport! I live at the Tanunda end of Bethany Road with my very elderly mother who uses a walking frame. She is unable to go for walks because of the appalling state of the footpaths both close to home and in the township.

7/22/2018 3:50 PM

21 Absolutely not. Parks are for people, NOT dogs barking & defecating where ever & when the owners see fit, regardless of others who may wish to use the park. Not from our rates thank you.

7/21/2018 3:24 PM

22 I was disappointed in the Dog Park Survey questions that seemed to imply such a facility as a given. How can Council even think of such a proposal for animals when there are so many elderly people in the Barossa in need of compassion and support? Those who wish to own dogs should not be subsidised by Council with resources that should be directed first and foremost to those who pay rates. I have nothing against dogs (other than the annoying barking of those in our neighbour’s yard) but I draw the line on Council using tax-payer funds to provide a facility for dogs just because it seems to have become a popular and fashionable thing to do so. Will registered dog owners have an extra fee attached to their rates for the use of such a Park, and conversely will those who choose not to own dogs be given a discount? I think not! Councillors should get a hold of yourselves and see that they are there as a service to the betterment and welfare of human beings before animals.

7/19/2018 5:01 PM

23 Cost too great compared to benefit

7/19/2018 4:10 PM

24 Use open spaces already available. Money could be better spent policing dog owners to pick up poo

7/19/2018 4:06 PM

25 In my view the anticipated usage compared to construction and maintenance costs does not provide enough benefit/value per person compared with other discretionary services. We have multiple ovals and ovals in our region that provides the same opportunity currently with no extra resources required.

7/19/2018 4:01 PM

26 People don't control their dogs when their are meant to be on lead.

7/19/2018 3:48 PM

27 see below

7/19/2018 3:29 PM

28 Test

7/19/2018 9:48 AM

29 My dog was attacked & died from that attack walking my local streets in Tanunda, because people are dumb & some dog owners don’t know or care how to train/look after their dog properly-you’ll be fenced in together & the possibility of an attack is still high & I do not wish this to happen to anyone’s beloved pet, it’s hell to witness/go through, for me it was like losing a child (yes I have children to know) I do not walk my dogs on public roads/among houses, I definitely won’t take them to a dog park.

7/19/2018 9:02 AM

30 More important to provide facilities for humans, particularly the aging ones.

7/18/2018 5:44 PM

31 I dont own a dog and don't want to increase my rates by paying for something I'm not going to use. I'm sure many of the rate payers would agree. Plus i work nights and dont want a park at my property with dogs barking while i'm sleeping .

7/18/2018 11:08 AM

32 na

7/17/2018 8:28 PM

33 Yes! brings people together, introduces neighbours and builds community spirit. Also gives the dogs a chance to run around tiring them out and preventing excessive barking.

7/16/2018 4:04 PM
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7.4.1 DEBATE AGENDA – DIRECTOR WORKS AND ENGINEERING SERVICES

7.4.1.1 PROPOSED ROAD CLOSURE – 2018 TANUNDA CHRISTMAS PAGEANT

B7475

PURPOSE
Tanunda Christmas Pageant Committee has applied to The Barossa Council for support as they plan the 2018 Tanunda Christmas Pageant on Friday 7 December 2018.

RECOMMENDATION
That the Commissioner of Police be advised that The Barossa Council endorses the closure of the following roads:

- Murray Street, Tanunda from Theodor Street to the Northern Archway, and
- Bilyara Road, Tanunda from Elizabeth Street to Park Street, and
- Elizabeth Street, Tanunda for a distance of approximately 80 metres from Murray Street, and
- Basedow Road, Tanunda between Murray Street and McDonnell Street

between 5.00pm and 10.00pm,

on Friday 7 December 2018 to stage the 2018 Tanunda Christmas Pageant.

REPORT

Background
Council has supported township Christmas parades for many years by organising and implementing the required road closures for the events.

Introduction
The 2018 Tanunda Christmas Parade will require a street closure and diversion of traffic on the night and Council operations staff will be required to provide this support.

Organisers have requested an earlier commencement for the 2018 Parade, however, Officers maintain a 5.00pm start as in previous years is appropriate to allow all local traders maximum trading time on the day.

Summary and Conclusion
Council Operations staff has further assisted the local community to prepare and stage this event with assistance in the following areas:-
· Putting up the Christmas banners by mid-November (the banners owned and stored by the Council, and they go up on the frames which have been installed by the Council)
· Street sweeping - as close as possible to the event
· Emptying of bins – also as close as possible to the event

Attending to these items enables the Committee to successfully host the event each year as per the Community Plan.

Council Officers will also request SAPOL direct that persons taking part in the ‘Barossa Christmas Parade’ on the above roads be exempted from all Australian Road Rules relating to pedestrian behaviour on roads.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMUNITY PLAN / CORPORATE PLAN / LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="Community and Culture" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="Health and Wellbeing" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="Business and Employment" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.1 Initiate and support activities which encourage participation and pride in the Barossa Council area.

2.6 Support a vibrant and growing arts, cultural, heritage and events sector.

4.2 Create opportunities for people of all ages and abilities to participate in the community.

5.13 Support economic development through events.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislative Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Government Act 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Traffic Act 1961</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FINANCIAL, RESOURCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT CONSIDERATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial and Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The in-kind cost and implementation of the road closure is to be met by Council via Council’s Road Closure – Support budget.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk management -</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council officers deem the closure necessary as a risk mitigation strategy to maintain the safety of participants and the general public. Council staff will closely monitor the road closure and reopen the road/s as soon as practical after the conclusion of the event.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMUNITY CONSULTATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The community will be advised of the proposal by public advertisements to be placed in The Herald and Leader and also via placement of the SAPOL notice on Council’s website.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.4.1 DEBATE AGENDA – DIRECTOR WORKS AND ENGINEERING SERVICES

7.4.1.2 PROPOSED ROAD CLOSURE – 2018 BOTT ADELAIDE HILLS RALLY B7475

**PURPOSE**

Ultimate Motorsport Events has applied to The Barossa Council for support as they plan the 2018 Adelaide Hills Rally on Sunday 23 September 2018.

**RECOMMENDATION**

That the Commissioner of Police be advised that The Barossa Council endorses the closure of the following road:

Starkey Road, Mount Crawford between Cricks Mill Road and Glen Devon Road between 7.00am and 2.00pm,

on Sunday 23 September 2018 to stage the 2018 BOTT Adelaide Hills Rally.

**REPORT**

**Background**

The dates for the 2018 BOTT Adelaide Hills Rally will be from 21 – 23 September based at the Mount Barker Showgrounds and traversing the greater Adelaide Hills Region.

The BOTT Adelaide Hills Rally will be the penultimate round of the 2018 CAMS Australian Rally Championship, and the finale of the South Australian Rally Championship.

**Summary and Conclusion**

The Rally will require a road closure and diversion of traffic on race day and organisers have engaged Workzone Traffic Control Pty Ltd to implement and monitor the closure.

**COMMUNITY PLAN / CORPORATE PLAN / LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS**

Community Plan

- Community and Culture
- Health and Wellbeing
- Business and Employment
2.1 Initiate and support activities which encourage participation and pride in the Barossa Council area.

2.6 Support a vibrant and growing arts, cultural, heritage and events sector.

4.2 Create opportunities for people of all ages and abilities to participate in the community.

5.13 Support economic development through events.

Legislative Requirements
Local Government Act 1999
Road Traffic Act 1961

**FINANCIAL, RESOURCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT CONSIDERATIONS**

**Financial and Resources**
The cost and implementation of the road closure and associated advertising is to be met by the organisers.

**Risk management**
Council officers deem the closure necessary as a risk mitigation strategy to maintain the safety of participants and the general public.

**COMMUNITY CONSULTATION**
The community will be advised of the proposal by public advertisements to be placed in The Herald and Leader and also via placement of the SAPOL notice on Council’s website.
COUNCIL
WORKS AND ENGINEERING SERVICES
DIRECTOR’S REPORT
21 AUGUST 2018

7.4.1 DEBATE AGENDA – DIRECTOR WORKS AND ENGINEERING SERVICES

7.4.1.3
2018 MOUNT PLEASANT CHRISTMAS STREET PARTY
B7475 18/50748

PURPOSE
Mount Pleasant Christmas Street Party Committee has applied to The Barossa Council for support as they plan the 2018 Mount Pleasant Christmas Street Party on Saturday 1 December 2018.

RECOMMENDATION
That the Commissioner of Police be advised that The Barossa Council endorses the closure of:–

Melrose Street, Mount Pleasant from McGormans Road to Saleyard Road between 5.00pm and 6.00pm, and

Melrose Street, Mount Pleasant from Saleyard Road to Phillis Street between 5.00pm and 10.00pm,

on Saturday 1 December 2018 to stage the 2018 Mount Pleasant Christmas Street Party.

REPORT

Discussion
Application has been received from the Mount Pleasant Progress Association requesting Council assistance and support for the 2018 Mount Pleasant Christmas Street Party.

Organisers have requested an earlier commencement time for the closures, however, Officers maintain a 5.00pm start is appropriate to allow local traders maximum trading time on the day.

Summary and Conclusion
Council has supported this event for many years by assisting the local community to prepare and stage this event and by organising and implementing the road closures for the event.

The proposed road closure is pursuant to Section 33 of the Road Traffic Act 1961.
COMMUNITY PLAN / CORPORATE PLAN / LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS

Community Plan

- Community and Culture
- Health and Wellbeing
- Business and Employment

2.1 Initiate and support activities which encourage participation and pride in the Barossa Council area.

2.6 Support a vibrant and growing arts, cultural, heritage and events sector.

4.2 Create opportunities for people of all ages and abilities to participate in the community.

5.13 Support economic development through events.

Legislative Requirements
Local Government Act 1999
Road Traffic Act 1961

FINANCIAL, RESOURCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT CONSIDERATIONS

Financial and Resources -
The in-kind cost and implementation of the road closure is to be met by Council via Council’s Road Closure – Support budget.

Risk management –
Council officers deem the closure necessary as a risk mitigation strategy to maintain the safety of participants and the general public.

Council staff will closely monitor the road closure and reopen the road/s as soon as practical after the conclusion of the event.

COMMUNITY CONSULTATION
The community will be advised of the proposal by public advertisements to be placed in the Herald and Leader and also via placement of the SAPOL notice on Council’s website.
7.5.1 DEBATE AGENDA – DEVELOPMENT SERVICES REPORT

7.5.1.1

NURIOOTPA (STURT HIGHWAY SERVICE CENTRE) DEVELOPMENT PLAN AMENDMENT – AUTHORISATION FOR CONSULTATION

B6245

Author: Paul Mickan, Principal Planner

PURPOSE
To receive and endorse the draft Nuriootpa (Sturt Highway Service Centre) Development Plan Amendment (DPA) and to authorise public and agency consultation to commence following the induction of the new Council and receipt of a briefing on the DPA.

RECOMMENDATION
That:

(1) The draft Nuriootpa (Sturt Highway Service Centre Development Plan Amendment) be endorsed for public and agency consultation.

(2) Noting the provisions of Clause 4.4 of Council’s Caretaker Policy public and agency consultation be undertaken following induction of the new Council after the election to be held on 10 November 2018 and receipt of a briefing on the project and that the Chief Executive Officer be authorised to set the commencement date of consultation thereafter.

(3) The Chief Executive Officer be authorised to make any necessary minor amendments to the draft Development Plan Amendment prior to public consultation.

REPORT

Background
At its meeting on 18 July 2017 Council agreed to initiate a developer funded Development Plan amendment process to facilitate a highway service centre and associated facilities at 7 Belvidere Road, Nuriootpa (corner Sturt Highway). Council also resolved that the draft DPA be presented to Council for endorsement prior to commencing consultation (Refer Agenda Item 7.5.2.1, Resolution 2014-18/1136).
A subsequent update was provided to Council at its meeting on 20 March 2018 (Refer Consensus Agenda item 4.5.4.1).

Access Planning consultants have now prepared a draft DPA document in consultation with Council staff and have co-ordinated various supporting investigations (refer to draft DPA in Attachment 1). The draft DPA document is considered to be suitable for public and agency consultation subject to minor formatting and insertion of consultation dates.

Consultation period
Immediate commencement of consultation would see the consultation running concurrently with a portion of the forthcoming election period. Accordingly consideration needs to be given to how this should be dealt with under Council’s Caretaker Policy.

Endorsement of the DPA for consultation is not a ‘Designated Decision’; however it is considered to have the characteristics of a ‘significant decision’ which will significantly affect the community. Under the Caretaker Policy a ‘major policy’ decision such as conducting unplanned public consultation is considered to be a significant decision, and while Council would only be endorsing the DPA for consultation and not binding the incoming Council to the proposed policy changes, the community may perceive that commencement of public consultation is an indication of overall support for the project, bar finalisation of the specific development policies. This position has been discussed with the proponent who acknowledges and understands the situation.

It is therefore recommended that Council endorse the draft document and that the Chief Executive Officer sign off on the final consultation documents on the basis that consultation only commences after the new Council has been inducted and suitably briefed on the DPA and proposed policy changes.

Following consultation a subsequent report on any public submissions and agency comments will be presented to a future Strategic Planning and Development Policy Committee or Council meeting.

**ATTACHMENTS OR OTHER SUPPORTING REFERENCES**
Attachment 1: Draft Nuriootpa (Sturt Highway Service Centre) DPA

**COMMUNITY PLAN / CORPORATE PLAN / LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS**

**Community Plan**

- Natural Environment and Built Heritage

**Corporate Plan**

1.11 Provide transparent, efficient and effective development assessment processes and regulatory activities.

**Legislative Requirements**
- Development Act 1993
- Development Regulation 2008
**FINANCIAL, RESOURCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT CONSIDERATIONS**

**Financial**
A previously endorsed Deed of Agreement provides for a contribution from the developer to cover out of pocket expenses but also provides scope for additional resources to be recovered from the developer to cover any additional or unforeseen costs and tasks.

**Resource**
Refer above discussion.

**Risk**
The Deed of Agreement and various legislative provisions ensure that Council will control the DPA process including the right to decide not to proceed with the DPA at any stage. However given the current planning reforms the potential exists for the Minister for Planning to not approve a final DPA with an associated risk of wasted staff resources. Alternatively the project could be delayed significantly if any proposed policy approach is only able to be incorporated into the forthcoming Planning and Design Code via a new and unknown ‘designated instrument’ amendment process.

**COMMUNITY CONSULTATION**
Consultation will take place in accordance with legislative requirements, but in addition will include direct mail to all land owners in the vicinity of the land together with a non-statutory community information session.
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The Amendment ........................................................................................................ 1
### Have Your Say

This Development Plan Amendment (DPA) will be available for inspection by the public at "Click and Type" from "Insert Consultation Start Date" until "Insert Consultation Close Date".

During this time anyone may make a written submission about any of the changes the DPA is proposing.

Submissions should be sent to "Click and Type".

Submissions should indicate whether the author wishes to speak at a public meeting about the DPA. If no-one requests to be heard, no public meeting will be held.

If requested, a meeting will be held on "Click and Type" at "Click and Type".
Explanatory Statement

Introduction

The Development Act 1993 provides the legislative framework for undertaking amendments to a Development Plan. The Development Act 1993 allows either the relevant council or, under prescribed circumstances, the Minister responsible for the administration of the Development Act 1993 (the Minister), to amend a Development Plan.

Before amending a Development Plan, a council must first reach agreement with the Minister regarding the range of issues the amendment will address. This is called a Statement of Intent. Once the Statement of Intent is agreed to, a Development Plan Amendment (DPA) (this document) is written, which explains what policy changes are being proposed and why, and how the amendment process will be conducted.

A DPA may include:
- An Explanatory Statement (this section)
- Analysis, which may include:
  - Background information
  - Investigations
  - Recommended policy changes
  - Statement of statutory compliance
- References/Bibliography
- Certification by Council's Chief Executive Officer
- Appendices
- The Amendment.

Need for the amendment

The proposed amendment seeks to facilitate the development of an integrated highway service centre that will provide refuelling facilities for cars and trucks, a rest stop area for trucks in particular, food outlet/restaurants and associated land uses for the travelling public. It is also proposed to include a road train marshalling area, RV dump point, toilets and playground/outdoor eating facilities for travellers.

The recent commencement of works associated with the Northern Connector road project; a critical component of Adelaide’s North-South corridor, which will link the Northern Expressway to the Port River Expressway and South Road; and which, together with the Torrens to Torrens upgrade of South Road, will enable an almost non-stop traffic corridor from the River Torrens to Nuriootpa, bypassing the current fuel stops along Port Wakefield Road at Bolivar.

Fuel stops are available on the southern end of the Sturt Highway at Nuriootpa, at a small facility at Truro, but the then next available fuel stop on the outward north bound side of the Sturt Highway is only found at Blanchetown.

The subject land is well placed to provide an integrated highway rest centre including the above-mentioned facilities.

The subject land is presently zoned Primary Production (Barossa Valley Region), within which all forms of development are listed as being non-complying, save a limited number of exceptions.

Development of the subject land for the facilities proposed as part of an integrated highway rest stop would be non-complying under the present provisions of the Development Plan.

Positionally, the land is ideally located to accommodate an integrated highway service centre. It is located about an hour’s drive from Adelaide, a similar distance to the traditional rest stops at Tailem Bend and Port Wakefield. In addition, it is located at the end of the dual carriageway so is a perfect spot for drivers to take a break before proceeding on the more challenging conditions of the single lane highway further east, or to the
north to the Clare Valley. Furthermore, it is in an area where accessible road stops with facilities are very limited, particularly for trailered or articulated vehicles.

All of the above indicators support a change to development policies applying to the land to accommodate a highway service centre of the kind envisaged.

**Statement of Intent**

The Statement of Intent relating to this DPA was agreed to by the Minister on 6 December 2017.

The issues and investigations agreed to in the Statement of Intent have been undertaken or addressed.

**Affected area**

The land in question is located on the north-west corner of the intersection of the Sturt Highway and Belvidere Road, Nuriootpa. The site is 7 Belvidere Road, Nuriootpa (formally identified as Allotment 147, Filed Plan 176219. Certificate of Title Volume 6008 Folio 939).

![Figure 1: Area Affected](image-url)

The area affected is a roughly triangular shaped parcel of the land with an area of some 10.6ha and a frontage to the Sturt Highway of some 520m, a corner cut off to Belvidere Road of some 81m and a frontage to Belvidere Road of some 44m.

The land contains a winery, which is confined largely to the north western corner of the property, the remainder of the land being given over to a vineyard.

The land is relatively flat and apart from scattered trees is devoid of more significant vegetation.
Land to the north is used by the Barossa go-kart club and contains a track which occupies a small section of the property, the remainder of which is largely given over to native vegetation.

To the east and west land is in primary production comprising open grazing land generally to the west, with vineyards to the east. To the south lie the outskirts of Nuriootpa Township.

A significant feature of the locality is the alignment of the Sturt Highway, a primary arterial road comprising one lane in each direction but with long acceleration and deceleration lanes leading to the intersection of the Highway with Belvidere Road.

![Figure 2: Location of the Area Affected relative to Nuriootpa](image)

### Summary of proposed policy changes

The DPA proposes the following changes:

- Retain the land in the Primary Production (Barossa Valley Region) Zone but introduce a new Policy Area over the land, (Nuriootpa Sturt Highway Service Centre Policy Area 13), with policies specific to the nature of the existing and proposed land uses, including but not limited to:
  - Restaurant or café facilities (excluding the sale of alcohol);
  - Convenience retail shop not exceeding 250m² in floor area;
  - Service station providing fueling facilities for both cars and commercial vehicles;
  - Parking for vehicles, including recreational vehicles, heavy vehicles (trucks and buses), and cars;
  - Rest areas, playground and public amenities, including free access toilets;
  - Emergency services facilities;
  - Rest facilities for transport drivers;
  - Marshalling yards to enable B Double transports to be broken down to component trailers for transport off site;
  - Charging points for electric vehicles;
  - Controlled signage;
  - Dump points to dispose of black and grey water from recreational vehicles.

- Introduce a list of Category 1 and 2 land uses relative to the Policy Area.
Legal requirements

Prior to the preparation of this DPA, council received advice from a person or persons holding prescribed qualifications pursuant to section 25(4) of the Development Act 1993.

The DPA has assessed the extent to which the proposed amendment:
▪ accords with the Planning Strategy
▪ accords with the Statement of Intent
▪ accords with other parts of council’s Development Plan
▪ complements the policies in Development Plans for adjoining areas
▪ accords with relevant infrastructure planning
▪ satisfies the requirements prescribed by the Development Regulations 2008.

Consultation

This DPA is now released for formal agency consultation with:

▪ Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure
▪ Department of State Development
▪ Primary Industries and Regions SA
▪ Regional Development Australia (RDA) - Barossa
▪ Primary Producers SA
▪ South Australian Freight Council (SAFC).
▪ South Australian Road Transport Association
▪ Department of Environment and Water
▪ Country Fire Service
▪ Department of the Premier and Cabinet - Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation Division
▪ Department of Primary Industries and Regions SA
▪ Department of Treasury and Finance
▪ Environment Protection Authority
▪ SA Power Networks
▪ SA Water
▪ South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service
▪ South Australian Police
▪ State Emergency Services
▪ South Australian Tourism Commission
▪ Federal Member of Parliament
▪ Mr. Tony Pasin MP Member for Barker
▪ State Members of Parliament
▪ Mr. Stephan Knoll MP Member for Schubert

Preliminary consultation has also occurred with the following key stakeholders:

Regional Development Australia - Barossa
▪ Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure - Transport Division
▪ South Australian Road Transport Association

This DPA is now released for formal public consultation.

All written and verbal, agency and public submissions made during the consultation phase will be recorded, considered, summarised and responses provided. Subsequent changes to the DPA may occur as a result of this consultation process.
The final stage

When the council has considered the comments received and made any appropriate changes, a report on this (the Summary of consultations and proposed amendments report) will be sent to the Minister.

The Minister will then either approve (with or without changes) or refuse the DPA.
Analysis

1. Background

The highway network in South Australia is expanding with the Northern Connector and Torrens to Torrens projects to provide freeway like conditions effectively running from the River Torrens to just outside of Nuriootpa.

The land the subject of this rezoning is located about an hour drive from Adelaide and so is well placed to provide an opportunity for drivers to break their trip and have a rest prior to proceeding either into Adelaide or further east along the highway to the Riverland or eastern states.

The provision of rest areas for motorists and heavy vehicle drivers is identified as an integral part of an overall approach to the management of driver fatigue on South Australian roads. Fatigue is recognised as one of the ‘Fatal Five’ as a major contributor to the road toll across the country. Some estimates suggest that driver fatigue is a factor in up to 30 per cent of fatal crashes and up to 15 per cent of serious injuries requiring hospitalisation.

The primary objective of a highway service centre is to improve driver safety by providing safe, convenient and accessible services and facilities which encourage drivers to stop and take an effective rest break during a journey, thereby alleviating driver fatigue. Highway rest centres provide the opportunity for highway users to stop and rest when they otherwise would not because:

- The turn off to a bypassed town has been passed inadvertently;
- The distance to travel to a nearby town is uncertain or perceived to be too great or inconvenient; and
- The services required may not be available in adjoining or nearby towns on a 24-hour basis or during night-time hours.

With road safety a major issue, providing readily accessible rest centres that provide a range of services and amenities for drivers is becoming a very important part of highway planning. Such highway rest centres have been in evidence in Europe and the US for many years, just have they have been in Victoria and NSW, with Queensland and WA recognising the benefits of these facilities in more recent times.

On average, and given usual road conditions, the availability of rest opportunities at a preferred distance of 80 to 100km apart meets the needs of both motorists and drivers of heavy vehicles, providing for a drive time of approximately 1 hour between each rest opportunity.

From a functional perspective, and as evidenced by some of the policy approached identified above, highway rest stops are a now common feature of highways in other states where is has been recognised that they provide a significant benefit in terms of highway safety and convenience to the travelling public.

Specifically, the inclusion of a road train marshalling area as an envisaged use has arisen from discussions with Regional Development Australia (RDA) Barossa, who in 2015, together with the State Government conducted a project investigating transport issues that are holding back the South Australian Regional Economy. The Project was led by PIRSA and partnered by DPTI and had involvement from Rod Kerin and strong representation from Primary Producers SA, Regional Development Australia and major freight companies.

The following is an extract from a First Mile/Last Mile Analysis prepared by the South Australian Freight Council (SAFC).

“The addition of the Northern Connector will allow high efficiency vehicles to operate direct between some large wineries (with B-double access) and major export hubs at Penfield and Outer Harbour but many smaller to medium sized wineries who export are dotted throughout the Barossa on local roads and can

1 Road Safety in Australia A Publication Commemorating World Health Day 2004; Australian Transport Safety Bureau pp132
never get B-double or A-Double access. So, a staging/hitching point adjacent the Sturt Highway will be highly beneficial to allow many other wineries to realise lower transport costs and greater competitiveness. In all this will benefit the global advantage of the wine industry and aid hay, grain and other agricultural commodities."

RDA Barossa have advised that; “moving freight to B-Double and A-Double will improve efficiency by 50% and 25% respectively.

RDA Barossa estimates that each year there is on average 700,000 – 800,000 tonnes of grape related product transported; over 500,000 tonnes of hay, not including other stock feed, livestock, grain and general commodities. Transport SA in 2004 estimated more that 2 million tonnes of goods are transported around the Barossa each year, let alone what that figure might now be across a broader region and a decade later. All these products are components of a significant freight logistic equation the region, which is a significant industry in itself.

Nationally, movement of freight is expected to increase by 100% between 2009 and 2029, increasing demand for freight movement facilities and for amenities for drivers.

RDA Barossa have advised that “the development of a freight transport hub as being highly valuable in servicing regional transports logistics, improving road safety by having a rest area for freight operators and potentially providing a staging/hitching point for high efficiency vehicles to allow them to consolidate freight brought in on the local road network.”

The land is very well located in respect to freight movement generally throughout the region. In this regard Belvidere Road provides B -double access to the Clare Valley, and site is well placed for movement to the Riverland and eastern states.

The land has access to existing acceleration and deceleration lanes from the Sturt Highway and can service both sides of the highway.

All of the above indicators support the rezoning of the land to accommodate a highway service centre of the kind envisaged.

2. The strategic context and policy directions

2.1 Consistency with South Australia’s Strategic Plan

South Australia’s Strategic Plan outlines a medium to long-term vision for the whole of South Australia. It has two important, complementary roles. Firstly, it provides a framework for the activities of the South Australian Government, business and the entire South Australian community. Secondly, it is a means for tracking progress state-wide, with the targets acting as points of reference that can be assessed periodically.

The DPA supports the following targets of South Australia’s Strategic Plan:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Plan Objective/Targets</th>
<th>Comment/Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target 4: Tourism industry</strong></td>
<td>Additional infrastructure such as the fuel and retail facility assist with both the attraction and retention of tourists to the region. There is also potential at the proposed site to establish additional tourism related services such as services for recreational vehicle waste disposal, electric car charging and tourism information. Bus services potentially using the site as a transitional pick up and drop off point for passengers travelling to and from the Barossa Region, which</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
South Australia’s Strategic Plan 2011

Target 21: Greater safety at work
Achieve a 40% reduction in injury by 2012 and a further 50% reduction by 2022

Target 22: Road safety
Reduce road fatalities and serious injuries by at least 30% by 2020

Target 35: Economic growth
Exceed the national economic growth rate over the period to 2020

Target 40: Food industry
Grow the contribution made by the South Australian food industry to $20 billion by 2020

Target 47: Jobs
Increase employment by 2% each year from 2010 to 2016

2.2 Consistency with the Planning Strategy

The Planning Strategy presents current State Government planning policy for development in South Australia. In particular, it seeks to guide and coordinate State Government activity in the construction and provision of services and infrastructure that influence the development of South Australia. It also indicates directions for future development to the community, the private sector and local government.

The following volumes of the Planning Strategy are relevant to this DPA:

The DPA will support the relevant volume of the Planning Strategy, the 30-Year Plan for Greater Adelaide, by implementing the following policies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Themes and Policies</th>
<th>How the policy will be implemented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transit corridors, growth areas and activity centres</td>
<td>The 30-Year Plan for Greater Adelaide (2017 Update)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P8 Provide retail and other services outside designated activity centres where they will contribute to the principles of accessibility, a transit-focused and connected city, high quality urban design, and economic growth and competitiveness.</td>
<td>The highway related service centre will provide facilities directed primarily to the travelling public and particularly to the transport industry. The land within the Affected Area is strategically located adjacent to a major freight route. It will provide an important service to the Barossa Region, particularly in respect to...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Policy Themes and Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Policy Themes and Policies</strong></th>
<th><strong>How the policy will be implemented:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>transport logistics, industry efficiencies and regional tourism, Access to and from the Sturt Highway will be of particular importance to ensure the safe and free flow of traffic on the adjoining road network. As identified above the development of a Highway Service Centre has significant economic benefits to the State and, more particularly, the local community, especially in the creation of employment opportunities, most of which will be generated locally.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### The economy and jobs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P58 Ensure that the Environment and Food Production Areas, Character Preservation Districts and planning policies work in an integrated way to:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• protect key primary production assets and opportunities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• facilitate local operating and investment conditions that support primary production and related agribusiness development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| P62 Manage the interface between townships and adjacent primary production activities and areas of nature protection. | The proposed development is not a sensitive land use for the purposes of its relationship with adjoining or potential future rural land uses in the locality and will be able to coexist with the existing adjoining low impact rural land uses. Adjoining uses to the north (go-kart track), to the east (vineyards) and to the west farmland with an adjoining farmhouse are generally non-sensitive land uses, the farmhouse being separated from the proposed development by the buildings of the Rocland Winery and a separation distance of some 250m. Noise attenuation is not considered to be required, and in as much as the interface is relevant, it will primarily relate to the visual relationship between the development and adjoining land uses. Highways service centres are a feature of highways in other states and more broadly throughout the world where they are often located in rural or sensitive landscapes without impacting on the productive capacity of adjoining land. To the extent that the development will provide economies in the shipping of rural produce it will have the potential to support investment in agribusiness. Policies for the Policy Area will seek to protect the existing winery and allow for its reasonable expansion in accordance with the present Zone policies. The land is ideally suited to range of transport related activities and as described above, is well placed relative the nature and siting of adjoining land uses to provide a suitable interface relationship. In so far as the development of the land will result in significant local employment opportunities the proposed rezoning is consistent with these policies. |  |

| P73 Provide sufficient strategic employment land options with direct access to major freight routes to support activities that require separation from housing and other sensitive land uses. |  |

### Transport

| P74 Ensure development does not adversely impact the transport function of freight and/or | The DPA will seek to ensure access to and from the land is able to be achieved in a manner that will ensure the safe |  |

---

b) 322
Policy Themes and Policies | How the policy will be implemented:
--- | ---
major traffic routes and maintains access to markets | and free flow of traffic on the adjoining road network in accordance with the requirements of DPTI.

Water

P115 Incorporate water-sensitive urban design in new developments to manage water quality, water quantity and water use efficiency and to support public stormwater systems. | The Affected Area is within the Barossa Prescribed Water Resources Area and The Gawler River catchment area. The Development Plan already includes WSUD principles under the Natural Resources module in the Development Plan and as such additional policies in relation to water use efficiency are not required, although it is proposed to investigate how stormwater runoff from the development may be used efficiently in the development.

2.3 Consistency with other key strategic policy documents

This DPA accords with other key policy documents in the following manner:

2.3.1 Department of Trade and Economic Development Strategic Directions 2011-2014 (Regional Development)
- Undertake projects that deliver significant economic development opportunities in regional areas.
- Promote regional participation in major project value chains.

2.3.2 State Tourism Plan
- Creating new and refreshed tourism developments in South Australia
- Ensuring external planning and policy impediments to sustainable tourism development are removed and that strategic investments are case managed through the development process
- Encouraging further investment in South Australia’s tourism assets and experiences.

2.3.3 The Integrated Transport and Land Use Plan 2015
- Fine-tuning, maintaining and better utilising our existing transport assets
- Developing and maintaining a planning system that ensures integrated transport and land use
- Enhancing vital freight and road traffic corridors
- Support for regional industry
- Greater freight productivity
- Making our transport system safer

The benefits of the development of a highway service centre have been canvassed above and are expected to result in positive outcomes around employment and local investment, both in the construction of the facility but also in the infrastructure development/extension required to service the development. The benefits to road safety and freight movement have also been addressed. The benefits to regional tourism are a little less obvious, but opportunities to promote the region and its tourism features to people that might just be passing through, does offer the opportunity to divert tourists to the region.

2.3.4 Council’s Strategic Directions Report

The Barossa Council’s Strategic Directions Report (prepared under Section 30 of the Development Act 1993) was finalised in December 2013. The purpose of the Strategic Directions Report was to ensure alignment between the policies and targets in the 30-Year Plan for Greater Metropolitan Adelaide and the Council’s Development Plan. The Council’s Strategic Directions Report did not specifically identify options for the development of highway related service functions, but at bullet point 3 below recognises, generically, “emerging projects” of strategic importance to the Council.
The Strategic Directions Report identifies the following:

- Achieving orderly and efficient development through the implementation of planning policies;
- Integrating transport and land-use policies within its area; and
- Any other project or initiatives considered to be of strategic importance by the Council.

### 2.3.5 Infrastructure Planning

Where relevant, a DPA must take into account relevant infrastructure planning (both physical and social infrastructure) as identified by Council (usually through the Strategic Directions Report), the Minister and/or other government agencies.

The following infrastructure planning is of relevance to this DPA:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council Infrastructure Planning</th>
<th>Response/Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extension of the Council CWMS to service the land.</td>
<td>Connection and any required improvements to the CWMS specifically arising from the development will be borne by the applicant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Government Agency Infrastructure Planning</th>
<th>Response/Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to and from the Sturt Highway.</td>
<td>Any works required on the Sturt Highway and at the intersection of Belvidere Road will be carried out by the applicant to DPTI requirements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.3.3 Current Ministerial and Council DPAs

This DPA has taken into account the following Ministerial and Council DPAs which are currently being processed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council DPAs</th>
<th>Response/Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ministerial DPAs</th>
<th>Response/Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.3.4 Existing Ministerial Policy

This DPA proposed changes to the following, existing Ministerial policy:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Ministerial Policy</th>
<th>Proposed Change and Justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Investigations

3.1 Investigations undertaken prior to the SOI

Prior to preparation of the Statement of Intent Hudson Howells were engaged to undertake an economic analysis of the development, a full copy of which is contained in Appendix A.

In summary, the economic analysis found that;

- During the construction phase the project is expected to peak at 141 full time employees (FTEs) with a contribution to Gross State Product (GSP) of $19.9 million.
- When fully operational, the project is estimated to support 295 FTEs, with a contribution to GSP of $25.4 million per annum.
- The benefit to the Barossa Region’s economic development is expected to peak at 94 FTEs with a contribution to GSP of $11.9 million during the construction phase and when fully operational, an estimated 220 FTEs, with contribution to the GSP of $17.9 million in the Barossa Region.
- Development cost is estimated at 15 million dollars, with much of this being put into the local economy through the use of local contractors.

3.2 Investigations undertaken to inform this DPA

In accordance with the Statement of Intent for this DPA the following investigations were identified as being necessary to inform this DPA:

- Review the most appropriate policy approach to facilitate the development while not restricting existing uses or future primary production related activities - for example, the introduction of an additional policy area or precinct to the Primary Production (Barossa Valley Region) Zone;
- Review Desired Character Statements and specific policy options to facilitate the development of an integrated highway service centre together with the existing use of the land for a winery;
- Investigate appropriate policy controls to prevent unanticipated and undesirable land use outcomes;
- Prepare where necessary, the development of a concept plan for the land affected by the DPA;
- The provision of a comprehensive infrastructure analysis that identifies all potential infrastructure issues that will have to be addressed in any subsequent development application, and provide a strategy which offers a funding solution for each of these issues;
- Importance of protecting residential and primary production land from conflicting land uses including, but not limited to traffic generation, noise emissions, hours of operation, amenity;
- Review the impacts from loss of primary production land;
- Investigate the existing land use mix and built form and landscape character within the Sturt Highway Corridor to guide the development of policy which is consistent with the objectives of the Character Preservation District Overlay and the Character Preservation (Barossa Valley) Act 2012;
- Undertake a landscape assessment to develop appropriate policy controls to ensure new built form, including advertising, will recognise, protect and enhance the special character of the Barossa Valley district while at the same time provide for the economic, social and physical well-being of the community;
- Provide scope for policy change and analyse the relative impact this would have on the functionality of existing zones, particularly the District Centre Zones, and the surrounding Council area; and
- Investigate access to and from the Sturt Highway and general traffic management impacts in the locality arising from the proposed development.
In approving the Statement of Intent, the Minister for Planning also required that the following matters be investigated.

- Consider and address design quality and visual amenity impacts, including the management of signage, on the special character of the district and approach to the Nuriootpa township as well as any impacts on primary production land.
- Prepare a Traffic Impact Statement, Road Safety Audit and concept plan for a future highway service centre in this location.
- Consider noise / air quality issues and wastewater management, including impacts on the capacity of the existing Community Wastewater Management System servicing the local area or options for alternate treatment and disposal of wastewaters.

The investigations are as follows:

### 3.2.1 Review the most appropriate policy approach, Review Desired Character Statements and specific policy options and Investigate appropriate policy controls

There are various definitions for Highway Service Centres in interstate planning jurisdictions, the most generic of which is the definition provided in the NSW Government’s Standard Instrument Local Environmental Plan, which defines such centres thus;

A highway service centre means a building or place used to provide refreshments and vehicle services to highway users. It may include any one or more of the following:

- Restaurant or café
- Take away food and drink premises
- Service stations and facilities for emergency vehicle towing and repairs
- Parking for vehicles
- Rest areas and public amenities.

NSW Transport – Roads and Maritime Services require that highway service centres;

- That the centre is open 24 hours a day, seven days a week
- That all traffic arrangements are safe and efficient
- Provide at least 25 heavy vehicle parking spaces (nominally to suit B-Doubles, with capacity to expand to cater for longer combinations in the future)
- A number of parking spaces for recreation vehicles and coaches
- The provision of children’s play areas and tourist information
- That use of toilets and other amenities be free of obligation to purchase goods or services
- Separate undercover fuel areas for heavy and light vehicles
- That no alcohol be sold on site.

Policy in Victoria seeks to ensure that;

- freeway service centres are appropriately designed and located.
- access to a freeway service centre from a freeway is designed to the requirements of the Roads Corporation.
- freeway service centres with access to a rural freeway provide only essential services and facilities which encourage drivers to stop and take an effective break at appropriate intervals in the interests of driver safety.
- any new freeway service centre meets an identifiable need to provide essential services and facilities along a freeway where those services and facilities are not readily available.
- the use of land for a freeway service centre does not adversely affect the amenity of surrounding land uses.

The policy in Victoria imposes a non-mandatory limit on retailing of convenience goods of not more than 240m².
In WA, policies pertaining to Freeway Service Centres are similar to the above but with non-mandatory limits on convenience shopping of up to 300m² and discouragement of drive-through facilities for take-away foods.

Management of signage and access to and from the highway is a significant feature of policies in all three of the above jurisdictions. Signage policy generally interstate seeks to limit signage to not more than 1 shared primary sign adjacent to the street alignment.

There are no specific zones for Highway Service Centres in Victoria or WA. In WA they are most often accommodated in Special Use Zones, and in Victoria they seem in large part to be located in Rural and Landscape zones adjoining highways, often on the outskirts of towns from which employees are sourced. This seems to be the same for NSW.

In NSW, Victoria and WA there are specific policy guidelines, which are not part of the relevant planning schemes for the development of such facilities. In Victoria the Planning Scheme contains specific provision for the development of Highway Service Centres.

Zoning options considered for the purposes of the DPA included consideration of locating the land in a Commercial zone, and in a specific policy area to accommodate both the highway service centre and wine industry activities. This approach was rejected as being impractical given that it was considered paramount that in the event of the development not taking place, that there were no impediments to the ongoing use of the land for primary production activities in accord with the present Primary Production (Barossa Valley Region) Zone.

It is therefore proposed to retain the land in the Primary Production (Barossa Valley Region) Zone and introduce a Policy Area specific to the subject land to accommodate the development of a highway service centre in addition to recognising the substantial existing investment in wine industry infrastructure on the land.

In the absence of a definition for a highway service centre in the Development Regulations 2008 and recognising the need to be specific about the range of land uses that might be appropriate in association with such a development, it is proposed to provide a comprehensive Desired Character statement and principles of development control that identify the range of land uses that would be associated with such a development.

This will include for example;

- Designated parking spaces for both light and heavy vehicles;
- Undercover and segregated fuel sales designed to cater for both light and heavy vehicles;
- Food and refreshment facilities, including indoor sit-down eating areas and take-away food outlets, excluding the sale of alcohol;
- Convenience store not exceeding 250 square metres;
- Comfortable and safe, free access toilets and washroom facilities;
- Public telecommunication facilities;
- Local and regional tourist information;
- Facilities for Emergency services;
- RV Dump point and facilities for charging electric vehicles;
- Outdoor picnic and eating areas and playground facilities for children.

The design, cladding, colour, scale and layout of the buildings will be important to the integration of the development into the landscape, noting that the land is located in the Character Preservation District.

**Location**

The NSW Department of Planning and other State and Federal jurisdictions\(^2\) have determined that highway service centres should be ideally be spaced 50 to 110km apart.

---

Highway service centres need to be located at strategic intervals along highways so that the demands of highway users are met in the interests of driver safety, comfort and convenience, whilst the proliferation of competitive centres in one area is suggested to be avoided.

The interstate policy approach identifies that highway service centres should be located as close as reasonably practicable to an existing township preferably at an interchange or intersection point with a local town access road to facilitate the provision of local employment and connections to utility services at the centre.

From the South Road Bridge as it crosses the River Torrens, the distance to the subject land will be in the order of 80 kilometres, and as such the site accords with the recommended siting distances for such facilities. Moreover, the land is located adjacent to the Township of Nuriootpa which not only provides infrastructure connections but will be a primary source of employment and service provision to the development.

Road Safety

The subject land is located adjacent to Belvidere Road, a B-double route linking to the Clare Valley provides existing declaration and acceleration lanes for both east and west bound traffic that will allow safe access to and from the Sturt Highway.

A traffic impact assessment carried out GTA consultants has confirmed that the development of the land can be carried out in accordance with Austroads requirements, and can provide safe and efficient operation, noting that the actual design of the left turn lane would be confirmed in detailed planning of the site and in consultation with DPTI. A copy of the traffic impact assessment is contained in Appendix B.

In addition, it is proposed to introduce policy designed to ensure that, in as much as is possible, domestic and heavy transport vehicles are separated on site and that internal road speeds can be kept below 20kph.

Policies relating to site access seek to ensure that landscaping does not adversely impact on driver sightlines.

Whilst it is outside the scope of this DPA, signage on the highway leading to the development and identifying its location and the facilities therein will be an important aspect of encouraging drivers to stop.

Recommendations for advance advisory signage is that they be erected at appropriate spacings (i.e. 5km, 2km, 1km) to announce the facility, so that drivers can make a timely and safe decision to stop.

Figure 3: Typical on highway signage and advertising for a highway service centre
Site Planning

Site planning should seek to minimise the potential for environmental harm and as such site planning and design of a highway service centre site should take into account the following matters:

- Retention of native vegetation;
- Noise and vibration impacts associated with heavy vehicle movements to, within and from the land;
- The natural topography, avoiding the need for substantial excavation and levelling of the site;
- Likelihood of flooding;
- Nature, type and sensitivity of the local water environment (i.e. surface and ground waters);
- Potential for erosion and sediment prevention and pollution control;
- Litter control and weed management;
- Waste storage, removal and disposal arrangements;
- Potential conflict with adjoining land uses, including appropriate fencing, mounding and landscape planting treatment to address noise and visual amenity issues, light and other impacts;
- Ground conditions;
- Effluent disposal (if proposed);
- Retention of top soil for redistribution across the site.

In terms of the above site planning issues, the subject land is ideally located. The land is flat but will require some filling to accommodate future built form and to provide adequate falls for stormwater drainage. Stormwater will be directed to existing (expanded) on site detention basins, and as the winery on the land is a gross user of water, as much of the clean stormwater from rooftops will be retained on site for use in the winery or on site. An Engineering and Infrastructure Assessment has been carried by Herriot Consulting Engineers. A copy of their report is contained in Appendix C.

There is no vegetation on the land at the present save some perimeter landscaping and scattered stands of trees (which are not expected to be affected by the proposed development). Where at all possible native vegetation that might be affected by the proposed development will be retained, and revegetation of the land will comprise, in as much as possible, vegetation endemic to the locality. Fencing, where required, will be traditional rural post and wire fencing.

Adjoining land uses are for the most part not sensitive to the future development of the land as a highway service centre. Adjoining land uses comprise a go-kart track, vineyards and broadacre farming activities, the latter separated from the site for the highway service centre by the existing winery development.

Development in Nuriootpa, on the southern side of the Sturt Highway is separated from the land by the alignment of the highway, adjoining landscape buffer and by the orientation of development away from the highway and use of side boundary fencing to separate residential development in particular from the existing noise from the highway. Development in the locality is thus already impacts by the movement of heavy vehicles and it is not expected that the development of the land for a highway service centre and intermodal facility will make these impacts any worse.

The land is not subject to inundation as identified in the relevant Council flood mapping.

An acoustic assessment undertaken by Sonus has indicated that noise sources from the future development of the land will not exceed the background noise levels arising from traffic on the Sturt Highway. As such, no specific noise attenuation measures are expected to be likely. A copy of the acoustic assessment is contained in Appendix D.

Aspects around litter management, landscaping development and maintenance and waste management will be issues for the future development of the land. These are matters that are already extensively dealt with by existing policy in the Development Plan and or proposed policy relative to the Nuriootpa Sturt Highway Service Centre Policy Area 13.

---

3 Hassell, Ove Arup and Partners Highway Service Centres Design Victorian Department of Infrastructure May 1997
4 Sonus Service Centre Sturt Highway Nuriootpa - Development Plan Amendment Noise From Vehicles April 2018
Built Form

The built form of highway service centre should be both functionally efficient and aesthetically pleasing so as to encourage drivers to stop. All buildings within the highway service centre development should adopt a unified architectural approach, and signage should be integrated with the overall architectural approach. The design, finishes, colour and layout of buildings should address the local landscape character and visual context. Buildings should also be designed to promote the use of natural light and ventilation and incorporate materials with low embodied energy. The use of solar panels for on-site power generation should be encouraged.

As most of these elements are already addressed by the Council Development Plan, specific policies directed at these design standards are supplemented by the policies in the proposed Nuriootpa Sturt Highway Service Centre Policy Area 13.

Landscape Treatment

Highway service centres should be integrated with the natural environment by protecting, retaining and enhancing existing native vegetation communities wherever possible and identifying and protecting significant flora and fauna habitat areas. The retention of trees and other existing vegetation, especially mature trees, should be considered as part of the design process.

A landscape buffer zone should also be maintained between the centre and the highway other than as required to provide safe and convenient access.

Planting should be endemic to the local area and robust to local climatic conditions. Any new vegetation should be located and positioned so as to avoid obscuring access, signage or lighting and should be undertaken in accord with water sensitive urban design initiatives.

Screening of buildings from the highway and surrounding areas should take into consideration that visibility of a centre may encourage drivers to stop.

Landscaping of development is already extensively addressed in the General Section of the Council Development Plan, specific policies directed at site landscaping are supplemented by the policies in the proposed Nuriootpa Highway Service Centre Policy Area 13.

3.2.2 Undertake a comprehensive infrastructure analysis

Potable water
The land is connected to a mains supply at the corner of Sturt Highway and Belvidere Road. Mains water will be supplemented by on-site catchment for re-use on site for flushing of toilets and for use as wash-down water in the winery.

Effluent disposal
The land is not connected to the Council CWMS at present. It is intended to connect the future development to the Council CWMS. A connection point is available in Milway Avenue just opposite the intersection of Belvidere Road and the Sturt Highway. This will require pumping from the subject land under the highway to existing connection in the Township. Directional boring will be used to accommodate the connection to minimise disruption to traffic using the highway.

Electricity
High voltage electricity is already connected to the land and an additional connection point is available at the intersection of Belvidere Road and the Sturt Highway via an existing high voltage underground cable. The additional development of a highway service centre on the land will require a new electricity transformer to service the development.

Telecommunications
Telstra have advised that their network can be upgraded to provide the required telecommunications services to the land. Telstra will undertake a Business Plan assessment for the sites once details of the development are confirmed.
**Road Access**

Access to the land will be via the existing acceleration and deceleration lanes on the Sturt Highway. At this stage it is not expected that there will be a need for further work on the highway to achieve safe ingress and egress to the highway, save a possible centre line median to bar access to the land from the westbound lane, other than via Belvidere Road. An assessment of the access arrangements to the land by GTA Consulting\(^5\) have suggested a short “piggy back” turning lane off the deceleration lane leading the Belvidere Road intersection. They advise that there is sufficient space within the road reserve adjacent to the development site to accommodate a “piggy-back” style turning lane into the land.

GTA Consulting also advise that discussions with DPTI has identified a possible need for the provision of a median on Sturt Highway (a narrow median on the centreline) to prevent westbound vehicles on Sturt Highway from turning right into the Sturt Highway access point for the site. They note that the need for this will depend on the actual design of the access point and whether this movement would be desirable to westbound traffic. The need for this median will be considered in detailed planning of the site and the cost of any works on the highway will be borne by the applicant.

Access to and from Belvidere Road is intended at the northernmost edge of the site, at which there is an existing driveway for the winery. This location provides 60 metres of separation from the Sturt Highway intersection which provides approximately 4 seconds of travel time at 60 km/h, that has been identified as being adequate given the low speed of vehicles turning from Sturt Highway.

There is clear sight distance to and from the Sturt Highway at the proposed access point. There is clear sight distance to the north, including to the neighbouring go-kart club access point located some 90 metres north of the site. There will be sufficient separation between the access points to enable safe operation between uses.

Access points on the land will be shared between the proposed highway service centre and the wine industry development on the western portion of the land. This is identified in the Concept Plan Map Baro/18.

### 3.2.3 Protecting residential and primary production land from conflicting land uses

The subject land is well placed in relation to adjoining land uses. To the north is a go-kart track operated by the Barossa Go-kart Club. To the east are vineyards, to the west is the premises of the Rocland winery which are located on the subject land. Further to the west and some 350m distant there is a farmhouse and firewood depot. Portion of the land to the west is leased by Rocland wines for the storage of effluent and stormwater.

On the southern side of the highway is the TAFE SA site along with houses that are sited facing Milway Avenue and Drinkwater Crescent.

Houses adjoining the highway are sited to face away from the highway and have the benefit of a 20m minimum width landscape buffer along the highway, separating them from the noise and activities associated with the highway.

An acoustic assessment indicates that noise generated by traffic on the highway will be similar to traffic accessing the proposed highway service centre. In its assessment the advice from Sonus was as follows;

> "As noted by the EPA, the proposed location of the service centre is separated from residences by Sturt Highway, which has a 110km/hr speed limit at this location. The noise associated with a vehicle travelling at 110km/hr is higher than the noise of a vehicle travelling at a lower speed and further away. Therefore, in such a circumstance, the noise from vehicles on the site cannot have a detrimental impact on the amenity at the residences in the vicinity."

To confirm the comparison, the noise from vehicles on Sturt Highway was measured at the location of the residential property boundaries on Wednesday 11 April, 2018 at approximately 9:30pm. The typical level of noise (L\(\text{Amax}\)) from a passby was 73 dB(A) for a truck and 65 dB(A) for a car. This compares with the
highest predicted noise (LAmax) from a vehicle travelling on site of 57 dB(A) for a truck and 52 dB(A) for a car. A comparison of the average noise (LAeq) from vehicles on site will also be significantly lower than the average noise from vehicles on Sturt Highway.

The analysis has demonstrated that the noise from vehicles (including heavy vehicles) moving on the proposed site will not have a detrimental impact on the amenity of residences on the opposite side of Sturt Highway."

As identified above, a highway service centre is not a sensitive land uses for the purposes of its relationship with adjoining rural and industrial activities, and it expected that with appropriate design and siting as provided for by the existing Development Plan provisions and proposed policies for the Precinct the future development of the land will be able to co-exist with adjoining land uses.

3.2.4 Review the impacts from loss of primary production land

The development of the land for a highway service centre and intermodal facility will impact an area of approximately 2.8ha of vineyard operated by Rocland wines. Wine Australia\(^\text{6}\) information indicates that there are some 11,370ha of vineyard in the Barossa Valley.

Future planned expansion of the winery is likely affect the remaining area of vineyard on the land which totals some 5.2ha

The vineyard on the subject land represents something in the order of 0.45% of the vineyard area in the Valley and as such its redevelopment will have minimal impact on the productive capacity of the region.

It is noted that present policy for the Primary Production (Barossa Valley Region) Zone would render the existing winery non-complying where it does not include at least 4 hectares of vineyard. Given the possibility of the loss of the vineyard on the land, policy for the Zone will be amended to allow an exception for the development of a winery without 4Ha of vineyard in the Nuriootpa Sturt Highway Service Centre Precinct.

Figure 4: Subject land and features

Sufficient land has been set aside as identified in the Concept Plan, Map Baro/18, for the expansion of the existing winery and as such the development of the land should not otherwise impact the productive capacity of the land or adjoining land.

3.2.5 Investigate the existing land use mix and built form and landscape character within the Sturt Highway Corridor

A detailed Landscape Character and Visual assessment analysis the land and locality has been undertaken by Oxigen Landscape Architects, a full copy of which is contained in Appendix E, a summary of which is provided below.

"The site is located within the Primary Production (Barossa Valley Region) zone and in the Character Preservation District. Development within this zone should balance the needs of primary production, tourism and residential living with the preservation of the scenic qualities of the Barossa Valley. The visual effects of developments within this zone should be minimised by design that incorporates appropriate scale, bulk and mass, form, and colour and material selection.

The visual assessment has demonstrated that the overall visual impact of the proposal is likely to be medium. The main viewpoints that are impacted by the proposal are from the Sturt Highway. The assessment demonstrates that from publicly accessible viewpoints the site of the proposal will be visible to varying degrees, and that visibility is influenced by existing trees and vegetation, rural dwellings and ancillary buildings, overhead power lines, topography and the limited time duration in which the site is viewed to moving traffic.

Whilst this visual assessment has determined that development on this site may result in a medium visual impact, that is acceptable from a site planning point of view, it is important that the proposal be evaluated further in respect to the detailed design that will also include final plans, elevations, landscaping and photomontage images. The resolution of these details that will also include height and mass, colours, signage, materials palette etc. will determine whether the proposal is acceptable when considered against the provisions of the Development Plan."

Figure 4: Subject land and locality showing main features

Being within the Landscape Preservation District, the Character Preservation (Barossa Valley) Act 2012 is relevant to the proposed rezoning.

The objects of the Act are;
(a) to recognise, protect and enhance the special character of the district while at the same time providing for the economic, social and physical well being of the community; and
(b) to ensure that activities that are unacceptable in view of their adverse effects on the special character of the district are prevented from proceeding; and
(c) to ensure that future development does not detract from the special character of the district; and
(d) otherwise to ensure the preservation of the special character of the district.

The following character values of the district are recognised under the Act:
(a) the rural and natural landscape and visual amenity of the district;
(b) the heritage attributes of the district;
(c) the built form of the townships as they relate to the district;
(d) the viticultural, agricultural and associated industries of the district;
(e) the scenic and tourism attributes of the district.

(2) The character values of the district are relevant to:
(a) assessing the special character of the district; and
(b) the policies to be developed and applied under the Planning Strategy and any Development Plan under the Development Act 1993 that relates to the district.
The site for the development is located adjacent to Nuriootpa Township (see figure 5 below) and thus the landscape character of the locality is influenced by many factors not found to the same extent in those parts of the District, not so influenced by interface issues resulting from a juxtaposition with land in a different zone.

For example, signage, both highway information and private signage is prevalent in the locality, overhead power lines and street lights are a significant feature of the road alignments in the immediate locality. Armco barriers along the edge of the highway are more in evidence as is the impact of urban development (housing, industry and the premises of the TAFE College and Redeemer Lutheran School) on the southern side of the highway in the Nuriootpa Township, where long lengths of fencing have been used to separate housing in particular from the impacts of traffic movement along the highway.

The alignment and impacts of the highway itself have a significant impact on the character and amenity of the locality.

On the northern side of the highway are the premises of the Rocland Winery, which although well setback from the road reserve is nonetheless a significant feature of the local landscape.

A Landscape Assessment of the site/development was undertaken by Oxigen Landscape Architects who noted that;

- The site of the proposal sits within a landscape context that is already modified. It forms part of an area that comprises cleared native vegetation for the purposes of primary production.
- Views to the site are infrequent and broken by rural dwellings and ancillary buildings, vegetation, overhead power lines and localised changes in topography.
- Existing vegetation to the northern, western and southern boundaries of the site form a definite and distinguishable backdrop to the site.
- The speed limit of 110km hour along Sturt Highway reduces the time duration in which the site is viewed to moving traffic.

![Figure 5: Land relative to the Character Preservation District/Nuriootpa Township](image-url)
In assessing the impact of the development of the land under the proposed zoning, Oxigen undertook a viewpoint analyses from 5 locations along the Sturt Highway and Belvidere Road and found the overall visual impact of the (future) development of the land to vary between Negligible and Medium as summarised below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Viewpoint</th>
<th>Location of viewer</th>
<th>Distance to Site</th>
<th>Summary evaluation from visual assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Non-elevated viewpoint travelling south along Belvidere Road</td>
<td>50m</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Non-elevated viewpoint travelling west along Sturt Highway</td>
<td>300m</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Non-elevated viewpoint travelling west along Sturt Highway</td>
<td>150m</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Non-elevated viewpoint travelling east along Sturt Highway</td>
<td>150m</td>
<td>Low to Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Non-elevated viewpoint travelling east along Sturt Highway</td>
<td>300m</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Oxigen have concluded from their assessment that; "The main viewpoints that are impacted by the proposal are from Sturt Highway. The assessment demonstrates that from publicly accessible viewpoints the site of the proposal will be visible to varying degrees, and that visibility is influenced by existing trees and vegetation, rural dwellings and ancillary buildings, overhead power lines, topography and the limited time duration in which the site is viewed to moving traffic."

They rightly note that; "it is important that the proposal be evaluated further in respect to the detailed design that will also include final plans, elevations, landscaping and photomontage images. The resolution of these details, that will also include height and mass, colours, signage, materials palette etc. will determine whether the proposal is acceptable when considered against the provisions of the Development Plan."

The Development Plan already contains significant policy relation to the design and appearance of development. These are contained in large part in the Design and Appearance module in the General Section of the Development Plan, with additional relevant policies relating to site Landscaping, Advertising and Building Setbacks in the General and Zone Sections of the Plan.

It is clear from the above assessment of the landscape that the landscape quality of the locality is significantly influenced by the location of the land adjoining Nuriootpa township.

The landscape assessment bears out this principle. It notes quite rightly that the future form, scale, siting and landscaping of the development will be the determining feature of its impact on the character of the locality and to that end, policy proposed in the DPA seeks to ensure that the future development of the land is sympathetic to its location at the boundary of the Character Preservation District.

There is no particular built form character in the locality, with development adjoining the highway comprising a mix of industrial buildings (in the case of the winery on the land), housing, which largely backs on to the highway and where fencing forms the predominate view from the highway, or larger educational/commercial buildings in the case of the TAFE site. Landscaping buffers are a significant feature of the southern side of the highway and grazing/vineyards form the principle landscape on the northern side of the highway.

To all intents and purposes a highway service centre on the land will appear what it is. It will need to be visible and accessible from the highway, with landscaping and as necessary some mounding being used to integrate the development into the landscape.
The built form of the centre should be functional, efficient and aesthetically pleasing to encourage drivers to stop. Buildings should adopt a unified architectural design, and signage should be integrated and shared to minimise the proliferation of signage fronting the highway. The design, cladding, colour and layout of the buildings should address the local landscape character and visual context. Buildings should also be designed to promote the penetration of natural daylight, use natural ventilation and incorporate materials with low embodied energy.

### 3.2.6 Provide scope for policy change and analyse the relative impact this would have on the functionality of existing zones, particularly the District Centre Zone

The majority of the economic impacts arising from the operation of the highway service centre concern nearby towns.

The extent to which these towns are affected will depend on:
- The types of services and facilities provided at the highway service centre;
- The distance between the highway service centre and nearby towns, and the ease of access between them; and
- The interaction between the highway service centre and nearby towns in terms of access and function.

The services and facilities considered essential for highway users, and therefore included as part of a highway service centre, may duplicate some of those services provided in nearby or bypassed towns. A highway service centre can detract from opportunistic trade that occurs when people drive directly into a township. However, by controlling the type and scale of services provided at a highway service centre, the economic impact on nearby towns resulting from competing services can be reduced.

Interstate, policy for highway service centres discourage the provision of accommodation and provide varying limits to retail floor areas, generally in the order of 250m$^2$ to 300m$^2$, although, for the most part these are non-mandatory limits. In some jurisdictions, drive through take away food facilities are discouraged as these are seen to dissuade drivers from taking a break. In particular, it is considered that there should be limitations on convenience good retailing provided in a highway service centre to avoid competition with shops on nearby towns, although it is noted that the recent highway service centre at Tailem Bend, albeit developed in conjunction with a wider range of land uses, provides a convenience store limit up 1000m$^2$, in addition to dine-in and fast food restaurants.

Fast food restaurants are a normal feature of a highway service centres and whilst the highway service centre is intended to provide services primarily to the travelling public, its location on the periphery of Nuriootpa and access more generally to other towns in the region will mean that any fast food restaurant is likely to have a wider catchment than just the passing traffic on the highway.

It is not expected that the inclusion of fast food restaurants as part of the development will impact development of the District Town Centre Zone as they:
- are considered to be a destination in their own right and do not form part of the day to day shopping needs of the community that necessitate a location the District Town Centre Zone;
- are traditionally sited on arterial roads, from which they draw a large percentage of their custom. On average at suburban stores, some 60% of custom is generated by the drive-thru facility, whilst the vast majority of customers attend the stores by car and pick and delivery of food by 3rd parties (Ubereats and Deliveroo) now form a large part of the take away food experience in urban areas.
- have a much larger footprint because of the area required to accommodate the drive-thru lanes and service access that limits their ability to be sited in the District Town Centre Zone;
- have opening hours that differ significantly from normal retail outlets (24 hours) with peak evening trade occurring at times (6 to 7pm) when other outlets are often shut, such that any benefits to other shops in the District Town Centre Zone deriving from the customers to a fast food restaurant would be minimal;
- have a customer base, and reason to visit a fast food restaurant differs from the day to day shopping trip normally associated with the reason to visit the District Town Centre Zone, it is not considered that

b) 336
its location outside of this Zone will detract from its function or viability; or result in the deterioration of the Zone;

Apart from the food offering via any eat in restaurant or fast food development, it is considered that convenience retailing should be limited in area to avoid direct competition with shops in any of the Centre Zones in nearby towns.

The Development Plan presently seeks that shops with a gross leasable area of greater than 250m² should be located within a centre zone and that shops with a gross leasable area of less than 250m² not be located on arterial roads unless in a centre zone.

The development of a highway service centre is in effect a de-facto centre zone, albeit directed primarily at the travelling public and given that the vast majority of customers to the facility will be passing travellers, who have no specific need to turn off the highway to access shops at Nuriootpa in particular, a retail floor area of 250m² for convenience goods is not unreasonable, is consistent with the floor area limit for shops outside of centre zones, and should not affect the viability of shops in the District Town Centre zone.

3.2.7 Investigate access to and from the Sturt Highway

A detailed analysis of traffic conditions has been undertaken by GTA Consultants, a full copy of which is contained in Appendix B.

The report concludes that;

- The exiting intersection of Belvidere Road and the Sturt Highway operates well below capacity with minimal delays and queue lengths on any approach.
- The development is expected to generate approximately 760 trips during the PM peak period, which is a conservative estimate based on an initial site concept and metropolitan traffic generation rates.
- An analysis of the forecast turning movements for the predicted development traffic indicates an increase in traffic volumes which would result in average delay and queue lengths of a minor nature which will be a low impact on the operation of the adjacent road network.
- There is more than adequate sight distance for vehicles entering and exiting Belvidere Road to ensure the increase in traffic volumes will continue to operate safely and efficiently without impacting through traffic on Sturt Highway.
- Access to the site will be provided by a dedicated left turn lane on Sturt Highway in to the site, as well as use of an existing driveway for the site on Belvidere Road.
- Preliminary concept plans for the left turn lane on Sturt Highway indicates it can be developed in accordance with Austroads requirements and provide safe and efficient operation. The actual design of the left turn lane to be confirmed in detailed planning of the site.

4. Recommended Policy Changes

Following is a list of the recommended policy changes based on the investigations of this DPA:

- Amend Policy Area Map Baro/2, to include a new Policy Area over the Area Affected to be called Nuriootpa Sturt Highway Service Centre, Policy Area 13.
- Introduce Objectives, a Desired Character Statement and Principles of Development Control providing for the development of a highway service centre and associated land uses on the land, whilst allowing the continued development of the land consistent with the Primary Production (Barossa Valley Region) Zone.
• Amend the list of non-complying land uses in the zone to exclude development associated with the Highway service Centre.

• Introducing a list of Category 1 and 2 land uses relevant to the development of the land for a highway service centre, with the specific intention that a highway service centre and associated land uses be listed as a category 1 form of development requiring no public notification.

• Introducing a non-complying limit on convenience goods retailing of 250m² to ensure that convenience goods retail development does not impact on development that should otherwise be located in the District Town Centre Zone.

5. Statement of statutory compliance

Section 25 of the Development Act 1993 prescribes that the DPA must assess the extent to which the proposed amendment:

- accords with the Planning Strategy
- accords with the Statement of Intent
- accords with other parts of council’s Development Plan
- complements the policies in Development Plans for adjoining areas
- accords with relevant infrastructure planning
- satisfies the requirements prescribed by the Development Regulations 2008.

6.1 Accords with the Planning Strategy

Relevant strategies from the Planning Strategy are summarised in the Appendices of this document. This DPA is consistent with the direction of the Planning Strategy.

6.2 Accords with the Statement of Intent

The DPA has been prepared in accordance with the Statement of Intent agreed to on 6th December 2017. In particular, the proposed investigations outlined in the Statement of Intent have been addressed in section 3 of this document.

6.3 Accords with other parts of the Development Plan

The policies proposed in this DPA are consistent with the format, content and structure of The Barossa Council Development Plan.

6.4 Complements the policies in the Development Plans for adjoining areas

The proposed policy amendment is a site-specific rezoning that results from the specific attributes of the land, it is not part of a cumulative rezoning process and is a one-off policy review to provide additional supporting development for the function of the Sturt Highway. As such it is not, nor will it influence or impact on the Development Plans of adjoining Council’s.

6.5 Accords with relevant infrastructure planning

The DPA will create no financial or supply impacts on existing infrastructure.
6.6 Satisfies the requirements prescribed by the Regulations

The requirements for public consultation (Regulation 11) and the public meeting (Regulation 12) associated with this DPA will be met.
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CERTIFICATION BY COUNCIL’S CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS 2008

SCHEDULE 4A

Development Act 1993 – Section 25 (10) – Certificate - Public Consultation

CERTIFICATE OF CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER THAT A DEVELOPMENT PLAN AMENDMENT (DPA) IS SUITABLE FOR THE PURPOSES OF PUBLIC CONSULTATION

I, Martin McCarthy, as Chief Executive Officer of The Barossa Council, certify that the Statement of Investigations, accompanying this DPA, sets out the extent to which the proposed amendment or amendments-

(a) accord with the Statement of Intent (as agreed between the "Insert Name of Council" and the Minister under section 25(1) of the Act) and, in particular, all of the items set out in Regulation 9 of the Development Regulations 2008; and

(b) accord with the Planning Strategy, on the basis that each relevant provision of the Planning Strategy that related to the amendment or amendment has been specifically identified and addressed, including by an assessment of the impacts of each policy reflected in the amendment or amendments against the Planning Strategy, and on the basis that any policy which does not fully or in part accord with the Planning Strategy has been specifically identified and an explanation setting out the reason or reasons for the departure from the Planning Strategy has been included in the Statement of Investigation; and

(c) accord with the other parts of the Development Plan (being those parts not affected by the amendment or amendments); and

(d) complement the policies in the Development Plans for adjoining areas; and

(e) satisfy the other matters (if any) prescribed under section 25(10)(e) of the Development Act 1993.

The following person or persons have provided advice to the council for the purposes of section 25(4) of the Act:


DATED this "Insert Date" day of "Insert Month" 20"Insert Year"

.............................................................
Chief Executive Officer
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Rocland

Proposed Commercial Fuel Reselling and Retail Facility

Sturt Highway Nuriootpa

Economic Impact Assessment

February 2017

Introduction and Summary of Economic Impacts

Hudson Howells has been engaged by the Rocland Group to undertake an Economic Impact Assessment in support of a proposed Commercial Fuel and Retail Facility at Lot 147 Sturt Highway, Nuriootpa, South Australia (the Project).

The development represents a major regional project that will contribute to State’s and the Barossa Region’s economic and transport sector infrastructure. In particular, it offers an opportunity to boost regional incomes and employment through both the construction of the mixed use facility and future operational phases of the fuel facility and other associated retail businesses/occupiers.

The proposed project will contribute to the State’s economic development as follows:

- **During the construction phase**, State employment associated with the project is expected to peak at 141 FTEs with a contribution to Gross State Product of $19.9 million.
When fully operational, the project is estimated to support 295 FTEs per annum, with a contribution to Gross State Product of $25.4 million per annum.

The proposed project will contribute to the Barossa Region’s economic development as follows:

- During the construction phase, Barossa Region employment associated with the project is expected to peak at 94 FTEs, with a contribution to Gross State Product of $11.9 million.

- When fully operational, the project is estimated to support 220 FTEs, with a contribution to Gross State Product of $17.9 million in the Barossa Region.

It should be noted that the above economic impacts include the direct and indirect (or multiplier) impacts of the project on the State as measured by the South Australian Input – Output Tables. It should also be noted that the assessment does not factor in employment and GSP that might be displaced from other projects or facilities, or loss of production from current land uses (i.e. it is a measure of the gross impact of the Project and the jobs and GSP that it supports).

Employment and Income Opportunities

This section of the report details the employment and income opportunities associated with the project including ‘multiplier’ impacts as measured by employment and value added (contribution to Gross State Product, or salaries, wages and profits). These impacts cover all aspects of the project including both the construction of the facility and the operational phases.

The multiplier (or downstream) impacts are important in the context of total State wide impacts of the project. They recognise that there will be ‘leakage’ of expenditure associated with the project to other regions (metropolitan areas and possibly other economic regions) and that the economic impacts reach further than the immediate region.
Project Contribution to Economic Development

The project has the potential to provide a major economic stimulus to the region and the State as a commercial project. This section of the report provides estimates of the economic impact that the project could have on the State economy over the lifetime of the project, including both the Construction and Operational Phases of the project.

A Microsoft Excel model has been developed to assess the economic impacts of the project and an Input – Output methodology has been employed to model the impact of the Project on the State economy. 2011/12 Input - Output Tables for South Australia have been sourced as a methodology for assessing the economic impacts. These economic impacts include the direct value added and employment impacts, plus the flow through effects as estimated using the RISE model – as reported in Econsearch “Economic and Environmental Indicators for South Australia and its Regions” – with employment impacts adjusted for inflation at 2% p.a.

This economic impact assessment has been undertaken to identify the potential jobs and incomes that may be associated with the Project. Job and income creation are critical elements of the social agenda for economic regions. Economic and social development are intertwined and there is a very strong correlation between economic growth and social indicators (e.g. unemployment and crime rates).

An accepted methodology for measuring economic outcomes, and one that is used nationally and internationally, is to measure the value added and employment associated with investment or turnover outcomes.

Value added is defined as the extent to which the local economy adds value to the product or services supplied, and essentially is the returns to labour and capital in the region for that activity – it represents the incomes to labour and capital. It is consistent with the predominant national measure of economic activity of Gross Domestic Product (GDP) or Gross State Product (GSP).

This value added and employment impact can be measured at two levels. Firstly there is the direct impact – the value added and employment contribution or share associated directly with the
expenditure (e.g. the labour and profits involved in the initial fuel and retail facility construction activity). Secondly there is the indirect or multiplier impact – for example that associated with the suppliers to the construction service, and the spend of employee wages.

The following construction multipliers have been obtained from the Input – Output Tables for South Australia.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
<th>South Australian Construction Sector Multipliers¹</th>
<th>($2011/12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employment (per $ million)</td>
<td>8.682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value Added ($ million)</td>
<td>1.107</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above multipliers mean that $1 million of construction output (in 2011/12) would have resulted in the employment of 8.682 persons in the State (directly and through the multiplier effects). The value added or GSP (salaries, wages and profits) associated with this activity would have been $1,107,000.

The following sections of this report estimate the employment and value added impacts of the project on the State, based on the above multipliers. The following additional notes and assumptions are made:

- Value added is defined as returns to capital and labour (i.e. salaries, wages and profits).

- Employment is defined as full time equivalent (FTE) employees.

- As the Input-Output tables were prepared in 2011/12, they do not incorporate movements in the value of money (inflation) since that time. Without adjustment, this would result in an overestimation of the number of jobs generated per $1m of increased production. A deflator

¹ 2011/12 Input - Output Tables for South Australia, Econsearch
of 2% p.a. is considered appropriate and is applied to new investment and expenditures to adjust for inflation during the period 2012 - 2017.

- There may also have been structural and other changes in the State economy during this time which are not reflected in the tables. For example, structural reform may have improved the efficiency of some industries thereby leading to shifts in the relationships between economic inputs and outputs.

- The Input-Output Tables provide multipliers across a broad range of industries. For the purposes of this assessment the construction sector’s multipliers have been used as it is assumed that the majority of capital expenditure will go into the fuel and retail facility capital works and other construction related economic activity.

**Construction Economic Impacts**

It is assumed that the construction phase of the Project will take in the order of 1 year to complete. Construction costs\(^2\) are estimated to be approximately $18 million including the following key project components:

- Car refueling facilities.
- Truck refueling facilities.
- Truck rest stop area.
- Food retail outlets (e.g. McDonalds).
- Car parking.

The estimated construction cost is assumed to include all infrastructure costs such as:

---
\(^2\) Cost estimates are based on preliminary estimates provided by the Rocland Group.
Any external infrastructure requirements including, for example:

- External road upgrades (minimal).
- Storm water, potable water, sewer and recycled water.
- Gas and electricity

Any internal infrastructure requirements such as:

- Access roadways and footpaths.
- Storm water, water, sewer and recycled water.
- Electricity and telecommunications.

The following table details the calculation of economic impacts associated with this investment at the State level. These are per annum estimates based on the estimated investment in the project over 1 year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2</th>
<th>South Australian Total Construction Economic Impacts(^1) (Per Annum Over 1 Year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment (Full Time Equivalent jobs after adjusting for inflation since 2011/12)</td>
<td>141 FTE Jobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value Added or Contribution to Gross State Product per annum (Salaries, Wages and Profits)</td>
<td>$19.9 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) These economic impacts include the direct value added and employment impacts, plus the flow through effects as estimated using the RISE model – as reported in Econsearch “Economic and Environmental Indicators for South Australia and its Regions” – with employment impacts adjusted for inflation at 2% p.a.
It is important to note that the above estimates indicate the total gross economic impact of the project but it is not an indication of the net benefits and costs of the project from a community wide perspective.

In summary, over the expected 1 year construction period there are good and sustainable employment and value added (salaries, wages and profits) benefits that the project could generate for the State. During the construction phase, State employment associated with the project is expected to peak at 141 FTEs with the value added contribution (GSP) reaching $19.9 million.

**The Operational Phase**

The impact of the retail expansion itself has been modelled using an estimate of direct employment on site of 10 FTE’s per 100 square metres.

The Rocland Group estimates that, when fully operational, there will be approximately 214 additional FTE employees associated with the project including:

- Car and truck refuelling facility – 20 FTEs (estimate based on similar facilities).

- **McDonalds** – 158 FTEs (based on 24 hour operations, 6 employees per square metre and allocation of 880m square metres retail space. Note that this could equate to over 250 full, part-time and casual employees). The general standard for employment in food and drink services is the order of 6 FTE’s per 100 square metres and for general retail around 4.  

- Other retail – 36 FTEs (based on 24 hour operations, 6 employees per square metre and allocation of 200m square metres of additional retail space. Note that this could equate to over 60 full, part-time and casual employees).

---

The Retail Sector of the Input-Output Tables best reflects these activities for which the following Type 2 multipliers have been derived from the State Input-Output Tables to estimate the flow on or multiplier impacts of this direct employment.

### Table 3

| South Australian Retail Sector Multipliers$^5$ |  
| ($2011/12) |  
| --- | --- |
| Type 2 Employment Multiplier | 1.38 |

It is therefore estimated that, when fully operational, the total State employment impact of the project alone will be 295 FTEs per annum.

The Projects’ contribution to Gross State product when fully operational can be modelled by applying the general Retail Sector multipliers for South Australia detailed below:

### Table 4

| South Australian Retail Sector Multipliers$^6$ |  
| ($2011/12) |  
| --- | --- |
| Employment (per $ million) | 14.262 |
| Value Added ($ million) | 1.358 |

Applying these multipliers (and adjusting for inflation), it is estimated that the fuel and retail facility will inject $18.7 million into the State economy with a value added, or contribution to GSP, of $25.4 million per annum.

**Potential New Regional Economic Activity – Barossa and Surrounding Regions**

The fuel reselling and retail facility will also impact on the regional economy and in this case predominantly the Barossa Region. The difference between the State and regional impacts represents

---

$^5$ 2011/12 Input - Output Tables for South Australia, Econsearch  
$^6$ 2011/12 Input - Output Tables for South Australia, Econsearch
the ‘leakage’ of economic activity out of the region to other areas of the State. The regional impact will therefore be considerably lower than the State impact.

The following construction multipliers have been obtained for the Barossa Region from the Input – Output Tables for South Australia.

| Table 5 | Barossa Construction Sector Multipliers
| ($2011/12) |
|-----------------|-----------------|
| Employment (per $ million) | 5.756 |
| Value Added ($ million) | 0.661 |

The following table details the calculation of economic impacts associated with the construction investment at the regional level. These are per annum estimates based on the estimated investment in the Project over 1 year.

| Table 6 | Barossa Region
| Total Construction Economic Impacts (Per Annum Over 1 Year) |
|-----------------|-----------------|
| Employment (Full Time Equivalent jobs after adjusting for inflation since 2011/12) | 94 FTE Jobs |
| Value Added or Contribution to Gross State Product per annum (Salaries, Wages and Profits) | $11.9 million |

---

7 2011/12 Input - Output Tables for South Australia, Econsearch
8 These economic impacts include the direct value added and employment impacts, plus the flow through effects as estimated using the RISE model – as reported in Econsearch “Economic and Environmental Indicators for South Australia and its Regions” – with employment impacts adjusted for inflation at 2% p.a.
It is again important to note that the above estimates indicate the total gross economic impact of the Project but it is not an indication of the net benefits and costs of the project from a community wide perspective.

In summary, over the expected 1 year construction period there are good and sustainable employment and value added (salaries, wages and profits) benefits that the project could generate for the Barossa Region and surrounding areas. During the construction phase, Barossa Region employment associated with the project is expected to peak at 94 FTEs with the value added contribution (GSP) reaching $11.9 million.

For the operational phase of the facility, the following retail multipliers have been obtained for the Barossa Region from the Input – Output Tables for South Australia.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7</th>
<th>Barossa Retail Sector Multipliers(^9) ($2011/12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment (per $ million)</td>
<td>11.767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value Added ($ million)</td>
<td>0.956</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the above, it is estimated that the fuel reselling and retail facility, when fully operational, will support in the order of 220 FTE jobs and $17.9 million GSP in the Barossa Region.

**Other Socio-Economic Benefits**

Finally, it is important to acknowledge that projects of this nature do have other potential socio-economic benefits that will also contribute further to job and GSP outcomes. These include:

- **Improved transport logistics and industry efficiencies** - The transport sector supports a wide range of agricultural and other rural businesses throughout the Barossa Region. The fuel and

\(^9\) 2011/12 Input - Output Tables for South Australia, Econsearch
retail facility will provide an important rest area for freight operators along with a potential consolidation/deconsolidation point for inter and intra-regional freight. Moving freight to smaller and more efficient vehicles has the potential to reduce freight costs for local industries.

- **Improved regional tourism** – Additional infrastructure such as the fuel and retail facility assist with both the attraction and retention of tourists to the region. There is also potential at the proposed site to establish additional tourism related services such as services for recreational vehicle waste, electric car charging, tourism information, etc.

- **Improved road safety and emergency services** – An additional rest stop at this busy highway location has the potential to reduce road accidents due to fatigue etc. It will be the first rest stop on the highway for truck and car drivers following completion of the next stage of the Northern Expressway and provides an additional rest stop for regional traffic. There is also potential for the facility to host emergency services vehicles improving incident response times and safety.

- **Improved property values and local government income** – There are potential net benefits to local government arising from increased net rates (i.e. net of any additional costs) associated with increased property values as a result of improved amenity, services and business incomes.
Appendix B - GTA Traffic Impact Assessment
Reference: #S109460
20 June 2018

Access Planning
235 Henley Beach Road
TORRENsville SA 5031

Attention: Mr. David Hutchison

Dear David

RE: DEVELOPMENT PLAN AMENDMENT, BELVIDERE ROAD, NURIOOTPA
TRAFFIC IMPACT ASSESSMENT

A Development Plan Amendment is proposed for a site located on the north-western corner of the intersection of Belvidere Road and Sturt Highway. GTA Consultants has been commissioned to prepare a Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) for the proposed land uses to be considered by the DPA.

The TIA report below documents the results of our traffic survey, an analysis of the anticipated traffic generated by the development and the resulting impact on the network, and road safety effects of the development on this site.

Introduction

An integrated service station development is proposed on an allotment at the north-western corner of the intersection of Stuart Highway and Belvidere Road Nuriootpa (Figure 1). The integrated service station will include refuelling facilities for light and heavy vehicles, car wash, and food retail outlets. Additionally, a small truck marshalling area is proposed, providing a facility for up to about 6 truck and trailer combinations to enable splitting and coupling of trailers.

Figure 1: Subject Site and its Environs
Existing Conditions

The proposed development site is bounded by the Sturt Highway along its southern boundary and Belvidere Road along its eastern boundary. The site is part of an existing winery site which has vineyards and production facilities. The site is currently used for vineyards. The existing site generates traffic associated with daily and seasonal viticulture production operations, including light and heavy vehicles. Average daily traffic generation is very low associated with staff and delivery vehicles.

The Sturt Highway forms part of the National Highway Network is under the care and control of the Department for Planning, Transport and Infrastructure (DPTI). Sturt Highway is a two-way highway and within the locality of the site, is divided by a painted median with a single lane of traffic in either direction (Figure 3). At the intersection with Belvidere Road, the Sturt Highway has a left in deceleration lane approximately 430 metres long, a left-out acceleration lane approximately 500 metres long and a channelised right (CHR) turn lane approximately 185 metres long. Traffic volumes obtained from the Department for Planning, Transport and Infrastructure (DPTI) indicate the annual average daily traffic volumes (AADT) is 6,100 vehicles per day within the locality of the development site. Heavy vehicles contribute to 26% of the total traffic volume. Based on traffic data.

GTA conducted a traffic survey at the intersection of Belvidere Road and Sturt Highway on Thursday 22 February 2018 from 16:00 to 17:00. The peak hour was determined from traffic data provided by DPTI for the Sturt Highway. The turning counts recorded at the intersection by GTA are shown in Figure 2.
The weekday peak hour traffic volume is approximately 120 vehicles per hour (vph). When compared to data recorded in 1995, there has been no identified traffic growth on the section of the Sturt Highway adjacent to the site since the previous survey.

Figure 3: Sturt Highway view looking east towards the intersection with Belvidere Road
The intersection of Old Kapunda Road is located on the Sturt Highway approximately 550 metres west of the intersection of Stuart Highway and Belvidere Road. The left turn lane into Belvidere Road commences approximately 145 metres east of the intersection of Sturt Highway and Old Kapunda Road. The left turn lane is extremely long and exceeds the minimum requirements of the Austroads Guidelines for a deceleration lane. It is assumed that the length of the lane is based on used by heavy vehicles during seasonal viticulture vintage periods, and to enable vehicles to manoeuvre between Old Kapunda Road and Belvidere Road with minimal impact on through traffic on the Sturt Highway.

Belvidere Road is under the care and control of the Barossa Council. The road is approximately 7 metres wide set within a road reserve approximately 20 metres wide. Belvidere Road is two-way with a lane of traffic in either direction and has a posted speed limit of 100km/h within the vicinity of the development site.

Based on traffic data recorded at the site by GTA and previous data collated by DPTI in 1995, the AADT on Belvidere Road is estimated to be between 1,000 and 1,500 vehicles per day. Based on GTA’s survey results, the PM peak hour traffic volume was approximately 900 vph.

Figure 4: Belvidere Road view from the intersection with the Sturt Highway, looking north

There are two properties adjacent to the proposed service station site; Rocland Estate Wines is located on the west side of the development and the Barossa Go Kart Club is located on the north side. Rocland Estate Wines has an existing driveway on Belvidere Road adjacent it’s northern boundary.
Crash Data
An analysis was undertaken of crash records on the Stuart Highway between 2012 and 2016. The data, illustrated in Figure 5, showed that five crashes had occurred over that period at the intersection, resulting in four instances of property damage only and one instance involving minor injury. One crash involved a rear end collision in the right turn lane. One crash involved a driver on the Sturt Highway swerving due to inattention and hitting a vehicle waiting to turn right from Belvidere Road. One right turn crash was attributed to a driver who was D.U.I and only two crashes were attributed to right turn movements failing to Give Way. Only one crash has occurred in the last three years and involved the rear end collision.

Figure 5: Crash Data 2012 - 2016

Development Proposal
The proposed development includes a service station with provision of bowsers for light and heavy vehicles, car wash facility and food retail outlets with drive-through facilities. There will be approximately 1,200 square metres of floor space for retail and food stores on the site, with associated car parking and re-fuelling dispensers at various locations.

Access (entry only) to the development is proposed to be via a left turn deceleration lane for vehicles travelling eastbound on the Sturt Highway. For all other traffic, an access/egress point will be provided on Belvidere Road, north of the intersection with Sturt Highway.
Traffic Assessment

The trip generation has been developed based on approximate floor areas for the proposed uses on the site.

Trip generation rates from the RTA Guide to Traffic Generating Developments were adopted for the development except for the Service Station for which GTA empirical data was adopted. A summary of the trip estimates is provided in Table 1.

### Table 1: Trip Generation Estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Measured Building Area</th>
<th>Peak Trip Generation</th>
<th>Estimated Trips</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control Building Including Truckie Lounge &amp; 3 Food Outlets</td>
<td>800 sq.m</td>
<td>0.6 x GFA</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast Food Outlet with drive-thru</td>
<td>150 sq.m</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant with drive-thru</td>
<td>250 sq.m</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Trips</strong></td>
<td><strong>760</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is noted that the traffic generation is based on metropolitan rates for these uses, hence this assessment should be considered a high traffic scenario. For the purposes of this assessment, deliveries and waste collection traffic are included in the traffic generation estimates.

It is unlikely that the truck marshalling area will generate significant trips since the majority of the vehicles using the marshalling area is expected to be passing trade using other facilities within the site.

The directional distribution and assignment of traffic generated by the proposed development will be influenced by a number of factors, including the:

i configuration of the arterial road network in the immediate vicinity of the site;

ii existing operation of intersections providing access between the local and arterial road network;

iii distribution of households in the vicinity of the site;

iv configuration of access points to the site.

Having consideration to the above, for the purposes of estimating vehicle movements, the directional distributions shown on have been assumed.
Furthermore, an assumption has been made that 95% of eastbound traffic will use the proposed dedicated left turn deceleration lane into the site while the remaining 5% will access the site via Belvidere Road.

Based on the above, Figure 7 has been prepared to show the additional turning movements generated by the subject site and Figure 8 shows the estimated total turning movements post development.
Figure 7: PM Peak Hour Additional Turning Movements

Figure 8: PM Peak Hour Post Development Turning Movements
The operation of the intersection of Sturt Highway and Belvidere Road was carried out with SIDRA Intersection 7. The analysis was undertaken during the PM Peak Hour on a weekday evening. A summary of the performance of the intersection under existing conditions and post development conditions is provided in Tables 2 and 3 respectively.

Table 2: SIDRA Results – Intersection Existing Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement Performance - Vehicles</th>
<th>Mov ID</th>
<th>OD Mov</th>
<th>Demand Flows</th>
<th>Deg. Saturation</th>
<th>Average Delay</th>
<th>Level of Service</th>
<th>95% Back of Queue</th>
<th>Prop Queued</th>
<th>Effective Stop Rate</th>
<th>Average Speed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total v/h</td>
<td>HV %</td>
<td>sec</td>
<td>v/h</td>
<td>Distance m</td>
<td></td>
<td>per v/h</td>
<td>km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East: Sturt Highway (East)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 T1</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>LOS A</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>70.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>0.132</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>98.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North: Belvidere Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 L2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>LOS A</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>72.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 R2</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>LOS B</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>LOS B</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>96.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West: Sturt Highway (West)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 L2</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>LOS A</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>79.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 T1</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>LOS A</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>92.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Vehicles</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>0.132</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>92.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the above existing analysis, the following conclusions have been made:

- The intersection operates with traffic volumes well below capacity with Degree of Saturation of less than 0.15 (with 0.9 being general accepted practical capacity of an intersection).
- Average Delay and queue lengths at the intersection also very minor given existing low traffic volumes for turning movements;
- The Sturt Highway through movements operate under free flow conditions.

Table 3: SIDRA Results – Intersection Post Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement Performance - Vehicles</th>
<th>Mov ID</th>
<th>OD Mov</th>
<th>Demand Flows</th>
<th>Deg. Saturation</th>
<th>Average Delay</th>
<th>Level of Service</th>
<th>95% Back of Queue</th>
<th>Prop Queued</th>
<th>Effective Stop Rate</th>
<th>Average Speed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total v/h</td>
<td>HV %</td>
<td>sec</td>
<td>v/h</td>
<td>Distance m</td>
<td></td>
<td>per v/h</td>
<td>km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East: Sturt Highway (East)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 T1</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>0.145</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>LOS A</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>109.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>0.220</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>LOS B</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>65.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North: Belvidere Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 L2</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>0.129</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>LOS A</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 R2</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>0.637</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>LOS D</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>48.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>0.637</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>LOS C</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>56.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West: Sturt Highway (West)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 L2</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>LOS A</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>66.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 T1</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>LOS A</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>88.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Vehicles</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>0.637</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>71.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on the above post-development analysis, the following conclusions have been made:

- The proposed development could increase traffic volumes at the intersection and increase the Degree of Saturation of the intersection to just over 0.6. This would remain well below practical capacity.
- Queue lengths and average delay would increase with the proposed development but still remain within acceptable parameters for unsignalised intersections.
- Belvidere Road right turn to Sturt Highway would reduce to Level of Service D but this would be similar to many other roads intersection arterial roads in greater and rural Adelaide.
- All other movements are not significantly affected including Sturt Highway through movements.

The analysis of the intersection has found that the impacts of the proposed development on the site would be minor with the existing intersection continuing to operate within acceptable parameters with regards to key measures of average delay and queue length.

Road Safety Assessment

Sight distance was measured from the Belvidere Arm of the intersection and was found to be approximately 450 metres to the west (Figure 10) and 450 metres to the east (Figure 9), although some shrubs created a blind spot within the eastern sight envelope.

Notwithstanding, the available sight distance from the intersection exceeds the AustRoads Safe Intersection Sight Distance (SISD) of 340 metres based on a 120km/h design speed in both directions.

Old Kapunda Road is located approximately 550 metres west of the intersection of Sturt Highway and Belvidere Road. The requirement for an acceleration lane for vehicles turning right out of Old Kapunda Road is mitigated by the extensive sight distance available at the intersections and the relatively low volume of traffic on the Sturt Highway which will provide sufficient gaps in the traffic.

The extent of the left turn lanes provided for Old Kapunda Road and Belvidere Road will facilitate vehicles turning right then left between the intersections, mitigating the risk of “weaving”. As the left turn lanes commence approximately 100 metres after each intersection, and the left turn lane into Belvidere Road is proposed to be extended, the travel time for slower vehicles moving within the through lane is minimised, further reducing the risk associated with this manoeuvre.
Concerns have been raised regarding westbound traffic turning right on the Sturt Highway to access the development via the left turn deceleration lane. While unlikely, the design is subject to review at the concept design stage and a physical median could be constructed to prevent this manoeuvre however street lighting would also require review if this were to be included as part of the design.

Access Arrangements

A left turn lane from the Sturt Highway into the development site is proposed as shown in Figure 11. The left turn lane will join the existing left turn lane onto Belvidere Road in the form of a “piggy-back”, with directional signs installed to indicate the corresponding exits. As the left turn lane into Belvidere Road is approximately 430 metres long and there is sufficient space within the road reserve adjacent to the development site, a “piggy-back” style.

The left turn lane into the site will be designed to provide drivers with appropriate time to make a choice about either entering the site or continuing to Belvidere Road in the left turn lane. The left turn lane will be designed with the following features:

- Extension to the existing left turn lane to provide sufficient decision time between the start of the left turn lane and the start of the left turn lane into the site;
- Appropriate deceleration distance for vehicles turning left into the site, with a design speed of 30km/h when vehicles enter the site.
- Clear direction for drivers of heavy and light vehicles to enter the specific areas of the site.

Preliminary discussions with DPTI has identified a possible need for the provision of a median on Sturt Highway (a narrow median on the centreline) to prevent westbound vehicles on Sturt Highway from turning right into the Sturt Highway access point for the site. The need for this will depend on the actual design of the access point and whether this movement would be desirable to westbound traffic. The need for this median will be considered in detailed planning of the site.
An access to the proposed development will also be provided on Belvidere Road at the northernmost edge of the site, at which there is an existing driveway for the winery use of the site.

This location provides 60 metres of separation from the Sturt Highway intersection. This provides approximately 4 seconds of travel time at 60 km/h and will be more than adequate given the low speed of vehicles turning from Sturt Highway.

There is clear sight distance to and from the Sturt Highway at the proposed access point. There is clear sight distance to the north, including to the neighbouring go-kart club access point located some 90 metres north of the site. There will be sufficient separation between the access points to enable safe operation between uses.

The design of the proposed service centre will integrate the existing winery driveway with the service centre and ensures an access arrangement which separate turning movements appropriately form each site with an appropriate intersection. The weighbridge location will be considered as part of this design. It is not envisaged traffic entering the service station will impact on the intersection with Sturt Highway given the deceleration lane length and current priorities at the intersection.

The proposed access arrangements will be capable of providing safe and efficient access to the site.
Conclusion

Based on the analysis and discussions presented within this report, the following conclusions are made:

i. The proposed land uses for the site will include an integrated services stations for heavy and light vehicles, and provide retail food and beverage uses within the site. A small truck marshalling area for about 6 truck and trailer combinations will also be provided.

ii. A traffic survey of the Belvidere Road and Sturt Highway intersection in February 2018 confirmed that the exiting intersection operates with well below capacity with minimal delays and queue lengths on any approach.

iii. The development is expected to generate approximately 760 trips during the PM peak period. This is a conservative estimate based on initial site concept and metropolitan traffic generation rates.

iv. An analysis of the forecast turning movements for the predicted development traffic indicates an increase in traffic volumes which would result in average delay and queue lengths of a minor nature which will be a low impact on the operation of the adjacent road network.

v. There is more than adequate sight distance for vehicles entering and exiting Belvidere Road to ensure the increase in traffic volumes will continue to operate safely and efficiently without impacting traffic on Sturt Highway.

vi. Access to the site will be provided by a dedicated left turn lane on Sturt Highway in to the site, as well as used of an existing driveway for the site on Belvidere Road.

vii. Preliminary concept plans for the left turn lane on Sturt Highway indicates it can be developed in accordance with Austroads requirements and provide safe and efficient operation. The actual design of the left turn lane would be confirmed in detailed planning of the site.

Naturally, should you have any questions or require any further information, please do not hesitate to contact me in our Adelaide office on (08) 8334 3600.

Yours sincerely

GTA CONSULTANTS

Paul Morris
Director
Appendix C - Herriot Consulting Engineering Assessment
STORMWATER CALCULATIONS

CLIENT: ROCLAND ESTATE

OWNER: ROCLAND ESTATE

SITE ADDRESS: LOT 147 STURT HIGHWAY, NURIOOTPA

JOB NO: 1803-002

COUNCIL: BAROSSA

DESIGNER: J.T DATE: 3/05/2018
STORMWATER INVESTIGATION
COUNCIL BARRASSA
D.N - JOB 1803-002
CLIENT ROCLAND ESTATE
DATE 3/05/2018

STORMWATER CALCULATIONS FOR - LOT 147 STURT HIGHWAY, NURIOOTPA

DESCRIPTION: Determine net increase of Peak discharge between Pre-development to Post development run-off to council Stormwater system, to be restricted to Q_pre20 Flow, for the critical storm up to 100Yr A.R.I

APPROACH - RATIONAL METHOD

\[ Q_y = \frac{C \cdot I \cdot A}{360} \]

Where -

\( Q_y \) = Is the design flow rate (m³/s) of A.R.I (y) years

\( C \) = Is a dimensionless runoff Coefficient

\( I \) = The rainfall intensity (mm/h) corresponding to a storm duration & A.R.I of (y) years

\( A \) = Area of Catchment (ha)

Area Dimensions (m)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>width</th>
<th>depth</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>20000 m²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Total only if irregular dimensions) 2.000 ha

A.R.I (average recurrence interval)

\[ A.R.I = 20 \] (Council Request)

Time of Concentration: As adopted by A.R&R for flows for single dwellings a nominated time can be assumed of 5 min. For more complex sites the kinematic wave equation should be adopted.

Kinematic wave equation (time of overland flow)

\[ t = 6.94 \left( \frac{L \cdot n^*}{I} \right)^{0.6} / I^{0.4} \cdot S^{0.3} \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( t ) = Overland flow time (min)</th>
<th>Surface roughness coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.010-0.013 Concrete or Asphalt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.010-0.016 Bare Sand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.012-0.030 Graveled Surface</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.012-0.033 Bare clay-Loam soil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.053-0.130 Sparse Vegetation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.100-0.200 Shod grass prairie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.170-0.480 lawns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Calculations of \( t < 5 \) minutes are assumed to be equal to 5 minutes

Therefore:

\[ t = 10 \] (Estimated)

Therefore:

\[ I = 81 \] (mm/hr) Refer Appendix A for Intensity Data
STORMWATER INVESTIGATION

STORMWATER CALCULATIONS FOR - LOT 147 STURT HIGHWAY, NURIOOTPA

PRE-DEVELOPMENT RUNOFF - 20YR

Run-off Coefficients

\[ C = (C_a A_a) + (C_b A_b) / A_{ab} \]

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
(a) = pervious & 100% & 20000 & 2.000 & 0.1 \\
\hline
(b) = impervious & 0% & 0 & 0.000 & 0.9 \\
\hline
C_{pre} = & 0.10 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Peak Discharge (Pre-Development)

\[ Q_{20} = C.I.A / 360 \]

\[ C = 0.10 \]
\[ I = 81 \text{ mm/hr} \]
\[ A = 2.000 \text{ ha} \]

therefore \[ Q_{20} = 0.04500 \text{ m}^3/\text{s} \]

Peak Predevelopment outflow

45.0 L/s Pre Development

Maximum controlled outflow

0.020 L/s 100yr Allowable discharge

POST DEVELOPMENT RUNOFF - 100Yr

\[ \text{A.R.I} = 100 \text{ (Council Requirement)} \]

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline
Total A (m^2 / ha) & 20000 & 2.000 \\
Roof A (*) & 1900 & 0.190 \\
Paved/Grassed A (*) & 18100 & 1.810 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Run-off Coefficients

\[ C = (C_a A_a) + (C_b A_b) / A_{ab} \]

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
(a) = pervious/grass & 6% & 1100 & 0.110 & 0.1 \\
(b) = impervious/paved & 94% & 17000 & 1.700 & 0.75 \\
\hline
C_{post} = & 0.71 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\[ C = (C_a A_a) / A_r \]

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
(r) = impervious/Roof & 100% & 1900 & 0.190 & 0.9 \\
\hline
C_{post} = & 0.90 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Quick approximate estimate of outflow peak

\[ Q_{100} = C.I.A / 360 \]

\[ \text{Where -} \]
\[ C = 0.90 \]
\[ I = ? \text{ mm/hr} \]
\[ A = 0.190 \text{ ha} \]

therefore \[ Q_{100} = 0.00048 \text{ ha} \]

Total post \[ 0.00045 \text{ ha} \]
STORMWATER INVESTIGATION

COUNCIL: BAROSSA
D.N: 1803-002
CLIENT: ROCLAND ESTATE
DATE: 3/05/2018

STORMWATER CALCULATIONS FOR -
LOT 147 STURT HIGHWAY, NURIOOTPA

STORMWATER INVESTIGATION

Q_p = I_p(1-S_max/V_I)

Where -
I_p = peak discharge of inflow hydrograph
Q_p = peak discharge of outflow hydrograph
V_I = volume of inflow flood
S_max = Storage

Refer Appendix A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>t_c (Min.)</th>
<th>I (mm/hr)</th>
<th>I_p (m^3/s)</th>
<th>V_I (m^3)</th>
<th>S_max (m^3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>0.6637</td>
<td>199.12</td>
<td>193.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>0.4816</td>
<td>288.97</td>
<td>276.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>80.4</td>
<td>0.3254</td>
<td>390.48</td>
<td>366.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>0.2525</td>
<td>454.58</td>
<td>418.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>0.1599</td>
<td>575.52</td>
<td>503.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>0.1121</td>
<td>605.38</td>
<td>497.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>0.0996</td>
<td>716.84</td>
<td>572.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>0.0757</td>
<td>817.38</td>
<td>601.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>14.41</td>
<td>0.0583</td>
<td>839.81</td>
<td>551.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

therefore I_p -

Q_{100} = C.I.A/360

Where -
C = 0.90
I = 18.7 mm/hr
A = 0.190 ha

therefore -
Q_{100} = 0.0089 m^3/s

V_{reqd} = 601.38 m^3

Road Pipe Storage
Length - Line 1
Storage m^2
Volume
0.110 m^2
44.18 m^3

Retention tank
562 m^3

Ponds
(1/3 ave depth x m^2)
0.15 m
300 m^2
15.00 m^3
Overflow 274.1

Total Volume 621.18 m^3

O.K
### Intensity-Frequency-Duration Table

**Location:** 34.450S 138.975E NEAR Nuriootpa  
**Issued:** 1/5/2018

**Rainfall intensity in mm/h for various durations and Average Recurrence Interval**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>1 YEAR</th>
<th>2 YEARS</th>
<th>5 YEARS</th>
<th>10 YEARS</th>
<th>20 YEARS</th>
<th>50 YEARS</th>
<th>100 YEARS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5Mins</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>75.6</td>
<td>90.7</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6Mins</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>70.2</td>
<td>84.2</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10Mins</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20Mins</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>69.1</td>
<td>80.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30Mins</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>62.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1Hr</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Hrs</td>
<td>7.27</td>
<td>9.55</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3Hrs</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>7.37</td>
<td>9.75</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6Hrs</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>8.40</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12Hrs</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>7.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24Hrs</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>4.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48Hrs</td>
<td>.808</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72Hrs</td>
<td>.571</td>
<td>.741</td>
<td>.972</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Raw data: 15.15, 3.07, 0.76, 31.73, 5.96, 1.5, skew=0.32, F2=4.45, F50=14.99)  
© Australian Government, Bureau of Meteorology
4th May 2018  
C1803-002  

Rocland Estate  
Lot 147 Sturt Highway,  
Nuriootpa SA 5355  

Attention: Mr. Franc Rocca  

Dear Franc,  

RE: Lot 147 Sturt Highway, Nuriootpa Service Station  

1. Introduction & Stormwater Catchment Description  

Rocland Estate is situated on the corner of Sturt Highway & Belvidere Road. The site is currently developed in the North Western portion of the site. The proposed serviced station is to be located over the Eastern side of the site comprising approximately 2Ha in size. This area, currently vegetated with grape vines, has been surveyed by Alexander & Symonds and is grading West to East towards a 1200x300 box culvert crossing under Belvidere Road. Review of council data, & aerial topography suggests flows continue via roadside swale 500m East to the Sturt Highway Culvert Rd crossing and then South via watercourse into the township.  

The aim of the stormwater management system described here and detailed on drawing Sheets C1 & C2 inclusive is to safely capture and convey stormwater flows from the proposed development to existing Council infrastructure at an acceptable flow rate which will not have a detriment on the downstream system, cause flooding to adjacent properties, and not exceed the predevelopment flows from the site. Modelling of the capacity of the stormwater drainage system has been undertaken using the Rational Method to design both the ‘minor’ and ‘major’ drainage systems (20yr ARI, & 100yr ARI) as well as the detention sizing to restrict outflows to suitable levels.  

The area modelled covers the extent of development shown in the associate drawing Sheet C1-Stormwater Management Plan, and there is no upstream external catchment to be considered for potential overland flow based on review of the existing survey and council flood mapping which indicates no inundation to the area.  

The preliminary civil design has been provided based on the concept layout by McIntyre and Cross Architects. The proposed development consists of a mixed use development forming a Service Station Convenience store, petrol bowsers, restaurant, truck & car parking, and picnic area including waste dump point.  

Council ‘Standards and Requirements for the Design, Construction and Development of Infrastructure Assets’ has been reviewed in relation to the particular development and the site requirements set-out by council include the following:  

- Site Discharge will be required as per section 8.2  
  o The maximum point discharge to kerb and gutter up to a 10yr ARI event shall be 12L/s; 100yr ARI event shall be 20L/s.  
- Detention will be required as per section 8.7 – Commercial development  
  o Detention shall be provided to limit the 100yr ARI post-development discharge to the 20yr ARI pre-development discharge from the site or as required by section 8.2 (Site Discharge), whichever is the lesser.  

The existing Council infrastructure drainage system adjacent the site consists of a swale with a Box Culvert drainage pipe crossing Belvidere Road. The proposed outfall pipe shall be directed to the local underground drainage system adjacent the site.
2. **Stormwater Quality Improvement**

The EPA requires this development to have a full retention Class 1 oil separator with alarm and to direct all runoff from the hardstand area to this separator.

It is proposed to have all stormwater runoff from the hardstand and forecourt area to be directed to the Class 1 SPEL Puraceptor (with an alarm) which has a capacity to hold a fuel spill with an emergency drainage outlet cut-off in the event of a spill. The size of this unit will be determined on final design, capable of holding the design target fuel spill to be advised.

This separator is approved by EPA to discharge treated water to the stormwater system.

3. **Design**

**Hydrology/Rainfall Data:**

Design Storms for use in DRAINS of 20yr ARI & 100yr ARI were adopted for the Minor and Major Stormwater Systems respectively. Duration & Intensity data was obtained from the Bureau of Meteorology’s Rainfall IFD Data System, and the concept modelled using the Rational Method. It should be noted that this is a concept design and any final working drawing for building rules approval would undertake review via the DRAINS modelling program for final sizing of all parameters. These were assessed with a wide range of storm durations from 5 minutes to 4 hours to determine the critical duration for design.

**Modelling Assumptions & Methodology:**

Consideration has been given to stormwater management for the entire site as it is not intended to be constructed as separate stages rather than comprising a single system. Key modelling assumptions & methodology was used are as follows;

- Predevelopment flows calculated based upon a runoff coefficient of $C_{20} = 0.1$.
- Developed allotment were calculated as 94.5% impervious area, with the entire area directly connected to either the surface water or roof stormwater system as appropriate.
- ‘Minor System’ infrastructure to convey up to the 100yr ARI critical storm with a restricted outlet by way of pump within the detention tank to limit outflows to the predevelopment 20yr ARI levels. This is to discharge to the swale adjacent the site in Belvidere Road with no overland flows leaving the site.

4. **Modelling Results**

**Post Site Development Discharge (PSD):**

Based upon the modelling undertaken and the methodology described above, the following peak flow rates were observed at the outfall location:

- **PSD$_{20yr}$**: 20L/s total pump rate to Swale = Maximum allowable of 20L/s. The flow to be dissipated with scour protection or the like to ensure velocity is minimised.
  *Actual 20yr ARI predevelopment flow is 45L/s.*

- **PSD$_{100yr}$**: 20L/s total pump rate to Swale = 20L/s allowable peak flow based on 20yr ARI ARI Maximum flow rate. 565,000L u/g detention volume required. 180min critical storm duration for storage, no overland flow exiting the site.
5. **Stormwater Conclusion**

The above stormwater management strategy, detention measures and water sensitive urban design elements ensure the proposed development will have minimum impact upon neighbouring land and infrastructure around the site. Proposed as part of the system are the following:

- Internal drainage system to a minimum 100yr ARI capacity, safely conveying flows within the site.
- Detention tank to limit the 100yr ARI to runoff equivalent to a 20yr ARI predevelopment runoff via pumped discharge.
- Class 1 device to protect waterways of containment spill.
- Utilisation of the existing outfall point to Belvidere Road.

Whilst a design solution is achievable with the detention tank volume nominated, further investigation is ongoing as to alternate stormwater discharge locations. This includes recycling the water to other locations via the Barossa Valley Irrigation Scheme (BIL water) or pumped to an offsite storage Dam storage.

Generally the outflows predicted by the Rational method modelling of the catchment appear typical for the catchment size and composition. The proposed underground drainage network is able to deal with these effectively and the major drainage system adequately conveys the 100yr ARI without producing unsafe flows. Stormwater quality requirements for pollutant reduction are achieved.

6. **Common Effluent**

Review of the Township Common Effluent Scheme (CWMS mapping) indicates no CWMS main or connection adjacent the site. It is proposed to service the site from the existing main located in Drinkwater Crescent as shown on Sheet C2-Wastewater Management Plan. The Council 'As Constructed' and current survey have been analysed for local reticulation information, and the selected flushing point on Sheet C2 shall provide suitable depth and gradient for the main extension.

Loadings of the main are to be determined on final design of services. The main extension design and internal waste design will be in accordance with SA Health LGA Septic Tank Drainage Scheme Design Criteria. The system design to reflect the public dump point, any requirement for grease arrestors, and the ultimate sizing of the septic tank.

Should you have any questions or require any clarification, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Yours faithfully

JOHN TAGLIENTI

HERRIOT CONSULTING

**Attachments:**
- Drawing Sheets C1-C2 incl.
- EPA letter of compliance – SPEL Puraceptor
- Bureau of Meteorology IFD – Rosewater
- Local Water Course Mapping
- Council Flood Mapping
- Drinkwater Cr Common Effluent As Constructed
Dear Sir

Letter of Compliance

Ref: South Australia Code of Practice for Industrial, Retail and Commercial Sites. Section 6.5

The SPEL Purceptor Class 1 complies with Table 6.1.3 of Section 6.5 of the Code and is approved for use at high risk sites such as service stations, power stations and sub stations (as nominated in the Code) for stormwater discharge.

It complies with the requirements as follows:
- It is a full retention separator with an alarm.
- Independent certification for a discharge water quality of <5ppm.
- Complies with European Standard BSEN 858.1.

For further information on this matter, please contact Peter Scott on 08 8463 7801 or peter.scott@epa.sa.gov.au.

Yours sincerely

Peter Scott
Principal Environment Protection Officer
Science & Assessment Division
Environment Protection Authority

Date: 26/7/2010
Local Watercourse

- Stormwater Nodes
- Stormwater Drains
- Water Courses

Disclaimer: The information provided above is not represented to be accurate, current or complete at the time of printing this report.

May 2, 2018
Appendix D - Sonus Acoustic Assessment
Attention:  David Hutchison  

13 April 2018

Dear David,

SERVICE CENTRE STURT HIGHWAY NURIOOTPA - DEVELOPMENT PLAN AMENDMENT
NOISE FROM VEHICLES

A Statement of Intent (SOI) for The Barossa Council’s Nuriootpa (Sturt Highway Service Centre) Development Plan Amendment has been issued to the Environment Protection Authority (EPA) for comment.

The following comment related to noise was provided by the EPA:

\[ Interface \text{ between land uses} \]

The affected area is located in the northern side of the Sturt Highway, Nuriootpa west of Belvedere Road. Land on the southern side of the Sturt Highway and opposite the affected area is zoned for residential development. The envisaged Highway Service Centre has the potential to generate the following noise and air emissions:

- Noise from vehicles (including heavy vehicles) moving onsite

As noted by the EPA, the proposed location of the service centre is separated from residences by Sturt Highway, which has a 110km/hr speed limit at this location. The noise associated with a vehicle travelling at 110km/hr is higher than the noise of a vehicle travelling at a lower speed and further away. Therefore, in such a circumstance, the noise from vehicles on the site cannot have a detrimental impact on the amenity at the residences in the vicinity.

To confirm the comparison, the noise from vehicles on Sturt Highway was measured at the location of the residential property boundaries on Wednesday 11 April, 2018 at approximately 9:30pm. The typical level of noise (L\text{Amax}) from a passby was 73 dB(A) for a truck and 65 dB(A) for a car. This compares with the highest predicted noise (L\text{Amax}) from a vehicle travelling on site of 57 dB(A) for a truck and 52 dB(A) for a car. A comparison of the average noise (L\text{Aeq}) from vehicles on site will also be significantly lower than the average noise from vehicles on Sturt Highway.

The analysis has demonstrated that the noise from vehicles (including heavy vehicles) moving on the proposed site will not have a detrimental impact on the amenity of residences on the opposite side of Sturt Highway.
If you have any questions or require clarification, please call me.

Yours faithfully
Sonus Pty Ltd

Chris Turnbull
Principal

+61 417 845 720
cr@sonus.com.au
Appendix E - Oxigen Landscape Character and Visual Assessment
Highway Service Centre Nuriootpa
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1 — Introduction

Purpose

This landscape character and visual assessment report is prepared in relation to a proposal for the construction of a new, integrated highway service centre located on Sturt Highway at Nuriootpa.

This report has been prepared by Oxigen by Landscape Architects and Urban Designers as part of the Nuriootpa (Sturt Highway Service Centre) Development Plan Amendment process.

This report:

— Describes the existing landscape character of the proposal's locality.
— Reviews the likely visibility of the proposal from publicly accessible locations within the surrounding region.

Background

The following background information has been referenced in relation to this report:

— Nielson Architects, Site Plan, KFC Nuriootpa, not dated.

Proposed development

The proposal is for a new, integrated highway service centre. The facility will provide refuelling facilities for cars and trucks, a rest stop area for trucks, food outlets and associated land uses. It is also proposed to include a road train marshalling area, RV dump point, playground and outdoor eating.
2 — Site

Context

The site of the proposal is located within allotment 147, Sturt Highway, at the intersection of Sturt Highway and Belvidere Road, Nuriootpa (refer Figure 01), approximately 80km from Adelaide and 2.5km from the township of Nuriootpa.

The site is located within the Barossa Council local government area and is within the Primary Production Zone (Barossa Valley District) and Character Preservation District Overlay. The Light Regional Council flanks the site to the north and west.

Adjacent development to the east and west of the site comprises open broad acre cropping, scattered rural dwellings, vineyards and wineries, including ancillary buildings. Development to the south of the site comprises residential development at the edge of the Nuriootpa township, open reserves, vineyards and institutional buildings (TAFE SA and Redeemer Lutheran School). The site is bound to the north by the Barossa Go Kart Club and a woodland.

Within the site’s locality, scattered copses of mature trees are located along road corridors and water courses, property boundaries and within private properties.

Figure 01: Location of proposed development (Source: Nearmaps, 2018)

Legend

- Location of proposed development
- Site property boundary
Site description

Currently, the site’s allotment comprises existing vineyards, sheds, ancillary structures and tanks, fencing and isolated mature trees.

The Barossa Bottling Services and Rocland Estate buildings and storage tanks are located to the north west corner of the allotment. The buildings and tanks are partially screened to the south by vines and a row of mature trees. Two dams are located within the allotment.

The proposed service centre is located on the south east corner of the site within an area that currently comprises a vineyard.

A number of mature trees are located within the site boundary in isolated clusters between vineyard blocks. Mature rows of eucalyptus trees are located south of the site within the Sturt Road verge and north of the site within the Barossa Go Kart Club and adjacent woodland.
3 — Landscape assessment

Landscape character

The landscape of the locality is characterised by:

— An agricultural landscape used primarily for viticulture and broad-acre cropping. The landscape character includes rural dwellings, fences, sheds and ancillary buildings and structures associated with wine and agricultural production.

— An open rural character with scattered stands of mature native vegetation located within road verges, private properties and reserves.

— Residential development comprising single storey detached dwellings at the edge of the Nuriootpa township.

Methodology

The following section describes the existing character of the site and locality, including the following:

— Existing structures
— Development plan zoning
— Character preservation
— Topography
— Water and drainage
— Vegetation
— Access
— Soil
Image 01: View north to the site from Sturt Highway

Image 02: View west to the site from Belvidere Road

Image 03: View of adjacent vineyards and residential development at the edge of the Nuriootpa township
Existing structures

Existing development within and adjacent to the site of the proposal includes:

— Ancillary buildings and structures associated with viticulture (Barossa Bottling Services and Rocland Estate).

— Storage sheds and rural dwellings scattered within private properties to the east, north and west of the site.

— Residential development to the southern side of Sturt Highway, generally characterised by medium to large allotments containing detached single storey dwellings.

— A service station and rest stop located approximately 1.5km east of the site at 174 Murray Street, Nuriootpa.

— TAFE SA, Barossa Valley campus to the south of the site.
Figure 03: Existing development (Source: Nearmaps, 2018)

Legend
- **Site of proposal**
- **Site property boundary**
- **Building**

3 — Landscape assessment
The site is located within The Barossa Council local government area and is within the ‘Primary Production (Barossa Valley Region)’ zone. The zone’s objectives and principles of development control aim to:

— Maintain and support economically productive, efficient and environmentally sustainable primary production activity.

— Preserve the rural land character by limiting additional dwellings and non-agricultural development.

— Support development that contributes to the desired character of the zone.

![Development plan zoning](image-url)
The site is also located within a Character Preservation District. The District’s objectives and principles of development control aim to:

— Value, protect and retain the scenic and rural landscape character of the area by maintaining and supporting primary production activity.
— Control development at entrances to towns, not diminish the rural setting, character and heritage of the district.
— Ensure buildings and development compliments the character of the district.
— Actively support tourism.
— Preserve the heritage value of the area.
Topography

The topography of the site's locality includes:

— A gently sloping landscape that subtly rises from east to west.
— Subtle undulations in landform resulting from construction of dam batters and roadside swales that restrict views to the site.
Water and drainage

Stormwater and drainage within the locality includes:

— Dams located within the allotment and adjacent properties.

— Open grass swales located to the northern side of Sturt Highway and eastern side of Belvidere Road.

— Tributaries of the North Para River to the southern side of Sturt Highway.
Vegetation

Existing vegetation within the locality includes:

1. Mature roadside trees located along Sturt Highway and Belvidere Road. Prominent species include eucalyptus, sheoak and native pine.
2. Mature eucalypts within a stand located at the northern edge of the site.
3. Scattered eucalyptus species located within the site and adjacent vineyards.
4. A stand of mid-block trees.
5. Eucalyptus woodland to the north of the site and adjacent to the Barossa Go Kart Club.
6. Densely populated vegetation along water corridors to the south of the site.
Figure 08: Site vegetation (Source: Nearmaps, 2018)

Legend

- Site of proposal
- Site property boundary
Circulation and access

Circulation and access includes:

— The Sturt Highway, which is classified as national highway (Primary Arterial).
— Old Kapunda Road, a sealed collector road providing vehicle access to the township of Nuriootpa.
— Belvidere Road, a sealed collector road providing vehicle access to Kapunda and Truro via Truro Road.
— An internal road within the site that provides access from Belvidere Road to Rocland Estate and Barossa Bottling Services.
Thick sand over clay is the dominant soil found within the site’s locality (Data SA, 2018) - this is typical of this region the Barossa Valley. A narrow band of deep sandy loam soil passes to the east of the site.
4 — Visual assessment

Methodology

The methodology used for this visual assessment includes use of the following analytical techniques:

i. Viewshed

This describes the viewshed of the proposal; that is, the area from which the site may be visible. The definition of a viewshed incorporates the parameters of human vision which assist in defining the viewshed.

ii. Landscape sensitivity

Landscape sensitivity is primarily an assessment of the extent to which the landscape can accept change. It considers the visual change to the existing landscape as a result of the proposal.

iii. Assessment of visual impact from publicly accessible viewpoints

An assessment of the visual impact from viewpoints within the landscape is based on site inspection. The viewpoints are the locations from which the site is visible, assisting in the analysis of the overall visual impact of the proposal.

The visual impact of a development is affected by the following criteria:

— The distance of the viewer from the development.
— The nature of the surrounding landscape.
— The number of viewers able to see the development.

Accordingly, the overall effect of the proposal on each viewpoint has been assessed, ranking each as being negligible, low, medium or high. An assessment of the overall effect of the proposal can then be made by balancing each of the above criteria.

iv. Magnitude of visual impact

The overall visual impact of the proposed development has been assessed on the following scale:

— **Negligible adverse effects** – very small visual impact over the day-to-day experience. Negligible adverse effects are usually based on distance.
— **Low adverse effect** – these effects are noticeable but do not cause any significant adverse visual impacts. Low adverse effects occur if the distance, viewer numbers and landscape sensitivity is assessed as low.
— **Medium adverse effect** – there are significant effects that may be able to be mitigated or remedial action taken. Medium adverse effects depend on all three assessment criteria being assessed as higher than ‘low’.
— **High or unacceptable adverse effects** – these effects are extensive and cannot be avoided, mitigated or remedial action taken. High or unacceptable adverse effects usually requires all three assessment criteria to be assessed as high.
**Viewshed**

An analysis of viewshed is particularly useful in a landscape setting where there are likely to be open views to the subject and factors like distance, size, materiality and colour will influence visibility.

The viewshed is defined as the area in which the site of the proposal may be visible from publicly accessible viewpoints, including roads and road verges, and reserves within the locality.

In this case, the viewlines to the subject are restricted by overhead power lines, rural dwellings and ancillary buildings, subtle undulations of the topography and large trees located within road verges, reserves and adjacent properties.

The most significant views of the site are from Sturt Highway travelling west, where breaks in vegetation allow open views to the site.

**Landscape sensitivity**

Typically, a visual landscape assessment is also based on the sensitivity of the surrounding landscape.

Given the site of the proposal is located within the Primary Production Zone (Barossa Valley) and a Character Preservation District, particular care must be taken to ensure that development is designed so that any potential negative visual effects are minimised. In this case, the sensitivity rating of the location is given a *medium* rating:

— The site of the proposal sits within a landscape context that is already modified. It forms part of an area that comprises cleared native vegetation for the purposes of primary production.

— Views to the site are infrequent and broken by rural dwellings and ancillary buildings, vegetation, overhead power lines and localised changes in topography.

— Existing vegetation to the northern, western and southern boundaries of the site form a definite and distinguishable backdrop to the site.

— The speed limit of 110km hour along Sturt Highway reduces the time duration in which the site is viewed to moving traffic.
**Viewpoints**

A photographic survey was undertaken to record viewpoints and assist in determining the visibility of the site.

Figure 09 identifies viewpoints from where the site is visible from publicly accessible locations, including roads and road verges, and reserves. Viewpoints include:

1. Belvidere Road
2. Sturt Highway 01 (travelling east)
3. Sturt Highway 02 (travelling east)
4. Sturt Highway 03 (travelling west)
5. Sturt Highway 04 (travelling west)

**Photography**

Photos included in this report were taken using a Nikon digital SLR camera with a 45mm focal lens.
## Viewpoint 1

Summary of visual impact from viewpoint 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Belvidere Road, Nuriootpa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Belvidere Road runs in an approximate north-south direction to the east of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance to site</td>
<td>50m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visibility</td>
<td>Views are restricted by existing vegetation within the Belvidere Road verge and adjacent property (Barossa Go Kart Club).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance of view</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall visual impact</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Photograph 01: Site viewed travelling south along Belvidere Road
### Viewpoint 2

Summary of visual impact from viewpoint 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Sturt Highway, Nuriootpa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
<td>Sturt Highway runs in an approximate east-west direction passing to the south of the site. This view is taken on the approach to the site from the east.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Distance to site</strong></td>
<td>300m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visibility</strong></td>
<td>Travelling along Sturt Highway, generally open views to the site are possible. Views are partially restricted in the foreground by a dam embankment, overhead power lines and groundcover vegetation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Significance of view</strong></td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall visual impact</strong></td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Viewpoint 3**

Summary of visual impact from viewpoint 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Sturt Highway, Nuriootpa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Sturt Highway runs in an approximate east-west direction to the south of the site. This view is taken on the approach to the site from the east.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance to site</td>
<td>150m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visibility</td>
<td>Generally, open views to the site are possible at this location due to a lack of foreground vegetation. Stobie poles and overhead power lines run parallel to Sturt Highway and form prominent features in the view.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance of view</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall visual impact</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Viewpoint 4

**Summary of visual impact from viewpoint 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Sturt Highway, Nuriootpa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
<td>Sturt Highway runs in an approximate east-west direction to the south of the site. This view is taken from the approach to the site from the west.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Distance to site</strong></td>
<td>150m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visibility</strong></td>
<td>Large existing trees located within the northern verge of Sturt Highway and existing vines located within a vineyard restrict views to the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Significance of view</strong></td>
<td>Low to medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall visual impact</strong></td>
<td>Low to medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Photograph 04: Site viewed travelling west along Sturt Highway](image_url)
Viewpoint 5

Summary of visual impact from viewpoint 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Sturt Highway, Nuriootpa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Sturt Highway runs in an approximate east-west direction to the south of the site. This view is taken from the approach to the site from the west approximately at the intersection of Sturt Highway and Old Kapunda Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance to site</td>
<td>300m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visibility</td>
<td>Large existing trees located within the northern verge of Sturt Highway restrict views to the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance of view</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall visual impact</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cumulative Visual Impact

The following table summarises the results of the preceding analysis of the viewpoints from publicly accessible viewpoints with the locality.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Viewpoint</th>
<th>Location of viewer</th>
<th>Distance to the site</th>
<th>Summary evaluation from visual assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Non-elevated viewpoint travelling south along Belvidere Road</td>
<td>50m</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Non-elevated viewpoint travelling west along Sturt Highway</td>
<td>300m</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Non-elevated viewpoint travelling west along Sturt Highway</td>
<td>150m</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Non-elevated viewpoint travelling east along Sturt Highway</td>
<td>150m</td>
<td>Low to medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Non-elevated viewpoint travelling east along Sturt Highway</td>
<td>300m</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusion

The site of the proposal is located within the Primary Production (Barossa Valley) zone and a Character Preservation District. Development within this zone should balance the needs of primary production, tourism and residential living with the preservation of the scenic qualities of the Barossa Valley. The visual effects of developments within this zone should be minimised by design that incorporates appropriate scale, bulk and mass, form, and colour and material selection.

The visual assessment has demonstrated that the overall visual impact of the proposal is likely to be medium. The main viewpoints that are impacted by the proposal are from Sturt Highway. The assessment demonstrates that from publicly accessible viewpoints the site of the proposal will be visible to varying degrees, and that visibility is influenced by existing trees and vegetation, rural dwellings and ancillary buildings, overhead power lines, topography and the limited time duration in which the site is viewed to moving traffic.

Whilst this visual assessment has determined that development on this site may result in a medium visual impact, that is acceptable from a site planning point of view, it is important that the proposal be evaluated further in respect to the detailed design that will also include final plans, elevations, landscaping and photomontage images. The resolution of these details, that will also include height and mass, colours, signage, materials palette etc. will determine whether the proposal is acceptable when considered against the provisions of the development plan.
Development Plan Amendment

By the Council

Council

Nuriootpa (Sturt Highway Service Centre) DPA

The Amendment

For Consultation
# Amendment Instructions Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Local Government Area: The Barossa Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of Development Plan: The Barossa Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of DPA: Nuriootpa (Sturt Highway Service Centre)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following amendment instructions (at the time of drafting) relate to the Council Development Plan consolidated on 11th August 2016.

Where amendments to this Development Plan have been authorised after the aforementioned consolidation date, consequential changes to the following amendment instructions will be made as necessary to give effect to this amendment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amendment Instruction Number</th>
<th>Method of Change</th>
<th>Detail what in the Development Plan is to be amended, replaced, deleted or inserted.</th>
<th>Is Renumbering required (Y/N)</th>
<th>Subsequent Policy cross-references requiring update (Y/N) if yes please specify</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Replace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Insert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If applicable, detail what material is to be inserted and where. Use attachments for large bodies of material.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COUNCIL WIDE / GENERAL SECTION PROVISIONS (including figures and illustrations contained in the text)

Amendments required (Yes/No): **No**

General Section

1.  
2.  
3.  
4.  

ZONE AND/OR POLICY AREA AND/OR PRECINCT PROVISIONS (including figures and illustrations contained in the text)

Amendments required (Yes/No): **Yes**

### Primary Production (Barossa Valley Region) Zone

5. Insert At the end of zone objective 3 the following; “except as provided for in Nuriootpa Highway Service Centre Policy Area 13.” No No

6. Insert In the Desired Character statement after paragraph 3, the following; “Provision has been made for the development of a highway service centre at the corner of the Sturt Highway and Belvidere Road, with policy area specific policies applicable to this land contained in Nuriootpa Sturt Highway Service Centre Policy Area 13.” No No

7. Insert In Procedural Matters, Non-complying Development - Exceptions; under the definition Advertisement and/or advertising hoarding, and at the end, the following; “or Is located Nuriootpa Highway Service Centre Policy Area 13, satisfies the associated principles of development” No No
control, and is limited to information relating to an approved land use within the Policy Area

### Table 1: Amendment Instructions Table

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Insert</td>
<td>In Procedural Matters, Non-complying Development - Exceptions; after the definition Deck; the following: “Development associated with a highway service centre in Nuriootpa Sturt Highway Service Centre Policy Area 13.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Insert</td>
<td>In Procedural Matters, Exceptions; after the definition Land Division and at the end; “Is located in Nuriootpa Sturt Highway Service Centre Policy Area 13.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Insert</td>
<td>In Procedural Matters, Exceptions; after the definition Solar photovoltaic panels, the following; “Shop, where located in Nuriootpa Highway Service Centre Policy Area 13, other than convenience retailing as part of an integrated service station development where the floor area is less than 250 square metres.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Insert</td>
<td>In Procedural Matters, Exceptions; at the end of the exception applicable to restaurant; the following “or is located in Nuriootpa Sturt Highway Service Centre Policy Area 13.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Insert</td>
<td>In Procedural Matters, Exceptions, at the end of the exception relating to a winery, the following, “or is located in Nuriootpa Sturt Highway Service Centre Policy Area 13.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Insert</td>
<td>Under Public Notification, in the list of Category 1 land uses, the following; “All development associated with a highway service centre in Nuriootpa Highway Service Centre Policy Area 13.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Policy Area

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Insert</td>
<td>New Policy Area provisions contained in Attachment A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Precinct No

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLES

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MAPPING (Structure Plans, Overlays, Enlargements, Zone Maps, Policy Area & Precinct Maps)

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Amendments required (Yes/No): No

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Map Reference Table

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Map(s)

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Insert</td>
<td>In Policy Area Maps, after Residential Lyndoch Policy Area 12; under Policy Area Name “Nuriootpa Highway Service Centre Policy Area 13” and under the associated Policy Area Map Numbers “Baro/2”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Insert</td>
<td>In Concept Plan Maps after Lyndoch Fringe, the following “Sturt Highway Service Centre and Baro/18”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Insert</td>
<td>Policy Area Map Baro/2 Nuriootpa Highway Service Centre Policy Area 13 contained in Attachment B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Insert</td>
<td>Under Concept Plan maps after Concept Plan Map Baro/17, the Concept Plan Map contained in Attachment C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Refer to the *Map Reference Tables* for a list of the maps that relate to this policy area.

**OBJECTIVES**

1. Development of land uses that provide services and facilities to cater for the needs of highway users.
2. Development that contributes to the desired character of the policy area.

**DESIRED CHARACTER**

Development within the Policy Area will comprise a continuation of existing wine related land uses together with the potential development of a highway service centre which would provide safe and convenient access onto and off the highway, a recognised and expected range of services and facilities to cater for the needs of both heavy and light vehicle traffic and which is open on a 24-hour/7-days per week basis.

A highway service centre within the Policy Area may include, but not be limited to, the following services and facilities:

- Designated parking spaces for a range of light and heavy vehicles;
- Undercover and segregated fuel sales designed to cater for light and heavy vehicles;
- Food and refreshment facilities, including indoor seating eating areas and take-away food outlets, excluding the sale of alcohol;
- Convenience store not exceeding 250 square metres;
- Truck marshalling yards and rest facilities for truck drivers;
- Comfortable and safe, free access toilets, shower and washroom facilities;
- Public telecommunication facilities;
- Local and regional tourist information;
- Facilities for Emergency services;
- RV dump point and facilities for charging electric vehicles;
- Outdoor picnic and eating areas and playground facilities.

The built form of the highway service centre will be low in scale, functional, efficient and aesthetically pleasing to encourage drivers to stop. Buildings will adopt a unified architectural design, and signage will be integrated throughout and shared to minimise the proliferation of signage. Advertising should not dominate the buildings to which they relate.

The design, cladding, colour and layout of the buildings should respond to the local landscape character and visual context by avoiding highly commercial architectural finishes and maximising use of stone, timber and other rustic architectural elements.

Landscaping and signage will be located and designed to assist drivers to identify entrance points and to integrate the built form development into the landscape. Particular importance will be given to landscaping the development as viewed from the Sturt Highway east of the land. Shaded picnic and public outdoor dining facilities will be an integral part of the landscape design.

**PRINCIPLES OF DEVELOPMENT CONTROL**

**Land Use**

1. The following forms of development are envisaged in the policy area:
   - advertisements and advertising hoardings
   - rest facilities for truck drivers
   - highway service centre including
     - fuel sales
     - cafés and restaurants
- free public access washrooms
- public telecommunication facilities
- facilities for emergency services
- RV dump point and facilities for charging electric vehicles;
- Outdoor picnic and eating areas and playground facilities for children.

- industry and commercial activities associated with the wine industry
- shop, (other than a single convenience retail area not exceeding 250 square metres)
- truck marshalling facilities

2 Development should be undertaken in accordance with Concept Plan Map Baro/18 – Nuriootpa Sturt Highway Service Centre

3 Development listed as non-complying is generally inappropriate

4 Development should provide safe and convenient access to and from the adjoining road network

5 The development of a highway service centre should;
   (a) provide safe and convenient access to and from the adjoining road network;
   (b) be visible from the adjoining roadway and be clearly signposted to promote safe access from the highway, but should not be so prominent so as to adversely impact on the landscape character of the locality;
   (c) provide a layout that is simple, understandable and accessible for drivers and which separates heavy from light vehicles wherever possible, and keeps internal traffic speeds to not more than 20kph;
   (d) adopt a unified architectural design with building material, colour and the layout of buildings to address the visual context of the locality;
   (e) locate buildings, (excluding an advertising hoarding) a minimum of 25m from the road alignment;
   (f) provide a minimum of 5 metres of landscaping along the road frontages, with additional internal landscaping around buildings and to separate driveways;
   (g) include landscaping which provides safe driver sightlines and that reflect local landscape character;
   (h) be well lit;
   (i) provide for integrated and shared advertising to minimise the proliferation of signage; and
   (j) manage noise, odour, visual or light spill impacts on road users and any existing adjacent sensitive land uses.

6 To avoid visual clutter, there should be a single, multi-tenancy pylon sign not more than 12m high that identifies the primary facility and individual tenancies

7 Advertising for individual tenancies should be integrated with the design of the buildings and should not be located above the roofline of any building including above any refuelling area canopy

8 Individual freestanding signs for separate tenancies should not exceed 6 metres in height and should be sited a minimum of 20m from each other and from adjoining road reserves

9 Fencing where required should be traditional rural post and wire fencing, except as required to screen service areas
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7.5.5. DEBATE AGENDA – WASTE SERVICES REPORT

7.5.5.1 REGIONAL WASTE MANAGEMENT STRATEGY
B7212

**PURPOSE**
To provide Council with a draft Regional Waste Management Strategy prepared by the Waste Management Working Group.

**RECOMMENDATION**
That Council endorse the Regional Waste Management Strategy.

**REPORT**

*Background*
In 2017, Council considered a number of reports regarding the future management of waste. After community consultation on the proposed collection service options, Council resolved to maintain services essentially the same.

*Introduction*
In considering the options, Council resolved to have administration prepare a high level waste education strategy in support of the new waste management contract.

Following discussion with the partnering Councils (Adelaide Plains, Barossa, Gawler, Light Regional, and Mid Murray), it was agreed that a Regional Waste Management Strategy would be prepared that will address a range of waste streams (ie soft plastics, hard waste, E-waste).

Given the regional collaboration, it was felt that the initially proposed waste education strategy could be incorporated as a key element in the regional strategy.

*Discussion*
The Regional Waste Management Strategy seeks to promote the benefits of recycling as a means of reducing waste to land fill and reducing the financial cost of waste management for the community.

A copy of the draft Regional Waste Management Strategy is provided in Attachment 1.

Education is seen as a critical tool for changing behaviour, which aims to facilitate better usage of the services provided by the Councils.
It is acknowledge that education takes many forms, hence the strategy is not prescriptive in nature, noting that education needs to be tailored for the specific audiences being targeted (i.e., school children, parents, community groups).

The draft strategy delivers on an action in the Barossa, Light and Lower Northern Region Public Health and Wellbeing Plan, in particular the action under Commitment 8.3:

*Implement a regional strategy for waste management and recycling.*

The Barossa Regional Procurement Group is seeking to identify opportunities to work across the four councils that are a part of the new waste management contract, and the Town of Gawler (member council of the Northern Adelaide Waste Management Authority).

There are identified opportunities to collaborate on addressing other waste streams.

**Summary and Conclusion**

A draft Regional Waste Management Strategy has been prepared in support of the new waste management contract and management of other waste streams.

The Regional Waste Management Strategy is to be considered by all councils when initiating activities associated with waste management.

---

**ATTACHMENTS OR OTHER SUPPORTING REFERENCES**

Attachment 1: Regional Waste Management Strategy

---

**COMMUNITY PLAN / CORPORATE PLAN / LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS**

**Community Plan**

- Health and Wellbeing
- Business and Employment

**Corporate Plan**

4.9 Provide residents kerbside waste collection and recycling services that reduce waste disposed to landfill.

4.10 Facilitate access to hard and green waste facilities and associated recycling opportunities that reduce waste disposed to landfill and support the environment.

5.6 Implement purchasing initiatives that generate savings or reduce expenditure growth and grow the capacity of local suppliers to obtain Council contracts.

**Legislative Requirements**

Local Government Act 1999

Environment Protection Act 1993

Green Industries SA Act 2004
FINANCIAL, RESOURCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT CONSIDERATIONS

Financial Management
There are no immediate costs associated with the adoption of the regional strategy. The working group will seek to identify projects each year that may require a budget allocation for delivery.

Council has already provided funds to address e-waste and hard waste pilot projects. Depending on the success of these pilots, further budget allocation may be required.

Resources
Council had endorsed budget allocation for a part time Waste Management Officer to oversee management of waste programs. The officer will have responsibility for overseeing implementation of the actions within the strategy.

Risk Management
Council has set itself targets for waste and recycling – 46% of waste recycled greater that the state rural average, and 54% of waste disposal to landfill less than the state average.

To meet the targets, Council has opted to focus on community education to encourage the adoption of positive waste behaviours, in favour of altering the waste service levels provided as part of the kerbside collection.

During the life of the new waste management contract, reporting will be put in place to measure Council’s performance in meeting the stated targets, and whether the education strategy has been effective to deliver behaviour change.

COMMUNITY CONSULTATION
Nil
Regional Waste Management Strategy for the Adelaide Plains, Barossa, Gawler, Light Regional and Mid Murray Councils
INTRODUCTION

Waste management is a core service provided by local government to the community, which presents an environmental, social and economic challenge to councils.

Waste services represent a significant cost for councils, one that has increased in recent years due to a combination of factors, including increases in the State Government’s solid waste levy, transportation and processing costs.

As with all councils, Councils of the Barossa Regional Procurement Group are seeking to implement a high-performing waste management system that is cost-effective, responsive to community needs and achieves a high rate of waste diversion.

Awareness of waste management requires a coordinated and multifaceted approach. This Regional Waste Management Strategy aims to raise awareness of waste issues and foster behaviour change by implementing targeted behaviour change projects/programs in partnership with relevant organisations that focus on:

a. increasing recovery and recycling of materials
b. reducing the level of contamination in the recycling stream
c. reducing waste generation.

What is Waste?

The Environmental Protection Authority (EPA) of South Australia defines waste as “any material or substance that is of no further use and has been discarded.” It goes on to state, “if not properly managed waste can cause pollution and adverse impacts on the environment. Disposing of waste that could be reused or recycled is often a waste of resources, a lost opportunity and a waste of money.”

Waste can be defined into distinct types depending on its composition and how it was generated.

1. Municipal solid / domestic waste
2. Disaster waste
3. Commercial and industrial waste
4. Regulated waste
5. Construction and demolition waste
6. Illegal dumping and litter
Waste Management Hierarchy

The waste management hierarchy is a nationally and internationally accepted guide for prioritising waste management practices with the objective of achieving optimal environmental outcomes. It sets out the preferred order of waste management practices, from most to least preferred.

The waste management hierarchy is one of the guiding principles of the Zero Waste SA Act 2004, and is regarded in South Australia’s Waste Strategy 2015 – 2020 as a key element for guiding waste management practices in South Australia, while still recognising the need for flexibility based on local and regional economic, social and environmental conditions.

Managing our Waste

Local government is responsible for municipal solid/domestic waste, which includes:

- Kerbside collection of recyclable and non-recyclable waste from households;
- Materials generated from local councils activities, such as parks and gardens maintenance;
- Transfer stations; and
- Resource and material recovery facilities.

The five Councils spends approximately $5 million annually on waste management. It represents considerable use of resources and presents a considerable cost to the community.

The focus of the Councils over the past years has been identifying ways to achieve best practice waste management across the region in order to improve diversion rates and maximise recovery of resources for recycling. A key driver of increasing diversion rates and improving resource recovery opportunities has been the increase in the waste levy imposed by the State Government.
## What services are provided?

### HOUSEHOLD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Provision</th>
<th>Service Provision</th>
<th>Service Provision</th>
<th>Hard</th>
<th>Electronic</th>
<th>Mattresses</th>
<th>Construction/ Demolition</th>
<th>Hazardous</th>
<th>Solvents/ Liquid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Township</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Township</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Food</td>
<td>Organic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adelaide Plains</td>
<td>Fortnightly 140Litre</td>
<td>Fortnightly 240Litre</td>
<td>Fortnightly 240Litre</td>
<td>Council supported</td>
<td>Transfer Stations</td>
<td>Transfer Stations</td>
<td>Transfer Stations</td>
<td>Transfer Stations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weekly 140Litre</td>
<td>Weekly 140Litre</td>
<td>Fortnightly 240Litre</td>
<td>Opt-in Fortnightly 240Litre</td>
<td>Townships/ Commercial Service Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barossa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Weekly 140Litre</td>
<td>Fortnightly 240Litre</td>
<td>Fortnightly 240Litre</td>
<td>Fortnightly 240Litre</td>
<td>Council supported</td>
<td>Transfer Stations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trial for Concession Card Holders to commence 2018/19</td>
<td>NAWMA</td>
<td>NAWMA</td>
<td>NAWMA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gawler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NAWMA Pilot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not accepted clients referred to EPA/NAWMA</td>
<td>Not accepted clients referred to EPA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Transfer station/ other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid Murray</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Transfer Stations</td>
<td>Transfer Stations</td>
<td>Transfer Stations</td>
<td>Transfer Stations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not accepted clients referred to EPA</td>
<td>Only engine oil accepted clients with other liquids or solvents referred to EPA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council Street/Facilities</td>
<td>Agricultural</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adelaide Plains</td>
<td>Kerbside collection or Self-Managed</td>
<td>Kerbside collection or Self-Managed</td>
<td>Self-Managed</td>
<td>Kerbside collection or Self-Managed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barossa</td>
<td>Self-Managed</td>
<td>Self-Managed / Kerbside Optional (Township only)</td>
<td>Self-Managed / Kerbside Optional (Township only)</td>
<td>Self-Managed / Kerbside Optional (Township only)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gawler</td>
<td>Kerbside collection or Self-Managed</td>
<td>Kerbside collection or Self-Managed</td>
<td>Kerbside collection or Self-Managed</td>
<td>Kerbside collection or Self-Managed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light</td>
<td>Self-Managed</td>
<td>Self-Managed</td>
<td>Self-Managed</td>
<td>Self-Managed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid Murray</td>
<td>Self-Managed</td>
<td>Self-Managed</td>
<td>Self-Managed</td>
<td>Self-Managed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## What volume gets collected? (2017-18 kerbside data)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Waste</th>
<th>Recycling</th>
<th>Green Organics</th>
<th>Hard Waste</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adelaide Plains</td>
<td>1,615 tonnes</td>
<td>685 tonnes</td>
<td>198 tonnes</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
<td>2,498 tonnes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barossa</td>
<td>5,621 tonnes</td>
<td>2,128 tonnes</td>
<td>1,037 tonnes</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
<td>8,786 tonnes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gawler</td>
<td>5,040 tonnes</td>
<td>4,236 tonnes</td>
<td>2,342 tonnes</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>11,618 tonnes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light</td>
<td>2,750 tonnes</td>
<td>1,125 tonnes</td>
<td>1,200 tonnes</td>
<td>90 tonnes</td>
<td>5,165 tonnes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid Murray</td>
<td>2,533 tonnes</td>
<td>529 tonnes</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>3,062 tonnes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>17,559 tonnes</td>
<td>8,703 tonnes</td>
<td>4,777 tonnes</td>
<td>90 tonnes</td>
<td>31,129 tonnes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Operating Budgets (2018-19)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Waste</th>
<th>Recycling</th>
<th>Green Organics</th>
<th>Hard Waste</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adelaide Plains</td>
<td>$228,674</td>
<td>$79,310</td>
<td>$29,645</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>$337,629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barossa</td>
<td>$1,174,392</td>
<td>$546,913</td>
<td>$146,975</td>
<td>$32,936</td>
<td>$1,901,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gawler</td>
<td>$386,523</td>
<td>$190,142</td>
<td>$250,292</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
<td>$826,957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light</td>
<td>$584,629</td>
<td>$241,071</td>
<td>$195,114</td>
<td>$191,645</td>
<td>$1,239,304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid Murray</td>
<td>$575,500</td>
<td>$199,600</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>$775,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$2,949,718</td>
<td>$1,257,036</td>
<td>$622,026</td>
<td>$224,581</td>
<td>$5,080,206</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Future Drivers and Opportunities

Legislation and policy changes

There has been significant recent change in government laws and policies that regulate or affect waste services, and further changes during the life of this Waste Management Strategy are likely. Some of these changes have or may significantly affect the cost and service obligations our Council incurs in providing waste services. Table x provides a range of examples.

Rising Costs in Disposal of Rubbish to Landfill

The waste that Councils collect from the community and sends to landfill is subject to disposal fees and a State Government Solid Waste levy. In July 2016 the State Government increased the Waste Levy from $31 per tonne in 2015-16 to $51.50 per tonne by 2019-20.

It is estimated that the current service will increase in cost due in the main to increasing costs of landfill disposal from a current rate of $172 per service to approximately $233 per service by 24/25.

To minimise the impact of the increased levy on our community, the Councils are exploring opportunities to encourage increased recycling and diversion of organic waste from landfill.

China’s ban on foreign waste

China’s announcement that it would no longer import certain waste products from overseas will impact the local waste and recycling industry. It is estimated that the impact on Australia is about 620,000 tonnes of material.

While the initial challenge will be to find a new home for our recycling, and the need to curb an increase in recycling costs – the long term may present an opportunity for an increase in local industry to find solutions for processing and manufacturing of goods from recycled products.

Minimising the Impact of Waste on the Environment

A key strategy to minimise the impact of waste on the environment is to reduce the amount of waste our community places in household rubbish bins therefore reducing waste to landfill. The priority is to redirect waste to both the organics and recycling bins.

Our Targets

30% of waste disposed to landfill

70% of waste recycled
Waste Management Strategy

The Waste Management Strategy is made up of three components

Vision
Principles
Strategic Directions

Vision:

“To foster behavioural change to reduce waste and increase recycling in the region”

Overarching Principles:

- Minimise waste to landfill through application of the waste hierarchy, and seek a ‘closed system of resource recovery’.
- Engage with the community to increase participation in and awareness of sustainable waste management practices.
- Provide a quality and cost-effective waste management service.
- Minimise the environmental impact of waste generation, collection and disposal.
- Maintain effective relationships with key stakeholders to maximise regional outcomes.
Strategic Directions:
– Regional collaboration

Commitment to a regional approach to waste management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIONS</th>
<th>WHO</th>
<th>WHEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Establish a regional meeting of waste officers</td>
<td>All councils</td>
<td>January 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Adopt common approach to recording and reporting waste data that will facilitate regional waste planning and external requirements (i.e. Grants Commission).</td>
<td>All council</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Adopt common approach to waste education (refer Waste Education).</td>
<td>All councils</td>
<td>July 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Adopt common Waste Management Policy with supporting guidelines.</td>
<td>All councils</td>
<td>July 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

– Resourcing Waste Service

Delivery of an efficient and cost-effective kerbside collection service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIONS</th>
<th>WHO</th>
<th>WHEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Maintain the collection of the waste, recycling and green organic bin (where applicable) for occupied rateable properties.</td>
<td>Participating councils Contractor</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 Audit kerbside bins to determine use/trends and identify opportunities</td>
<td>Contractor All councils</td>
<td>Annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7 Promote the diversion of food scraps into the green organics bin throughout the community</td>
<td>Participating councils</td>
<td>July 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACTIONS</td>
<td>WHO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>Maintain the availability of kitchen caddies</td>
<td>Adelaide Plains Barossa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>Undertake service reviews within the community</td>
<td>All Councils</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**– Waste to Energy**

Reducing reliance on landfills for disposal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIONS</th>
<th>WHO</th>
<th>WHEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.10 Explore opportunities to establishing a waste to energy facility</td>
<td>Waste Industry State Govt</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as part of an overall waste management system for the region</td>
<td>All Councils</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**– Public Places and Events**

Improve waste and recycling opportunities at Public Places and Community Events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIONS</th>
<th>WHO</th>
<th>WHEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.11 Introduce specific waste stream bins at public events (i.e.</td>
<td>All council</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Festivals, Australia Day) to aid in responsible waste management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.12 Audit waste generated at Council facilities to determine use/trends</td>
<td>All councils</td>
<td>Bi-annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and identify opportunities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.13 Provide waste and recycling collection services at Council</td>
<td>All councils</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- **Hard Waste**

Support and encourage reuse and recycling of hard waste

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIONS</th>
<th>WHO</th>
<th>WHEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>Provide one pre-booked hard waste collection for occupied residential properties each year.</td>
<td>Light Regional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>Promote the availability of the hard waste collection service</td>
<td>Barossa, Light Regional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>Promote the responsible disposal of e-waste through Recycling Program or other e-waste recycling facilities.</td>
<td>All councils</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Electronic Waste**

Support and encourage recycling of electronic waste

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIONS</th>
<th>WHO</th>
<th>WHEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>Promote effective disposal of eWaste.</td>
<td>Adelaide Plains, Barossa, Light Regional, Mid Murray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>Provide recycling services Batteries and Mobile Phones at Civic Centre, Libraries, Works Depot and Community Centres</td>
<td>All councils</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Other Waste

Advocate for increase in recycling of other waste streams

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIONS</th>
<th>WHO</th>
<th>WHEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.19 Promote effective recycling of Soft Plastics.</td>
<td>Barossa (pilot) Gawler (pilot)</td>
<td>2018 Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.20 Provide information on Hazardous waste</td>
<td>All Councils EPA</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Illegal Dumping

Promote responsible waste disposal practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIONS</th>
<th>WHO</th>
<th>WHEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.21 Introduce a standardised process for illegal dumping responses and investigations</td>
<td>All councils</td>
<td>December 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.22 Investigate reports of illegal dumping on Council land.</td>
<td>All councils</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.23 Increase surveillance in identified illegal dumping hotspots</td>
<td>All councils</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.24 Promote responsible waste disposal practices through education material and use of illegal dumping tools</td>
<td>All councils</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.25 Provide support for Clean Up Australia Day volunteers through the collection and disposal of Clean Up Australia bags</td>
<td>All councils</td>
<td>Annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.26 Work with the EPA’s Investigations Branch when/where required</td>
<td>All Councils</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Landfill / Transfer Stations

**Upgrade, maintain and improve environmental management of waste facilities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIONS</th>
<th>WHO</th>
<th>WHEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>Effective management and operation of landfills located in the region</td>
<td>Mid Murray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>Maximise the recovery and subsequent reuse and recycling of materials entering Transfer Stations in the region</td>
<td>All councils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>Maximise the efficient operation of council operated transfer stations and explore opportunities to expand services.</td>
<td>All councils</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Waste Education / Advocacy

**A consistent message**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIONS</th>
<th>WHO</th>
<th>WHEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>Actively promote the ‘Waste Less Recycle More – Take the Challenge’ message through advertising and other publication materials.</td>
<td>All councils Contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>Promote the philosophy of a ‘closed system of resource recovery’ whereby as little waste as possible goes into the bin systems but is recycled on site.</td>
<td>All councils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>Run a quarterly waste campaign through council venues and multimedia.</td>
<td>All councils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>Produce series of waste and recycling fact sheets to be distribute as part of the New Resident Pack and on the council website.</td>
<td>All councils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>Promote the use of Apps to promote messaging of what items can be recycled.</td>
<td>All councils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>Provide regular (i.e. monthly or quarterly) statistics on waste collection and disposal in local newspapers.</td>
<td>All councils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>Update council websites to include up-to-date information, web based learning tools, podcasts/animations and links to relevant waste and recycling sites.</td>
<td>All councils</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Integrate education**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIONS</th>
<th>WHO</th>
<th>WHEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.37 Actively promote the different waste streams that are generated by industry and households.</td>
<td>All councils</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.38 Lobby to have waste education better integrated into the school curriculum as part of Education for Sustainability (EFS).</td>
<td>NRM Education All councils</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.39 Work with schools with regard to EFS via mechanisms such as Student Voice, incorporating programs and initiatives aimed at increasing people’s awareness of waste and other sustainability issues.</td>
<td>NRM Education</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.40 Provide Waste and Recycling activities at the Barossa Bushgardens and Mount Pleasant Natural Resource Centres.</td>
<td>Barossa</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.41 Provide training for council front-line staff in waste and recycling issues.</td>
<td>NRM Education All councils</td>
<td>Annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.42 Facilitate tours to landfill sites/transfer stations/processing facilities (e.g. NAWMA).</td>
<td>NRM Education</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Capacity building

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIONS</th>
<th>WHO</th>
<th>WHEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.43 Promote awareness of the ‘Share n Save’ website to enable people to connect and collaborate on waste minimisation activities.</td>
<td>All councils</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.44 Participate in and promote the ‘Garage Sale Trail’ campaign</td>
<td>Barossa</td>
<td>October 2018 - October 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.45 Undertake an annual waste audit to gather information on household waste generation and minimisation efforts, and report the results through local media.</td>
<td>All councils</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.46 Engage with community groups to demonstrate the importance of sustainability and waste avoidance, reuse, recovery and appropriate disposal.</td>
<td>All councils</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.47 Deliver community presentations and workshops</td>
<td>All councils</td>
<td>Annually</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Best Practice and Innovation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIONS</th>
<th>WHO</th>
<th>WHEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.48 Prepare a Waste Minimisation Guide - Events and Venues for council and community events, and is understood by all staff and personnel organising the event.</td>
<td>All councils</td>
<td>December 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.49 Facilitate a Bi-Annual Awards for Waste Management Excellence amongst the local community, businesses and households.</td>
<td>Regional Working Group</td>
<td>July 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.50 Ensure that Council’s Procurement Strategy incorporates a consideration of sustainable practices amongst contractors.</td>
<td>All councils</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Partnership and Advocacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIONS</th>
<th>WHO</th>
<th>WHEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.51 Work with Green Industries SA to engage and promote the Collaborative Economy initiative.</td>
<td>All councils</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.52 Identify and work with organisations to promote sustainable waste management practices.</td>
<td>All councils</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.53 Investigate potential synergies with the goals of the NR-AMLR Board</td>
<td>All councils, NRM Education NRCs</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.54 Work with the retail sector to actively promote and recycle soft plastics.</td>
<td>All councils</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.55 Pilot food waste avoidance programs with the retail sector.</td>
<td>All councils</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.56 Become a corporate member of the Waste Management Association of Australia to promote the benefit and importance of the waste and resource recovery industry.</td>
<td>All councils</td>
<td>Annually</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.5.5. DEBATE AGENDA – WASTE SERVICES REPORT

7.5.5.2
WASTE MANAGEMENT SERVICE POLICY – AMENDMENT
B6242

**PURPOSE**

To inform Council of the proposed amendment to the Waste Management Service Policy.

**RECOMMENDATION**

That Council endorses the Waste Management Services Policy as amended.

**REPORT**

*Background*

In May, Council considered and adopted the new Waste Management Service Policy.

*Introduction*

As outlined in the Policy, council’s collection service is divided into three categories, with each entitled to the services listed in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Waste to Landfill (Red Bin)</th>
<th>Recyclable (Yellow Bin)</th>
<th>Green Organic (Green Bin)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Township</td>
<td>140L</td>
<td>240L</td>
<td>240L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>140L</td>
<td>240L</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>140L</td>
<td>240L</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Discussion*

Council opted for the Green Organic Service to remain a voluntary service. Consequently the service has been restricted to households located within townships, as there is a greater concentration of ratepayers to ensure a viable service.

Since commencement of the new contract, Council Administration has been approached by food and beverage premises inquiring into the green organic service.

As these premises are predominately located within townships, it is considered appropriate that they have access to the service. These operators may not benefit from paying for a private commercial waste service. By allowing them to access the kerbside collection service will improve the rate of waste diverted from landfill.

Following discussion with Members at the conclusion of last Council meeting, we are allowing these premises to access the service, but are now seeking to formally amend the policy.
The amendments are listed below.

Amendment 1
Clause 4.5.1: Amend table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause 4.5.1: Amend table.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waste to Landfill (Red Bin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amendment 2
Clause 4.5.8: Add after last dot point.

- An option to opt into a fortnightly collection service for Green Organics Recycling (240L Green Bin) within the townships of Nuriootpa, Tanunda, Angaston, Lyndoch, Williamstown, Springton, and Mount Pleasant.

Summary and Conclusion
An amendment to the Waste Management Services Policy is proposed to allow commercial premises within the Designated Waste Collection Area to access the Green Organic Service.

ATTACHMENTS OR OTHER SUPPORTING REFERENCES
Nil.

COMMUNITY PLAN / CORPORATE PLAN / LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS

Community Plan

- Health and Wellbeing
- Business and Employment

Corporate Plan

4.9 Provide residents kerbside waste collection and recycling services that reduce waste disposed to landfill.

4.10 Facilitate access to hard and green waste facilities and associated recycling opportunities that reduce waste disposed to landfill and support the environment.

5.6 Implement purchasing initiatives that generate savings or reduce expenditure growth and grow the capacity of local suppliers to obtain Council contracts.

Legislative Requirements
Local Government Act 1999
Environment Protection Act 1993
Green Industries SA Act 2004
## FINANCIAL, RESOURCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT CONSIDERATIONS

**Financial Management**
Nil

**Risk Management**
Nil.

## COMMUNITY CONSULTATION
Nil
8.1 REPORT NUMBER

8.1.1 STRATEGIC LAND PURCHASE UPDATE

The matter of the agenda item being the update on negotiations to undertake a strategic land purchase from a landowner could reasonably be expected to commercially disadvantage negotiations should it be made public and put at risk the ability to conclude a successful commercial and community outcome by Council. Therefore pursuant to Section 90(3)(b) of the Local Government Act 1999 ("the Act") being information that disclosure of which:

i) could reasonably be expected to confer a commercial advantage on a person with whom the Council is conducting, or proposing to conduct, business; or to prejudice the commercial position of the Council; and

ii) would, on balance, be contrary to the public interest.

There is strong public interest in enabling members of the public to observe Council’s transparent and informed decision-making. This helps to ensure accountability, maintain transparency of public expenditure, facilitate public participation, assist public awareness and allow for the scrutiny of information. Attendance at a Council meeting is one means of satisfying this interest. The public will only be excluded from a Council meeting when the need for confidentiality pursuant to Section 90(2) of the Act outweighs the public interest of open decision-making.

In this matter, the reasons that receipt, consideration or discussion of the information or matter in a meeting open to the public would be contrary to the public interest are that it would disclose the commercial pricing and offer position of Council and this would give an unfair advantage to a person with whom the Council proposes to do business.
On balance, the above reasons which support the need for confidentiality pursuant to Section 90(2) of the Act outweighs the factors in favour of the public interest of open decision-making.

**RECOMMENDATION**

That Council:

1. Under the provisions of Section 90(2) of the Local Government Act 1999, make an order that the public be excluded from the meeting with the exception of the Chief Executive Officer, Director Corporate and Community Services, Director Development and Environmental Services, Director Works and Engineering, and the Minute Secretary, in order to consider in confidence a report relating to Section 90(3)(b) of the Local Government Act 1999, relating to agenda item 8.1.1 Strategic Land Purchase being information that must be considered in confidence in order to ensure that the Council does not disclose information that i) could reasonably be expected to confer a commercial advantage on a person with whom the Council is conducting, or proposing to conduct, business, or to prejudice the commercial position of the Council; and ii) would, on balance, be contrary to the public interest; and

2. Accordingly, on this basis, Council is satisfied that public interest in conducting meetings in a place open to the public has been outweighed by the need to keep the information and discussion confidential to ensure that disclosure of commercial pricing and the offer position of Council would not give rise to an unfair advantage to a person with whom Council proposes to do business.
8.2 CORPORATE AND COMMUNITY SERVICES - CONFIDENTIAL

8.2.1 BAROSSA AQUATIC AND FITNESS CENTRE AND NURIOOTPA WAR MEMORIAL SWIMMING POOL - TENDER FOR PROFESSIONAL MANAGEMENT SERVICES

The matter of the agenda item being a tender for the provision of services pursuant to Section 90(3)(k) of the Local Government Act 1999 ("the Act") being information that must be considered in confidence in order to ensure that commercial in confidence information is not divulged and Council does not disclose information which may prejudice the outcome of the tender or future tenders.

There is strong public interest in enabling members of the public to observe Council’s transparent and informed decision-making. This helps to ensure accountability, maintain transparency of public expenditure, facilitate participation, assist public awareness and allow for the scrutiny of information. Attendance at a Council meeting is one means of satisfying this interest. The public will only be excluded from a Council meeting when the need for confidentiality pursuant to Section 90(2) of the Act outweighs the public interest of open decision making.

In this matter, the reasons that receipt, consideration or discussion of the information or matter in a meeting open to the public would be contract to the public interest are that:-

- The disclosure would unreasonably expose commercial in confidence information provided by tenderers through the tender process and the Council report, attachments, and associated document; and
- The disclosure would give an unfair advantage to a person with whom Council proposes to do business.

On balance, the above reasons which support the need for confidentiality pursuant to Section 90(2) of the Act outweigh the factors in favour of the public interest of open decision making.
**RECOMMENDATION**

That Council:

(1) Under the provisions of Section 90(2) of the Local Government Act 1999 an order be made that the public be excluded from the meeting with the exception of the Chief Executive Officer, Director Corporate and Community Services, Director Development and Environmental Services, Director Works and Engineering Services, Manager Community Projects and the Minute Secretary, in order to consider in confidence a report relating to Section 90(3)(k) of the Local Government Act 1999 relating to the receiving, reviewing and assessing of Barossa Aquatic and Fitness Centre and Nuriootpa War Memorial Swimming Pool – Tender for Professional Management Services being information that must be considered in confidence in order to ensure that Council does not disclose information relating to tenders for the supply of goods, the provision of services or the carrying out of works; and

(2) Accordingly, on this basis, Council is satisfied that public interest in conducting meetings in a place open to the public has been outweighed by the need to keep the information and discussion confidential to prevent the unreasonable exposure of commercial in confidence information provided by tenderers through the tender process and the Council report, attachments and associated documents and to prevent an unfair advantage to a person with whom Council proposes to do business.
The matter of the agenda item being the update on negotiations to undertake a strategic land purchase from a landowner could reasonably be expected to commercially disadvantage negotiations should it be made public and put at risk the ability to conclude a successful commercial and community outcome by Council. Therefore pursuant to Section 90(3)(b) of the Local Government Act 1999 ("the Act") being information that disclosure of which:

i) could reasonably be expected to confer a commercial advantage on a person with whom the Council is conducting, or proposing to conduct, business; or to prejudice the commercial position of the Council; and

ii) would, on balance, be contrary to the public interest.

There is strong public interest in enabling members of the public to observe Council’s transparent and informed decision-making. This helps to ensure accountability, maintain transparency of public expenditure, facilitate public participation, assist public awareness and allow for the scrutiny of information. Attendance at a Council meeting is one means of satisfying this interest. The public will only be excluded from a Council meeting when the need for confidentiality pursuant to Section 90(2) of the Act outweighs the public interest of open decision-making.

In this matter, the reasons that receipt, consideration or discussion of the information or matter in a meeting open to the public would be contrary to the public interest are that it would disclose the commercial pricing and offer position of Council and this would give an unfair advantage to a person with whom the Council proposes to do business.
On balance, the above reasons which support the need for confidentiality pursuant to Section 90(2) of the Act outweighs the factors in favour of the public interest of open decision-making.

**RECOMMENDATION**

That Council:

1. Under the provisions of Section 90(2) of the Local Government Act 1999, make an order that the public be excluded from the meeting with the exception of the Chief Executive Officer, Director Corporate and Community Services, Director Development and Environmental Services, Director Works and Engineering, and the Minute Secretary, in order to consider in confidence a report relating to Section 90(3)(b) of the Local Government Act 1999, relating to agenda item 8.1.1 Strategic Land Purchase being information that must be considered in confidence in order to ensure that the Council does not disclose information that i) could reasonably be expected to confer a commercial advantage on a person with whom the Council is conducting, or proposing to conduct, business, or to prejudice the commercial position of the Council; and ii) would, on balance, be contrary to the public interest; and

2. Accordingly, on this basis, Council is satisfied that public interest in conducting meetings in a place open to the public has been outweighed by the need to keep the information and discussion confidential to ensure that disclosure of commercial pricing and the offer position of Council would not give rise to an unfair advantage to a person with whom Council proposes to do business.
8.1 DEBATE AGENDA – CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

8.1.1 STRATEGIC LAND PURCHASE PROPOSAL - UPDATE
B5431 and B3907

PURPOSE
To update Council on the preliminary negotiations to purchase land adjacent to Council’s recreational park in Lyndoch. To endorse the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) to pursue a further opportunity to purchase the land.

RECOMMENDATIONS
That Council, having noted the update on the resolution of Council at its’ special meeting dated 17 October 2017 and reviewed this report, resolve as follows:

1. Instruct the Chief Executive Officer to continue to enter into negotiations for the purchase of land being allotment 744 certificate of title 6101/50 in deposited plan 89654 in the Hundred of Barossa.

2. Approve the Chief Executive Officer to act in all things in this matter and enter into an offer and sales document or other necessary document if negotiations are successful seeking at least a three month settlement.

3. Authorise the Chief Executive Officer to offer up to $500,000 for the purchase of the land outlined in 1 above.

4. Authorise the Chief Executive Officer, if the purchase of the land outlined in 1 above is successful, to offer to the market a lease for a period of 1 -3 years to operate the vineyard at no cost and no risk or return to Council whereby the option is only excisable by Council.

5. Pursuant to Section 193 (4) of the Local Government Act exclude the land being allotment 744 certificate of title 6101/50 in deposited plan 89654 in the Hundred of Barossa from Community Land status, should the land be successfully purchased.

6. Authorise a budget adjustment of $525,000 to the 2018-19 budget for the purposes of purchasing the land and costs associated with settlement.

7. Authorise the Chief Executive Officer to seek an exemption from the Minister for Local Government pursuant to Section 91A of the Local Government (Elections) Act and clause 4.3.1 of Council’s Caretaker Policy on the grounds
of the strategic and long term importance of entering into a contract for the purchase of the land to achieve the community outcomes identified within The Big Project as it relates to the future implementation of the Southern Barossa Recreational Hub initiative.

8. Having considered this matter in confidence under Section 90(2) of the Local Government Act 1999 in accordance with Section 90(3)(b)(i) and (ii) of the Act, makes an order pursuant to Section 91(7) of the Act, that the report, attachments, analysis and minutes other than the minutes relating to this confidentiality order of the Confidential Council Meeting held on 21 August 2018 in relation to item 8.1.1 Strategic Land Purchase Proposal - Update be kept confidential and not available for public inspection (noting the Chief Executive Officer will release information on a confidential basis to relevant parties including the landowner and legal and other support as necessary) until the recommendations contained herein are resolved and any resulting transactions are fully concluded and authorises the Chief Executive Officer to review and revoke the order subject to ensuring compliance with Section 91(8)(c) of the Local Government Act.

REPORT

Background
At the Attachment is the report provided to Council at the special meeting held on 17 October 2017. The rationale for pursuing the purchase, the independent valuation and other advice remain unchanged.

Discussion

Summary of Actions to Date

After Council's resolution in October 2017 the Mayor, Cr de Vries and CEO met with Mr Burge with the necessary offer documentation ready to provide to him. At this meeting Mr Burge outlined the purchase would need to be structured around the purchasing of the organisation through its shares and not the assets directly. Council is precluded at law from doing so pursuant to Section 47(1)(b) of the Local Government Act. There are no mechanisms within Act for exemptions or other mechanisms to avoid this legislative direction, it is absolute. We attempted to find a path to re-arrange the offer to counteract taxation and other matters that were associated with the structure of the sale Mr Burge wanted but this could not be achieved.

Understandably the property was placed on the market via an expression of interest. In accordance with the resolution of Council on 17 October 2017 an offer was made by the CEO on behalf of Council after consulting with the Mayor, as it was principally in line with the intent and resolution of Council. The offer also included an offer, if a purchase could not be negotiated directly, that Council would be interested in partnering or speaking with a successful bidder to try and structure an arrangement that would see at a point in the future a transfer of the land sought. This too was unsuccessful.
A New Opportunity

Recently, due in the main to it being known that there is community interest in the parcel of land adjacent to the Lyndoch Recreation Park, and the fact the expression of interest was made outlining our interest to negotiate, the Mayor was approached by a third party who is representing the successful bidder. The Mayor organised an urgent meeting with the representative and we were informed the purchaser would sell the land as a simple land sale process as they have no direct interest in maintaining that portion of the land and vineyard. The discussion summary is:

1. The purchaser still has to undertake final documentation and settlement of the entire site and would not be in a position to consider the on-sale for around a month (with the efflux of time that is now 2 weeks away).
2. Settling a price, the third party representative indicated that in the order of $100,000 per hectare (excluding costs) would be their commercial position, this is however not yet confirmed.
3. Council provided assistance with identifying the allotment area and maps indicating the extent of the property of interest.
4. On behalf of Council and in accordance with Councils prior consideration, the Chief Executive Officer was able to express absolute interest in the parcel of land and that the figure presented was “in the ball park” but that the matter would have to go back to Council for determination.
5. A subsequent conversation ascertaining what could be said publicly at this juncture was made and determined that the purchaser does not want anything public at this time and lack of confidentiality could put the negotiations at risk.

The valuation for the land undertaken to inform the prior decision making (October 2017) was $493,000 or $122,637 per hectare. For valuation purposes it was put at $500,000. The area of the land in question is 4.02 hectares, therefore the purchaser, subject to finalising their purchase of the entire site, and if this negotiation is successful, is seeking in the order of $402,000. Section (6) of the recommendation provides sufficient allowance for costs associated with the transaction over and above the anticipated purchase price (ie: stamp duty; legal costs; maintenance allowances).

The proposed transaction significantly de-risks the project for Council as there is no:

1. stock;
2. surplus land to requirements;
3. winery and equipment;
4. house; or
5. other assets;

to dispose of, maintain or indeed ensure commercial operations are attended to.

Council would, if successful, acquire the smaller vineyard parcel, which it could simply lease on the market on the principle of “no cost, no risk” through an annual, renewable agreement or simply clear the land. Although the first option is possibly the more preferable on initial assessment, due to the aesthetics of the approach to Lyndoch; the options will be assessed further as negotiations continue. The simplest option is to clear and maintain and to engage our contractors to mow and keep the area tidy on a periodic basis for open space. Under the current contract, based on a monthly service regime the cost would be in the order of $3,570 per annum, and it is proposed to allow an overall maintenance figure of $5,000 per annum. After consulting with BGWA they have estimated the average clearing costs per hectare at $7,500 which is dependent on many factors; total cost for the land would therefore be in the order of $30,000.
Caretaker Period

There is the chance this matter may require resolution during caretaker period. Based on the law and Council’s Caretaker Policy, Council or the Chief Executive Officer as delegate, cannot enter into a contract for greater than 1% of the total revenue from the 2017/18 financial year (which is $247,448) during the caretaker period (18 September 2018 until the election is declared somewhere in the week commencing 12 November 2018) unless the transaction is of an exempt type. Exemptions mainly relate to roads, wastewater and infrastructure contracts and works. The purchase of the land does not meet the exemption criteria and is greater than the prescribed value. This interpretation has been verbally checked with Kellyed Jones Lawyers and they confirm the interpretation is correct. Therefore, there is only two ways in which to deal with the matter if the contract needs to be entered into during the caretaker period, the first is any contract is delayed until after the caretaker period, this carries increased risk due to delay. The second is to seek an exemption from the Minister. Whilst the contract may be entered into prior to caretaker period it is recommended as a pre-emptive and sound risk mitigation approach the exemption be sought immediately.

Summary and Conclusion

In summary there is ongoing effort to try and bring this land purchase to fruition and achieve the goals of the Southern Barossa Recreational Hub. The revised opportunity outlined comes at a much reduced risk than the original proposal and in essence is de-risked and consistent with our risk policy and subsequent management matters are easily managed within the resources, budget and expertise of Council.

ATTACHMENTS OR OTHER SUPPORTING REFERENCES

Attachment - Prior Report to Council Special Meeting of 17 October 2017 (in confidence)

COMMUNITY PLAN / CORPORATE PLAN / LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS

Community and Culture

Infrastructure

Health and Wellbeing

Business and Employment

Community Plan

2.7 Embrace place-making principles when developing community infrastructure and regulate planning and development in public spaces.

2.9 Create places where people want to live and plan for the future in a coordinated, appropriate and proactive manner.

3.1 Develop and implement sound asset management which delivers sustainable services.

4.2 Create opportunities for people of all ages and abilities to participate in the community.

4.4 Support sporting, recreational and community clubs and organisations to grow and be sustainable.
4.6 Ensure that community members can participate in cultural, recreational, sporting and learning opportunities.

5.3 Help build the capacity of the tourism sector and encourage the development of tourist services, including eco and recreational tourism infrastructure.

5.13 Support economic development through events.

Legislative Requirements
Local Government Act 1999, Section 46, 47, 48, 49(a1), 193
Risk Management Policy

FINANCIAL, RESOURCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT CONSIDERATIONS
Key financial and risk management considerations outlined in the body of the report.

There is an extremely high confidence level that there will be sufficient surplus funds from the 2017/18 financial year operating surplus result to support the cash requirements for a settlement, should negotiations be successful.

Internal resources will be utilised to undertake negotiations with legal support provided to draw up any final agreements as necessary.

COMMUNITY CONSULTATION
Extensive planning, consultation and engagement with the community has been undertaken in relation to the Southern Barossa Recreational Hub, there is a level of confidence that Lyndoch is the preferred location for the hub supported by other facilities. There is no requirement to consult in relation to the purchase proposal, in fact to do so could result in loss of the opportunity to put a bid forward outside of a market process.
3.1 DEBATE AGENDA – CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

3.1.1 STRATEGIC LAND PURCHASE PROPOSAL
B5431 and B3907

PURPOSE
To seek Council decision on undertaking a strategic land purchase in support of the Southern Barossa Hub by placing a bid to Burge Family Wines and then on selling the balance of the land and all other assets.

RECOMMENDATIONS
That Council, having reviewed the valuation report from Gaetjens and Pickett and this report and all attachments, resolve to:

1. Proceed to enter into negotiations for the purchase of land, improvements and all assets associated with Burge Family Wines, being allotments 743 and 744 being certificate of titles 6101/49 and 6101/50 in deposited plan 89654 in the Hundred of Barossa.

2. Approve the Chief Executive Officer to act in all things in this matter and enter into an offer and sales document if negotiations are successful seeking at a three month settlement and authorisation to immediately remarket the land subject of resolution 5 below.

3. Authorise an offer of $2.47M for all land, improvements, buildings, equipment and machinery and stock and set a ceiling that the Chief Executive Officer can offer for purchase at $2.97M noting stock must be adjusted at settlement day.

4. Authorise the Chief Executive Officer to engage a sales agent to on-sell allotment 744 and all improvements, buildings, equipment and machinery and stock.

5. Appoint Mayor Sloane and Councillor ..... to support the Chief Executive Officer and assist in negotiations, contractual arrangements and any other matters to give effect to this resolution.

6. Seek a report from the Chief Executive Officer of the outcomes of negotiations and to approve subsequent matters in relation to budget and community land management status.
CONFIDENTIAL - COPY OF 17 OCTOBER 2017 AGENDA ITEM

7. Having considered this matter in confidence under Section 90(2) of the Local Government Act 1999 in accordance with Section 90(3)(b) of the Act, makes an order pursuant to Section 91(7) of the Act, that the report, attachments, analysis and minutes other than the minutes relating to this confidentiality order of the Confidential Council Meeting held on 17 October 2017 in relation to item 3.1.1 Strategic Land Purchase Proposal be kept confidential and not available for public inspection (noting the Chief Executive Officer will release information on a confidential basis to the landowner and legal and other support as necessary) until the recommendations contained herein are resolved and any resulting transactions are fully concluded and authorise the Chief Executive Officer to review and revoke the order.

REPORT

Background
During the development of the Southern Barossa Hub it became clear that the preferred and most efficient outcome, so as to achieve the best strategic and long term outcome for the Southern Barossa was to locate the main hub at Lyndoch. One significant matter that is unable to be addressed is the ability to co-locate the majority of uses at Lyndoch whilst trying to realise the repurposing of Williamstown in a new recreational economic driver linked into investment in things like the Warren, mountain bike trails and expanded caravan park usage.

It has been known for some time that land located directly to the west of the Lyndoch oval complex, an allotment in the ownership of Burge Family Wines was zoned recreational and would provide sufficient room to expand the oval footprint and achieve a sound long term strategic outcome for the community.

Introduction
In 2015 and 2016 senior officers attempted to negotiate an agreement to at least consider including this land in the spatial planning work as well as obtain a first right to bid on the land. This was ultimately unsuccessful with the owner preferring not to pursue it.

Recently it has become understood that the landowner would entertain an offer for the whole of the land and all the assets. The landowner has stated he needs this offer quickly. To facilitate the opportunity officers engaged a specialist industry valuer, Gaetjens Pickett to undertake a commercial valuation. That valuation is provided at Attachment 1. Unfortunately due to serious illness of one of the valuers the report has been delayed two weeks and time is now even more acutely of the essence.

Discussion

The Proposal
The proposal is relatively simple; namely to purchase the totality of the assets including land, house, winery, equipment, stock and other rights. As part of this transaction try to obtain the right to immediately on-sell all but the land allotment Council requires to support the Southern Barossa Hub outcome including leasing back the land to the purchasers for up to five years. The timing of settlements for purchase would be hopefully as close as possible so that cash impacts on Council are minimal and any management and maintenance of the site is limited.
The parcel of land which Council wishes to retain is Allotment 744, the maps provided as Attachment 2 outlines generally the area as well as clarify the land division and thus the two independent parcels. The current allotment is already on two titles which coincide with the land parcel sought to be retained and the area to be on sold.

**Land Use, Zoning and Other Site Considerations**

Importantly the land that is being explored through this proposal is zoned Town Centre with a policy area of Recreation and thus is already zoned appropriately for expansion of the Lyndoch facility. All other available land within the area, namely across Barossa Valley Highway is zoned Primary Production and would result in any development being non-complying which is a higher risk path to obtaining the necessary approvals to proceed with development and having facilities across the road adds additional risk of pedestrian movement between the sites.

Further, Council have explored an available site at Fromm Square that too is zoned Primary Production and would have required the transfer of activities from Williamstown and Lyndoch to a rural location between both towns and had significant earthmoving cost to achieve levels that would support the required 2 oval configuration and was determined to be an inappropriate site for these reasons.

**Fall-Back Position and Risk Exposure**

It is important to consider any fall back positions for Council in the event:

1. The offer is not accepted or cannot be negotiated;
2. The purchase is accepted but the balance of the assets cannot be on-sold.

In relation to matter 1 ultimately this is not within the control of Council, we need to place the best offer forward if it is decided to move forward with the opportunity. Some room to immediately negotiate upwards to a maximum value would provide some flexibility, however if it is refused then Council can do little about that. There would remain a further opportunity if the landowner does go to open market.

In relation to matter 2 due to the commercially restrictive and sensitive nature of this work and ability to undertake further analysis within the timeframe of receiving the valuation, the risks associated with the resale are real as to pricing and timing. Some risk is mitigated by the discount factor provided for in the valuation report of 15-20% and the financial analysis presented has used a weighted average of the various scenarios to cater for a best and worst case outcome. Timing is difficult to tell, however the valuation report does highlight the strong growth and buoyancy of the industry at present. Further enquiries have been made of a local sales agent on this issue, and the possible lease value of the land in the interim at the time of release of this report this is still under investigation.

In summary there is no real fall-back position for matter 2, if it cannot be sold immediately Council has a commercial asset it will need to manage. In all likelihood the main fall-back position would be to engage an appropriate manager, company or lease to a party for a short period on the basis of neutral financial impact. There is an important link to maintain the property to ensure the best financial return for Council in the short or medium term.

Other key risk exposures are:
1. Political and reputation matters of Council undertaking to purchase a commercial winery. On balance the strategic land purchase is centred on achieving a community outcome and not for commercial reasons.

2. Financial risks which have been quantified as best they can at this time with the long term maximum exposure to Council being understood.

Ultimately it comes down to Council understanding these risks and willingness to accept them and be flexible around solutions should Council proceed and any of these risks materialise either in totality or partially.

The following table provides a high level risk assessment against Councils risk matrix:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Consequence</th>
<th>Likelihood</th>
<th>Level of Risk</th>
<th>Management Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purchase offer not accepted</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Possible</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Ultimately risk not within Council control, provide the best balanced offer possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Take into account the opportunity costs (of both proceeding and not proceeding) and the community value considerations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial risk of purchase if it proceeds</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Certain</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Whilst there is exposure to a financial impact it is difficult to label this a loss as it is adding to considerable long term community benefit. Management action will be to try and negotiate a price that is within the financial model presented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial risk of delayed on-sale</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Unlikely</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Proactively market and prioritise work to achieve sale. Implement mechanisms to manage land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political or reputational risk</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Certain</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>On balance it is thought the strategy will be received well by the community. If successful, implement a proactive and open conversation and release of information to the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance or legal risk</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Unlikely</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Engage legal and land sale support to achieve outcomes of sale and purchase.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Valuation and Financial Analysis
The valuation and financial analysis is attached at Attachment 3.

In summary the valuation analysis can be outlined in four distinct units:

1. Allotment 743 – containing the larger area of plantings, all the main fixed assets including home, winery, cellar door and the like.
2. Allotment 744 – containing the smaller area of plantings.
3. Equipment and Machinery.
4. Stock.

The valuers have discounted any goodwill as that is tied so heavily to the owner. Therefore Council in essence is not paying for the purchase of the intellectual property associated with the name, business transfer would not fall into this transaction.

The valuations for each component are:

1. Allotment 743 - $1,500,000
2. Allotment 744 - $500,000
3. Equipment and Machinery - $235,000
4. Stock - $735,000 – this would be adjusted at settlement day and is therefore likely to reduce.

Total valuation is $2.97M, interestingly Council valuation of the land is $810,000 whereas the land values in this commercial valuation are $1.315M.

The value of the assets that would be held for resale are $2.47M. There are no water rights attached to the land, mains irrigation is the only water applied to the site.

The estimated discount rate for the sale of the assets is 15-20%, this caters for the fact that the facility at some stage will not have access to some 42.4% of its planting when Council wishes to utilise Allotment 744. Therefore the realisable value of the assets held for resale is between (noting the discount rate has been applied only to the value of allotment 743 and the stock and equipment and machinery are not exposed to this discount factor as their value is intrinsic in themselves) $2.17M and $2.47M based on the valuations provided.
In estimating the financial analysis there are various assumptions made in the calculations as outlined in the attachment but most importantly the analysis assumes no more than a three month period between purchase of the assets and resale of the other assets. If a right is gained to market the remaining property whilst settlement and other activities are taking place this would give Council a window of approximately 6 months to achieve a sale.

The financial estimates based on borrowing the funds and paying it back over a 10 year period, using a weighted average of the various scenarios are (excluding GST as this will be neutral to Council):

1. Purchase costs $2.857M - this has been discounted as the landowner will benefit significantly through a simple and direct sale that is not exposed to agent fees, market approach and other uncertainties.
2. Financing costs of three months of $28,565.
3. Sale of remaining land and assets $2.199M
4. Net debt of $657,366 to be repaid over 10 years.
5. Interest costs over those 10 years of $131,473.
6. Lease fee for 5 years of $246,512.

As modelled the net cost of the land would be $660,284.

Conclusions and Recommendations of the Approved Southern Barossa Recreational Hub Feasibility Study

It is relevant to consider the key conclusions and recommendations of the feasibility study relevant to this strategy which are (the full conclusions and recommendations are at Attachment 4).

Relevant conclusions:

5. The preferred future Southern Sporting Hub model of a purpose built, central hub facility at a greenfield site within the town boundaries of Lyndoch is not currently achievable as a suitable location is not available. If the community is set on a greenfield model then consideration needs to be given to deferring the project otherwise possible resources will be diverted to a less preferred option and will not be available in the event that a greenfield site becomes possible in the future.

7. Lyndoch is the preferred location for the centralised hub for all activities other than Rugby and the site with the optimal development potential across the range of assessed criteria.

8. The preference for a second oval on any of the existing sites cannot be accommodated.

16. There is excitement and recognition of the significant economic, social and environmental benefit opportunities from a re-purposed Williamstown QVJP facility focused around non-traditional sporting, outdoor “adventure” and leisure style activity based recreation and the potential for associated accommodation development.

Relevant recommendations:
2. The preferred option of stakeholders for a greenfield, shared use site at Lyndoch for a central multipurpose facility cannot be implemented at this time because at this point no suitable, available greenfield site is identified. If the community is set on a greenfield site then consideration of deferring the project in the hope that a site may become available needs to be given. (Should be identified as a distinct option in future community consultation process and the knock on impact on repurposing Williamstown and relocating Rugby highlighted).

**Prudential Management Requirements of the Local Government Act**

There are four key legislative provisions that Council needs to consider.

1. Community land status of the land should the purchase be successful pursuant to Section 193 of the Local Government Act (the Act).
2. Commercial activities pursuant to Sections 46 and 47 of the Act.
3. Prudential management requirements pursuant to Section 48 of the Act.
4. Sale of Land and Other Assets pursuant to Section 49 of the Act.

**Community Land**

All land that Council acquires must be classified prior to the settlement into Council ownership, if this is not done then the land automatically becomes encumbered by the provisions of the Act. In this case if Council is successful in purchasing the land it must make a resolution to exclude it from community land status pursuant to Section 193(4) of the Act. An appropriate report will be brought to Council to manage this matter should Council proceed with negotiations and that they be successful.

**Commercial Activities**

Clearly the ownership of a winery is a commercial venture and whilst this is not the purpose of the strategy it is an outcome. Pursuant to Section 46 and 47 of the Act this is permitted within the context of the performance of the functions of Council. Council cannot participate in the formation of a company or acquire shares in a company and this is not occurring. The functions of a Council prescribed by Section 7 of the Act that are consistent with this strategy are:

(a) to plan at the local and regional level for the development and future requirements of its area.
(b) to provide services and facilities that benefit its area, its ratepayers and residents, and visitors to its area (including general public services or facilities (including electricity, gas and water services, and waste collection, control or disposal services or facilities), health, welfare or community services or facilities, and cultural or recreational services or facilities).
(f) to provide infrastructure for its community and for development within its area (including infrastructure that helps to protect any part of the local or broader community from any hazard or other event, or that assists in the management of any area).
(g) to promote its area and to provide an attractive climate and locations for the development of business, commerce, industry and tourism.

The strategy therefore is soundly based in supporting the functions of Council and can reasonably be expected to support community based outcomes.
Prudential Management Requirements
Section 48 requires Council to consider if an independent prudential management report is necessary based on a few key factors. If Council does elect to put an offer forward the land and proposed future development would be captured by The Big Project work and a prudential management report will be done for that purpose. However, the purchase of the land in its own right in officer’s views does not trigger the need for a report as:

1. This strategy of itself does not propose to incur operating expenses over a five year period exceeding 20% of the Councils average annual operating expenses over the previous 5 years, which would be in the order of $6M;
2. The expected capital expenditure over the next five years is not likely to exceed $4,000,000.

The last factor for consideration is whether Council considers it necessary or appropriate, which is a matter for Council.

Sale of Land or Other Assets
Council as prescribed under Section 49 of the Act has a policy in place for the Disposal of Land or Other Assets. In this case Council would, if it proceeds and is successful in negotiations, exclude the land from community land use so that the commercial assets can be resold. It would do this in all likelihood via a full market approach and therefore will clearly meet the requirements of this policy and legislative requirement.

Key Factors for Setting an Offer
In setting a price to offer the following matters are consider key:

- Value of the land and assets as provided for in the valuation report.
- Discount factor for future resale.
- Commercial risks faced by Council.
- Opportunity this presents for Council.
- It presents an easy solution for the landowner rather than proceeding to a full market approach.

In weighing up the factors and estimates it is recommended that an original purchase offer of 75% of the land value, given the commercial risk exposure and ease of sale for the landowner, plus the full value of equipment and stock being $2.47M.

It is further recommended that Council appoint the Mayor and one other Councillor to support the CEO in negotiating the offer and provide a maximum ceiling value that Council is willing to offer. It is suggested that this maximum ceiling shall be the full valuation estimate of $2.97M.

Summary and Conclusion
In summary there is a unique opportunity for Council to obtain strategically important land which has the correct zoning and can achieve the goals of the Southern Barossa Recreational Hub. The strategy does come at risk, but it is felt this can be reasonable managed.

ATTACHMENTS OR OTHER SUPPORTING REFERENCES
Attachment 1 – Valuation Report
Attachment 2 – Maps of Land
Attachment 3 – Valuation and Financial Analysis
Attachment 4 – Conclusions and Recommendations of the Approved Southern Barossa Recreational Hub Feasibility Study
Attachment 5 – Business Assessment Tool Score

COMMUNITY PLAN / CORPORATE PLAN / LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS

- Community and Culture
- Health and Wellbeing
- Business and Employment

Community Plan
2.7 Embrace place-making principles when developing community infrastructure and regulate planning and development in public spaces.
2.9 Create places where people want to live and plan for the future in a coordinated, appropriate and proactive manner.
3.1 Develop and implement sound asset management which delivers sustainable services.
4.2 Create opportunities for people of all ages and abilities to participate in the community.
4.4 Support sporting, recreational and community clubs and organisations to grow and be sustainable.
4.6 Ensure that community members can participate in cultural, recreational, sporting and learning opportunities.
5.3 Help build the capacity of the tourism sector and encourage the development of tourist services, including eco and recreational tourism infrastructure.
5.13 Support economic development through events.

Legislative Requirements
Local Government Act 1999, Section 46, 47, 48, 49(a1), 193
Risk Management Policy
Disposal of Land or Other Assets Policy

FINANCIAL, RESOURCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT CONSIDERATIONS

Key financial and risk management considerations outlined in the body of the report.

In accordance with Council policy an assessment of the financial impacts is provided for in this analysis and attachment 3. A business assessment tool has been undertaken and estimated at 54 which would rank it as a high priority in the recent budget assessment.

Internal resources will be utilised to undertake negotiations with legal support provided by Norman Waterhouse.

The valuation report although unbudgeted was funded from the Executive Services budget and a budget request for additional funds, if required, will be done at the second quarter review.
The valuation report was $9,000.

COMMUNITY CONSULTATION

Extensive planning, consultation and engagement with the community has been undertaken in relation to the Southern Barossa Recreational Hub. There is a level of confidence that Lyndoch is the preferred location for the hub supported by other facilities. There is no requirement to consult in relation to the purchase proposal, in fact to do so could result in loss of the opportunity to put a bid forward outside of a market process.