NOTICE OF MEETING

Notice is hereby given that the next ordinary meeting of Council will be held on Tuesday 15 December 2020 in the Council Chambers, 43 – 51 Tanunda Road, Nuriootpa, commencing at 9.00am. The meeting will be live streamed and recorded and posted onto Council’s website by Friday 18 December 2020.

Martin McCarthy
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER
THE BAROSSA COUNCIL

AGENDA

1. THE BAROSSA COUNCIL
   1.1 Welcome by Mayor Lange - meeting declared open
   1.2 Present
   1.3 Leave of Absence
       Cr Hurn
   1.4 Apologies for Absence
   1.5 Minutes of previous meetings – for confirmation:
       Council meeting held on 17 November 2020 at 9.00am
       Special Council meeting held on 19 November 2020 at 2.00pm
   1.6 Matters arising from previous minutes
       Nil
   1.7 Petitions
       Nil
   1.8 Deputations
       Nil
   1.9 Notice of Motion
       Nil
   1.10 Questions with or without Notice
       Nil
2. **MAYOR**
   2.1 Mayor’s report - *attached*

3. **COUNCILLORS’ REPORTS**
   3.1 Nil

4. **CONSENSUS AGENDA**
   4.1 **MAYOR**
       Nil
   4.2 **EXECUTIVE SERVICES**
       4.2.1 **CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER**
           4.2.1.1 Electorate Review Outcome
           4.2.1.2 Mutual Services Annual Report
           4.2.1.3 Legatus Minutes of 27 November 2020
   4.2.2 **COMMUNICATION AND ENGAGEMENT OFFICERS**
       4.2.2.1 Communications and Engagement – Quarterly Report
   4.3 **CORPORATE & COMMUNITY SERVICES**
       4.3.1 **DIRECTOR CORPORATE AND COMMUNITY SERVICES**
       Nil
       4.3.2 **MANAGER COMMUNITY PROJECTS**
       Nil
   4.4 **WORKS AND ENGINEERING**
       4.4.1 **DIRECTOR’S REPORT**
       Nil
   4.5 **DEVELOPMENT & ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES**
       4.5.1 **DEVELOPMENT SERVICES**
           4.5.1.1 Town of Gawler – Local Heritage Transition Development Plan Amendment – Public Consultation
       4.5.2 **ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES**
           4.5.2.1 Northern and Yorke Landscape Board – Lower Mid
           North and Valley and Plains District Progress Report
           4.5.2.2 Gawler River Floodplain Management Authority – State Government Funding
           4.5.2.3 Williamstown, Lyndoch Landcare Group Inc
           4.5.2.4 Progress Report
       4.5.3 **HEALTH SERVICES**
           4.5.3.1 Food Recalls
           4.5.3.2 Food Premises Inspections
       4.5.4 **REGULATORY SERVICES**
       Nil
4.5.5 WASTE SERVICES
Nil

5. CONSENSUS AGENDA ADOPTION
5.1 ITEMS FOR EXCLUSION FROM CONSENSUS AGENDA
5.2 RECEIPT OF CONSENSUS AGENDA
5.3 DEBATE OF ITEMS EXCLUDED FROM CONSENSUS AGENDA

6. VISITORS TO THE MEETING/ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING
6.1 VISITORS TO THE MEETING
Nil
6.2 ADJOURNMENT OF COUNCIL MEETING

7. DEBATE AGENDA
7.1 MAYOR
7.1.1 Review of Confidentiality Orders 48

7.2 EXECUTIVE SERVICES
7.2.1 CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER
7.2.1.1 Elected Members’ Training and Development Plan 50
7.2.1.2 Ombudsman Correspondence – Land Exchange at Chateau Tanunda 55
7.2.1.3 Principal Office and Other Offices – Late Opening 59

7.2.2 FINANCE
7.2.2.1 Monthly Finance Report (as at 30 November 2020) 61
7.2.2.2 Long Term Financial Plan 2021/22 to 2030/31 and Annual Budget & Business Planning Timetable, New Initiative Inclusion, Indexation and Assumptions 2021/22 64

7.3 CORPORATE AND COMMUNITY SERVICES
7.3.1 DIRECTOR CORPORATE AND COMMUNITY SERVICES
7.3.1.1 Request for Funding – Completion of Verandah – Nuriootpa Multi Use Change Rooms 70

7.3.2 MANAGER COMMUNITY AND CULTURE
7.3.2.1. Deed of Variation – Commonwealth Home Support Program 80

7.4 WORKS AND ENGINEERING
7.4.1 DIRECTOR’S REPORTS
7.4.1.1 Infrastructure Asset Management Plan – Community Consultation 93
7.4.1.2 Proposed Road Closure – 2021 Declaration of Vintage

7.5 DEVELOPMENT AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES

7.5.1 DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

7.5.1.1 Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act – Business Readiness
7.5.1.2 Revised Draft Phase Three Amendment to the Planning and Design Code

7.5.2 ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES

7.5.2.1 Barossa Bushgardens Urban Design Framework – Post Consultation
7.5.2.2 Barossa Bushgardens – Open Space and Places for People Grant Acquittal

7.5.3 HEALTH SERVICES

Nil

7.5.4 REGULATORY SERVICES

Nil.

7.5.5 WASTE SERVICES

7.5.5.1 Proposed Mandatory Green Waste Organic Service
7.5.5.2 Hard Waste

8. CONFIDENTIAL AGENDA

8.1.1 Citizen of the Year
8.1.2 Young Citizen of the Year
8.1.3 Community Event of the Year
8.1.4 Community Project of the Year
8.1.5 COVID-19 Grants – Updated and Deferred Matters
8.2.1 Menge Road - Tanunda – Noise complaint
8.3.1 Development Services – Customer Focus Protocols

9. URGENT OTHER BUSINESS

9.1 Request for Leave of Absence – Cr Wiese-Smith 1 January 2021 to 31 March 2021 inclusive
9.2 Request for Leave of Absence- Cr Boothby 27 January 2021

10. NEXT MEETING

Wednesday 27 January 2021 at 9.00am

11. CLOSURE
Mayor’s Report to Council – December Meeting 2020

November

10/11/2020 Meeting with Katie Gilfillan and Daniel Searson - The Bicycle Institute of SA (BISA)
   Our Town RDA Workshop - Williamstown
   Our Town RDA Workshop - Mount Pleasant
14/11/2020 Southern Barossa Men’s Shed Village Workshop opening event
20/11/2020 ABC Port Pirie interview promoting Garage Sale Trial
23/11/2020 Leader Newspaper photo - GM impact decision
25/11/2020 Meeting with Herald of Hope representatives regarding Barossa stage
   Highway to Health Tractor Trek - Alice Springs to Barossa (Massey Ferguson tractor)
26/11/2020 Flow FM radio interview - Barossa Happenings
27/11/2020 Legatus Group Ordinary Meeting – Zoom Meeting
30/11/2020 Tourist Train Working Group Meeting facilitated by Tony Piccolo

December

4/12/2020 Meeting with James March (Barossa Grape and Wine) and Martin McCarthy
4/12/2020 Tanunda Oval Lights – Opening Event
6/12/2020 Meeting with SA Rally representatives regarding possible Rally
   Barossa event
7/12/2020 Seppeltsfield Road Business Alliance - Neighbours Night
7/12/2020 Meeting with Keoride Barossa representatives and Stephan Knoll
4.2.1 CONSENSUS AGENDA – CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

4.2.1.1 ELECTORAL DISTRICTS BOUNDARIES COMMISSION - REVIEW OF FINAL OUTCOME

The Barossa Council supported the submission to the South Australian Electoral Districts Boundaries Commission regarding the proposed changes to State electoral boundaries outlining six key considerations. The Commission has finalised and endorsed the report, which can be located at https://edbc.sa.gov.au/redistributions/2020.html.

The outcome is the Schubert electorate has been further changed. The changes are reasonably consistent with the outcomes sought by Council's submission. The new electoral boundaries map has been provided at the Attachment.

RECOMMENDATION
That Council receive and note the final outcome of the South Australian Electoral Districts Boundaries Commission report.
4.2.1 CONSENSUS AGENDA – CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

4.2.1.2 LOCAL GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION MUTUAL SERVICES ANNUAL REPORT 2019-2020
B8185

Correspondence has been received from LGA Mutual Services providing advice of their annual report and providing a link to review the report. It can be downloaded as outlined in the attached correspondence.

RECOMMENDATION
That Council receive and note the annual report of the Local Government Association Mutual Services for the 2019-2020 financial year.
Dear Martin

Please find enclosed a printed copy of the 2019/20 LGASA Mutual Services Annual Report.

Digital copies of these reports can be accessed and downloaded via the LGA web site (www.lga.sa.gov.au) and the LGRS Member Centre (www.lgrs.com.au).

Whilst it has been a difficult year, pleasingly we can advise that the Mutual Schemes have delivered strong results and achieved the commitment to the maintenance of stable, predictable contributions. The LGASA Mutual Services Annual Report for 2019/20FY provides key insights into the achievements and results highlighting the Scheme's performance and success.

Since its inception three decades ago the LGAMLS has navigated through the most challenging year for Local Government in South Australia. A strong financial result was made possible through successful claim outcomes, effective risk management and the continued focus on consistent application of the Local Government statutory immunities. Continued 100% Council membership is a key ingredient to the long term success of the LGAMLS. The annual report highlights the benefits of various risk based projects and support delivered to the Sector as it navigates significant changes in legislations and regulation.

The LGAWCS continues to deliver strong results for the Local Government Sector in the 2019/20FY amidst a challenging year. Despite a year of uncertainty the LGAWCS has recorded an all-time low 427 claims across the sector, which is a 10% decrease on last year and a 45% reduction on 5 years ago. This is an incredible result which enables stable member contributions and highlights the benefits of being Self-Insured with the independent actuary confirming that the sector has now saved over $259 in savings over the last 32 years. The LGAWCS continues to effectively deliver key programs and strategies to the sector, including injury management, return to work and work health and safety systems.

The Schemes have continued to deliver positive financial results in 2019/20 with the return of $4.8m to Members in special distribution and risk incentive fund. These results confirm that a sector owned Mutual fund creates value for the sector with the benefits returned to Members and the community, not to the profits of insurers.

If you have any questions or feedback on either report please do not hesitate to contact us directly, and if you require additional copies please contact Danielle.Bitmead@lta.com.au

Yours faithfully,

Dr Andrew Johnson
Chief Executive Officer
LGASA Mutual Pty Ltd

Tony Gray
General Manager
LGRS
4.2.1 CONSENSUS AGENDA – CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

4.2.1.3 LEGATUS MINUTES

B10496

The Minutes of the Legatus meeting and annual general meeting held on 27 November 2020 are attached for Council’s information.

RECOMMENDATION
That Minutes of the Legatus meeting of 27 November 2020 be received and noted.
Unconfirmed Minutes of the Legatus Group Meeting
27 November 2020 10am via zoom

1.0 Meeting Preliminaries

The meeting was advised that each of the Board Members taking part in the telecommunications meeting, must at all times during the meeting be able to hear and be heard by each of the other Board Members present. Each Board Member announced their presence to all other Board Members taking part in the meeting. The Board Members were advised that they must not leave the meeting by disconnecting their communication equipment unless they have previously notified the Chair of the meeting.

Mayor Bill O’Brien advised that he would be leaving the meeting at 11am and would endeavour to return if the meeting were still proceeding.

Present

Board members: Mayor Peter Mattey OAM – Chairman (Goyder), Mayor Leonie Kerley (Barunga West), Mayor Roslyn Talbot (Copper Coast), Mayor Bill O’Brien (Light), Mayor Mark Wasley (Adelaide Plains), Mayor Phillip Heaslip (Mount Remarkable), Mayor Ben Browne (Northern Areas), Mayor Kathie Bowman (Orroroo Carrieton), Mayor Rodney Reid (Wakefield), Mayor Peter Slattery (Flinders Ranges), Mayor Ruth Whittle OAM (Peterborough), Mayor Leon Stephens (Port Pirie) Mayor Wayne Thomas (Clare and Gilbert Valleys), Mayor Bim Lange OAM (The Barossa). and Mayor Darren Braund (Yorke Peninsula).

In Attendance

Cr Greg Flint (Flinders Ranges), Mr David Stevenson (CEO Goyder), Mr Colin Byles (CEO Northern Areas), Mr Dylan Strong (CEO Orroroo Carrieton), Mr James Miller (CEO Adelaide Plains), Mr Russell Peate (CEO Copper Coast), Mr Eric Brown (CEO Flinders Ranges), Mr Sam Johnson (CEO Mt Remarkable), Ms Kelly-Anne Saffin (CEO RDAYMN), Mr Tony Fox (GM Northern and Yorke landscape Board), Mr Nathan Petrus & Ms Allison Down (LGA) and Mr Simon Millcock (CEO Legatus Group).

Apologies

Council CEO’s Ms Maree Wauchope (Barunga West), Mr Martin McCarthy (Barossa), Mr Brian Carr (Light), Mr Peter McGuiness (Peterborough), Mr Peter Ackland (Port Pirie), Mr Andrew MacDonald (Wakefield), Mr Andrew Cameron (Yorke Peninsula) and Dr Helen Macdonald (Clare and Gilbert Valleys). MP’s Hon Stephan Knoll (Schubert), Hon Geoff Brock (Frome), Hon Dan van Holst Pellekaan (Stuart), Mr Fraser Ellis (Narrunga), Hon Tony Piccolo (Light), Mr John Gee (Taylor) and Federal MP Mr Rowan Ramsey.

1.1 Opening

The Chairman declared the meeting open at 10.03am
1.2 Welcome

The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting and a report on the change to Mayor at Northern Areas Council was included with the agenda.

Motion: That the Legatus Group welcomes Mayor Ben Browne as the newly appointed Mayor of the Northern Areas Council and acknowledges the active support by Cr Denis Clark to the Legatus Group during his tenure as Mayor of the Northern Areas Council.

Moved: Mayor Bill O’Brien Seconded: Mayor Phillip Heaslip  CARRIED

Mayor Peter Slattery advised the meeting that he was resigning as Mayor at The Flinders Ranges Council and that elections would be held with a result likely by early March 2021.

Motion: That the Legatus Group acknowledges the active support by Mayor Peter Slattery for the past ten years to the Legatus Group during his tenure as Mayor of The Flinders Ranges Council.

Moved: Mayor Rodney Reid Seconded: Mayor Leonie Kerley  CARRIED

3 Confirmation of Previous Minutes

Minutes of the Ordinary Meeting held 4 September 2020.

Motion: That the minutes of the Legatus Group Meeting held on 4 September 2020 be taken as read and confirmed.

Moved: Mayor Ruth Whittle  Seconded: Mayor Rodney Reid  CARRIED

4 Presentations

4.1 Kelly-Anne Saffin CEO Regional Development Australia Yorke Mid North

Kelly-Anne (slides will be distributed after the meeting):

- COVID-19 and economic impacts although figures on retail have yet to come in
- People choosing to not re-enter the workforce
- Economic data now available through the Commonwealth Government
- A Job match program for the Yorke Mid North undertaken and focus now on immediate employment shortages
- Tourism across the region rebounded strongly and good forward bookings
- Local love where I live program now moving to a more regional marketing program
- Two Regional Growth Fund application confirmed and possibly more to follow
- BBRF waiting on announcement of opening date
- Strategic Planning process underway, Commonwealth have committed 4 ½ years to RDAs
- Call from YMN Chair and Board currently open

4.2 Tony Fox GM Northern and Yorke Landscape Board

- New Board now in place and commenced strategic planning process
- Aboriginal Engagement Committee commenced and includes Legatus Group CEO
- Attempting to meet twice a year with member councils and seeking increased engagement by Landscape Board staff with councils
• Grass roots grant saw over 60 applications with approx. 50% funded
• Great value in the Regional Alliance working on Coastal Management Action Plan and the Future Drought Fund – looking to work with councils on longer term multi-year projects
• Water allocation planning reviews commencing

5 Chairman’s Report

Chair Mayor Peter Mattey advised that he and Mayor Bill O’Brien had attended all the required SAROC and LGA meetings on behalf of Legatus Group. Noted that discussions with the new Minister for Local Government on Local Government Reform have been fruitful with the Minister being open and aware to the issues raised. Other items will be raised during the meeting.

Mayor Bill O’Brien noted the unsuccessful Climate Emergency motion at the LGA AGM and recognised that whilst the motion was not successful there is a need for action.

6 Business arising not otherwise on the agenda

6.1 Drought

The Legatus Group CEO provided a report with the agenda including the “Future Drought Fund – Opportunities for the Northern and Yorke Region” report. He provided a written update prior to the meeting on the potential role for the Legatus Group re the Drought Resilience Adoption and Innovation Hub grant which closes 23 December 2021. He outlined he was a facilitating a meeting that afternoon with other regional partners on this topic.

Motion:

1. That the Legatus Group notes the report including that the Legatus Group CEO is working in collaboration through the Northern and Yorke Alliance on opportunities to identify and progress grants.
3. That an Australian Postgraduate Research Internships project is undertaken to complete a Community Wellbeing Awareness and Gap Analysis report for greater clarity of the current situation and needs in the Legatus Group region.

Moved: Mayor Mark Wasley  Seconded: Mayor Leon Stephens  CARRIED

6.2 Rating Equity

The letter from Hon Vickie Chapman Minister for Planning and Local Government was provided with the agenda and Mayor Mattey provided an update on the continuing discussions between the LGA and the Minister.

Motion: That the Legatus Group notes the report.

Moved: Mayor Rodney Reid  Seconded: Mayor Darren Braund  CARRIED

6.3 Climate Change Sector Agreement

The Legatus Group CEO provided a report with the agenda.
Motion: That the Legatus Group notes the report.

Moved: Mayor Bim Lange  Seconded: Mayor Leonie Kerley  CARRIED

6.4 Reconciliation Action Planning Northern and Yorke Region

The Legatus Group CEO provided a report with the agenda which included the “Reconciliation Action Planning Northern and Yorke Region” report.

Motion:

1. That the Legatus Group receives the Reconciliation Action Planning Northern and Yorke Region report and publishes it on its website.
2. That the Legatus Group delivers an ‘Acknowledgement of Country’ at the start of each meeting.
3. That Constituent Councils are encouraged to (1) consider the report and (2) liaise with the Legatus Group CEO on possible areas of support for Reconciliation Awareness and Sharing Culture Sessions.
4. That the report is used as the basis for further consideration in the Legatus Groups Strategic and Business Plans.

Moved: Mayor Leon Stephens  Seconded: Mayor Ruth Whittle  CARRIED

Mayor Bill O’Brien leaves the meeting.

6.5 Strategic Planning Review

The Legatus Group CEO provided a report with the agenda and advised that he has still to meet with the Barossa, Port Pirie and Goyder Councils.

Motion: That the meeting notes the report and sets a new date in early February 2021 for the workshop.

Moved: Mayor Phillip Heaslip  Seconded: Mayor Darren Braund  CARRIED

6.6 RDA Funding Model

A letter from RDA Yorke Mid North Chair Mr Bill Vandepeer was provided with the agenda.

Motion: That the meeting notes the report.

Moved: Mayor Ben Browne  Seconded: Mayor Mark Wasley  CARRIED

7  Items referred by Councils

7.1 Support to Remarkable Southern Flinders Local Government Alliance

The District Council Mount Remarkable, Northern Areas Council & Port Pirie Regional Council provided and spoke to their report with the agenda. General discussions undertaken and consensus from the meeting was that support to sub-regional projects developed by member councils be a discussion item at the Legatus Group Strategic Planning Workshop.
Motion: That the Legatus Group notes the formation of the Remarkable Southern Flinders Local Government Alliance and supports the Alliance in the current financial year with administration support.

Moved: Mayor Bim Lange  Seconded: Mayor Rodney Reid  
NOT CARRIED

Motion: That the Legatus Group notes the formation of the Remarkable Southern Flinders Local Government Alliance and supports the Alliance in the current financial year with administration support and a contribution of up to $24,000.

Moved: Mayor Ben Browne Seconded: Mayor Leon Stephens  
CARRIED

Mayor Bim Lange departs the meeting 11.55am

7.2 Copper Coast Council – Cat Management Laws

The Copper Coast Council provided and spoke to a report with the agenda and general discussions were held.

Motion: That the Legatus Group request the Local Government Association of South Australia through the South Australian Regional Organisation of Councils to highlight to the State Minister for Environment and the Dog and Cat Management Board the need for review of cat management laws.

Moved: Mayor Roslyn Talbot  Seconded: Mayor Leonie Kerley  
CARRIED

8 20/21 Business Plan Project Updates

8.1 Project Updates: The Legatus Group CEO’s report and Project Officer updates were contained in the agenda and the Legatus Group CEO provided the following updates:

- Use of the colour system to identify the current status of projects.
- Coastal Management Strategic Planning Session being held on 7 December 2020 has 26 attending with representatives from all 7 Coastal Councils.

The Chair invited questions.

Motion: That the Legatus Group notes the report.

Moved: Mayor Rodney Reid  Seconded: Mayor Leonie Kerley  
CARRIED

9 Audit and Risk Management Committee

Mayor Kathie Bowman as Chair of the Committee provided a report which included the minutes of their meeting held 13 November 2020. The Legatus Group CEO advised that he will be meeting with The Flinders Ranges Council CEO and Finance Officer in December to discuss amongst other things internal controls.

Motion:

1. That the Legatus Group notes the report.
2. That the Legatus Group investigates options for the provision of financial management services for the Legatus Group.
3. That the Legatus Group uses an external facilitator for the next Legatus Group CEOs performance review.
4. Reappoints Independent member Ian McDonald for a further two years commencing from 15 February 2021.
5. Calls for expressions of interest for the position held by Cr Denis Clark which will expire on 30 April 2021.

Moved: Mayor Peter Slattery Seconded: Mayor Ben Browne

10 Financial Report


The Legatus Group CEO provided a report with the agenda containing the Budget Comparison report for the audited 2019/2020 financial year

Motion: That the Legatus Group receives and confirms the Budget Comparison report for the audited 2019/2020 financial report.

Moved: Mayor Rodney Reid Seconded: Mayor Mark Wasley

10.2 2020/2021 Budget / Finance Update

The Legatus Group CEO provided a report containing the balance sheet and profit and loss statement for the July-Oct 2021 period and the budget comparison report for the first quarter 2020/2021. He advised the meeting that a budget update will be provided at the Strategic Planning Workshop after he meets with the Finance Officer.


Moved: Mayor Rodney Reid Seconded: Mayor Leonie Kerley

10.3 LGA Research & Development Scheme Funding Interim Report

The Legatus Group CEO provided the interim report submitted to LGA. He advised that there has been response from LGA and that that a recent funding application submitted by the Legatus Group which was not approved had been noted by LGA that there was a large carry over of funds by the Legatus Group.

Motion: That the Legatus Group notes the Local Government Research & Development Scheme Funding Interim Report for 2020-21 has been provided to the LGA.

Moved: Mayor Rodney Reid Seconded: Mayor Darren Braund

10.4 CEO Credit Card Payments

The Legatus Group CEO provided a report on the credit card expenditure for the period 1 August 2020 – 31 October 2020.

Motion: That the Legatus Group notes the CEOs credit card expenditure report for the period 1August – 31 October 2020.
11 Legatus Group Regional Management Group

Mr Colin Byles Chair of the committee provided a report with the agenda noting that they will be meeting in December 2020 subject to LGA Mutual availability.

Motion: That the Legatus Group notes the report.

Moved: Mayor Darren Braund  Seconded: Mayor Mark Wasley  CARRIED

12 Legatus Road and Transport Infrastructure Advisory Committee

Dr Helen Macdonald the Chair of the committee provided a report with the agenda which contained the notes of the Legatus Group Legatus Road and Transport Infrastructure Advisory Committee meeting held 18 November 2020.

Motion:

1. That the meeting notes the report.
2. Approves the Legatus Group CEO to obtain a quote for consideration by the Legatus Group re a consultancy to undertake a review of the Local Bridge Network in the Legatus Group Region for consideration of a regional approach under the Bridges Renewal Program.

Moved: Mayor Mark Wasley  Seconded: Mayor Kathie Bowman  CARRIED

13 Legatus Group CWMS Advisory Committee

Andrew MacDonald Chair of the Committee provided a report which included the minutes of their meetings held on 10 November 2020.

Motion: That the meeting notes the report and writes to LGA Mutual thanking them for their involvement with the Legatus Group CWMS Risk Workshop.

Moved: Mayor Roslyn Talbot  Seconded: Mayor Phillip Heaslip  CARRIED

Mayor Bill O’Brien returns to the meeting.

14 Legatus Group Visitor Information Services Advisory Committee

The Legatus Group CEO provided a report with the agenda which included the minutes of their meeting on 6 November 2020.

Motion: The Legatus Group notes the report.

Moved: Mayor Phillip Heaslip  Seconded: Mayor Leonie Kerley  CARRIED

15 Local Government Association and SAROC

15.1 LGA Update

Nathan Petrus and Allison Down advised the meeting of:

- Infrastructure funding and shovel ready program
• Federal Govt support for apprentices and trainees via 50% subsidy
• Local Govt Reform Bill is likely to be debated in Parliament by Christmas
• SAROC meeting delayed and occurring next week
• Public Health Workshops are occurring
• Looking for items for the OGM by 25/2/2021

15.2 SAROC Key Outcomes report provided with the agenda.

16 Other Business

Nil

18 NEXT MEETING

Was to be hosted by the Adelaide Plains Council and the meeting noted that due COVID-19 both meetings planned in 2020 for the Yorke Peninsula Council were held via zoom.

Motion: That the next Legatus Group Ordinary Meeting be held on Friday 5 March 2021 starting at 10.30am be hosted by the Yorke Peninsula Council.

Moved: Mayor Darren Braund  Seconded: Mayor Rodney Reid CARRIED

The meeting noted that the Strategic Planning Workshop will be held in early February in Clare.

19 CLOSE

Meeting closed by the Chair at 12.38 pm

Chairman _________________________ Dated _____________
4.2.2  CONSENSUS AGENDA – COMMUNICATIONS AND ENGAGEMENT OFFICERS

4.2.2.1
COMMUNICATION AND ENGAGEMENT – QUARTERLY REPORT

This report provides a quarterly snapshot of C&EO activity for Elected Member information:

- Community consultation:
  - Mandatory green organic waste service
  - Community Plan 2020-2040 and Advocacy Strategy
  - Barossa Bushgardens draft Urban Design
  - Expanded Community Shopping Bus
- Events
  - Tanunda Under Lights T20 cricket event
  - Garage Sale Trail
- Annual Report 2019-2020
- Website content development and implementation
- Shadow Cabinet presentation
- Community engagement / messaging:
  - Covid-19 Public Health updates (November/December)
  - Covid-19 Recovery Grants
  - Nuriootpa Swimming Pool
  - Citizenship of the Year Awards
  - Bushfire prevention
  - Love Your Library

Please note community feedback received during community consultation is captured as part of quarterly reporting to Council.

RECOMMENDATION
That Report 4.2.2.1 be received
COUNCIL
DEVELOPMENT & ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES REPORT

15 DECEMBER 2020

4.5.1 CONSENSUS AGENDA – DEVELOPMENT SERVICES REPORT

4.5.1.1 TOWN OF GAWLER – LOCAL HERITAGE TRANSITION DEVELOPMENT PLAN AMENDMENT FOR PUBLIC CONSULTATION
B10493

Correspondence has been received from Town of Gawler, seeking comments on the Local heritage Transition Development Plan Amendment (DPA), refer attached.

Town of Gawler have recently reviewed all 609 Contributory Items for the council area, ahead of the preparation of a draft Development Plan Amendment, which is now undergoing public consultation until 25 February 2021.

RECOMMENDATION:
That the report item 4.5.1.1 be received.
27 November 2020

Mayor Bill Lange
The Barossa Council
P.O. Box 867
NURIOOTPA SA 5355

Dear Sir/Madam,

RE: LOCAL HERITAGE TRANSITION DEVELOPMENT PLAN AMENDMENT FOR PUBLIC CONSULTATION

Your comments are sought on the above Development Plan Amendment (DPA), which has been released for public consultation in accordance with section 25 of the Development Act 1993.

The amendment proposes changes to the Gawler (CT) Development Plan to transition 150 Contributory Items to Local Heritage Places. This involves the updating of Table Ga/5 Local Heritage Places and Table Ga/6 Contributory Items, including changes to maps (Figures GA(HPCI))/3, 5, 6, 9, 10 and 11) showing the location of heritage places.

The DPA will be available for public inspection and purchase at the Town of Gawler Council Administration Centre, 43 High Street, Gawler East, during normal business hours from Thursday 3rd December 2020 to Thursday 25th February 2021. The DPA is also accessible on Council's website: www.gawler.sa.gov.au.

A public workshop will be held by appointment on Wednesday 10th February 2021 at the Gawler Civic Centre, 89-91 Murray Street, Gawler.

During this time, you may make a written submission about any of the changes proposed in the DPA. All written submissions should be addressed to the Chief Executive Officer, Town of Gawler, PO Box 130, Gawler SA 5118. Alternatively, electronic submissions can be emailed to planningadmin@gawler.sa.gov.au up until 5.00pm on Thursday 25th February 2021.

A public hearing will be held on Tuesday 16th March 2021 at 7:00pm in the Council Chamber, Gawler Civic Centre, 89-91 Murray Street, Gawler, at which time interested persons may be heard in relation to their submissions. The public hearing may not be held if no submissions are received or if no submission specifically requests to be heard as part of their submission.

Please note that due to ongoing COVID-19 concerns, the format of the public hearing (i.e. whether in person or on-line) will not be determined until consultation is closed in case the hearing is required to be conducted on-line rather than with a physical presence.
Copies of all written submissions will be available for public inspection by interested persons at the Town of Gawler Council offices following the consultation period until the conclusion of the public hearing. For further information or to arrange an appointment for the public workshop on 10th February 2021 please contact our Development Assessment Planner, Jessica Lewig on 8522 9279.

Yours sincerely

Henry Inat
Chief Executive Officer
Local Heritage Transition Development Plan Amendment Process

Council to review all 609 Contributory Items in the Town of Gawler Initial letter sent to affected landowners/occupiers

Identification of Contributory Items eligible for assessment against the Local Heritage Places criteria

A Statement of Intent to be produced and lodged with Minister for Planning seeking support to prepare a Local Heritage Places Development Plan Amendment

Development Plan Amendment preparation.

Statutory consultation period to be undertaken from 3 December 2020 until 25 February 2021, pursuant to the Development Act 1993

*Current status*

Public hearing scheduled for Tuesday 16th March 2021
The public hearing may not be held if no submissions are received or if no submission makes a request to be heard.

Summary of Consultation and Proposed Amendments Report prepared and Development Plan Amendment reviewed appropriately

Final Development Plan Amendment to be lodged with Minister of Planning prior to 30 June 2021
Local Heritage Transition Development Plan Amendment

Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)

- **What is being proposed?**

  Council has committed to assessing all Contributory Items currently listed in the Town of Gawler Development Plan against the criteria for Local Heritage Places defined in the *Development Act 1993*, in order to convert all eligible items to Local Heritage Places via a Local Heritage Development Plan Amendment.

- **What are Contributory Items?**

  Contributory Items are buildings that are considered to make a positive contribution to the historic streetscape character of an area.

  Contributory Items generally form part of a cohesive group of buildings that demonstrate a consistent grouping of particular forms of development, representing a defined period and its built-form character, usually described in Desired Character statements.

- **What are Local Heritage Places?**

  Local Heritage Places are listed in Development Plans and are established through the *Development Act 1993*.

  Local Heritage Places are also listed in Table Ga/5 of the Gawler Development Plan and are stand-out examples of heritage buildings in the Council area, however not of significance to the State.

- **What defines an area's historic character?**

  Character is demonstrated through roof forms, traditional materials, wall heights, proportions and composition of elements such as chimneys, windows and doors, verandahs and other details that provide visual interest.

  The allotment size as presented to the street is an important aspect of character, leading to the consistent spacing and setting of buildings and their placement on allotments.

  Policies applying to contributory items are aimed at preserving and enhancing the combination of historic elements that contribute to the historic streetscape character of an area.
- **How many Contributory Items are in the Town of Gawler, and where are they located?**

  There are 609 Contributory Items with the Town of Gawler and they are predominately located with defined historic conversation zone identified with the Gawler Development Plan. These zones include the following suburbs:
  - Gawler
  - Gawler East
  - Gawler West
  - Gawler South
  - Evanston
  - Willaston

- **Who makes the decision about whether a Contributory Item is converted to a Local Heritage Place?**

  To be eligible to be a Local Heritage Place it must meet one or more of the following defined criteria:

  - Displays historical, economic or social themes that are of importance to the local area
  - Represents customs or ways of life that are characteristic of the local area
  - Has played an important part in the lives of local residents
  - Displays aesthetic merit, design characteristics or construction techniques of significance to the local area
  - Is associated with a notable local personality or event
  - Is a notable landmark in the area
  - Is a tree of special historical or social significance or importance within the local area.

  However, the ultimate decision is made by the Minister for Planning.

- **How long will this process take?**

  Council will need to finalise this project for Ministerial review by no later than 30 June 2021.

- **What support does Council provide to heritage listed property owners?**

  Council provides a free Heritage Advisory Service to the community, with a Heritage Advisor available to the public every fortnight (generally every 2nd Wednesday) to provide advice on the following matters:
  - Preliminary Development Application
  - Design suggestions for improvements/renovations/repairs to Heritage Places
  - Local Heritage Grant advice
Furthermore, Council offers a grant of up to $1,500 to assist owners of Local Heritage Places with conservation work. This grant is subject to assessment and approval by Council staff and is available for actual conservation work to the building exterior only.

- **What will it mean for my rates if my property is considered a Local Heritage property?**

  Council rates are not affected by heritage listings.

- **If my property is converted from a Contributory Item to a Local Heritage Place, will it be subject to greater development restrictions?**

  Development policies generally seek to retain and enhance both Contributory Items and Local Heritage places. Greater emphasis is placed on development involving Local Heritage Places and there are tiered controls for development, particularly in relation to demolition. Demolition of a Local Heritage Place is therefore controlled and carefully considered by Council.

- **How and when can I provide comment on this process?**

  Council welcomes submissions regarding the DPA.

  A formal written submission is required to include your full name and address.

  Written submissions regarding the DPA should be submitted no later than 5.00 pm on Wednesday 25th February 2021. All submissions should be addressed to the Chief Executive Officer, Town of Gawler, PO BOX 130, Gawler SA 5118. Alternatively, electronic submissions can be emailed to council@gawler.sa.gov.au up until 5.00pm on Wednesday 25th February 2021.

  Copies of all submissions received will be available for inspection by interested persons at the Administration Centre until the time of the public hearing. You are required to indicate if you wish to speak at the Public Hearing to be held at 7pm on Tuesday 16th March 2021, in the Council Chambers, Gawler Civic Centre, 89-91 Murray Street, Gawler.

  Please note that due to ongoing COVID-19 concerns, the format of the public hearing (i.e. whether in person or on-line) will not be determined until consultation is closed in case the hearing is required to be conducted on-line rather than with a physical presence. The public hearing may not be held if no submission indicates an interest in speaking at the public hearing.
The opportunity also exists for property owners to appear before the Local Heritage Advisory Committee (LHAC) should they be unhappy with Council's final decision. The LHAC will then provide recommendations to the Minister. On receipt of the Council report, and LHAC's advice, the Minister will:

a) Authorise the Development Plan Amendment; or
b) Authorise the Development Plan Amendment subject to minor changes; or

c) Decline to authorise the Development Plan Amendment Further details on this process are available from the Department for Infrastructure and Transport on 8343 2222.
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4.5.2.1 NORTHERN AND YORKE LANDSCAPE BOARD – LOWER MID NORTH AND VALLEY AND PLAINS DISTRICT PROGRESS REPORT
B10699

Correspondence has been received from Northern and Yorke Landscape Board, providing the Progress Report for 1 July – 30 September 2020, which is attached for information.

RECOMMENDATION:
That report items 4.5.2.1 be received.
Dear Councillors, Mayors and Chief Executives

RE: NORTHERN AND YORKE LANDSCAPE BOARD – Lower Mid North and Valleys and Plains District Progress Report

I am pleased to be able to present to you the progress report for the Lower Mid North and Valleys and Plains District for the quarter ending September 2020.

This report is aimed at providing the Barossa Council with a better understanding as to the range of Landscape levy funded work that is being carried out by staff from the Northern and Yorke Landscape Board in your local government area on behalf of your ratepayers.

As you can see this work runs across a number of important programs including pest animal and plant control, water management, community engagement and sustainable agriculture. This report also contains work that is being conducted as a result of federally funded projects as well as through the parks system, all of which are important in applying a landscape scale approach to managing environmental issues.

Importantly the report also captures the significant amount of work we do in partnership with local landholders and the community as well as collaborative work with many stakeholder groups.

If you require further information regarding the works undertaken, please contact Landscape Operations Manager, Terry Boyce on 0467 725 630.

Sincerely

General Manager
Northern and Yorke Landscape Board
### Strategic Roadside Weed Control Project:
- Developed to support Local Government, Communities and stakeholders to deliver a targeted, planned and co-ordinated approach to Roadside Weed Control across the region.
- Focus is directed towards protecting native vegetation, assets, agricultural and primary production by controlling declared and environmental weeds.
- Project plan completed / scope of works being developed for councils.
- Meetings with Barossa, Adelaide Plains, Town of Gawler and Light Regional Councils completed. Work plans drafted. Consultation with Goyder, Wakefield & Clare & Gilbert Valley planned.
- Budget allocations and peer reviews of draft/completed plans scheduled in November.

### Horehound Plume Moth Project:
- Horehound (*Marrubium vulgare*), is a weed that is declared for control in the Northern & Yorke Board Region. Since 2018 there has been a program to distribute the horehound plume moths (*Wheeleria spilodactylus*). The moth offers landholders other control options and the opportunity to integrate current control methods. Plume moths are host specific, with the larvae feeding on the growing tips, weakening the plant and reducing the flowers and burrs. Landholders are advised of the potential of the biological control through media. Landholders register interest for releasing the caterpillar with the Board and collect the insects.
  - This year staff collected approximately 1600 caterpillars over four visits to nursery sites and distributed these to approximately 40 landholders across the Board region.
### 3. Co-ordinated Fox Baiting Program
*NY Landscape Board Funded*

- Spring coordinated fox baiting days were held in collaboration with Lower Mid North & Valleys and Plains with 5 staff across 6 sites - Balaklava, Riverton, Clare, Spalding, Crystal Brook and Freeling. 2390 baits were distributed to 34 landowners.

Outside of coordinated baiting days:
- Clare distributed 1900 baits to 34 landowners (same quarter 2019 1830 baits to 29 landowners) Gawler distributed 890 baits to 17 landholders and Burra distributed 360 baits to 4 landholders
- One landowner west of Clare is interested in using the Canid Pest Ejector on his land, where traditional baits will be a high risk.

### 4. Wakefield & Light Regional Council (WRC)
Communities combatting pests & weeds during drought Program
*Federally Funded*

A collaborative project for pest and weed control with the working group represented by two Board staff:
- All funds have been allocated or spent, completion and acquittal due by the end of October
- $30,000 of weed control works in the WRC and $40,000 in the LRC areas targeting Silver leaf Nightshade, Boxt喉, Wild Artichoke and Olive
- Fifty two landholders received funding (28 in WRC and 24 in LRC) to control weeds.
- Two Boxt喉 Pullers purchased for Light and Wakefield Councils
- Fifty two landowners in WRC and ten landholders in LRC received subsidised fox baits.

### 5. Landholder Advice (technical advice of control methods/options)

A total of 171 enquiries for technical and other advice were logged by staff across the Lower Mid North and Valleys & Plains district. The main categories for advice included:

- Rabbits & Foxes 38, Weeds 38, Land Management 13, Native Vegetation 14, Compliance 2, Grants 10, DEW 38.

**Weeds**
- One permit to transport declared plant permit is under development for the Port Wakefield bypass construction project
- NY assisted PIRSA biosecurity and the SAAL region in conducting a risk assessment of the Pine Cone Cactus (*Tephrocactus/Opuntia articulates*). The outcome being very high risk with a very high feasibility of containment resulting in **eradicate - alert weed status**
- An enquiry from a land owner about how Olive orchards fall under the Act and what they would have to do if they purchased a property which had one on it
- A targeted letter drop and several property visits have resulted in Calomba daisy control west of Mallala.
### Rabbits
- Increase enquiries around the urban fringes of Clare, Gawler Belt & Lyndoch.

### Wild dogs
- Two reports of wild dogs were investigated and cleared.

### Artichokes
- Letters were sent early in the Artichoke season to landholders in the Valleys and Plains district. Staff have been following up with landholders who are under voluntary compliance to ensure appropriate control is being undertaken. In the Lower Mid North area artichoke letters were sent to compliment works being undertaken by the LRC & WRC Drought Program funding.

### 6. Declared Plant Management (linked to District Weed Action Plans) NY Landscape Board Funded
- Artichoke control completed on 4km section of Belalie Creek (Jamestown) with collaboration with Northern Areas Council
- The two known Boneseed sites have been inspected with some control taken place. One population will be burned this spring in a NPWS prescribed burn. The other population has been extent mapped with control to begin shortly
- Salvation Jane is on the increase this spring, with Landscape Officers looking into sourcing biological control to stock nursery sites and for a potential release and monitoring
- Staff at Burra treated incursions of Boxthorn (100 plants) and Wild Artichokes (300 plants) on various/priority roadsides.

### Board Priority: Sustainable Agriculture

#### 1. Wildlife for Wine (Barossa) Project: NY Landscape Board Funded
This project aims to engage the grape and wine industry and to provide key initiatives that will improve economic and environmental aspects of sustainable wine, which in turn will benefit biodiversity.

Activities this year have included:
- A community planting day on the 9 August 2020 at Nietschke Farms, Moppa attended by over 20 community members and with over 500 seedlings planted into a Heritage Agreement
  This was followed by a presentation by Ian Falkenberg on his bird surveys of Wildlife for Wine properties and a walk through the Heritage listed Peppermint Box woodland
- A community planting day on 30 September 2020 at Stonewell Cottages attended by 15 community members planting over 300 seedlings, followed by a barbeque lunch
- Completed four property visits and draft Biodiversity Action Plans.
# Board Priority: Water Management

| 1. **Upper Wakefield Catchment Project**  
  *NY Landscape Board Funded* | Riparian Restoration focus  
  - Previous projects /catchment works mapped and project scoped.  
  - Landholders currently being engaged.  
  - Site visits undertaken.  
  - Management plans being written with Greening Australia. |   |
|---|---|---|
| 2. **Burra to Kapunda Project**  
  *Federally funded* | The project aims to improve the condition of remnant native vegetation communities in the Mid North of South Australia with a focus on Peppermint Box (Eucalyptus odorata) Grassy Woodlands and Iron-grass Natural Temperate Grasslands - listed as Critically Endangered under the EPBC Act, 1999.  
  - Staff held a project meeting to determine works undertaken and milestones yet to be achieved  
  - Final site visits to determine priority vegetation communities completed in September  
  - Final reporting to be completed before last quarter of financial year. |   |
| 3. **Water Affecting Activity Permit Investigation** | Two inspections carried out and referred to WAA permits officer. Locations included Mintaro  
  One of the properties is also under investigation as the large quantity of declared plants is likely to impact its natural flow. The Public Trustee is in ownership of the property and have been engaged  
  - Georgetown Hills Renewable Energy PTY LTD application for WAA permit for power infrastructure to follow a creek line for the wind farm development  
  - Earthworks altering a watercourse and dam in Stanley Flat were investigated and resulted in NY requesting the landowner rectify the issue. A WAA permit has been issues for the repair works. |   |
| 4. **Referrals** | A Town of Gawler request for comments regarding a consultant’s report “Recovery and response after the Hillier Fire” was completed by operations, planning and partnerships staff  
  - Landscape Officers reviewed and provided feedback (prior to community consultation) on The Barossa Council’s Draft Roadside Vegetation Management Plan. |   |
### Board Priority: Biodiversity

| Vegetation Assessment Surveys Adelaide Plains 2019-20 Levy Funded | - Staff assisted with spring surveys of remnant vegetation that had been fenced under a federally funded Adelaide Plains Council project in 2003  
- The recent surveys were undertaken by the previous Board to determine a biodiversity score for the remnants since fencing, any threats, risks and opportunities for improvement  
- The surveys have been undertaken by Sonia and Tim Croft across 26 different sites. Visits were completed in autumn and spring and a report for each site has been produced with a detailed plant species list and suggested management strategies. |

### Board Priority: Communities

| 1. Community Events | Trees for Life planting day at Willaston Cemetery  
- Staff attended and assisted with planting support including the provision by the Board of 250 wooden stakes  
**Gawler East Powerline Project**  
- Staff Attendance  
- Assistance in helping volunteer’s layout tube stock for community planting and sowing grass seed  
- Provided advice on integrated plan for rabbit control and gazania control. |
| 2. Grants | - Thirty six Grass Roots Grant applications were received for the LMN & VP District and background advice provided prior to the assessment process. District Staff also provided direct input and advice to approximately six applications. |
| 3. Partnerships & Community Group Support | - NY are collaborating with Australian Rail Track Corporation and Genesee & Wyoming Australia to plan pest plant control along operational and disused rail corridors  
- Staff have facilitated the formation of a Rabbit Control Group in Lyndoch. This action was in response to a request for assistance across a large area and includes land uses covering grazing, viticulture, urban, tourism and winery land uses. Staff have set up a number of meetings to distribute advice and that will focus on a range of integrated control techniques and follow up control methods |
Landscape staff met with a landholder adjacent to the Para Wirra Conservation Park and the South Para River in August. The landholder has conducted many years of habitat restoration on his property (supported by the previous Board) and was seeking interest in DEW purchasing the property. Staff provided landholder with details to further discuss opportunity.

Staff assisted in the compilation of information for the SA Volunteer Awards. The award nomination was volunteer, landholder and long standing environmental activist Michael Johnson.

Staff attended the opening of the new Glenburnie property that has been purchased as an addition to Para Wirra CP. The Glenburnie property was previously owned by the Johnson family who worked collaboratively with the previous Board to invest in weed control and much of the initial work toward the DEW purchase.

N&Y Staff have meet with staff from adjoining Landscape SA Boards to complete handover of assets, and information exchange where there have been boundary changes.

Staff supported and attended the Clare Valley Deer control Group annual meeting. In the past two years the group has successfully removed 861 deer from private property in the Clare area. With the assistance of a commercial contractor. The group has received a further $6K in grant funding (Back to Basics) from the N&Y Board to continue this work.

Staff continue to provide administrative and venue support for two key community advisory groups – The Northern Coast & Plains and South Para Biodiversity committees. The groups are made up of a wide range of community, agency and local government representatives.

Burra staff attended the August Burra Rangelands Action Group meeting and gave an update of Board activities in the area.

Staff assisted Gawler Scouts with a planting project at their Willaston camp site and provided 150 stakes and guards.

**Community Group Support:**
LMN & V&P staff have been assigned 28 community groups - to attend meetings and continue to assist in 2020 as their Landscapes Board liaison.

**4. Community Action Planning**

- Valleys & Plains staff participated in the first of a series of meetings in September to develop a CAP for the Valleys & Plains sub district. Further community meetings are planned for October.
5. Media & Communications

- Regional media coordination working group
  - All districts are working together on a more coordinated approach to media releases by starting a working group with a representative from each region to meet on a quarterly basis

- Media Releases & Social Media
  - Plume Moth and Group Fox Baiting days

### Compliance Activity Log

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Title</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Progress Report</th>
<th>Future Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Active Cases</td>
<td>There are 31 active cases relating to breaches or potential breaches under the “Act” in the Lower Mid North - Valleys and Plains district.</td>
<td>The compliance status are: 7 verification required, 14 under investigation, 10 Monitor. Land degradation: 1 Plant/Weed issues: 18 WAA: 5 Pest animals: 4</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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4.5.2.2 GAWLER RIVER FLOODPLAIN MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY – STATE GOVERNMENT FUNDING

B10461

Correspondence has been received from the Hon David Speirs, Minister for Environment and Water (refer attached), confirming State Government funding of $9 million to be made available to the Gawler River Floodplain Management Authority over the next three years for a range of projects aimed at reducing flood risks across the northern Adelaide plains.

Ongoing Funding model options will be considered by the GRFMA Board and Constituent Councils, with potential additional funds to be sought from the Federal Government.

The next meeting of the GRFMA Board is to be held 10 December 2020.

A further report will be provided to Council in due course.

RECOMMENDATION:
That report items 4.5.2.2 be received.
Dear Mayor Lange,

I write to share with you some good news from the State Budget announced on 10 November 2020. The Budget includes new funding for flood risk mitigation on the Gawler River, reflecting the Marshall Liberal Government’s commitment to work with your council on this critical issue.

As you know, responsibility for the management of Gawler River flood risk lies with the Gawler River Flood Management Authority (GRFMA), and with its constituent councils. The State Government is making $9 million available through the Stormwater Management Authority (SMA), to support your council’s work to discharge this responsibility. The funding is for “no regrets” projects that focus on reducing risk of infrastructure damage downstream and minimising impacts on irrigated horticulture during flood events, improving flood forecasting and warnings for action and improving flood behaviour.

Your council’s co-contribution will be critical. It will enable the State Government’s investment to be leveraged - to support these projects and to make possible the long term planning that is also required. In particular, the development of a Stormwater Management Plan is required to inform future flood risk mitigation planning and investment decisions.

As you are more than aware, this project has been troubled by lack of agreement, direction and funding in recent times. I am determined to put the disagreements of constituent councils to one side and get on with this project. Communities that are and could be impacted by floods deserve leadership to be shown by all tiers of government and I trust your council will be a willing and enthusiastic partner to fix this problem once and for all.

I have asked the Department for Environment and Water (DEW) to support the delivery of practical outcomes for Gawler River flood mitigation. DEW will work in partnership with other State Government agencies, the GRFMA, the SMA, and councils to facilitate success.

I look forward to continuing a productive partnership with you and your council to enable implementation of both the specific projects for which funding has been made available in this State Budget and the longer term works required to mitigate flooding of the Gawler River.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

DAVID SPEIRS MP
Minister for Environment and Water

Date: 11/11/2020
COUNCIL
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4.5.2  CONSENSUS AGENDA – ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES REPORT

4.5.2.3  WILLIAMSTOWN, LYNDOLCH LANDCARE GROUP INC.
B2791, 20/64618
Minutes of the Williamstown, Lyndoch Landcare Group Inc. meeting held 25 November 2020, are attached for information.

RECOMMENDATION:
That report items 4.5.2.3 be received.
Purpose: General Meeting

Prepared by: Tina Woods

Phone No.: 0421 616 444

Location: Council Rooms,
29 Barossa Valley Way,
Lyndoch, SA 5351

Date/Time: 25 November 2020, 7.40pm – 8.30 pm

Attendees:
- Angus Atkinson (Chair)
- Don Wegner
- Shirley Wegner
- Mick Kobryn
- Terry Peacock
- Diana Dancer
- Elke Wiese
- Joerg Wiese
- Tina Woods
- Tracy Sinclair

Distribution: All current & life members and Chris Kruger (Executive Assistant, Development and Environmental Services, The Barossa Council)

File: 20201125_GeneralMeetingMinutes.docx

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Action by</th>
<th>Date Due</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Meeting Opened</td>
<td>7.40pm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Apologies – Brian &amp; Margaret Teskey.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Minutes of previous Meeting held 23 September 2020 – Accepted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moved by Terry Peacock, seconded by Don Wagener – Carried.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Business Arising last meeting:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actions now closed:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACTION: Advertising - Investigate costs of advertising in the local Barossa and Gawler papers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Update:</strong> Angus has contacted The Bunyip (Gawler), they don’t offer any specific discount for community groups. The cheapest advertisement was $150/week. No further action will look for a news worth article about an event or happening in 2021 to get article in The Leader and/or The Bunyip.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACTION: Diarise dates for Saturday Working Bees – Aim for one a month from Feb 2021 – can then be added to information in The Grapevine.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Update:</strong> Agreed on Saturday 1st May, 26 June and 24 July 2021.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Update:</strong> Angus advised that he understand that the application was submitted but nothing has been heard back.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actions still open:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**ACTION:** Follow up with **Friends of Para Wirra Conservation Park** for possible joint working bee. Tracy Sinclair and Angus Atkinson to visit Friends of Para Wirra Conservation Park.

**ACTION:** Seed Collection List- Brian Green to prepare a list of target plants for seed collection and the appropriate time of year for collection so this can be incorporated into the relevant working bees.

**Update:** Brian Green commenced some seed collection during the working bee on Thursday 22 October.

**ACTION:** Social Campout at the Science Camp in Brookfield Conservation Park.

**Update:** Terry Peacock to confirm with Brookfield potential availability for 3 days in early May 2021.

**ACTION:** Birds SA Recent Bird Survey – Obtain a copy of the bird list arising from the recent BirdsSA field visit (can be downloaded from the Website).

**ACTION:** Photos from Photo Points – Recomence the taking of regular photos from the photo points. Suggest alternative points if needed.

**Update:** Diana to discuss time with Tracy Sinclair to recommence the taking of points, some photo points may need to be re-established, or new ones determined.

**ACTION:** Yearly Council Tour – Angus to follow up with Council.

**Update:** This is probably best left until Autumn/Winter when weather not so hot.

**New Actions from Business Arising this meeting:**

**ACTION:** Saturday Working Bees – Advertise the agreed dates of Saturday 1st May, 26 June and 24 July 2021 in the next edition of The Grapevine.

**Correspondence:**

**In:**
- 30 Oct - Enquiry about becoming a new member by current Thursday working bee volunteer.
- Barossa Council – Advise that the Council Rooms will be redecorated. A new notice board will be available if Landcare wanted to promote the group.

**Out:**
- Card to Noreen Walton with condolences for Eric’s passing.

**Chair Report:**
- Nothing additional to report

**Treasurers Report** – as presented by Joerg Wiese:

Moved by Tracy Sinclair, seconded by Shirley Wegner – Carried.

- **Monthly Income & Expenditure** – since last General Meeting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>OCT 20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance Brought Forward</td>
<td>$11,596.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>$10.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Expenses | nil  
---|---  
End Month Balance | $11,606.91

- **Account Balances – since last General Meeting**

| OCT 20 |  
| Administration | $1,620.61  
| Credit Union Share | $2.00  
| Project No.2 (Altona) | $9,984.30  
| **Total End Month Balance** | **$11,606.91**

Joerg Wiese advised meeting:

- Income this month was for one membership fees and bank interest.

Shirley advised that there was $221.15 in Petty cash with most arising from donations in the collection tin at the container in last 5 months.

8 Publicity:

- **Friends of Parks** – If there are any photos of the Reserve that would be good publicity, members to email them to Angus and he can upload to our space on the Friends of Park site.
  
  Update: Diana advised that she had some photos that she believes would be good to use, she will email to Angus.

- **2021 Reminders:**
  o Publish the Saturday Working Bees on Saturday 1st May, 26 June and 24 July 2021 in The Grapevine and Facebook closer to the time.
  o Find a newsworthy article about an event or happening in 2021 for The Leader and/or The Bunyip.

9 General Business:

- **Grader Blade** – Grader blade is now attached to the tractor. It’s use in grading the footpaths was successful.

- **New Year Dinner** – It was decided for 2021 to wait until mid-year to have a social Dinner or possibly lunch when Angus would be available to attended – suggested timing June/July.

- **New Signage** – Topic for next year to update promotional material displayed on the sign board at the entrance to the Reserve.

10 Next Meeting – Wednesday 24 February 2021, 7.30pm Council Rooms, Lyndoch.

11 Meeting Closed 8.30pm.
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4.5.2.4 PROGRESS REPORT
B8570
Council’s Senior Environmental Officer (SEO) has provided the following update of works for the period of 1 October – 8 December 2020.

- Met with Northern and Yorke Landscape Officers and The Barossa Council Operations Manager to finalise The Barossa Council Roadside Weed Control 2020 – 2021 Work Plan. The focus for this work is Declared Weed control obligations, specifically around high value biodiversity assets including Para Wirra Conservation Park, Hale Conservation Park, Sandy Creek Conservation Park, Para Woodlands, South Para Reservoir, Kaiserstuhl Conservation Park and Council’s Roadside Marker Sites (RMS). In addition there is some funding to support the protection of productivity in the adjacent agricultural land of the Barossa Valley floor for Caltrop (Tribulus terrestris), Innocent Weed (Cenchrus longispinus and C.spinifex) and Kahki Weed (Alternanthera pungens). DWES has contributed $5000 towards this project, Total $16000.

- Worked with Barossa Bushgardens NRC Co-ordinator to submit a Grant for the Natural Resource Management (NRM) Drought Resilience Program to develop a project: Revegetation of a Peppermint Box (Eucalyptus odorata) Grassy Woodland (PBGW) at the Barossa Bushgardens. This project will raise awareness and area of Environment Protection Biodiversity Conservation (EPBC) Listed critically endangered PBGW and demonstrate processes using new technology and traditional practices. Successful applications will be identified early 2021. Grant request $32,960 with The Barossa Council contributions (in-kind & $$) $14006, subject to final Council endorsement.

- SA Water breach of Native Vegetation Act (1991) and Local Government Act (1999) on The Barossa Council roadside (adjacent Gate 5, Para Wirra Road). This was reported to Native Vegetation Council and SA Water have self-reported. SA Water staff and SEO met on site to discuss remediation actions, and will communicate throughout the next 12 months as to how this will occur.
• Working with Council staff to identify Council Reserves with significant and remnant vegetation and best practice management techniques to enhance and preserve sites.

• Finalisation of the Roadside Vegetation Management Plan review which is now with Director, Works and Engineering Service to include Annual Works Plan. This document will be ready for Council to review and endorse for Community Consultation in the New Year and submission to Native Vegetation Council for comment.

• Responded to a request (CRMS 99586) regarding new land owners at Eden Valley, who called Council looking for someone to undertake a site visit to discuss appropriate property and land management. Site visit was undertaken and property owners were very grateful.

• Northern and Yorke Community Action Planning (CAP) – SEO and Environment Education Officer were in attendance representing The Barossa Council and summarise the following: Community workshops were held during October in the four new Council regions that have been included into the Landscape SA Board region. These were to capture local knowledge of the environmental and agricultural assets and issues within each District. This information is to guide local level planning for staff priorities, to assist project development and contribute to the regional Landscape Plan.

Priority and Community valued assets recognised in our Council included:

Vegetation; roadsides and linkages; connections between biodiversity and productive landscapes, paddock trees.

Flora & Fauna; large number of threatened communities on roadsides, Barossa Bush Gardens (BBG) as a seed source, declining bird, reptile & mammal species.

Riparian; North Para & tributaries, environmental flows, watercourses for wildlife corridors.

Parks & Reserves; Tanunda Urban Forest, Para Wirra Conservation Park, Sandy Creek Conservation Park, Altona, Kaiser Stuhl Conservation Park, Hale Conservation Park, cemeteries, SA Water & Forestry land and private land surrounding these, greening urban streets, unformed public roads, Heritage Agreements.

Cultural: culturally significant sites including trees with artefacts and engravings, working on Country opportunities.

Agricultural/Horticultural; grape vines in Barossa, grazing hills.
Social; More than just ‘places’ – sense of place and identify and belonging, Lavender trail, Heysen trail, valuing places for management of climate change, recreating cycling/walking, schools nature play and gardens, EDEN Project at Good Shepherd Lutheran Primary School, Angaston, Blue Gums Woodland at Nuriootpa High School, Barossa Bushgardens.

**TBC Biodiversity assets and threats:** Riparian, Grasslands, Grassy Woodlands, Heathy Woodlands.

EPBC listed Iron-grass Natural Temperate Grassland (RMS sites throughout Barossa & Springton/Mt Pleasant area);

EPBC listed Peppermint Box Grassy Woodland (Eucalyptus odorata), Blue Gum Woodlands, Pink Gum Woodlands (RMS sites throughout Barossa and Para Woodlands, Sandy Creek Conservation Park, Altona, Barossa Bushgardens, Para Wirra Conservation Park.

Discussions extended to how the Landscape Board staff can support and engage other stakeholders through resourcing and targeted project funding, education and extension work through multiple stakeholders (Agri-business, Wildlife for Wine, etc.).

There was strong community support for the Natural Resource Centres (NRC’s) and additional discussion about the Levy (as it is quite low), and the potential to increase this, known as ’participatory budgeting' where community decide where funds are allocated.

The final plan is due for completion June 2021.

**RECOMMENDATION:**
That report items 4.5.2.4 be received.
CONSENSUS AGENDA – HEALTH SERVICES REPORT

4.5.3.1  FOOD RECALLS
B10499

Consumer Level recalls were monitored for:

- Oscar Caramel Mylk Chocolate – 15g
- Pete Evans Healthy Everyday Jamaican Simmer Sauce – 330g
- Halo Top Plant Based Caramel Chocolate Pretzel Ice Cream – 473ml

RECOMMENDATION:
That the report item 4.5.3.1 be received.
4.5.3 CONSENSUS AGENDA – HEALTH SERVICES REPORT

4.5.3.2 FOOD PREMISES INSPECTIONS
B4573

During the month of November 2020 the following food businesses were inspected for their compliance with the Food Act 2001:

- Barossa Roadhouse – Reinspection
- Joanne’s Café – Routine inspection
- Mobile Cake Love – Routine inspection
- Lyndoch Bakery – Reinspection
- Soul with Zest – Reinspection
- Lovells Bakery – Reinspection
- Valley Hotel - Reinspection

RECOMMENDATION:
That the report items 4.5.3.2 be received.
COUNCIL
MAYOR
REPORT
15 DECEMBER 2020

7.1 DEBATE AGENDA – MAYOR

7.1.1 REVIEW OF ORDERS UNDER CONFIDENTIALITY PROVISIONS OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1999 – RELATED TO PREVIOUS PERFORMANCE REVIEW AND CONDITIONS OF CONTRACT FOR THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER (CEO)

B10322

PURPOSE
Any order made by Council that operates for a period of more than 12 months must be reviewed at least once in every year – thus, these orders pursuant to Section 91(9) Local Government Act (Act) are due for review.

RECOMMENDATION
That Council in compliance with Section 91(9)(a) of the Local Government Act (Act) and having reviewed the confidentiality orders of the follow matters:

- 16 July 2013 – Performance Review of the Chief Executive Officer;
- 24 June 2014 – Performance Review of the Chief Executive Officer;
- 17 February 2015 – Mid Year CEO Performance Target Report;
- 21 July 2015 – Performance Review of the Chief Executive Officer;
- 16 August 2016 – Chief Executive Officer’s 2015/16 Performance Review and New Contract Negotiation;
- 18 July 2017 – Chief Executive Officer’s 2016/17 Performance Review, and,
- 17 July 2018 – Chief Executive Officer’s 2017/18 Performance and Conditions of Contract Review;
- 16 July 2019 - Chief Executive Officer’s 2018/19 Performance and Conditions of Contract Review;
- 21 July 2020 – Chief Executive Officer’s 2019/20 Performance and Remuneration Review;

made in accordance with Section 90(3)(a) of the Act resolve that the performance documents, agenda reports and relevant minutes shall continue to remain confidential and that Council review the said orders prior to 15 December 2021.

REPORT

The following confidential orders were reviewed on 28 January 2020 and determined that the circumstances for which Council considered the original matters in confidence and subsequent reviews continues to meet the personal affairs test under Section 90(3)(a) of the Local Government Act and thereby all relevant documents
remained in confidence. There has been not change to these circumstances and it is recommended through this review the documents remain in confidence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date initiated</th>
<th>Orders due for review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16 July 2013</td>
<td>Performance Review of the Chief Executive Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 June 2014</td>
<td>Performance Review of the Chief Executive Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 February 2015</td>
<td>Mid Year CEO Performance Target Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 July 2015</td>
<td>Performance Review of the Chief Executive Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 August 2016</td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer’s 2015/16 Performance Review and New Contract Negotiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 July 2017</td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer’s 2016/17 Performance Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 July 2018</td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer’s 2017/18 Performance and Conditions of Contract Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 July 2019</td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer’s 2018/19 Performance and Conditions of Contract Review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further the annual review conducted for the 2019/20 financial year on 21 July 2020 was completed with an order to retain documentation in confidence. This order is not currently due for review, however to align all orders to a unified date it is recommended this order be reviewed as part of this annual process. Again there has been no change to these personal circumstances and it is recommended through this review the documents remain in confidence.

**ATTACHMENTS OR OTHER SUPPORTING REFERENCES**

Nil

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

Community Plan

- How We Work – Good Governance

Corporate Plan

6.1 Ensure that the community has access to information regarding the discussions held and decisions made by Elected Members

Legislative Requirements

Local Government Act 1999, S90 and S91

**FINANCIAL, RESOURCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT CONSIDERATIONS**

No relevant considerations are noted.

**COMMUNITY CONSULTATION**

No public consultation is required or considered appropriate.
7.2.1 DEBATE AGENDA – CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

7.2.1.1 ELECTED MEMBERS’ TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT PLAN

B2744

Author: Governance Advisor

PURPOSE

The Elected Members’ Training and Development Policy (the “Policy”) was adopted on 28 January 2020. Under clause 3.1.1 of the Policy, Council is required to ‘develop and adapt a Training and Development Plan to ensure that activities available to all Elected Members:

- comply with the Regulations and
- contribute to the personal development of the individual and the achievement of the strategic and good governance objectives of Council’.

The draft Plan is attached for Council’s consideration and adoption.

RECOMMENDATION

(1) That Council receives, considers and adopts the draft Elected Members’ Training and Development Plan (Attachment 1).

REPORT

Background

Section 80A of the Local Government Act 1999 (the “Act”) requires Council to prepare and adopt a training and development policy for its Elected Members to assist them in the performance and discharge of their functions and duties, and comply with any requirements of the Local Government (General) Regulations 2013 (the “Regulations”).

Introduction

The current Elected Members’ Training and Development Policy (the “Policy”) and the Elected Members’ Training and Development Plan (the “Plan”) were approved on 28 January 2020.

The Plan is now due for its annual review. The updated draft Plan is presented at Attachment 1 for the Elected Body’s consideration and approval.

Discussion

The Plan has been updated to include training and development opportunities. Elected Members should note that the Policy allows for Elected Members to attend
without Council approval, training and development opportunities not included in the Plan, that are necessary or expedient to the performance or discharge of official duties or functions, where the total training cost is under $500, and sufficient funds are available within the budget line for Elected Member training and development.

For training and development activities where the total training cost is greater than $500, Elected Members are required to submit an Elected Member’s Training and Development Request Form to the CEO for inclusion at the next available Council meeting for Council’s consideration. The Mayor may authorised an Elected Member’s Request Form (and the CEO may authorise the Mayor’s Request Form) where attendance is urgent and sufficient funds are available. The request must be ratified at the next practicable Council meeting.

**Summary and Conclusion**
Council is asked to receive, consider and approve the draft Elected Members’ Training and Development Plan, as attached to this report.

**ATTACHMENTS OR OTHER SUPPORTING REFERENCES**
Attachment 1 - Draft Elected Members’ Training and Development Plan (18/72136[v3])

**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.

6.13 Ensure that Elected Members undertake training and development to assist them in making informed decisions.

**Legislative Requirements**
Local Government Act 1999, Section 80A
Local Government (General) Regulations 2013, Regulation 8AA

**FINANCIAL, RESOURCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT CONSIDERATIONS**

*Financial –* Elected Members’ training and development is supported with an annual budget allocation, based on historical spending.

*Resource –* Officers undertake support for Elected Member training and development within their current duties.

*Risk Management –* It is fundamental to good governance that Council supports its Elected Members with the necessary training to make them effective advocates for the community.

**COMMUNITY CONSULTATION**
There is no community consultation required under the Local Government Act 1999. Further, the Training Plan is based on the Local Government Association recommendations and all training costs and attendances will be recorded in the Elected Members’ Allowances and Benefits Register and the Elected Members’ Training and Development Register. Accordingly, officers contend that no public consultation is required in this matter as public interest is already being protected through these transparent processes.
The Training and Development Plan ("the Plan"), at Appendix 1, has been developed using a range of sources including LGA advice, legislative requirements and refresher training needs identified by staff.

1. Approvals

**Activities in this Plan:** No further Council approval is required for an Elected Member to attend an activity which is approved in this Plan (subject to conditions on interstate and private sector/government events).

**Activities not in this Plan:** Council approval is required where activity is anticipated to cost $500 or more. HOWEVER: If less than $500 and necessary/expedient to performance of official duties and sufficient funds available in budget, then no further approval required.

2. Attendances

Elected Members who wish to attend training activities listed in this Plan should contact Marisa South at msouth@barossa.sa.gov.au to organise their attendance.

All attendances will be noted by the CEO’s office for inclusion in the Elected Members’ Training Register, Allowances and Benefits Register and Council’s Annual Report.

Elected Members may seek reimbursement of expenses associated with the activity as per Council’s Elected Members’ Allowances and Benefits Policy and Elected Members’ Training and Development Policy.

3. Reporting

Except for where attendance is at a mandatory training, the Elected Member should complete a Training Feedback Questionnaire and forward it to the CEO for inclusion in the next available consensus agenda.

4. Review

This Plan will be reviewed and updated annually by the Council in consultation with relevant stakeholders and the Annual Budget Allocation.

5. Document Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy link</th>
<th>Elected Members’ Training and Development Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document Owner:</strong></td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consultation Rating:</strong></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Version history**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Version No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description of Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>XX/XX/2020</td>
<td>Annual review and update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>28/01/2020</td>
<td>Annual review and update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0 (most recent version)</td>
<td>22/01/2019</td>
<td>Annual review and update</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# APPENDIX 1

## THE BAROSSA COUNCIL ELECTED MEMBERS’ TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Available to</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Training organised by the LGA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any half-day or full day course run by the Local Government Association, or in conjunction with external presenter/s or partner/s, whether on-site at Local Government House, or other location, at regional hubs, in the Council Chamber, or other Council office or building, or webinar/by electronic means. Refer to <a href="http://training.lga.sa.gov.au">training.lga.sa.gov.au</a> for courses offered</td>
<td>Mayor and Elected Members</td>
<td>Up to $500 pp</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Development/Networking: Conferences and Events organised by the LGA** | | |
| Elected Members Leadership Forum Session | Mayor and Elected Members | $550-385 plus incl GST pp |
| Mayors Forum | Mayor | $385 incl GST pp |
| Mayors’ and Chairpersons’ Leadership Program | Mayor | $550 plus GST pp |
| LGA Annual Best Practice Showcase | Mayor and Elected Members | TBA |
| LGA Ordinary General Meeting | Mayor and Elected Members | TBA |
| LGA Conference | Mayor and Elected Members | TBA |
| LGA Annual General Meeting | Mayor and Elected Members | TBA |
| LGA Roads and Works Conference, location TBA | Mayor and Elected Members | TBA |
| Local Government Emergency Management Seminar | Mayor and Elected Members | TBA |
| Tourism and Councils Forum | Mayor and Elected Members | $385 incl GST pp |

| **Development/Networking: Conferences and Events organised by Private Sector or State/Fed Government** | | |
| Any event where a key-note speaker provides information that is necessary or expedient to an Elected Member’s official duties or functions | The Mayor or in his absence the Deputy Mayor or other Member. Additional Elected Members: upon application to Council, with consideration as to how many Members should attend to officially represent Council | Various |

<p>| <strong>Development/Networking: Interstate Conferences and Seminars organised by ALGA</strong> | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Available to</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>many Members should attend to officially represent Council</td>
<td></td>
<td>Standard fees: $1099 – in person; $1059 – virtual delegate Regional Forum – add on event prior to the NGA: $425 – Standalone; $225 – with NGA ticket plus hotel / flights / food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALGA National Local Roads and Transport Congress, location TBA</td>
<td>The Mayor or in his absence the Deputy Mayor, or other Member. Additional Elected Members: upon application to Council, with consideration as to how many Members should attend to officially represent Council</td>
<td>TBA conference registration plus hotel / flights / food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALGA Regional Corporation and Development Forum 2020, <a href="canberra">Canberra location TBA (14-20 June 2020)</a></td>
<td>The Mayor or in his absence the Deputy Mayor, or other Member. Additional Elected Members: upon application to Council, with consideration as to how many Members should attend to officially represent Council</td>
<td>TBA conference registration plus hotel / flights / food</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Development/Leadership: arranged through Council

| Leadership Development Surveys | Mayor and Elected Members | Up to $500 plus GST pp |
COUNCIL
EXECUTIVE SERVICES
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER REPORT
15 DECEMBER 2020

7.2.1 DEBATE AGENDA

7.2.1.2
OMBUDSMAN CORRESPONDENCE – LAND EXCHANGE WITH CHATEAU TANUNDA
B10682

Author: Governance Advisor

PURPOSE
Council is asked to receive and note correspondence from the South Australian Ombudsman regarding a complaint made by Mr Robbert Sennef and Ms Shelley James.

RECOMMENDATION
That Council receive and note the correspondence from Ombudsman SA dated 13 November 2020.

REPORT

Background
The Ombudsman received complaints from Ms Shelley James and Mr Robbert Sennef with respect to the land exchange with Chateau Tanunda, via multiple letters between May and July 2020.

The Ombudsman’s reports with respect to those complaints were presented to Council at its meeting on 20 October 2020 and Council resolved as follows:

MOVED Cr Boothby that Council receive and note the Ombudsman correspondence dated 24 August 2020, 10 September 2020 and 15 September 2020.

Seconded Cr Johnstone CARRIED 2018-22/262

Introduction
Following the Ombudsman’s letter on 15 September 2020, it appears that the complainants provided a subsequent response to the Ombudsman, expressing their dissatisfaction with the Ombudsman’s response and lodging a further complaint. Further correspondence from the Ombudsman, responding to the subsequent complaint was received by the Chief Executive Officer on 13 November 2020.

Discussion
The correspondence from the Ombudsman received on 13 November 2020 is attached to this report. The Ombudsman states, ‘I remain of the view, for the reasons
that I have previously advised you, that investigation of your complaint is not necessary or justifiable. Any further correspondence in relation to issues that have already been thoroughly assessed by my Office will be read but may not be responded to.

The Ombudsman has now closed the complainants’ file and has authorised disclosure of his letter by the complainants and Council as seen fit.

Summary and Conclusion
Council is asked to receive and note the correspondence from Ombudsman SA dated 13 November 2020.

ATTACHMENTS OR OTHER SUPPORTING REFERENCES
Attachment 1 – Correspondence from Ombudsman SA received 13 November 2020 (ref: 20/68815)

COMMUNITY PLAN / CORPORATE PLAN / LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS
Community Plan

- Community and Culture

Corporate Plan
2.3 Support and promote community involvement and networks and provide opportunities for participation in local decision making.

Legislative Requirements
Ombudsman Act 1972
Local Government Act 1999

FINANCIAL, RESOURCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT CONSIDERATIONS
As at 30 June 2020, as reported to Council in the Annual Report on the Internal Review of Council Decisions 2019-2020 at Council’s meeting on 21 July 2020, the total cost to Council in dealing with section 270 internal review applications made by the complainants with respect to decisions relating to the Chateau Tanunda Land swap and Barossa Culture Hub was $30,695.21. Responses to queries by the Ombudsman were carried out as part of normal officer duties resulting in further internal resourcing and legal costs which are not included in the above estimates to date.

COMMUNITY CONSULTATION
Not required under Legislation and Council’s Public Consultation Policy. However, community consultation on the community land revocation of the Council-owned land subject to the land swap with Chateau Tanunda, and Barossa Culture Hub master plan was carried out respectively in 2017 and 2018.
Ms Shelley James and Mr Robbert Sennef

By email:

Dear Ms James and Mr Sennef

Your complaints about the Barossa Council (the council)

By letter dated 24 August 2020 I provided a response to your complaint to my Office about the council. That complaint was comprised within four letters dated 4 May 2020, 15 June 2020, 24 June 2020 and 9 July 2020.

By letter dated 14 September 2020, your lawyer, Mr George Manos, provided a response, disagreeing with my assessment.

By letter dated 15 September 2020, I responded to Mr Manos advising that I did not consider that any further information had been provided to change my assessment.

You have responded by letter dated 23 September 2020 to my officer, Ms Rebecca Hyde, to express your dissatisfaction with my response and to lodge a complaint about my Office’s response to Mr Manos.

You have submitted, in summary, that:

- my Office’s response had been made in ‘great haste’, and
- the complaints you have raised have ‘serious substance’, ‘appear to raise systemic issues’ and that ‘it is in the public interest for me to investigate the matter’.

You have also queried whether my Office’s Policy has been complied with in the handling of your complaints. I can assure you that the proper process has been followed in the handling of your complaints by my Office.

You have provided further information disputing my assessment of your complaints.

My Office has thoroughly reviewed the files dating back to 2018 in relation to your complaints to my Office about the issues. I consider that all of your complaints about issues surrounding the council’s decision to undertake a land exchange with the owners of Chateau Tanunda have been thoroughly assessed by my Office and I decline to further assess these issues.

Whilst I understand that you are of the view that the council ‘has not achieved the best possible outcome for its community’ I have a discretion as to whether to investigate a matter and do not investigate every complaint made to my Office. I remain of the view, for the reasons that I have previously advised you, that investigation of your complaint is not necessary or justifiable.
Any further correspondence in relation to issues that have already been thoroughly assessed by my Office will be read but may not be responded to.

Your file is now closed.

The Ombudsman Act imposes certain obligations\(^1\) on my Office and others, including complainants and officers in a council, to keep information about my assessment confidential. However, if I consider that disclosure of that information is in the public interest, then I may authorise or require its disclosure.

In my opinion, there is a public interest in disclosure of my decisions under the Ombudsman Act. Therefore, I authorise disclosure of this letter by you and the council as you both see fit.

I have sent a copy of this letter to the council.

Yours sincerely

Wayne Lines
SA OMBUDSMAN

13 November 2020

Cc  Mr Martin McCarthy
    Chief Executive Officer
    Barossa Council
    By email

\(^1\) Ombudsman Act 1972, section 26.
7.2.1 CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER - DEBATE AGENDA

7.2.1.3 PRINCIPAL OFFICE AND OTHER OFFICES – LATE OPENING 16 DECEMBER 2020
B10322

PURPOSE
To allow Council offices to open at 9.30am on Wednesday 16 December 2020 to allow a staff event to occur and allow as many employees to attend as possible.

RECOMMENDATION
That Council:

(1) Pursuant to Section 45(2) of the Local Government Act 1999, approves the principal office and other offices of the Council to open at 9.30am on 16 December 2020.

(2) Makes the following alternative arrangements to enable the local community to access the services of the Council which are ordinarily available at the principal office of the Council:

- Email: barossa@barossa.sa.gov.au
- Telephone: 8563 8444
- After Hours Service: Answering Adelaide 8563 8444

(3) In relation to any obligation under the Local Government Act 1999 to make a document available for inspection at the principal office of the Council, the document will be made available for inspection at [www.barossa.sa.gov.au](http://www.barossa.sa.gov.au).

REPORT
There is a staff event to thank officers for what has been a challenging year and members are also invited on the morning of 16 December 2020. This is being hosted by the management group. To allow as many staff to attend and return to the workplace the timing of the event, whilst starting early before normal hours, will run to approximately 9.10am. Allowing offices to open 30 minutes later than normal will allow staff to attend the event in its entirety and be back in the workplace and open by 9.30am.
ATTACHMENTS OR OTHER SUPPORTING REFERENCES
Nil

COMMUNITY PLAN / CORPORATE PLAN / LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS

Community Plan

- Natural Environment and Built Heritage
- Community and Culture
- Infrastructure
- Health and Wellbeing
- Business and Employment
- How We Work – Good Governance

All

Legislative Requirements
Section 45 of the Local Government Act

FINANCIAL, RESOURCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT CONSIDERATIONS
Nil

COMMUNITY CONSULTATION
No consultation required given the amendment is minor in nature.
7.2.2 DEBATE AGENDA – FINANCE

7.2.2.1 MONTHLY FINANCE REPORT (AS AT 30 NOVEMBER 2020)

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 30 November 2020 be received and noted.

REPORT
Discussion
The Monthly Finance Report (as at 30 November 2020) is attached. The report has been prepared comparing actuals to the Original adopted budget 2020/21 incorporating the Revised Budget for September.

ATTACHMENTS OR OTHER SUPPORTING REFERENCES
Attachment 1: Monthly Finance Report 30 November 2020

Policy
Budget & Business Plan and Review 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.

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.
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/July 2020, as per legislation. This report is advising Council of the monthly finance position compared to that budget.
MONTHLY FINANCE REPORT

AS AT 30 NOVEMBER 2020
FOR YEAR ENDING 30 JUNE 2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>% Actual Expenditure to Original Budget</th>
<th>Original Budget (Full-Year)</th>
<th>Revised Budget (Q1) (Full-Year)</th>
<th>Actual Result (Year-to-Date)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Uniform Presentation of Finances

OPERATING ACTIVITIES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operating Income</th>
<th>1) 39,728</th>
<th>39,802</th>
<th>35,568</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less Operating Expenses</td>
<td>36.12%</td>
<td>(39,494)</td>
<td>(39,949)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Surplus / (Deficit)</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>(147)</td>
<td>21,302</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CAPITAL ACTIVITIES:

Net Outlays on Existing Assets

| Capital Expenditure on Renewal and Replacement of Existing Assets | 2) 20.70% | (7,690) | (8,041) | (1,592) |
| Add back Depreciation, Amortisation & Impairment | 8,032 | 8,032 | 3,347 |
| Add back Proceeds from Sale of Replaced Assets | 412 | 412 | 70 |
| Subtotal | 754 | 403 | 1,825 |

Net Outlays on New and Upgraded Assets

| Capital Expenditure on New and Upgraded Assets | 2) 10.39% | (18,862) | (23,133) | (1,960) |
| Add back Amounts Received Specifically for New and Upgraded Assets | 8,480 | 8,182 | 1,786 |
| Add back Proceeds from Sale of Surplus Assets | 0 | 0 | 685 |
| Subtotal | (10,382) | (14,951) | 511 |

Net Lending/(Borrowing) for the Financial Year (9,394) (14,695) 23,638

Reconciliation for the movement in Net Lending / (Borrowing)

| Original 2020/21 Full Year Budget Net Lending / (Borrowing) | (9,394) |
| Carried Forward Budget Adjustments: Report on Financial Results. Funds were held for these projects in cash and investments at 30 June 2020. | (4,636) |
| September 2020 Budget Review: Funds required for these items will decrease Council's cash and investments. This amount includes amendments approved at the Council meetings held in June and November 2020. | (865) |
| Full Year Revised Budget - Net Lending / (Borrowing) | (14,695) |

Total % Capital Budget Spent 13.38%

NOTES

1) The second quarter Grants Commission payment $173k and Roads to Recovery grant funding $238k were received in November.

2) 2020/21 Capital Expenditure spent to end of November includes:
   Bridges $36k
   Bushgardens Sales Area Shed $8k
   CWMS $47k
   Drainage $49k
   Footpaths $5k
   Keil Gardens Tanunda Retaining Wall $100k
   Land Swap $666k (refer offset in Proceeds Surplus Assets)
   Nuriootpa Centennial Park Authority Change Rooms $395k
   Nuriootpa Office Solar Panels $98k
   Playground Equipment $5k
   Road Resheeting $154k
   Sealed Roads $1,259k
   The Big Project - Angas Recreation Park Junior Oval $25k, Clubrooms $52k, Cricket Nets $1k
   The Big Project - Angaston Railway Precinct $143k
   The Big Project - Barossa Culture Hub $13k
   The Big Project - Lyndoch Recreation Park Upgrade Lighting and Oval Works $184k
   The Big Project - Tanunda Recreation Park - Show Hall Upgrade $2k
   The Rex Solar Panels and LED Lighting Replacement $158k, Pool Deck Air Conditioning $32k
   Website Development Project $51k
7.2.2 DEBATE AGENDA – FINANCE

7.2.2.2 LONG TERM FINANCIAL PLAN 2021/22 to 2030/31 AND ANNUAL BUDGET & BUSINESS PLANNING TIMETABLE, NEW INITIATIVE INCLUSION, INDEXATION AND ASSUMPTIONS 2021/22

B7181

Author: Manager Financial Services

PURPOSE

A business planning timetable, new initiative inclusion, indexation and assumptions is required to ensure Council meets key milestones for the annual review and adoption of the Long Term Financial Plan (LTFP) 2021/22 to 2030/31 and the consideration and adoption of the Annual Budget & Business Plan (AB&BP) 2021/22.

RECOMMENDATION

That Council endorses

1. The Operating Expenditure for Contractors, Materials and Other expenses indexation to be applied as contained within this report;
2. New initiatives will be considered/not considered; and

REPORT

Discussion

The Local Government Association has produced a number of information papers to assist Councils to meet requirements of the Local Government Act 1999 and the Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 2011.

As part of the 2021/22 draft budget preparation Council will hold a strategic discussion to set the general service requirements and larger expenditure programs in detail for the next few years and at a summary level for the remaining years of the LTFP. As listed in this draft timetable it is proposed that Strategic discussion is held as a workshop on the 2 February 2021.
Indexation and Assumptions
Each annual review process provides an opportunity to introduce new assumptions or enhance the information base as required, using the existing indexation and assumptions.

The main assumptions and indexation being considered during this early stage of budget preparation is the income and expenditure indexation. As included in the draft timetable, with updated valuation data Council will review the proposed options for rate increases are reasonable and indexation for operational expenditure and ensure indexation is appropriate.

Council staff will provide information for the cost of delivering services and any suggested changes to service levels ensuring income or charges for the services are appropriate. The final expenditure amounts may differ from the LTFP estimates for the 2021/22 year due to external influences such as service contracts, agreements where costs such as fuel prices, State Govt. levies and contracted employee costs, ie. costs out of our control, including from COVID-19 and some areas of expenditure may be more or less than expected.

Council sets the expenditure budget required to meet its service provision and will make adjustments as needed for the benefit of its customers, an example of this was the required increase for service level requirements for tree trimming/planting where Council approved an increase to the resource - input to expand the tree timing/planting - output and thereby providing green space/shade/environment - better outcome for the community.

A Zero Based Budget basis was used for the 2018/19 year where costs were reviewed to actual $ required for that ongoing service provision, the 2021/22 will not use a zero based approach, under the current policy and process this is due for the 2022/23 budget year.

The LGPI (Local Government Price Index) is used as a base for the LTFP and considering local needs and requirements to meet service levels. The Local Government Price Index (LGPI) increase for 12 months to 30 June 2020 was 0.7%; (noting the Adelaide CPI for the 30 September 2020 period was 1%).

The financial impacts from COVID-19 for both the Council and Community will need to be assessed during the 2021/22 budget preparation.

For the purposes of this draft budget timetable until further information is provided, it has been assumed that the LG Reform Bill and Council requirements for information provision to the designated authority will start for the 2022/23 budget period.

The following indexation base information is sourced from the adopted LTFP for the 2020/21 year.

Operating Income
Rate increases to fund and ensure service level provision is maintained in line with revised sustainability requirements.
General Rate revenue increases for the 2020/21 year was reduced to 1.44%, as Council provided a lower increase to assist rate payers for financial impacts due to COVID-19. As this significantly reduced income and the future operating results, general rate revenue was then budgeted to increase at 2.75% pa from 2021/22 to 2025/26. And then from 2026/27 and the remaining years of the LTFP an increase of 2.5% pa, all plus growth at 1% pa. During the preparation of the 2021/22 draft budget Council management will review the revenue and expenditure requirements and report this to Council. Council will then assess and approve the general rate revenue increases required to ensure Councils financial sustainability in the annual review of the LTFP.

Waste collection & disposal of the three services the 2020/21 rate revenue increases was a net 6.73%, as a result of significant recycling disposal costs and the State Waste Levy increases. In the adopted LTFP the Waste Service Rate Revenue indexation service charge is set to increase at 2.5% from 2021/22 to 2028/29 and then at 2.25% for 2029/30, plus growth for new services budgeted at 1% pa.

Community Wastewater Management Systems (CWMS) Service Rate Revenue indexation rates in the adopted LTFP was budgeted to increase in 2021/22 at 1.5% and forward years ranging from 1.5% to 2.5% for the remaining years in the LTFP.

Service charge revenue is established to recover the cost to provide the services ensuring ongoing service delivery in a sustainable manner.

Other income indexation has a base increase of 2.0%.

**Operating Expenditure**

Operating expenditure indexation will be assessed individually for internal and external factors. All indexation quoted is from the adopted LTFP for 2021/22, and will be reviewed.

- employee costs increase for 2021/22 and 2022/23 was set at 2.25% and the remaining years at 2.5%; the draft budget will use existing awards, enterprise bargaining agreements and salary packaging costs and the ASU a 2% increase pa and the AWU is a 2.3% increase pa;

- contractor, materials and other expenses will be reviewed to meet service requirements, the increase for these costs for 2021/22 and 2022/23 was set at 2.25% and the remaining years at 2.5%. Indexation will be adjusted to meet existing service requirements:
  - selected costs are increased by indexation where agreements, contracts, licensing, arranged service charges, etc. provide for that option, along with costs outside of our control, inc fuel, postage; these will be considered where the relevant service provider(s) initiates the increases,
  - where costs will increase but the quantum is unknown a default increase in line with LGPI,
  - some areas of expenditure may actually be the same or less the expected; and
• for changes to service provision, ie. increased number of services provided (eg. no. of waste collection(s)) or usage (eg. water usage at parks and gardens).

New Initiatives
Council to decide if New Initiatives* (NIs) will be considered for the 2021/22 budget year.

In the past Council has decided not to consider or have added criteria for consideration of NIs when budget programs were significant and Council staff or contractors did not have the capacity to absorb further projects with its existing resourcing and funding to either coordinate or deliver the works. The funding requirements not only includes the grants available or rate income to pay for any additional programs and/or ongoing net operational, maintenance and replacement costs but also Council’s capacity to repay additional loans and ensuring a long term view of financial sustainability.

Councils existing programs include not in any particular order and/or limited to:

• Existing service provision, governance and administration,
• Capital renewal/replacement programs,
• Revaluation and condition assessment of assets update the estimate replacement cost over the LTFP. Council’s understanding and management will continually refine the operating result,
• Heavy vehicle and Plant utilisation review,
• Existing long term projects including,
  o Solar, LED and Climate Control – efficiency, financial and environmental benefits/requirements
  o Change Program – internal program for innovative and simple systems, process and productivity improvements
• Infrastructure Asset Management Plans due 2021,
• Strategic Management Plans,
• The Big Project(s),
• Transport renewal programs year 3 of the 3 year program,
• Asset maintenance and operational requirements

Timetable
The proposed timetable for the annual review/update of the Long Term Financial Plan and the consideration/adoption of the Annual Budget & Business Plan is outlined in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council Meeting</td>
<td>Endorse AB&amp;BP and LTFP timetable</td>
<td>15/12/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Workshop</td>
<td>1st Review and discuss - EM’s to be given the opportunity to put forward suggestions for the budget; CMT to present budget process, available advisory groups’ budget(s), priorities and pressures; strategic and long term aspirations; consider adopted long term indexing &amp; assumptions</td>
<td>3/2/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance/Elected Members/Community Advisory Groups</td>
<td>New Initiatives* and Capital Works to be submitted via website link – email will be sent to Elected Members with link. Community Advisory Groups/Committees</td>
<td>Due date for submissions 26/2/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Workshop</td>
<td>2nd - Capital Expenditure review programs: Year 3 - Transport works adopted 19/20 LTFP - Renewal/Replacement programs TBP – Grant submissions and ongoing items Prepare Rates report including: Rating Analysis of other Councils and consider other Council Rating Strategies</td>
<td>3/3/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit Committee</td>
<td>AB&amp;BP and LTFP review To review indexing and assumptions</td>
<td>Feb- March 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Workshop</td>
<td>3rd – Brief Council on EM and/or Community New Initiatives/Submissions Stage 2, consider what to progress to Stage 3 in the budget process</td>
<td>10/3/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Workshop</td>
<td>4th AB&amp;BP and LTFP New Initiatives review for DDR; Council to assess and stage approval Stage 5</td>
<td>7/4/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Workshop</td>
<td>5th AB&amp;BP and LTFP Review draft Operating Budgets &amp; Capital Works submissions and LTFP</td>
<td>20/4/21 after Council meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Management &amp; Staff</td>
<td>During January to April, budget preparation including rating and valuation modelling is undertaken</td>
<td>Jan to April 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Workshop</td>
<td>6th Rating &amp; Valuation Forecasting, valuation changes, rebate, rating options Final Operating and Capital Works review</td>
<td>5/5/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit Committee</td>
<td>AB&amp;BP and LTFP review and endorse for consultation</td>
<td>May- June 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Council Meeting</td>
<td>Endorse Nuriootpa Centennial Park Authority Budget Endorse draft AB&amp;BP and LTFP for public consultation</td>
<td>11/5/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Notices and Council internet provision for web submissions</td>
<td>12/05/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Submissions period – 3 weeks If delayed 20/05/20 to 10-06-20</td>
<td>12/5/21 to 3/06/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Council Meeting / Other process**</td>
<td>Process for the public to present/provide budget submissions in line with legislative/other requirements</td>
<td>2/06/21 or 9/06/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Meeting</td>
<td>AB&amp;BP and LTFP Consideration of public submissions</td>
<td>15/06/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Council Meeting</td>
<td>Adopt AB&amp;BP and LTFP, Valuation and Rating</td>
<td>23/06/21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
*New Initiatives discussions, processes and workshops will be included if Council approves to consider them for the 2021/22 budget processes.

**In 2020 due to COVID-19 restrictions no meeting was held for the public to present budget proposals or submissions to Council.

**ATTACHMENTS OR OTHER SUPPORTING REFERENCES**

**Policy**

Budget & Business Plan and Review Policy:

LGA Information papers – No. 8 Long-term Financial Plan and No. 13 Annual Business Plan; register to logon and access:

**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.

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 Act 1999 Section 123
Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 2011

**FINANCIAL, RESOURCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT CONSIDERATIONS**

Financial

The Budget and LTFP indexation, assumptions and timetable are integral parts of financial planning to ensure an organised and thorough process is undertaken.

As a result of TBP and other programs the discretionary spend amount (usually contributes to the expenditure for NIs) is not funded or available until the 2026/27 budget year starting at $500k pa for the remaining year of the LTFP.

**COMMUNITY CONSULTATION**

Included as part of the draft 2021/22 Budget & Business Plan consultation and adoption process.
7.3.1 DEBATE AGENDA – DIRECTOR CORPORATE AND COMMUNITY SERVICES

7.3.1.1 REQUEST FOR FUNDING – COMPLETION OF VERANDAH – NURIOOTPA MULTI USE CHANGE ROOMS

B10117

PURPOSE
To seek approval for additional funds to be drawn from Developer Contribution cash backed reserves to complete the addition of a verandah to the recently constructed Nuriootpa Multi Use Change Rooms at the Nuriootpa Centennial Park.

RECOMMENDATION
That Council:

(1) Approves the allocation of $11,089.99 from Developer Contribution Reserves to the construction of the remaining verandah to the Nuriootpa Multi Use Change Rooms at Nuriootpa Centennial Park as a contribution to the total cost of $20,180.90 ex GST (Option 2 – trafficable).

(2) Council’s contribution is subject to the allocation of the balance of $9,090.91 ex GST from the Nuriootpa Centennial Park Authority as indicated in its letter of 1 December 2020.

(3) Waives the requirement for additional quotations to be sourced noting that the quotation from BG Building Group is $179.90 ex GST over the Policy threshold requiring 3 quotations but supports the use of the contractor of the original building, noting it is still under the Defect Liability Period as a prudent risk mitigation measure.

REPORT

Background
Council received grant funding from the Office of Recreation Sport and Racing Football, Cricket and Netball Grassroots Funding Round 1 for the construction of multi use change rooms at Nuriootpa Centennial Park in 2019 and the work on the in scope items of the project was concluded in August 2020.

During the design development it was determined that the verandah to the public toilet component of the facility was an essential requirement to protect users from the elements when accessing or waiting to use the public amenities. This work has been completed. The Clubs also wanted to extend the verandah to provide further protection to the change room elevation of the building. Whilst funds were available to complete the concrete concourse to this side of the facility, there were insufficient funds to include the verandah.
Introduction
The Nuriootpa Centennial Park Authority (NCPA) and the user groups have now approached Council requesting that the verandah be completed to provide better shelter to users throughout the seasons and have offered to fund up to $9,090.91 ex GST of associated costs. Refer Attachment 1.

Quotations were provided by the project contractor BG Building Group during the construction period to indicate the cost of this work as a possible variation if funds had been available from the original budget. These are provided as Attachment 2.

The 2 options provided are:
Option 1: Non trafficable - $18,294.54 ex GST
Option 2: Trafficable - $20,180.90 ex GST

The trafficable option (Option 2) is recommended given the likelihood that access to the roof and verandah is likely (ie maintenance, retrieval of balls, etc).

Discussion
While there are no residual budget funds from the project, there are a number of cash backed Developer Contribution Reserves from local, Nuriootpa based developments that are intended to be applied to the provision of local open / recreational space. It is proposed that $11,089.99 ex GST of those funds be bought into the 2020/2021 budget and allocated to the completion of these works.

BG Building Group have confirmed that they will provide the works at the quoted July 2020 prices. While the proposed figure is $179.90 ex GST over the Policy threshold requiring 3 quotes, it is recommended, given BG’s role as head contractor for the original development and continuing liability in respect of the facility during the 12 month Defect Liability Period, that a waiver from seeking additional quotes be provided.

Summary and Conclusion
The completion of these works will finalise comprehensive weather protection for users of the new Nuriootpa Multi Use Change Rooms, with funding being provided by users and developer contributions intended for open/recreational space service provision.

ATTACHMENTS OR OTHER SUPPORTING REFERENCES
Attachment 1: Letter of funding commitment NCPA – 1 December 2020 – 20/70651
Attachment 2: Quotations (Option 1 and 2) BG Building Group – July 2020 – 20/68350
Attachment 3: Due Diligence Report (DDR) Level 1 – Nuriootpa Change Room Verandah 20/72088

COMMUNITY PLAN / CORPORATE PLAN / LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS
Community Plan 2020 – 2040

☀ Community and Culture
شؤون وثقافة

Infrastructure

❤ Health and Wellbeing

Health و رضاه
How We Work – Good Governance

4.1 Build on a strong sense of community pride with active community groups and individuals participating in local decision making and community building activities.

7.1 Build on sound asset management practices to deliver sustainable services to ensure that infrastructure is adequate to support the community.

10.3 Build on the capacity of community members to participate in cultural, creative, recreational, sporting and learning opportunities.

FINANCIAL, RESOURCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT CONSIDERATIONS

Financial:
A Due Diligence Report (DDR) Level 1 is provided as Attachment 3 as required under Budget and Business Plan Review Policy and Process.

The Budget Update as at 30 September 2020 for the 2020/21 financial year Key Performance Indicators forecast:

- Operating Deficit of $147k Operating Deficit Ratio of (0.4%)
- Net Financial Liabilities (NFL) of $19,926k NFL ratio of 50.1%
- Asset Funding Renewal Ratio of 122%

Financial assessment
A Due Diligence Level One Report has been completed as Attachment 3 with a BAT score of 52.

Council’s adopted Budget and Budget Review and Updates contain financial results, cash balances and information that represent all of Council operations, which includes both the Nuriootpa Centennia l Park Authority and Developer Contribution cash holdings. Consequently, the full amount requested for this item of $20,180 has been used for the 2020/21 financial assessment and revised forecasts.

The financial assessment revised forecast include year to date approved additions not listed in the Budget Update as at 30 September such as the Sub-Regions and Townships Project, Caravan Park Management Services, Community Consultation - Aquatic Services Provision and Stormwater Drainage and Footpath design and construction estimates, Nuriootpa War Memorial and Williamstown Swimming Pool - additional opening hours along with this report item (if approved) at $20k, a total of $252k; these will be included in the Mid-year Budget Review.

It is proposed that this item if approved, will be funded from the 2019/20 brought forward cash with allocations from the Nuriootpa Centennia l Park Authority operations and from the Developer Contributions, as available.

The 2020/21 budget update as at 30 September 2020 amounts and indicators including Council approved items year to date are used as the base for this financial assessment.
### Resource:
No significant impacts. The works can be easily managed by existing officer resources in conjunction with Nuriootpa Centennial Park and the contractor.

### Risk:
The addition of the verandah does not address a high risk issue but would alleviate heat impacts on users and the changerooms during summer months and reduce mud

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item for Budget inclusion:</th>
<th>Verandah to the recently constructed Nuriootpa Multi Use change rooms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net operating costs (incl depreciation)</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional project cost (ex GST)</td>
<td>$20,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant income reduced (ex GST)</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding required by Council</td>
<td>$20,180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CMT reviewed and recommended**

If approved - a BAR or NI will be included in the: 2020/21 Mid-year Budget Review as at 31 December 2020

**Assessment of Key Performance Indicators (KPI) for all changes council has approved and the reports at Council meetings since the Budget Update as at 30 September 2020/21***.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KPI</th>
<th>Revised forecast</th>
<th>Overall Change since*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Operating Surplus/ (Deficit)  
(Target: break even position over a five year period) | $-377k | Reduced by $230k |
| Operating Surplus Ratio  
(Target: >-2% to 10%) | -0.95% | Deficit unfavourable - minor |
| Net Financial Liabilities (NFL) $ | $20176.6k | Increase in NFL $250k |
| Net Financial Liabilities Ratio  
(Target: >0 to <100%) | 50.7% | Increase to NFL ratio 0.6% - minor |
| Asset Funding Renewal Ratio  
(Target: >80% to <110%) | 122% | No change |

Noting that after the addition of this and previously approved projects for 2020/21 - all KPI’s are within the target range set by Council.

Funding for this project will:

- [ ] Be transferred from existing budget line:
- [ ] Be allocated from next years discretionary spend:
- [ ] Be allocated from previous years surplus:
- [ ] Effect the Council's end of year results and cash position.

This item is an once-off net operating expenditure in 2020/21 of $20k.

Since Budget adoption 2020/21 the net cash reduction approved by Council for numerous budget amendments in the Budget Update 30 Sept and Council meetings reports for additional expenditure not included with this update, these have been funded from the brought forward cash.

The Mid-year Budget Review as at 31 December 2020 will include the actual closing financial and cash position for 2019/20, this report will update the opening cash position for 2020/21 used to fund the additional expenditure.

Resource:
No significant impacts. The works can be easily managed by existing officer resources in conjunction with Nuriootpa Centennial Park and the contractor.

Risk:
The addition of the verandah does not address a high risk issue but would alleviate heat impacts on users and the changerooms during summer months and reduce mud.
and water coming into the facility during the wet months providing a better all round user experience.

Use of the original head contractor (BG Building Group) for the construction while the overall building is still covered by the 12 month Defect Liability Period, is seen as a prudent risk mitigation strategy and rationale for waiving the requirement for 3 quotations for this additional work.

**COMMUNITY CONSULTATION**

Not required under legislation or Council Policy. The original master plan concept for the Nuriootpa Centennial Park facility was subject to full community consultation. User groups have been included in detailed development planning.
1st December 2020

The Barossa Council  
PO Box 867  
NURIOOTPA SA 5355  
Attn: Ms Joanne Thomas

Dear Jo,

Re: Contribution towards Change room Verandah

We write to confirm that the Nuriootpa Centennial Park Authority (NCPA) will make a financial commitment, up to a maximum of $10,000.00 (ten thousand dollars only), towards the verandah to be installed on the newly completed football club change rooms. A motion on this decision was made at the NCPA Board Meeting on the 25.11.2020.

Please note that if your accounting advice is to include GST on this contribution then we commit $9,090.91 + GST.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
Mr. Guy Martin
Chairperson
NURIOOTPA CENTENNIAL PARK AUTHORITY
Trading as BIG4 Barossa Tourist Park
## Document: Variation V.10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Credit</th>
<th>Extra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>V.10A</strong> OPTIONS 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>$18,294.54 + GST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply and install flat outback style verandah on south side of existing new change rooms measuring 34500mm long x 3100mm wide x 2700mm high.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verandah to be fixed to the existing fascia.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75SHS columns bolted to existing concrete apron.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All framework to be boxed section in powder coat finish.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roof pitch 1deg.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double sided colorbond outback deck roofing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council fees and lodgement costs included.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note: This option is considered to be a non trafficable roof.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TOTAL VARIATIONS (GST Exclusive) | | $18,294.54 + GST |
| Agreed mark up $10% | | $1,829.45 + GST |

<p>| FINAL VARIATION TOTAL | | $20,124.00 + GST |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Credit</th>
<th>Extra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V.10B  <strong>OPTION 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$20,180.90 + GST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As per option 1 but addition cross beams install to class the verandah as trafficable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL VARIATIONS (GST Exclusive)</strong></td>
<td>$20,180.90 + GST</td>
<td>$2,018.09 + GST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreed mark up $10%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,018.09 + GST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FINAL VARIATION TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$22,199.00 + GST</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Bid Analysis Tool

**Project Name:** Verandah - Nuriootpa Multi User Change Rooms

Minimal ongoing risk mitigation considerations. This is a preferred approach to finalise the project and improve amenity and shelter for users of the facility. It will potentially reduce the wear and tear on the new building particularly from exposure to extreme sunlight/heat and reduce significant ingress of mud in wetter months.

### Risk Priority Number (RPN)

**Priority Number calculated as L x I x W x P (if the Project does not proceed)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RPN</th>
<th>Likelihood of Risk Occurring</th>
<th>Impact if Risk Occur</th>
<th>Who Controls Risk</th>
<th>Political Environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Almost Certain</td>
<td>Catastrophic</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>Extreme Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Major Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Possible</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Moderate Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Unlikely</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Minor Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rare</td>
<td>Insignificant</td>
<td>External Bodies</td>
<td>Insignificant Impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Score Sum | 0 |

### Cost Priority Number (CPN)

**Priority Number calculated as A + C + F + P**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPN</th>
<th>Additional Staff Resources Required</th>
<th>Cash Required (non-sal) - Current Year</th>
<th>Future Project Financial Commitments</th>
<th>Period of Future Financial Commitments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>No additional FTE</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Under 1 FTE or additional salary funding</td>
<td>&lt; $20,000</td>
<td>Yes &lt; $20,000</td>
<td>1-3 out of 10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1-2 FTE</td>
<td>&lt; $20,001</td>
<td>Yes &gt; $20,001</td>
<td>3-5 out of 10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>&gt;2 FTE</td>
<td>&gt; $20,001</td>
<td>Yes &gt; $20,001</td>
<td>On-going &gt;10 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Score Sum | 16 |

### Impact Priority Number (IPN)

**Priority Number calculated as H + E + S + B**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IPN</th>
<th>Health &amp; Safety Impact</th>
<th>Environmental Impact</th>
<th>Social/Comm Wellbeing Impact</th>
<th>Business &amp; Economic Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Public at large threat</td>
<td>Significant Positive Impact</td>
<td>Net Positive Impact</td>
<td>Net Positive Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Section of community/council employee at threat</td>
<td>Positive Impact</td>
<td>Positive Impact</td>
<td>Positive Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neutral Impact</td>
<td>Neutral Impact</td>
<td>Neutral Impact</td>
<td>Neutral Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Negative Impact</td>
<td>Negative Impact</td>
<td>Negative Impact</td>
<td>Negative Impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Score Sum | 8 |

### Benefits Priority Number (BPN)

**Priority Number calculated as E + S + B + S**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BPN</th>
<th>Funding (External) Sources</th>
<th>Savings</th>
<th>Beneficiaries</th>
<th>Service Levels Outcome (to Community)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Fully Funded via External Sources</td>
<td>Generates Savings Immediately</td>
<td>TBC - Region Wide &amp; Beyond</td>
<td>Industry Best Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Part Funded External &gt;50% of Total Cost</td>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>TBC - Region Wide</td>
<td>Achieving contemporary standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Part Funded External &lt;50% of Total Cost</td>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>TBC - Section of Community/Key Stakeholders</td>
<td>Improvement/Increase in Services Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Potential for funding</td>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>TBC - Limited number of Beneficiaries</td>
<td>No Change to Current Service Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fully Funded via Rates</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Score Sum | 5 |

### Financial Sustainability Priority Number (FSPN)

**Priority Number calculated as O + C + J**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FSPN</th>
<th>Operating Budget Impact</th>
<th>Justification for Council Involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Favourable</td>
<td>Asset Renewal - Like for Like Replacement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>No Effect/Not Applicable</td>
<td>Legislative Requirement / Must Do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Unfavourable</td>
<td>New Asset</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Score Sum | 0 |

### Innovation / Continuous Improvement / Other Considerations Priority Number (ICN)

**Priority Number calculated as O x C + J**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ICN</th>
<th>Opportunities for Regional/Sector Collaboration</th>
<th>Addressing Local or Regional Emergency Plans</th>
<th>Continuous Improvement</th>
<th>Other Strategic Plans (Public Health, DAIP)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Yes to a great extent at regional level</td>
<td>Major contribution to achieving</td>
<td>Major contribution to achieving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Yes to a great extent at local level</td>
<td>Substantial contribution to achieving</td>
<td>Major contribution to achieving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Yes to a limited extent at local level only</td>
<td>Limited contribution to achieving</td>
<td>Substantial contribution to achieving</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Score Sum | 1 |

### Any Other Comments:

While NCPA is making a significant contribution to the funding it is noted that this is still Council expenditure.
Please provide a clear description of the proposal
construction of verandah to changing room access elevation - Nuriootpa multi user change rooms

Provide an assessment of the associated Financial and Organisational risks, (including the Financial and Organisational risks of not proceeding or delaying the Project) and consideration of ways they can be managed and/or mitigated

Minimal ongoing risk mitigation considerations. This is a preferred approach to finalise the project and improve amenity and shelter for users of the facility. It will potentially reduce the wear and tear on the new building particularly from exposure to extreme sunlight/heat and reduce significant ingress of mud in wetter months.

An overall evaluation that weighs up all of the factors above as to why the NI should proceed
Completion of the project with input from NCPA, user groups and cash backed Developer Reserves intended for application to recreational purposes. Ongoing operational costs will be incorporated into the NCPA / user group arrangements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operating Expenditure</th>
<th>Forward Estimates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Starting Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and oncosts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials, Contractors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capital Expenditure</th>
<th>Forward Estimates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Starting Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design, Engineering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Planning and Advice/Consultants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries/Wages and Other Internal Direct Project Costs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractors / Construction</td>
<td>20,181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legals / Procurement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees and Charges including CITB and Planning and Building</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20,181</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income (ie. grants, user charges, other income)</th>
<th>Forward Estimates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>starting from NCPA (Council subsidiary)</td>
<td>9,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9,091</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Net Cost/(Saving) of NI</th>
<th>Forward Estimates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenditure</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Expenditure</td>
<td>20,181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>9,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Cost/(Saving) of NI</td>
<td>11,090</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.3.2 DEBATE AGENDA - MANAGER COMMUNITY AND CULTURE

7.3.2.1 DEED OF VARIATION - COMMONWEALTH HOME SUPPORT PROGRAM

B10823

Author: Co-ordinator, Barossa & Light Community Transport and Home Assist

PURPOSE

That approval be provided for the Mayor and Chief Executive Officer to sign and seal the Commonwealth Government Deed of Variation relating to Commonwealth Home Support Programme Community Passenger Network Funding.

RECOMMENDATION

That Council:


2. Provide approval for the Mayor and Chief Executive Officer to affix the seal and sign the Deed of Variation in relation to Home Support in accordance with section 38 of The Local Government Act 1999.

REPORT

External funding for the Community Cars is currently provided via a single contract with the State Government. This was made up of a combination of State funding and Commonwealth Home Support Programme funding (the State having a funding agreement with the Commonwealth).

The Commonwealth will now be providing the Community Car funding directly to Council by extension of the existing Commonwealth Home Support Programme contract.

There is no change in funding amounts, simply a move from one contract to another. The State funding for the Community Cars remains within its existing contract.

The Deed of Variation being offered (Attachment 1) is subject to the South Australian Department of Human Services relinquishing all CHSP Transport funding to the Federal contract, commencing on 1 January 2021.

The Deed of Variation does not include any noteworthy changes to outputs, service types or funding when compared with the current agreement and no changes to service delivery are required or anticipated.
ATTACHMENTS OR OTHER SUPPORTING REFERENCES
Attachment 1: Deed of Variation in relation to Home Support

COMMUNITY PLAN / CORPORATE PLAN / LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS

Community Plan 2020 - 2040
Health and Wellbeing
9.1 Work towards combating loneliness and social isolation and ensuring that people enjoy a sense of inclusion and feel connected

FINANCIAL, RESOURCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT CONSIDERATIONS
Nil

COMMUNITY CONSULTATION
Not required as no changes to service delivery are taking place.
Deed of Variation in relation to Home Support

1. Date
This Deed is made on 2 December 2020

2. Parties
This Deed is made between:

1. The Commonwealth, as represented by Department of Health, ABN 83 605 426 759 (the ‘Commonwealth’); and
2. The Barossa Council, ABN 47 749 871 215 (the ‘Grantee’).

3. Context
A. The Parties entered in an agreement on 31 May 2018 under which the Commonwealth gave a Grant to the Grantee for Home Support (the ‘Agreement’).
B. The Parties have agreed to amend the Agreement on the terms and conditions contained in this Deed.

4. Amendments
With effect from the date of execution of this Deed, the Agreement is amended:

Funding for existing Activities under this Agreement is adjusted as per the table below. This table shows only those existing Activities with funding varied under this Deed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Name</th>
<th>Activity Id</th>
<th>Financial Year</th>
<th>Current Grant Amount (excl. GST)</th>
<th>Variation Amount (excl. GST)</th>
<th>New Total Grant Amount (excl. GST)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transport - Community and Home Support</td>
<td>4-7W4D6OU</td>
<td>2018-2019</td>
<td>$43,347.53</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$43,347.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport - Community and Home Support</td>
<td>4-7W4D6OU</td>
<td>2019-2020</td>
<td>$21,998.87</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$21,998.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport - Community and Home Support</td>
<td>4-7W4D6OU</td>
<td>2020-2021</td>
<td>$11,437.02</td>
<td>$39,647.37</td>
<td>$51,084.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport - Community and Home Support</td>
<td>4-7W4D6OU</td>
<td>2021-2022</td>
<td>$11,631.45</td>
<td>$80,642.75</td>
<td>$92,274.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This Deed varies Activities associated with Relinquishments, Variations, Withdrawals or Novations.

Revised payment amounts, reporting milestones and other detailed amendments resulting from this Deed are described in the Program Schedule, including any attachments, enclosed.

5. **Entire agreement and interpretation**

5.1 The parties confirm all the other provisions of the Agreement and, subject only to the amendments contained in this Deed, the Agreement remains in full force and effect.

5.2 This Deed and the Agreement, when read together, contain the entire agreement of the parties with respect to the parties’ rights and obligations under the Agreement.

5.3 Unless otherwise specified or the context otherwise requires, terms that are defined in the Agreement have the same meaning in this Deed.
## Executed as a deed

Signed, sealed and delivered for and on behalf of the Commonwealth of Australia by the relevant Delegate, represented by and acting through Department of Health, ABN 83 605 426 759 in the presence of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Name of Departmental Representative)</th>
<th>(Signature of Departmental Representative)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.../.../......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Position of Departmental Representative)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Name of Witness in full)</td>
<td>(Signature of Witness)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.../.../......</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signed, sealed and delivered by The Barossa Council, ABN 47 749 871 215 in accordance with its rules, and who warrants that he/she is authorised to sign this Deed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Name and position held by Signatory)</th>
<th>(Signature)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.../.../......</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Name and position held by second Signatory/Name of Witness)</th>
<th>(Signature of second Signatory/Witness)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.../.../......</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Explanatory notes on the signature block

- If you are an incorporated association, you must refer to the legislation incorporating the association as it will specify how documents must be executed. This process may differ between each State and Territory. If an authorised person is executing a document on behalf of the incorporated association, you should be prepared to provide evidence of this authorisation upon request.

- If you are a company, generally two signatories are required – the signatories can be two Directors or a Director and the Company Secretary. Affix your Company Seal, if required by your Constitution.

- If you are a company with a sole Director/Secretary, the Director/Secretary is required to be the signatory in the presence of a witness (the witness date must be the same as the signatory date). Affix your Company Seal, if required by your Constitution.

- If you are a partnership, the signatory must be a partner with the authority to sign on behalf of all partners receiving the grant. A witness to the signature is required (the witness date must be the same as the signatory date).

- If you are an individual, you must sign in the presence of a witness (the witness date must be the same as the signatory date).

- If you are a university, the signatory can be an officer authorised by the legislation creating the university to enter into legally binding documents. A witness to the signature is required (the witness date must be the same as the signatory date).

- If you are a trustee of a Trust, the signatory must be a trustee (NOT the Trust) – as the trustee is the legal entity entering into the Agreement. If requested by you, the words ‘as trustee of the XXX Trust’ could be included at the end of the name.
Schedule – Amendments to the Agreement

- The Program Schedule 4-7SYEL5H is deleted and replaced with the updated Program Schedule 4-7SYEL5H enclosed.
**Transport - Community and Home Support - 4-7W4D6OU**

**B. Grant Activity**

*Objective*
To provide frail, older people with access to transport services that supports their access to the community.

*Description*
The Grantee agrees to carry out the Activity as described in the Program Manual to eligible clients identified for this Activity in accordance with the Activity Work Plan (Item E.2) and the Program Manual. The Grantee agrees to participate in program development activity as reasonably requested by the Commonwealth.

**Performance Indicators**
The Activity will be measured against the following Performance Indicator/s:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Indicator Description</th>
<th>Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As described in the Activity Work Plan</td>
<td>As described in the Activity Work Plan and Item E. Reporting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Location Information**
The Activity will be delivered from the following site location/s:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location Type</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Direct Funded</td>
<td>The Barossa Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Barossa Council 43-51 Tanunda Road NURIOOTPA SA 5355</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Service Area Information**
The Activity will service the following service area/s:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Service Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Aged Care Planning Region (2015) Yorke Lower North &amp; Barossa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**C. Duration of the Grant**
The Activity starts on 1 July 2018. The Activity (other than the provision of any final reports) ends on 30 June 2022, which is the Activity’s Completion Date. The Agreement ends on 31 October 2022 or when the Grantee has provided all of the reports and repaid any Grant amount as required under this Agreement.

**D. Payment of the Grant**
The total amount of the Grant is $208,704.99* (GST exclusive). A break down by Financial Year is below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial Year</th>
<th>Amount * (excl. GST)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018-2019</td>
<td>$43,347.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Year</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-2020</td>
<td>$21,998.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-2021</td>
<td>$51,084.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021-2022</td>
<td>$92,274.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This amount may include Social, Community, Home Care and Disability Services Industry Award 2010 Supplementation (SACS).

The Grantee must ensure that the Grant is held in an account in the Grantee’s name and which the Grantee controls, with an authorised deposit-taking institution authorised under the Banking Act 1959 (Cth) to carry on banking business in Australia.

The Grantee’s nominated bank account into which the Grant is to be paid is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BSB Number</th>
<th>085-005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial Institution</td>
<td>Adelaide Ground Level 22-28 King William St NAB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Account Number</td>
<td>393831998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Account Name</td>
<td>The Barossa Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Grant will be paid in instalments by the Commonwealth in accordance with the agreed Milestones, and compliance by the Grantee with its obligations under this Agreement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestone</th>
<th>Anticipated date</th>
<th>Amount (excl. GST)</th>
<th>GST</th>
<th>Total (incl. GST)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Payment for the period 1 July 2018 - 30 September 2018 for the Activity described in Item B. Grant Activity</td>
<td>1 July 2018</td>
<td>$10,676.73</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$10,676.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment for the period 1 October 2018 - 31 December 2018 for the Activity described in Item B. Grant Activity</td>
<td>1 October 2018</td>
<td>$10,676.73</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$10,676.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment for the period 1 January 2019 - 31 March 2019 for the Activity described in Item B. Grant Activity</td>
<td>1 January 2019</td>
<td>$10,676.73</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$10,676.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment for the period 1 April 2019 - 30 June 2019 for the Activity described in Item B. Grant Activity</td>
<td>1 April 2019</td>
<td>$10,836.89</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$10,836.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indexation 2018-19 back payment</td>
<td>1 April 2019</td>
<td>$480.45</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$480.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment for the period 1 July 2019 - 30 September 2019 for the Activity described in Item B. Grant Activity</td>
<td>1 July 2019</td>
<td>$10,836.88</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$10,836.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment for the period 1 October 2019 - 31 December 2019 for the Activity described in Item B. Grant Activity</td>
<td>1 October 2019</td>
<td>$10,836.88</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$10,836.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indexation 2019-20 back payment</td>
<td>1 October 2019</td>
<td>$325.11</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$325.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment for the period 1 July 2020 - 30 September 2020 for the Activity described in Item B. Grant Activity</td>
<td>4 July 2020</td>
<td>$2,859.26</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$2,859.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment for the period 1 October 2020 - 31 December 2020 for the Activity described in Item B. Grant Activity</td>
<td>4 October 2020</td>
<td>$2,859.26</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$2,859.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment for the period 1 January 2021 - 31 March 2021 for the Activity described in Item B. Grant Activity</td>
<td>4 January 2021</td>
<td>$22,682.94</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$22,682.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment for the period 1 April 2021 - 30 June 2021 for the Activity described in Item B. Grant Activity</td>
<td>4 April 2021</td>
<td>$22,682.93</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$22,682.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment for the period 1 July 2021 - 30 September 2021 for the Activity described in Item B. Grant Activity</td>
<td>4 July 2021</td>
<td>$23,068.55</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$23,068.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment for the period 1 October 2021 - 31 December 2021 for the Activity described in Item B. Grant Activity</td>
<td>4 October 2021</td>
<td>$23,068.55</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$23,068.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment for the period 1 January 2022 - 31 March 2022 for the Activity described in Item B. Grant Activity</td>
<td>4 January 2022</td>
<td>$23,068.55</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$23,068.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment for the period 1 April 2022 - 30 June 2022 for the Activity described in Item B. Grant Activity</td>
<td>4 April 2022</td>
<td>$23,068.55</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$23,068.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Amount</strong></td>
<td><strong>$208,704.99</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$208,704.99</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Invoicing**
The Grantee agrees to allow the Commonwealth to issue it with a Recipient Created Tax Invoice (RCTI) for any taxable supplies it makes in relation to the Activity.

**Taxes, duties and government charges**
Refer to Clause 9. Taxes, duties and government charges.

**E. Reporting**
The Grantee agrees to create the following reports in the form specified and to provide the reports to the Commonwealth representative in accordance with the following.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestone</th>
<th>Information to be included</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance Report</td>
<td>A report on wellness and reablement approaches to service delivery for the period 1 July 2018 to 30 September 2018 as described in item E.1 Performance Reports.</td>
<td>31 October 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Report</td>
<td>Finalisation of period data within the Data Exchange, as per the Data Exchange Protocols for the period 1 July 2018 to 31 December 2018 as described in Item E.1 Performance Reports.</td>
<td>30 January 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Report</td>
<td>Finalisation of period data within the Data Exchange, as per the Data Exchange Protocols for the period 1 January 2019 to 30 June 2019 as described in Item E.1 Performance Reports.</td>
<td>30 July 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Acquittal Report</td>
<td>As described in item E.4 Accounting for the Grant.</td>
<td>31 October 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Report</td>
<td>A report on wellness and reablement approaches to service delivery for the period 1 October 2018 to 30 June 2019 as described in Item E.1 Performance Reports.</td>
<td>31 October 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Report</td>
<td>Finalisation of period data within the Data Exchange, as per the Data Exchange Protocols for the period 1 July 2019 to 31 December 2019 as described in Item E.1 Performance Reports.</td>
<td>30 January 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Report</td>
<td>Finalisation of period data within the Data Exchange, as per the Data Exchange Protocols for the period 1 January 2020 to 30 June 2020 as described in Item E.1 Performance Reports.</td>
<td>30 July 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Report</td>
<td>Unspent funds stocktake for 2019/20 financial year</td>
<td>7 August 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Report</td>
<td>A report on wellness and reablement approaches to service delivery for the period 1 July 2019 to 30 June 2020 as described in Item E.1 Performance Reports.</td>
<td>31 October 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Report</td>
<td>Finalisation of period data within the Data Exchange, as per the Data Exchange Protocols for the period 1 July 2020 to 31 December 2020 as described in Item E.1 Performance Reports.</td>
<td>30 January 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Report</td>
<td>Finalisation of period data within the Data Exchange, as per the Data Exchange Protocols for the period 1 January 2021 to 30 June 2021 as described in Item E.1 Performance Reports.</td>
<td>30 July 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Acquittal Report</td>
<td>As described in item E.4 Accounting for the Grant.</td>
<td>30 July 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Report</td>
<td>A report on wellness and reablement approaches to service delivery for the period 1 July 2020 to 30 June 2021 as described in item E.1 Performance Reports.</td>
<td>31 October 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Report</td>
<td>Finalisation of period data within the Data Exchange, as per the Data Exchange Protocols for the period 1 July 2021 to 31 December 2021 as described in Item E.1 Performance Reports.</td>
<td>30 January 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Report</td>
<td>Finalisation of period data within the Data Exchange, as per the Data Exchange Protocols for the period 1 January 2022 to 30 June 2022 as described in Item E.1 Performance Reports.</td>
<td>30 July 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Acquittal Report</td>
<td>As described in item E.4 Accounting for the Grant.</td>
<td>30 July 2022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
E.1 Performance Reports
The Grantee must provide client level data and service delivery information for all Activities described in Item B. Grant Activity (except for Sector Support and Development - Service System Development Activities) in accordance with the Data Exchange Protocols.

The Grantee must provide the data required within the Data Exchange Protocols through an approved mechanism as outlined in the Data Exchange Protocols.

The Grantee is required to finalise the submission of data within the Data Exchange by the due date set out at Item E.

For Sector Support and Development - Service System Development Activities, the Grantee must report progress in accordance with the Activity Work Plan in the format notified, referred or made available by the Commonwealth to the Grantee (including by reference to an internet site). The Grantee is required to submit reports by the applicable due date set out at Item E.

Wellness and Reablement Reports
The Grantee must provide service level information to the Commonwealth on wellness and reablement approaches being implemented by the Grantee as part of the Activities described in Item B Grant Activity. The service level information must be provided in accordance with the report template nominated by the Commonwealth.

The Grantee is required to provide a wellness and reablement report by the applicable due date set out at Item E.

E.2 Activity Work Plan
The Grantee agrees that its performance will be measured against the attached Activity Work Plan.

E.3 Annual Report
Not applicable

E.4 Accounting for the Grant
The Grantee must provide a financial declaration for each financial year of this Agreement. A financial declaration is a certification from the Grantee which:

- states that all grant funds were spent for the purpose as outlined in the Agreement; and
- declares the amount of unspent Grant funds.

The financial declaration must be certified by the Grantee’s board, the chief executive officer or an officer with the authority to do so verifying the funds have been spent on the Activity in accordance with the Grant Agreement. If SACS supplementation has been paid, confirmation must be provided that the funding was spent in accordance with Clause cb21.

The Grantee is required to provide a financial declaration by the applicable due date at Item E.

E.5 Other Reports
The Grantee must provide assistance and information to the Commonwealth as reasonably required by the Commonwealth, including but not limited to data on existing clients not registered on My Aged Care in the format notified, referred or made available by the Commonwealth in the timeframe specified by the Commonwealth.
F. Party representatives and address for notices

Grantee’s representative and address

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grantee’s representative name</th>
<th>Ms Jo Parker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postal/physical address(es)</td>
<td>The Barossa Council, 43-51 Tanunda Road, NURIOOTPA, SA, 5355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business hours telephone</td>
<td>08 8563 8444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jparker@barossa.sa.gov.au">jparker@barossa.sa.gov.au</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commonwealth representative and address

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of representative</th>
<th>Nok Davis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>CGH Funding Arrangement Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postal/physical address(es)</td>
<td>GPO Box 9820 ADELAIDE SA 5001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business hours telephone</td>
<td>08 8208 0305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td><a href="mailto:saperformancehealth@communitygrants.gov.au">saperformancehealth@communitygrants.gov.au</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Parties’ representatives will be responsible for liaison and the day-to-day management of the Grant, as well as accepting and issuing any written notices in relation to the Grant.

G. Activity Material

Activity Material means any material, other than Reporting Material, created or developed by the Grantee as a result of the Activity and includes any Existing Material that is incorporated in or supplied with the Activity Material.

None specified
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7.4.1 DEBATE AGENDA – DIRECTOR WORKS AND ENGINEERING SERVICES

7.4.1.1 INFRASTRUCTURE ASSET MANAGEMENT PLAN - COMMUNITY CONSULTATION

B11500 – 20/69918

PURPOSE
To formalise the opportunity for the community to provide feedback to Council on the Infrastructure Asset Management Plan (IAMP).

RECOMMENDATION
That

(1) Council endorses the draft Infrastructure Asset Management Plan for a three week community consultation period from 20 January 2021 to 10 February 2021.

(2) Council endorses the Infrastructure Asset Management Plan Communications Plan.

REPORT

Introduction
Under the Local Government Act, Council is required to have a number of Strategic Management Plans, of which the Infrastructure Asset Management Plan (IAMP) is one.

The IAMP needs to be reviewed by Council within 2 years following a Council election.

This year Council received a 6 month extension due to COVID-19.

Council was presented with the Communications Plan for the IAMP at the Workshop held 2 December 2020.

The IAMP must be formally adopted by Council, by March 2021 (following a community consultation period).

Discussion
Council previously produced an individual IAMP for each Asset Class, i.e. Recreation, Buildings and Structures, Stormwater, Bridges, Transport and CWMS.

The first sections of each Plan were basically duplicated across the suite of IAMPs, with minimal changes. Each Plan was approximately 135 pages in length, with numerous charts and data tables which presented minimal information.
Every time an update was required to the IAMPs, including the Glossary or Financial information, it needed to be re-adopted by Council.

During this current review, a single 36 page IAMP document covering all Asset Classes has been produced.

This approach has reduced duplication, and allows for one source of truth and only one document needs to be updated and adopted by Council.

Council’s methodology is presented in Sections 1 to 4, and then each of the six classes is added as an appendix to include base data and financial information (which is already adopted by Council) to ensure the IAMP does not need presenting to Council for every minor change.

Summary and Conclusion
The IAMP is a key strategic document of Council and a legislated requirement. As such, to maximise the opportunity for the community to provide feedback, a three week period is proposed.

ATTACHMENTS OR OTHER SUPPORTING REFERENCES
Attachment 1 – Infrastructure and Asset Management Communications Plan – 20/60782
Attachment 2 – Infrastructure and Asset Management Plan and Appendices 1-7

COMMUNITY PLAN / CORPORATE PLAN / LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS
Community Plan

Infrastructure

6. The Barossa maintains and develops infrastructure that meets the needs of the region and is efficient.
6.2 Continue to ensure that infrastructure considers place-making is inclusive and accessible for all.
7. Community infrastructure planning is aligned to both current and the future needs of the community.
7.1 Build on sound asset management practices to deliver sustainable services to ensure that infrastructure is adequate to support the community.
7.2 Ensure both current and future infrastructure needs are met in a proactive rather than reactive way.

Corporate Plan

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 building facilities and associated programs meet the current need of the community to an agreed level of service.
3.4 Ensure Council’s sporting, recreation and leisure grounds and playing arena and associated programs meet the current need of the community to an agreed level of service.
3.6 Maintain and improve transport infrastructure to support economic, social and
tourism activity within available resources and acceptable levels of service.

3.8 Ensure Council owned roads, bridges, footpaths, tracks and car parking are
accessible, safe and maintained to an agreed level of service.

3.9 Ensure Council facilities and assets are accessible, safe and maintained to an
agreed level of service.

3.10 Ensure Council owned stormwater infrastructure are accessible, safe and
maintained to an agreed level of service.

3.12 Ensure Council owned waste water systems are safe and maintained to an
agreed level of service.

Legislative Requirements
Section 122 Local Government Act 1999
Section 50 Local Government Act 1999

FINANCIAL, RESOURCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT CONSIDERATIONS
The review of the IAMPS may identify priority work that will require funding as part of
Council’s annual budget process.

COMMUNITY CONSULTATION
Minimum requirement - As per Section 50(4a) Local Government Act, at a minimum,
Council will publish a notice in a newspaper circulating in The Barossa Council region
describing the matter for which public consultation is required and inviting interested
persons to make submissions to the Council within a period being at least twenty-one
(21) days from the date of the Notice.

It is proposed that the administration will consult based on the Communications Plan for
a three week period.
**INFRASTRUCTURE AND ASSET MANAGEMENT PLAN COMMUNICATIONS PLAN**

Consultation dates: 20 Jan-10 February 2021

**Desired outcomes**

- Give the community opportunity to provide feedback through traditional and online platforms
- Use community feedback to inform Elected Member decision-making

**Specific considerations & inclusions**


  (1a) A council must, in conjunction with the plans required under subsection (1), develop and adopt—
  
  (a) a long-term financial plan for a period of at least 10 years; and
  
  (b) an infrastructure and asset management plan, relating to the management and development of infrastructure and major assets by the council for a period of at least 10 years,

  (and these plans will also be taken to form part of the council's strategic management plans).

<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>Your Say Barossa</td>
<td>Fact sheet</td>
<td>C&amp;EO and EPSO</td>
<td>Throughout consultation</td>
<td>Call to action to participate in community consultation, what the consultation is about and feedback mechanisms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Response form</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IAMPS/supporting documentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q&amp;A form tool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Release</td>
<td>Media distribution outlets</td>
<td>C&amp;EO</td>
<td>20 January</td>
<td>Call to action to participate in community consultation and what the consultation is about</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Online              | Council website                       | C&EO                | From 20 January           | Media release adapted for website
|                     | Facebook                              |                     |                           | Maintain a presence on the front page of the website                                  |
| **Weekly post encouraging participation; drive feedback Your Say Barossa** |
|---|---|
| **Advertisement** | The Leader | EPSO WES | 20 January | As per Public Consultation policy and in line with corporate templates |
| **Publications** | Monthly d’Vine | C&EO | January d’Vine | Summary article to be prepared |
| **Brief customer service/Barossa Visitor Centre staff/Records** | Email | C&EO | EPSO WES (responsible officer for data collection) | Brief re: consultation and associated/supporting documents |
| | | | | Container creation and feedback capture |
| | | | | Refer 20/62364 Guideline and Configuration - Public Consultation |
| | | | | Refer 20/69152 Knowledge Services Team Process |
| **Brief Elected Members** | Workshop | DWES | December 2020 | Workshop – DWES presentation December 2020 |
| **Staff awareness** | The Mark | C&EO | | Abridged version media release |
| **CLOSE THE LOOP** | | | | |
| **Online** | Facebook | C & EO | Post Council report | Communicate decision of Council |
## Version Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VERSION NO</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>OFFICER</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION OF CHANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>10/03/2020</td>
<td>SPO</td>
<td>Document Creation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>29/09/2020</td>
<td>SPO</td>
<td>Amendments following Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1 ASSET MANAGEMENT STRATEGY

1.1 Goal

The goal of asset management is to define a process to effectively maintain, operate and upgrade assets. This will provide a financially sustainable level of service at an acceptable level of risk, within statutory and legislative requirements, to present and future customers. Infrastructure represents a significant investment by the community and is vital to its health and wellbeing.

Council has developed a Strategic Framework to manage its Assets, which identifies who is responsible for approving Plans and Appendices in line with current legislation.
1.2 The Barossa Council – Demographics

The Council covers an area of approximately 912 square kilometres, is located approximately 60 kilometres north east of Adelaide, adjacent to the town of Gawler. The Barossa Council encompasses six major towns, Angaston, Lyndoch, Mount Pleasant, Nuriootpa, Tanunda, and Williamstown as well as smaller towns and communities, with a combined population of approximately 25,000.

With the ongoing projected increase in resident population, it is vital for Council to sustainably manage existing assets, as well as plan for additional future assets to meet demands.

1.3 Legislative Basis for the Plan

This Infrastructure Asset Management Plan (IAMP) has been prepared in accordance with Australian and State Legislations, and relevant Standards and guidelines.
1.4 Purpose of the Plan

The IAMP demonstrates responsive management of assets (and services provided from assets), compliance with regulatory requirements, and to communicate funding needed to provide the required levels of service over a 10 year planning period. The IAMP defines activities associated with the provision, operation, maintenance, renewal and disposal of assets.

The IAMP is to be read in conjunction with Council’s Asset Management Policy and Non-Current Asset Accounting Policy and the following associated documents:
### 1.5 Role of Key Stakeholders

The following table outlines, but is not limited to, the key stakeholder groups:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAKEHOLDER GROUP</th>
<th>ROLE OR INVOLVEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internal Stakeholders</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected Council</td>
<td>Custodian of the asset, with Elected Members representing the residents and setting strategic direction as per the Corporate and Community Plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Leadership Team and Strategic Management Team</td>
<td>To ensure that Asset Management (AM) Framework, Policy and IAMP is being implemented as adopted, and to ensure that long-term financial needs to sustain the assets for the services they deliver are advised to council for its strategic and financial planning processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directorate Representatives</td>
<td>Responsible for the overall management of the assets including planning, design, maintenance, capital works, monitoring, updating the IAMP and ensuring its outcomes are realised to achieve the levels of service being required from utilisation of the assets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asset Management Coordination</td>
<td>To ensure AM planning meets requirements that optimise useful asset life and service provision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asset Managers</td>
<td>The relevant asset managers will also receive financial information to facilitate sound management of the assets. Councils single subsidiary Nuriootpa Centennial Park Authority managing assets under their Constitution within their precinct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance Team</td>
<td>To ensure that Council, Audit Committee and relevant external bodies (State Government, Grants Commission, External Audit, etc) is provided with adequate financial information. Finance and asset staff need to meet Australian Accounting Standards, audit and other legislative requirements, to ensure assets are accounted for, including the capture, costing, consumption, replacement, reconciliation, reporting, impairment and existence, revaluation and condition assessments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge and Technology Services Team</td>
<td>To ensure that the relevant IT systems are functioning and that any data within the systems is secure, and its integrity is not compromised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Team</td>
<td>To ensure that risk management practices are conducted as per Council policy and assist operations managers with advice on risk issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal auditors</td>
<td>To ensure that appropriate policy practices are carried out and to advise and assist on improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWMS Operations Team</td>
<td>To ensure that the CWMS functions efficiently and within all regulatory frameworks, in both environmental and customer services guidelines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>External Stakeholders</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Users of the infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Services</td>
<td>Includes Police, Fire, Ambulance and SES for access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic/Transportation Managers</td>
<td>For the management of traffic flow through the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractors</td>
<td>To implement the procured level of service for asset components.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA Transport and Utility agencies</td>
<td>Those utility service providers where sharing the use of an asset (water, sewerage, gas, electricity, telecommunications, etc).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Audit Committee</td>
<td>To ensure that appropriate policy practices are carried out, and to audit and advise respectively on the plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State and Federal Government Departments</td>
<td>Periodic provision of advice, instruction and support funding to assist with management of the asset. Provide periodic operational information to comply with licensing requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developers</td>
<td>Investing of new assets, (includes private and public/government owned)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.6 Assets included in the IAMP

The assets included in this IAMP, are detailed in the table below. Replacement value of the assets as at 30 June 2019 is $527,214,040.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASSET CLASS</th>
<th>REPLACEMENT VALUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>$ 214,428,434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridges</td>
<td>$ 44,933,506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWMS</td>
<td>$ 54,143,773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community and Recreation</td>
<td>$ 145,716,009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater</td>
<td>$ 47,908,997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant and Equipment</td>
<td>$ 2,390,598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuriootpa Centennial Park Authority</td>
<td>$ 17,692,723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 527,214,040</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All assets are classed according to a hierarchy in terms of their specific function and construction/usage. A hierarchy classification at the asset level is used to assist in prioritising works programs and also intervention responses for any defects that exceed the relevant intervention levels.

These hierarchy classifications are identified in the tables below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASSET CLASS</th>
<th>ASSET CATEGORY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>Footpaths, Kerb and Gutter, Bike Paths, Road Earth, Road Pavement, Road Surface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridges</td>
<td>Bridges, Footbridges, Floodways, Major Culverts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Wastewater Management System (CWMS)</td>
<td>Lagoons, Wastewater Treatment Plants, Pump Stations, Pipes – Pressure mains, Fencing &amp; roadways, CWMS Buildings and Structures, Inspection Points, Manholes, Gravity Drain, Control systems, Operational support equipment, Flushing Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater</td>
<td>Stormwater Drains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSET CLASS</td>
<td>ASSET CATEGORY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drainage Channels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cross Drains</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2 SERVICE EXPECTATIONS

2.1 Strategic and Corporate Goals

This infrastructure asset management plan is driven by the commitments that Council has identified within its Community and Corporate Plans, which fall under the following themes:
2.2 Community Expectations

The Levels of Service defined in the IAMP are set by Council, and the community has an opportunity to provide feedback, through a variety of methods:

- Council website (www.barossa.sa.gov.au) and social media platforms
- Council Customer Relationships Management System
- Local Newspapers
- Direct communication and feedback to staff and elected members
- Community Engagement Platform (YourSay Barossa)
- Stakeholder engagement and consultation processes linked to The Big Project (Generational Community Infrastructure Project) and associated community recreational and cultural assets 2017 onwards

Council uses this information to develop the Annual Business Plan and Budget.

Specific levels of service for our assets are adopted by Council, and can be found in Council’s Service Statements document.

Growth in property development and an increasing population base has resulted in a demand for increased services delivered through assets. It is expected that the expectations of the Barossa community will continue to rise or change over time.

Community expectation needs to be balanced along with constraints such as fixed resource allocation, budgets and additional new assets.
2.3 Levels of Service

To monitor and manage our assets, as well as community expectations, operational or technical measures of performance are defined and approved by Council. These Levels of Service, relate to the allocation of resources to service activities to best achieve appropriately managed assets and the desired community outcomes, and demonstrate effective organisational performance.

Technical Levels of Service measure how the asset meets the relevant standards and comply with operational and safety performance required by this plan.

They include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SERVICE OBJECTIVES</th>
<th>CRITERIA AND METRICS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Asset Integrity        | • Assets are maintained according to the agreed Level of Service for the benefit of users  
                         | • Design, construction and maintenance meet technical standards and legislative requirements                                                        |
| Health and Safety      | • Assets performance and conditions are monitored to ensure potential hazards are identified  
                         | • Identified Hazards are managed                                                                                                                     |
| Functionality          | • Asset functionality meets long-term sustainability of services  
                         | • Assets are maintained and operated to be fit for purpose and visually pleasing  
                         | • Consider future proofing to provide for climate, other environment changes and other ‘Risk’ factors  
                         | • Where known, provide an added margin on renewal programs for upgrades to meet statutory changes and best practice                                   |
| Cost Efficiency        | • Deliver services at the approved Level of Service for the benefit of current and future users  
                         | • Financial planning takes into consideration the requirements of the IAMP.                                                                     |
| Responsiveness         | • Response to customer requests in accordance with the principles of Council’s Customer Service Charter and Service Statements                  |

2.4 Requests for Service

Customer Requests for services, both internal and external, are entered into Council’s Customer Relationship Management System.

This enables the request to be recorded, directed to the responsible officer or department and have its process tracked to completion. This allows Council to determine the effectiveness of services supplied to maintain Council assets.

2.5 Future Demand

Council’s priorities in managing assets and funding allocations may change over time. The main drivers affecting demand and change include:

- New residential development
- Population growth
- Aging and obsolete assets
- Upgrades to assets, including change in the operation of freight network
- Climate change
- Emerging new technologies and State, Council, regional, affiliations, partnerships and customer new requirements (Bike/shared paths, MTB networks, adventure playgrounds, ovals at AFL/SACA standards, grant funding programs expanding/enhancing our service/asset portfolio)
- Improvement in environmental outcomes

It is, therefore, important that Council continues to collect data and review the IAMP and relevant documents every four years.
3 LIFECYCLE MANAGEMENT

3.1 Asset Lifecycles

An effective IAMP requires a ‘whole-of-life’ approach. To ensure financial efficiency, this IAMP has a holistic approach over the life-cycle of all assets. It is important that all costs (i.e. up-front costs to acquire assets, ongoing costs to maintain and operate assets and renewal or disposal costs) are included in the financial analysis undertaken to evaluate asset investment options.

Initial capital cost constitutes a significant cost and often dominates the decision-making process while the ongoing recurrent expenditures (including depreciation, maintenance and operating) usually represent a high portion of the total life-cycle costs of many assets.

The structure of operations and maintenance, and capital works is represented by the following diagram:
3.2 Asset Inspections

Survey and inspection processes are required for competent management of all assets. A four-tier inspection regime is used. It covers safety, incidents, defects and condition inspections.

The inspection program not only identifies safety defects that exceed stated intervention levels and facilitates timely repairs, it also feeds into and guides the development of maintenance and capital works programs.

The inspection regime is as follows:

- **Programmed (Defect/Maintenance) Inspections** – Regular inspections, as part of the day-to-day maintenance of the asset, to monitor condition against defect intervention levels
- **Reactive/Safety Inspections** – Response to customer enquiries or notifications. Council inspects all reported defects and records this information in Council’s AMS following notification by members of the community or Council employees while undertaking their normal work duties. All inspections are conducted by an appropriate Council representative and defects are assessed against any relevant stated intervention level.
- **Condition Inspections** – Identify deficiencies in the structural integrity of the assets which if untreated, are likely to adversely affect system values. The deficiencies may impact short-term serviceability as well as the ability of the component to continue to perform for the duration of its intended life span.

Programmed and Condition Inspections are undertaken by way of a formal timetable regime. Condition inspections are conducted at a lesser frequency than programmed inspections.

3.3 Condition Assessment

Council undertakes periodic condition assessments of all of its assets, their components and programs. This condition data not only enables assessing current asset condition and reliability, it also assists in predicting an asset’s future life span. This forms the basis of programming maintenance works. It also feeds into and guides the development of capital programs.

The overall condition of each asset is rated using a scale of 1 to 5, although it should be noted that there is significant weighting behind each decision.

Condition is measured using a 1 to 5 grading system as detailed in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONDITION GRADING</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION OF CONDITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>As New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Very Good: only planned maintenance required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Good: minor maintenance required plus planned maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fair: significant maintenance required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Poor: significant renewal / rehabilitation required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Very Poor: physically unsound and/or beyond rehabilitation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A description of each condition rating is detailed in Appendix 5.

### 3.4 Intervention Levels

The intervention level is the extent of a defect above which the defect may pose an unacceptable risk to users of that asset and the community. The asset defect intervention levels are not definitive, due to the nature of on-site visual assessment, ground condition and light condition at the time of survey. Therefore, there may be variances within reasonable limit as to the extent of the reported severity of a defect when compared to detailed measurement of any particular defect.

A number of factors are considered when setting intervention levels, including:

- Safety
- Asset Integrity
- Cost
- Historical Practices
- Available Resources
- Public Opinion & Community Consultation
- Legislative Requirements
- Neighbouring Council Practices
- User Amenity and Accessibility
- Effect on Life Cycle Cost
- Engineering Judgement

The desired intervention level for Council assets is at a rating of 3.

### 3.5 Infrastructure Risk Management Plan

An assessment of risks associated with service delivery from infrastructure assets has identified critical risks that will result in loss or reduction in service from infrastructure assets or a 'financial shock' to the organisation. The risk assessment process identifies credible risks, the likelihood of the risk event occurring, the consequences should the event occur, develops a risk rating, evaluates the risk and develops a risk treatment plan for non-acceptable risks.

Full information on the applicable risks can be found in Council's Infrastructure Risk Management Plan, attached as Appendix 3.

### 3.6 Routine Operations and Maintenance Plan

Maintenance includes 'all actions necessary for retaining an asset as near as practicable to its original condition, but excluding rehabilitation or renewal. The objective of maintenance works is to ensure that assets and their various features continue to function at a level that meets the needs of the community.'

Asset maintenance levels of service provide for the day- to- day maintenance programs to ensure that the asset operations are safe within practical constraints, maintain to perform targets for day- to- day use and is managed and maintained to minimise environmental risk and protection of residents.

Maintenance may be classified as:

- Reactive maintenance is unplanned repair work carried out in response to service requests and management/supervisory directions. Assessment and prioritisation of reactive maintenance is undertaken by Council staff using experience and judgement and is based on the inputs into the Customer Relationship Management (CRM) System.
- Planned maintenance is repair work that is identified and managed through a Maintenance Management System (MMS). MMS activities include inspection, assessing the condition against failure/breakdown experience, prioritising, scheduling, actioning the work and reporting what was done to develop a maintenance history and improve maintenance and service delivery performance.
Specific maintenance is replacement of higher value components/sub-components of assets that is undertaken on a regular cycle including repainting, replacing air conditioning units, etc. This work falls below the capital/maintenance threshold but may require a specific budget allocation.

3.7 Operations and Maintenance Strategies

Council undertake a number of activities to assist in the development of maintenance standards. These activities include:

- Scheduling operations activities to deliver the defined level of service in the most efficient manner
- Undertaking maintenance activities through a planned maintenance system to reduce maintenance costs and improve maintenance outcomes. Undertake cost-benefit analysis to determine the most cost-effective split between planned and unplanned maintenance activities (50 – 70% planned desirable as measured by cost)
- Maintain a current infrastructure risk register for assets and present service risks associated with providing services from infrastructure assets
- Report High and Very High risks and residual risks after treatment to management, Council and regulatory bodies
- Review current and required skills base and implement workforce training and development to meet required operations and maintenance needs
- Review asset utilisation to identify appropriate asset usage
- Maintain a hierarchy of critical assets and required operations and maintenance activities
- Develop and regularly review appropriate emergency response capability and ensure compliance with all regulatory requirements
- Continually review the operations and maintenance activities of all assets to ensure Council is obtaining best value for resources used

The IAMP establishes schedules of maintenance standards for different categories of all assets for which Council has operational and/or maintenance responsibility. By developing long term maintenance programs, Council is better able to strategically plan its finances.

3.8 Renewal and Replacement Plan

Renewals include all works to replace existing assets with assets of equivalent capacity or performance capability. Replacement, on the other hand, is referred to as works to rebuild or replace parts or components of an asset, to restore it to a required functional condition and extend its life, which may incorporate some modification.

Renewal and replacement expenditure is major work which does not increase the asset’s design capacity but restores, rehabilitates, replaces or renews an existing asset to its original or lesser required service potential. Work over and above restoring an asset to original service potential is upgrade/expansion or new works expenditure.

Assets requiring renewal/replacement are identified from one of three methods:

- Method 1 uses Asset Register data to project the renewal costs including any known upgrades or at least a margin for that for selected assets, using acquisition year and useful life to determine the renewal year, or
- Method 2 uses capital renewal expenditure projections from external condition modelling systems, or
- Method 3 uses a combination of average network renewals plus defect repairs

Method 1 was used for this IAMP.
The useful lives of assets used to develop projected asset renewal expenditures are shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>USEFUL LIFE RANGE (YEARS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>Sealed Roads – Earth</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sealed Roads – Pavement (includes shoulders) - 2 components</td>
<td>40 - 150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>180 - 600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sealed Roads – Surface - 2 components</td>
<td>10 - 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40 - 150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sheeted Roads – Earth</td>
<td>12 - 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sheeted Roads – or Surface - 2 components</td>
<td>168 - 392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unformed Roads – Earth</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carpark Surfaces - 2 components</td>
<td>30 - 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60 - 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Footpaths</td>
<td>30 - 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kerb</td>
<td>70 - 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Buildings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Buildings – Market Value</td>
<td>20 - 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Buildings – valued over $100,000</td>
<td>20 - 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Toilets</td>
<td>20 - 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sheds, garages, pavilions and shipping containers</td>
<td>20 - 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pergola, cabins, carports, gazebo, shelters and other structures</td>
<td>20 - 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CWMS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pump Stations – Components</td>
<td>10 – 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lagoons - Components</td>
<td>40 – 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waste Water Treatment Plant - Components</td>
<td>5 – 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pipes – PVC/UPVC</td>
<td>60 – 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pipes – Earthenware</td>
<td>55 – 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bridges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Road Bridge – 2 components</td>
<td>1: Up to 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2: 200 – 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Footbridges – 2 components</td>
<td>1: Up to 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2: 150 – 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Floodways, major culverts – 2 components</td>
<td>1: Up to 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2: 200 – 240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recreation Infrastructure</td>
<td>15 - 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parks and Gardens Infrastructure</td>
<td>15 - 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sporting Reserve Infrastructure</td>
<td>15 - 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stormwater</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Box Culverts</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drainage Channel Assets</td>
<td>25 – 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grated Inlet Pits</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gross Pollutant Traps</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Headwalls</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Junction Boxes</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pipes</td>
<td>55 – 150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Side Entry Pits</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.9 Renewal and Replacement Strategies

The organisation will plan capital renewal and replacement projects to meet level of service objectives and minimise infrastructure service risks by:

- Planning and scheduling renewal projects to deliver the defined level of service in the most efficient manner
- Undertaking project scoping for all capital renewal and replacement projects to identify:
  - the service delivery ‘deficiency’, present risk and optimum time for renewal/replacement
  - the project objectives to rectify the deficiency
  - the range of options, estimated capital and life cycle costs for each option that could address the service deficiency
  - evaluate the options against evaluation criteria adopted by the organisation
  - select the best option to be included in capital renewal programs
- Using ‘low cost’ renewal methods (cost of renewal is less than replacement) wherever possible
Asset renewal and replacement is typically undertaken to either:

- Ensure the reliability of the existing infrastructure to deliver the service it was constructed to facilitate
- To ensure the infrastructure is of sufficient quality to meet the service requirements

It is possible to get some indication of capital renewal and replacement priorities by identifying assets or asset groups that:

- Have a high consequence of failure
- Have a high utilisation and subsequent impact on users would be greatest
- The total value represents the greatest net value to the organisation
- Have the highest average age relative to their expected lives
- Have high operational or maintenance costs
- Where replacement with modern equivalent assets would yield operational savings

The projected capital renewal and replacement program is shown in Appendix 1.

### 3.10 Creation / Acquisition / Upgrade Plan

New works are those works that create a new asset that did not previously exist, or works which upgrade or improve an existing asset beyond its existing capacity. They may result from growth, social or environmental needs. Assets may also be acquired at no cost to the organisation from land development.

New assets and upgrade/expansion of existing assets are identified from various sources such as elected member or community requests. Council has a New Initiative process to evaluate and prioritise requests for new assets. Validated New Initiative Requests are ranked by priority and available funds (as determined in the annual budget process and in accordance with the adopted Long Term Financial Plan) and scheduled in future works programs.

### 3.11 Capital Investment Strategies

The organisation will plan capital upgrade and new projects to meet level of service objectives by:

- Planning and scheduling capital upgrade and new projects to deliver the defined level of service in the most efficient manner
- Undertake project scoping for all capital upgrade/new projects to identify:
  - the service delivery 'deficiency', present risk and required timeline for delivery of the upgrade/new asset
  - the project objectives to rectify the deficiency including value management for major projects
  - the range of options, estimated capital and life cycle costs for each options that could address the service deficiency
  - management of risks associated with alternative options
  - evaluate the options against evaluation criteria adopted by Council
  - select the best option to be included in capital upgrade/new programs
- Review current and required skills base and implement training and development to meet required construction and project management needs
- Review management of capital project management activities to ensure Council is obtaining best value for resources used

Standards and specifications for new assets and for upgrade/expansion of existing assets are the same as those for renewal.

### 3.12 Disposal Plan

Disposal includes any activity associated with disposal of a decommissioned asset including sale, demolition, part replacement, missing and theft, written off or relocation.
4  PLAN IMPROVEMENT AND MONITORING

4.1 Monitoring and Review Procedures

To ensure that the IAMP remains a useful document and relevant to the ongoing management of the assets, the following review activities will be undertaken:

- The IAMP will be periodically reviewed
- The IAMP is to be formally adopted by Council as it is a strategic planning document
- Subsequent to this formal adoption, any significant changes to levels of service are to be reported to and endorsed by Council to ensure that elected members are fully aware of the consequences of their decision making which may have an impact on financial strategy and budget
- Any proposed variations to levels of service that have a financial impact are to be considered by Council through the budget process. If funding is approved the Service Statements are to be revised to reflect the new levels of service
- The IAMP review will also incorporate any changes arising from the improvement program
Changes to the IAMP need to be readily identified. The process that will be adopted for updating it is outlined below:

a) Where changes are made that do not materially alter the technical aspects of management (standards and specifications) and seek only to enhance the information provided within the Plan, the changes will be approved by the Director responsible for the asset.

b) If material changes are made to standards and specifications, a report will be presented to Council, along with a brief explanation as to why such changes were necessary, seeking its endorsement to them.

In relation to numbering the document version, material changes necessitating Council approval will cause a change to the prime number of the specific AM Plan Version (e.g. from Version 1.00 to 2.00).

Enhancements approved by the relevant Director will cause a change to the point number of the specific AM Plan Version that had previously been endorsed by Council (e.g. from Version 1.00 to 1.01).

The Appendices to the IAMP will be reviewed during annual budget planning processes and amended to recognise any changes in service levels and/or resources available to provide those services as a result of budget decisions.

The Appendices will also be updated as required to ensure they represent the current service level, asset values, projected operations, maintenance, capital renewal and replacement, capital upgrade/new and asset disposal expenditures and projected expenditure values incorporated into the organisation’s Long Term Financial Plan.

The IAMP has a life of 4 years (Council election cycle) and is due for complete revision and updating within two years of each Council election.
### 4.2 Improvement Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK NO</th>
<th>TASK</th>
<th>RESPONSIBILITY</th>
<th>RESOURCES REQUIRED</th>
<th>TIMELINE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Undertake a Gap Analysis of Council’s Organisational Asset Management practices – reviewing data, systems and capabilities with intent to drive greater level of preventive maintenance across all asset classes</td>
<td>SPO</td>
<td>Commenced</td>
<td>30 July 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Restructure Assets in Conquest and optimise the software to make the most of unused functionality</td>
<td>SPO CAM</td>
<td>Commenced</td>
<td>30 July 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Implement a new GIS solution to replace the existing software, which has reach its end of life</td>
<td>SPO CAM</td>
<td>Commenced</td>
<td>31 December 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Utilise mobile technology to enable field staff to easily access asset information and update as and when required, including inspections, cyclic actions and managing risks</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>Commenced</td>
<td>31 December 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Obtain better data on asset utilisation - Develop a plan and cost with the intent to collect Traffic Count data for Council’s Road Network</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>TBC – additional cost</td>
<td>31 July 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>CWMS – review of annual ESCOSA reporting to ensure continued compliance.</td>
<td>CWMS Coordinator</td>
<td>Commenced</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Review Council’s Acquisition and Disposal Policies and Processes to allow for a more streamlined and less labour intensive process</td>
<td>SPO CAM</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>31 March 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Review and update the Barossa, Light and Lower North Region Open Space, Recreation and Public Realm Strategy</td>
<td>DWES</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>31 July 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Undertake condition audits and obtain condition ratings for footpaths, stormwater, building and recreational assets, minor culverts and floodways</td>
<td>DWES</td>
<td>tbc – additional cost</td>
<td>FY2021/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Update CWMS asset register (disposal and renewal)</td>
<td>CWMS Coordinator</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>31 March 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Review grading maintenance service levels and intervention points to optimise patrol grading maintenance</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>FY2021/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Develop strategic tree management policy</td>
<td>DWES</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>FY2021/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Move towards ideal deterioration curves as a bases to determine the rate at which an asset deteriorates, currently deterioration curves are not used.</td>
<td>DWES</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>FY2021/22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5 TRANSPORT ASSETS

5.1 Asset Breakdown

This section of the infrastructure asset management plan provides details about Council’s approach to the management of the transport assets, in line with appropriate standards, and contributing to the achievement of the objectives in the Community Plan. The plan details the management systems for the management of transport infrastructure function under the care and control of the Barossa Council.

The plan covers the road network asset group that includes roads, footpaths, kerb and gutter, shoulders, shared pathways, street trees and traffic facilities such as road furniture and signs, roundabouts, traffic humps, linemarking, etc). It defines how Council will manage the road network and sets a standard in relation to discharge of duties in the performance of those assets. It also provides guidance that details future inspection, maintenance and data collection practices.

Council has a register which records the details of the public roads and ancillary areas for which it responsible for. Council’s Asset Management System breaks roads down into segments to provide better management of discrete portions of road. Typically these are lengths of road between intersecting streets, or in rural roads no greater than one kilometre in length. The assets related to a roads structural makeup (pavement / formation / surface / shoulder) sit under the individual road segments within the asset management system. The hierarchy within the asset management system can be seen below:
The asset register has been mapped in Council’s Geographic Information System (GIS), which forms an integral component of the asset management system. The asset register also records information such as the type, condition and valuation (e.g. replacement value, depreciation) of road assets together with a history of the assets including construction, maintenance, any additions, deletions and changes to those assets.

### 5.2 Data Collection

Council will undertake periodic surveys and/or audits to monitor transport infrastructure and associated elements such as road pavement, road surfacing, kerb and gutter and shoulder conditions, footpaths, signs and other road furniture. These audits, as highlighted in the table below, are to determine the overall condition of the assets and provide input into future maintenance, renewal and replacement plans. The specified intervals depend on the asset, the volume and nature of road usage (hierarchy classification), and any risk to safety.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASSET/COMPONENT</th>
<th>AUDIT INTERVALS</th>
<th>DATA TO BE COLLECTED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sealed road network</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>Overall condition rating scores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerb and Gutter</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>Overall condition rating scores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Shoulders</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>Overall condition rating scores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsealed road network</td>
<td>6 years</td>
<td>Pavement depth and Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footpaths including Bike Tracks</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>Condition audit to identify footpath defect extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture and Fittings</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>Overall condition rating scores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Trees – Urban Areas</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>Species, expected remaining life, qualified risk assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>Overall condition rating scores</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the specified audits, Council will undertake regular inspections to monitor asset condition and identify maintenance defects, which will then identify repair works as part of the day-to-day maintenance of the road infrastructure network. Council also conducts reactive inspections as part of the response to customer requests.
Information related to defects identified via inspection will be recorded in Council’s Asset Management System. Repair and maintenance works will be scheduled based on the severity of the defect ensuring the safety of infrastructure users and general public.

5.3 Deficiencies Identified

Council undertake regular condition audits as identified in section 5.2, and in addition to these, routine drive through checks are conducted in order to identify any deficiency within the transport network. An updated list of these deficiencies will be available following the next condition audit.

5.4 Duties to Maintain and Keep Safe

Road infrastructure assets

In accordance with the Local Government Act 1999, Council is responsible for the care and control of its Transport Assets and is required to maintain and keep them in a safe condition for their intended function.

Pursuant to Section 221 of the Act, a person (other than Council or a person acting under some statutory authority) must not make an alteration to a public road unless authorised to do so by the Council.

Any proposed work or activity on Council land, including a road, verge / nature strip, recreation reserve etc., is required to have a Section 221 “Application for Construction or Modifications on Council Property” lodged for Council consideration. Council may issue permits for certain activities and alterations to be made with conditions and requirements that are to be completed at the applicant’s expense to Council satisfaction.

Infrastructure Definition

- **Road Carriageway** - The traffic lanes on the road where a vehicle is not restricted by any physical barriers or separation lines to laterally move.
- **Verge / Naturestrip** - The Council land between the property boundary and the edge of road carriageway / back of kerb. A verge / naturestrip may sometimes be landscaped.
- **Kerb / Kerb and Gutter** - The road side infrastructure that conveys stormwater drainage along the length of the road. A kerb / kerb and gutter may comprise of upright barrier or mountable kerb profiles.
- **Invert / Gutter Crossing** - A crossing point within the kerb and gutter that allows safe and convenient access over the infrastructure. An invert / gutter crossing may be a spoon drain or other similar profile.
- **Driveway / Crossover** - The Council land between a property boundary and the edge of road carriageway / back of kerb utilised for private property access. A driveway / crossover includes the pavement surface and may also comprise a culvert crossing.
- **Culvert Crossing** - A culvert or pipe within the driveway / crossover that allows safe conveyance of roadside stormwater drainage. The culvert crossover may include inlet and outlet infrastructure such as headwalls and scour protection.
- **Stormwater Connection** - The stormwater connection between a property boundary and the road side drainage system. The stormwater connection may comprise of a pipe or channel conduit.
- **Stormwater Connection Sleeve** - The sleeve or conduit within a footpath or kerb and gutter that allows the placement of a stormwater connection conduit.
- **Footpath** - The paved or treated surface within the verge / naturestrip or within land acting as a thoroughfare from point A to point B allocated for pedestrian and/or bicycle use. The footpath includes the section of a driveway / crossover traversed by footpath infrastructure.

Infrastructure Operational Responsibility

The provisions of this plan apply to those assets listed in the Council’s asset register. The construction, operation and maintenance of the listed assets are Council’s responsibility. Roads and car parks on private properties and private drainage are the responsibility of the property owner, unless deemed otherwise by relevant easements and agreements. Arterial roads are the responsibility of Department for Infrastructure and Transport (DIT) in terms of the relevant DIT Operational Instructions.
The Barossa Council is responsible for constructing new, repairing and maintaining road carriageway, kerb / kerb and gutter, invert / gutter crossing, stormwater connection sleeve, footpath street trees, and associated infrastructure such as street furniture.

The property owner is responsible for constructing new, repairing and maintaining their driveway / crossover, culvert crossing, stormwater connection. However, construction of a driveway / crossover may require the property owner to modify the existing and/or construct a new kerb and gutter or invert / gutter crossing. All works on Council land will require approval through the Section 221 permit process where the conditions and requirements will be outlined.

It is the property owner’s responsibility to ensure their driveway and their private stormwater connection to Council drainage assets are maintained to the satisfaction of Council.

Whilst the portion of a driveway located between the road carriageway and the property boundary is the responsibility of the adjoining property owner to maintain, Council will maintain the section of a driveway/crossover that is part of a constructed footpath.

Council is required to ensure that the verge / naturestrip is safe and convenient for pedestrian access. Property owners are, however, encouraged to maintain verge / naturestrip land adjacent their respective allotments i.e. by mowing the grass. In townships, Council may, if required, spray unmaintained verge land with appropriate herbicides to control unsightly weed growth and to ensure safe pedestrian access. Council does not generally spray or cut rural roadside verges, except as required for road safety reasons.

Property owners are not permitted to landscape or install a structure (including planting or removal of vegetation, irrigation, excavations, letter boxes, pipes, wires, cables, fittings, fixtures and other objects) in, on, across, under or over Council verge / naturestrip land without Council approval through the Section 221 permit process or development application process.

All fences are required to be constructed entirely within the boundaries of the relevant allotment.

A property owner is required to enter an agreement with Council for the construction, maintenance, repair, and insurance of cattlegrids and gates in Council land. This agreement defines the roles and responsibilities of both the property owner and Council for the ongoing management of these items.

Council will not maintain an unmade road unless the road is identified in the asset register as a public road.

No built form or development requiring application through either the Development Act, Planning Development Infrastructure Act or Local Government Act (Section 221) processes will be approved on or over any Council service infrastructure or any easement in favour of The Barossa Council.

**Infrastructure Upgrade**

Any upgrade to transport assets i.e. sealing of unsealed roads, construction of new footpath or intersection upgrade will be determined based on the social, tourism and freight importance of the road and projected demand for future traffic.

Any proposed variations to infrastructure levels of service that have a financial impact are required to be considered by Council in terms of the revised asset function level. Any proposed upgrade is required to be considered through the Council budget process.

### 5.5 Asset Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASSET TYPE</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>REPLACEMENT VALUE AS AT 30 JUNE 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sealed Roads</td>
<td>344 km</td>
<td>$127,122,655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsealed Roads</td>
<td>560 km</td>
<td>$25,461,746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerb and Gutter</td>
<td>254 km</td>
<td>$47,265,157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footpath</td>
<td>452km (inc Bike Path)</td>
<td>$14,567,593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roundabout</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$11,283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$214,428,434</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6 BRIDGE ASSETS

6.1 Asset Breakdown

This section of the infrastructure asset management plan provides information on bridges, footbridges, floodways and major culverts, which are collectively known as Bridges.

Bridge assets are managed in a way to meet safety and functional standards and to achieve outcomes set in the Community Plan. The plan details the management systems for the management of bridge assets under the care and control of The Barossa Council. It also provides guidance that details future inspection, maintenance, upgrade and replacement of bridge infrastructure assets, where required.
The asset register has been mapped in Council’s Geographic Information System (GIS), and records information such as the type, condition and valuation (e.g. replacement value, depreciation) of bridge assets together with a history of the assets including construction, maintenance, any additions, deletions and changes to those assets.

6.2 Data Collection

In 2017 a bridge audit was conducted by WSP, which provided an overall asset summary, condition rating and defects list along with inspection photos. The purpose for conducting the bridge audit is to determine the overall quality of the assets and provide input into future maintenance, renewal and replacement plans. The aim is to conduct a condition survey on bridge assets every 4 years.

In addition to the specified audits, Council will undertake regular inspections to monitor asset performance and identify defects. This will inform Council of any repair works and intervention that may be required. Council also conducts reactive maintenance as part of the response to customer requests.

Information related to defects identified via inspection will be recorded in Council’s Asset Management System. Repair and maintenance works will be scheduled based on the severity of the defect ensuring the safety of infrastructure for use by the general public.

6.3 Deficiencies Identified

Within the bridge audit report, a number of key renewal and maintenance activities were identified and prioritised to form a recommended multi-year maintenance plan. These activities include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASSET CLASS</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>SERVICE DEFICIENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bridges</td>
<td>King Street North, Stockwell</td>
<td>• Replace with new bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jane Place, Tanunda</td>
<td>• Replace degrading timber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Re-tension cables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bilyara Road, Tanunda</td>
<td>• Replace two culvert units damaged by drainage installation with two new culvert units with designed opening for drainage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moss Smith Road, Eden Valley</td>
<td>• Replace with new bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Golden Gate Mines Road, Angaston</td>
<td>• Replace with new culvert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Smyth Road, Tanunda</td>
<td>• Undertake concrete testing (carbonation and chloride)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Concrete repair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Install collars / column strengthening to bridge piers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moculta Road, Moculta</td>
<td>• Replace with new culvert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Martin Road, Concordia</td>
<td>• Replace with new culvert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bethany Reserve, Bethany</td>
<td>• Replace chequer plate of main span and provide new fixings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Reinstate protective coating on all steel elements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Fill underneath north and south abutments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Treat exposed reinforcement and reinstate concrete wall to south western end</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Fill underneath north and south pier with CLSM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Reinstate scour protection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.4 Current Condition and Future Maintenance/Upgrade Plan

All bridges must adhere to legislative, standards and council’s Development Plan requirements. Bridges are designed to meet standards and guidelines at the time of construction. Some bridges will need to meet current, revised design standards when the asset is renewed or replaced.

The road bridges required to service our existing road network are largely in place, but were mostly built in the first half of the 1900s. Many of these bridges require upgrades as vehicle size and load limits have increased greatly, hence the focus is more on the capital renewal and upgrade of these structures. Careful
consideration is given to National Heavy Vehicle Regulator (NHVR) bridge use approvals to minimise the risk of bridge damage.

The requirement for new bridges to service new development within the Council will be a future development consideration for developers on a case-by-case basis.

The 2017 WSP Bridge Audit Maintenance Report short lists 10 selected bridge assets for priority capital upgrade work. The audit report also informs longer term bridge upgrade requirements across the region without specific priority assigned.

Load Limits may be placed on bridges in poor condition to extend the life of the bridge asset, where reasonable alternative access is not available.

The upgrade of major bridges on the DIT arterial road network is a consideration for the State Government which owns these assets.

### 6.5 Asset Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASSET TYPE</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>REPLACEMENT VALUE AS AT 30 JUNE 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vehicular Bridges</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>$15,497,243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Culverts</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>$15,358,551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footbridges</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>$5,226,641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floodways</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>$8,851,071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$44,933,506</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7 CWMS Assets

The Community Wastewater Management System (CWMS) Network within the Council Area services its customers as per the conditions of its Water Entity Licence as a Fee for Service Business within The Barossa Council. As the CWMS business is licenced as a water entity, it is fully compliant to the Water Industry Act 2012, and delivers services in-line with the Essential Services Commission of South Australia (ESCOSA) approved customer charter and guidelines.

7.1 Asset Breakdown

This asset management plan covers the Community Wastewater Management System (CWMS) assets under the care and control of Council.

Council’s Asset Management System breaks the CWMS assets down into whether the assets are associated with Reuse or Wastewater.

The hierarchy within the asset management system can be seen below:

**Wastewater**

**Reuse**
7.2 Data Collection

The CWMS Pipework Network was valued as at 1 July 2014 using unit rates provided by Tonkin Consulting. All other CWMS assets were revalued using in-house expertise comparing component values to actual costs from recent CWMS Waste Water Treatment Plant construction and industry rate comparisons.

One sixth of The CWMS Pipe Network is condition assessed annually. This sets the maintenance, upgrade and replacement program for the following years.

An in-house condition assessment of lagoons and waste water treatment plants was undertaken in 2013/14 using independent assistance as/when required together with a review of the independent useful life for this asset class.

7.3 Deficiencies Identified

Locations where deficiencies in service performance are known are detailed in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASSET CLASS</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>SERVICE DEFICIENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| CWMS | Drainage systems gravity lines | Drainage systems in townships require regular camera inspections to monitor condition, with some faulty drains replaced or repaired. Effluent infiltration/inflow involves the entry of surface water and groundwater into a wastewater collection system, causing hydraulic overloading of the system. This can result in;  
  • Surging of manholes and house connections, causing effluent to flow over properties, with potential public health impacts  
  • Overflow of effluent from wet wells and bypassing of treatment plants, causing environmental and public health problems  
  • Overloading of the treatment processes, causing a deterioration in effluent quality  
  Excessive pumping costs and increased pump wear; and premature and expensive system augmentations. |
| Critical asset failure (Lagoon, Reticulation Network, Pump Stations, Wastewater Treatment Plants, Reuse water distribution network. | Critical assets are those assets which have a high consequence of failure but not necessarily a high likelihood of failure. By identifying critical assets and critical failure modes, organisations can target and refine investigative activities, maintenance plans and capital expenditure plans at the appropriate time. Operations and maintenance activities may be targeted to mitigate critical assets failure and maintain service levels. These activities may include increased inspection frequency, higher maintenance intervention levels, etc. |
| Legislative Requirements are met | Ensure that all Water Industry Act and ESCOSA requirements are followed. |
### 7.4 Future Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASSET CATEGORY</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>SERVICE CONSIDERATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CWMS</td>
<td>Township</td>
<td>Population growth / new large scale housing developments and new townships. Augmentation of existing or new infrastructure, services and effluent disposal may lead to increased demands on the existing network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td>Maintenance includes all actions necessary for retaining an asset to an appropriate service condition to allow the asset to deliver all of the needs of the community. This may involve the regular ongoing day-to-day work necessary to keep assets operating, but excluding rehabilitation or renewal. Maintenance may be classified into reactive, planned and specific maintenance work activities. Reactive maintenance is unplanned repair work carried out in response to service requests and management/supervisory directions. Planned maintenance is repair work that is identified and managed through a Maintenance Management System (MMS). MMS activities include inspection, assessing the condition against failure/breakdown experience, prioritising, scheduling, actioning the work and reporting what was done to develop a maintenance history and improve maintenance and service delivery performance. Specific maintenance is replacement of higher value components/sub-components of assets that is undertaken on a regular cycle including manhole and inspection point replacement, etc. This work falls below the capital/maintenance threshold but may require a specific budget allocation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Renewal and Replacement Strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td>Planning and scheduling renewal projects to deliver the defined level of service in the most efficient manner,  - Undertaking project scoping for all capital renewal and replacement projects to identify: o the service delivery ‘deficiency’, present risk and optimum time for renewal/replacement, o the project objectives to rectify the deficiency, o of the range of options, estimated capital and life cycle costs for each option that could address the service deficiency, of and evaluate the options against evaluation criteria adopted by the organisation, and of select the best option to be included in capital renewal programs.  - Using ‘low cost’ renewal methods (cost of renewal is less than replacement) wherever possible.  - Maintaining a current infrastructure risk register for assets and service risks associated with providing services from infrastructure assets and reporting Very High and High risks and residual risks after treatment to management and Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**7.5 Asset Summary**

The following CWMS assets are used to provide effluent management and treatment services to the community:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASSET TYPE</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>REPLACEMENT VALUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gravity Mains</td>
<td>178kms</td>
<td>$25,786,984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gravity Property Connections</td>
<td>7,836 Connected</td>
<td>$4,859,674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Customers – 33.5km</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagoons</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$6,028,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man Holes</td>
<td>Bulk Item</td>
<td>$193,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pump Stations</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>$4,277,775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reuse Main</td>
<td>5 segments – 14 kms</td>
<td>$2,051,185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rising Main</td>
<td>324 segments – 44 kms</td>
<td>$6,403,765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Water Treatment Plants and Infrastructure</td>
<td>5 plants</td>
<td>$4,542,488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$54,143,773</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8 COMMUNITY AND RECREATION ASSETS

This infrastructure asset management plan covers the Land, Recreation & Sporting Facilities, Parks & Gardens, Buildings, Carparks & Internal Road assets under the care and control of the Council.

Council’s Asset Management System breaks the Community and Recreation Assets down into Land, Recreation/Sporting Facilities, Parks and Gardens, Buildings and Carparks/Internal Roads. The hierarchy diagram below shows the top layers of the structure, and contains Assets, Elements and Components below each Category:
8.1 Data Collection

In the 2020-2021 financial year Council is undertaking a Building Condition Assessment for Buildings within this class of Assets. The information obtained in this assessment will classify the quality and condition of assets and assist Council to prioritise operating expenditure, future capital works and guide assessment of new initiative budget funding.

The Assessment will also identify any deficiencies and defects within this group of Assets, and provide a suggested five year work plan for improvement.

Data is also collected via Council’s Customer Relationship Management System to inform reactive maintenance tasks and to document suggested improvement or investment.

8.2 Managing the Assets

The Community and Recreation Assets category is one of Council’s largest asset groups, and encompasses many different types of assets. The Asset Types within this class are managed quite differently, and in most cases have a specific service level, plan or strategy in place to identify the required management and maintenance activities. These service levels, plans and strategies can be found on Council’s website.

Land

Council owned and/or managed land is categorised as:

- Crown Land
- Community Land
- Council Owned and Managed Land
- Council Leased (not owned)
- Council Owned and Leased

**Crown Land**

Crown Land vested in the care and control of Council and managed in accordance with the Crown Land Management Act 2009 and any related Crown Condition Agreements.

**Community Land**

Management of Council Owned Community Land is managed in accordance with the Community Land Management Plans (CLMPs) which have been formally adopted by Council. The CLMPs provide a framework for Council to maintain and develop its community land to maximise its use by the community for recreational and leisure activities. Each plan contains the following information:

- Identity of the land and the owner
- Purpose for which it is held
- Objectives, policies and proposals of how the land is managed
- Performance targets and the measurement of performance against objectives and targets
- Nature of any trust, dedication or restriction
Any requirement placed on the land by the owner

**Council Owned and Managed Land**

Parcels of land that Council owns and manages, such as recreation facility locations, are managed in accordance with Council adopted service levels. Masterplans have been developed for each recreation facility location in conjunction with the community and registered user groups and adopted by Council, to provide a blueprint for future development and identify key improvements for each facility.

**Council Leased (not owned)**

This land type is managed in accordance with the lease agreement which Council has entered into with the land owner.

**Council Owned and Leased**

Many user groups, such as sporting clubs and other community groups, lease Council owned land and facilities. A formal lease agreement with the relevant tenant is in place, and identifies any maintenance or renewal responsibilities of Council and the tenant in accordance with Council’s Lease and Licence Policy.

**Recreation / Sporting Facilities**

Sporting and Recreation Assets are managed on a day to day basis in accordance with Council adopted service levels. Both proactive and reactive maintenance requirements are managed in accordance with the Annual Business Plan and Budgets for the facilities. In 2017, Council embarked on a Generational Community Infrastructure Project named “The Big Project”. Medium to long term investment in recreation, sporting, cultural and aquatic facilities is documented within the adopted masterplans and subsequent detailed design for each recreational facility.

Each masterplan has been subject to more detailed component planning, design, cost feasibility assessment and overarching prudential management review as required under the Local Government Act and has in turn been prioritised by Council at its meeting in August 2019. Council partnered with the community and user groups to complete a needs assessment and working groups were established to progress the detailed design elements of each prioritised project element.

**Parks and Gardens**

Parks and Gardens, like Recreation and Sporting Facilities, are managed on a day to day basis in accordance with service levels and Council’s Annual Business Plan and Budget which includes proactive and reactive maintenance requirements. This involves activities such as:

- Mowing
- Irrigation
- Fertilising
- Weeding
- Playground Inspections
- Plus much more

Most of the maintenance activities that are undertaken within Council’s Parks and Gardens are planned, with daily, weekly, fortnightly and monthly tasks scheduled to ensure that the assets are well maintained, safe and are aesthetically pleasing for the community. Customer requests are also key drivers for reactive maintenance activities undertaken.

**Building assets**

Council buildings are managed on a day to day basis in accordance with service levels and Council’s Annual Business Plan and Budget, which includes, proactive and reactive maintenance requirements. Capital investment in building assets in Council’s recreation parks is also documented and approved within The Big Project.

The Building Condition Assessment, which is being undertaken in the 2020/2021 financial year will be an important input in planning for future works, and will be detailed in Appendix 1 – Projected Capital, Renewal and Maintenance Program, from 2021 onwards.
Carparks and Internal Roads
Carparks and Internal Roads form part of the Community and Recreation Asset Class, although the maintenance and renewal activities for these Asset Types is undertaken in accordance with the Transport Asset Class (see Section 5).

8.3 Asset Summary
Below is a brief overview of the number of each Asset Type that Council currently own and maintain.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASSET TYPE</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>VALUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Land</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>$53,560,982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Owned Land</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>$10,551,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Managed Land</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barossa Recreation Assets</td>
<td>179 units</td>
<td>$8,665,528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged and Disabled Services Buildings</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$1,776,645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bushgardens Buildings</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$499,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car Park Buildings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$44,526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemetery Buildings</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$13,072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Buildings</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>$18,004,711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWMS Buildings</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$120,173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depot Buildings</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$307,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office / Library Buildings</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$6,039,902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park / Gardens Buildings</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$2,002,476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Buildings</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$17,675,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sporting Reserve Buildings</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>$25,671,278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Station Buildings</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$30,525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car Parks and Internal Roads</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$751,627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$145,716,010</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9 STORMWATER ASSETS

9.1 Asset Breakdown

Stormwater Assets are currently stored in Council’s Asset Management System, Conquest, however, a review of the formal structure is currently being undertaken during the 2020-2021 financial year.

9.2 Data Collected

Council’s stormwater drainage assets were surveyed in 2009 by visual inspection. Asset detail collected included pipe and pit data and pit depth information. Condition assessment information collected was notional.

The Stormwater Drainage Long Term Plan has been derived from the survey data in conjunction with Flood Mapping and Stormwater Management Plans (SMP) prepared for numerous Water Courses and Townships with an identified flood hazard risk to development. The flood management policies were reviewed in March 2013 and found to be adequate for flood hazard risk assessment. The Stormwater Drainage Long Term Plan is reviewed annually on this basis.

Stormwater Management Plans have been prepared for the following Townships:

- Lyndoch – GHD, September 2004
- Mount Pleasant – GHD, September 2004
- Tanunda – Tonkin, June 2001
- Nuriootpa – Tonkin, to be completed 2020

Flood Mapping Data also exists for the following watercourses:

- Angaston:
  - Angaston Creek
- Nuriootpa:
  - North Para River
  - Kalimna Creek
- Tanunda:
  - North Para River
  - Basedow Creek
  - Tanunda Creek, minimal localised data
- Moculta:
  - Moculta Creek, minimal localised data
- Mount Pleasant:
  - Torrens River
  - Isaac Street (Lot 30), minimal localised data
- Springton:
  - Hamiltons Road creek, minimal localised data
- Lyndoch:
  - Lyndoch Creek, minimal localised data
- Williamstown:
  - Yettie Creek, minimal localised data
- Review of Flood Management Policies, March 2013

9.3 Deficiencies Identified

The stormwater drainage long term construction masterplan outlines known deficiencies with the stormwater drainage infrastructure with planned long term interventions and capital costs.
### 9.4 Asset Summary

The assets covered by this Plan are shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASSET TYPE</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>REPLACEMENT VALUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Box Culvert</td>
<td>384 units</td>
<td>$9,938,239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage Channel</td>
<td>22 units, 1.7km</td>
<td>$2,435,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grated inlet Pit</td>
<td>9 units</td>
<td>$39,533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Pollutant Trap</td>
<td>6 units</td>
<td>$87,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headwall</td>
<td>2,832 units</td>
<td>$3,601,641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junction Box</td>
<td>657 units</td>
<td>$1,986,637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipe</td>
<td>73km</td>
<td>$24,538,218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Entry Pit</td>
<td>1,289 units</td>
<td>$5,282,506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$47,908,999</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10 PLANT AND EQUIPMENT ASSETS

This IAMP covers the Major Plant and Equipment assets under the care and control of Council.

Council’s role is to provide services to its community. Some of these services are provided by assets. Council have purchased Plant and Equipment assets to be used to manage and maintain its infrastructure.

Major Plant and Equipment assets include the following:

- Administration Fleet
- Roller
- Backhoes
- Jetpatcher
- Boats
- Shredder
- Bulldozers
- Skidsteers
- Forklifts
- Tractors
- Graders
- Trailers
- Loaders
- Truck
- Mowers
- Utilities
- Van
- Wood Chipper
- Reach Mowers
10.1 Managing Plant and Equipment

Council records kilometres travelled / hours used or the approved service schedule for Major Plant and Equipment. The information collected assists Council to prioritise operating expenditure, future capital expenditure and guide assessment of major plant upgrades.

Condition of Major Plant and Equipment assets is monitored by Council staff and while a full condition profile has not yet been developed, the following aspects are taken into account:

**Quality** – is operational, fit for purpose to meet agreed Level of Service (LoS) and maintained and managed to industry standards

**Function** – that is appropriate to meet operational requirements

**Capacity / Utilisation** – that is available to meet operation requirements

10.2 Asset Summary

Assets covered by this IAMP include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASSET TYPE</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>REPLACEMENT VALUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial/Light Commercial Vehicle</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$1,133,981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Equipment</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>$754,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Transport – Bus</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$136,443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Transport – Vehicles</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$270,592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWMS Equipment</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$102,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depot Equipment</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$92,062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Equipment</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>$1,588,569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Plant</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>$162,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Equipment</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>$780,707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant – Backhoe/Bobcat</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$536,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant – Grader</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$1,103,774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant – Loader</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$518,657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant – Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$245,319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant – Rollers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$247,248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant – Sweeper</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$321,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant – Tractor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$153,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant – Truck</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$1,597,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Equipment</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>$1,697,792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trailer/Tandem Trailer</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$220,869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$395,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$12,059,824</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11 RIGHT OF USE ASSETS

11.1 What are Right of Use Assets

In February 2016, the Australian Accounting Standards Board (AASB) introduced AASB 16, which is:

"a single lessee accounting model and requires a lessee to recognise assets and liabilities for all leases with a term of more than 12 months, unless the underlying asset is of low value. A lessee is required to recognise a right-of-use asset representing its right to use the underlying leased asset and a lease liability representing its obligations to make lease payments.

A lessee measures right-of-use assets similarly to other non-financial assets (such as property, plant and equipment) and lease liabilities similarly to other financial liabilities. As a consequence, a lessee recognises depreciation of the right-of-use asset and interest on the lease liability...""

As such, Council is introducing Right of Use Assets into its corporate Asset Management System as of 2021. A structure has not yet been decided as to what this will look like.

Right of Use Assets currently covered by this IAMP are:

- Angaston radio transmission site
- ICT Server
- Nuriootpa Office Photocopiers

The remainder of Councils leased items are classed as ‘peppercorn assets’, for which the AASB have given Local Government a temporary relief to include these in the new asset class, due to fair valuation methodology issues. They will continue to be excluded until the AASB make a final determination.

11.2 Data Collection

Council will undertake a review of all its Asset Leases that fall under the definition of Right of Use Assets as per the Standard (including peppercorn assets). It is assumed that all leased items are maintained in accordance with the relevant lease agreements, however this will be reviewed in detail upon creation of the Asset Register.
12 NURIOOTPA CENTENNIAL PARK AUTHORITY

The Nuriootpa Centennial Park Authority (NCPA) manages a tourism, recreational and sporting precinct (Nuriootpa Centennial Park) on behalf of The Barossa Council as a wholly owned subsidiary under s42 of the Local Government Act 1999.

The precinct incorporates:

- Playing fields (football ovals, soccer pitch and tennis / netball courts)
- Community and sporting buildings
- Reserves (including Coulthard Reserve and Bush Chapel)
- Barossa Valley Tourist Park: assets and infrastructure:
  - Cabins: 45
  - Powered Sites: 150
  - Ensuite Powered Sites: 8
  - Unpowered Sites: 20
- Supporting infrastructure (roadways, amenities blocks, playgrounds, barbeque areas, camp kitchen, and power and wastewater infrastructure)

12.1 Managing the Assets

**Barossa Valley Tourist Park (BVTP)**

Maintain a 4 star AAA Tourism (overall) park rating, remain competitive in the tourist accommodation market and increase park profitability and sustainability by:

- Renewing, replacing or removing (as appropriate) outdated, poor performing and aged infrastructure / assets / facilities
- Developing new infrastructure / assets / facilities determined as required to meet needs of key target markets (as identified in the NCPA Business Plan 2013-15);

**Sporting & Recreation Reserve**

Maintain sporting and recreational facilities and infrastructure in partnership with stakeholder user groups to attract visitors to the Barossa region and for sustainable (and increased) utilisation by the Barossa regional community by:

- Supporting user groups in the maintenance, renewal and replacement of existing infrastructure / assets / facilities to continue to meet the needs of users and manage associated risk
- Supporting user groups in the development of new infrastructure / assets / facilities determined as required to meet emerging and future needs of users

**Coulthard Reserve (incorporating the Bush Chapel)**

Provide recreational reserve open space and facilities for visitors to the Barossa region and for sustainable use by the Barossa regional community by:

- Working with key stakeholders to develop a Master Plan for future management of the reserve to maximise amenity, environmental benefit, visitation and use (local community and tourists)
- Implement recommendations from the Master Plan

12.2 Asset Summary

Assets covered by this IAMP include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASSET TYPE</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>REPLACEMENT VALUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td>7 Parcels</td>
<td>$3,770,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings and Structures</td>
<td>74 Units</td>
<td>$11,151,886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant and Equipment</td>
<td>27 Units</td>
<td>$389,855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Infrastructure</td>
<td>60 Units</td>
<td>$2,380,632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSET TYPE</td>
<td>QUANTITY</td>
<td>REPLACEMENT VALUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$17,692,723</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROJECTED CAPITAL, RENEWAL AND MAINTENANCE PROGRAM

Each year Council adopts an Annual Budget (AB) and a Long Term Financial Plan (LTFP). These documents identify the funds that have been allocated to Council’s Assets for Capital, Renewal and Maintenance works.

Adopted Capital Program 2020/21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2020/21 Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CORPORATE &amp; COMMUNITY SERVICES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angas Recreation Park Projects</td>
<td>2,849,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barossa Regional Gallery Air Conditioning (carried forward)</td>
<td>89,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Transport Vehicles (including 18 seater bus)</td>
<td>266,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cudnatta Recreation Park Projects (part externally funded)</td>
<td>141,118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIS Project</td>
<td>65,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Services - Library Books</td>
<td>71,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyndoch Recreation Park Projects (part externally funded)</td>
<td>661,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockwell Park Projects (part externally funded)</td>
<td>509,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taungla Recreation Park Projects (part externally funded)</td>
<td>525,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanunda Recreation Park Projects Retention Monies (carried forward)</td>
<td>86,699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Big Project - Phase 1 Implementation - Buildings (subject to grant funding)</td>
<td>6,231,929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Big Project - Phase 1 Implementation - Recreation (subject to grant funding)</td>
<td>2,954,007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Rex Disability Change Facility (subject to grant funding)</td>
<td>246,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXECUTIVE SERVICES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website Development Project</td>
<td>38,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURIOOTPACENTENNIAL PARK AUTHORITY</td>
<td>87,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Roadworks</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-use Change Rooms (carried forward)</td>
<td>47,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORKS &amp; ENGINEERING</td>
<td>11,727,448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barossa Visitor Information Centre Carpark Resealing (project will only proceed if Council receives part funding)</td>
<td>430,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridges</td>
<td>1,073,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Renewal and Replacement</td>
<td>142,544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemeteries - Cemetery Beam</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Wastewater Management System (CWMS) - including vehicle replacements (part carried forward)</td>
<td>932,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footpaths (some projects will only proceed if Council receives part funding)</td>
<td>1,840,661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Vehicles, Plant and Equipment (part carried forward)</td>
<td>964,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuriootpa Office/Library Airconditioning renewal program</td>
<td>70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playground Equipment Renewal and Upgrade</td>
<td>90,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Resheeting</td>
<td>922,299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Resealing - including Black Spot project (some projects will only proceed if Council receives part funding)</td>
<td>4,170,391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater</td>
<td>929,623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streetscaping - Mount Pleasant Main Street Upgrade</td>
<td>80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanunda and Williamstown Depots Renewal</td>
<td>75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Capital Total</td>
<td>26,552,061</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Adopted Long Term Financial Plan (LTFP)

Asset Sustainability Ratio

The Asset Sustainability Ratio (ASR) is an approximation of the extent to which infrastructure assets managed by Council are being replaced as they reach the end of their useful lives.

A score of 90% or greater shows that Council is sufficiently maintaining, replacing or renewing existing infrastructure assets as they reach the end of their useful life.

A score of less than 90% shows that Council is not sufficiently maintaining, replacing or renewing existing infrastructure assets as they are being depreciated, which may create a ‘renewals backlog’, resulting in a reduction in the service levels and/or useful lives previously expected.
A spike meeting the target generally appears every 5 years, which is most likely aligned to our Condition Assessments. What the trend shows is that since 2012/13, (aside from a slight dip in 2015/16), we are making a steady increase in closing the gap between our actuals and target. The expectation is that the actuals will dip back below the target next year, but based on the previous 5 year period, it is likely that we will continue to close the gap as indicated in the previous 5 years.

**Asset Renewal Funding Ratio – Transport Assets**

The Asset Renewal Funding Ratio (ARFR) considers the forecast renewals versus the planned renewal budget over the next 10 years. It is a summary of the percentage of the short or medium term renewal lifecycle costs that are currently funded in the planned budget. The industry target is 90% or greater per year, on average over the long term period.

The values used to calculate this ratio are for Transport Assets only (road pavement, road surface, footpaths, and kerb and gutter). Information relating to the other asset classes will be provided as and when the data becomes available.

**NPV = 88%**

Net Present Value of Capital Invested over 10 Years - $40,965,000

Needed Investment to Sustain Assets - $46,673,329
The Total Cumulative Budget line shows the closing of the gap between the budgeted amount and the assets that require intervention to bring them back to a condition level of 3. This information is based on the assumption that assets will not continue to be maintained to remain at a condition level of 3 and will become condition level 4 or 5 over the 10 year period. Work will continue to be undertaken to ensure that any maintenance costs currently being reported in the operational budget which actively rehabilitate an asset and increase its condition rating (and life span), will be accounted for accordingly and our data updated to reflect the works.

**Condition Based Assessment**

Where data is available, we will use the Condition of our Assets to determine our Intervention Levels. We are able to do this for the following Asset Classes:

- Transport
- Bridges

**Excluded from this process**

As we are currently in the process of having our Building and Recreation Assets revalued and condition assessed, we have not included these assets in this discussion. **Anticipated Intervention Level Review – March 2021**

CWMS Assets also need to be reviewed as to what has been disposed of and replaced that fall under the Capital threshold. **Anticipated Intervention Level Review – March 2021**
ASSET PRIORITY CLASSIFICATION

Introduction
In order to ensure that all of Councils’ Assets are classified in a fair and justifiable manner, Council has developed a priority rating model with rating score based on field data collection. A weighting score is determined for all of these assets, and is used in modelling to sort assets for treatment in priority order. This is particularly useful where budgets are limited and the model can assign funds to high priority assets.

Ratings are only applied where the data can be measured and verified for that particular asset. The Classification applied to each of the assets will not only be used for modelling purposes, but also to determine Councils’ Level of Service.

Transport

Function
The Function classification for roads (including kerb and gutter) is based upon the number of dwellings or key usage of the road.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCORE</th>
<th>FUNCTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Road Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Track or laneway (no dwellings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Local Access (&lt; 5 dwellings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Local Access (5 to 10 dwellings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Local Access (&gt; 10 dwellings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Local Collector (Connecting activity nodes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Local Collector (Connecting arterial roads)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Regional Collector (connecting centres)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Regional Collector (connecting townships)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Major Regional Collector (mainly roads between towns &gt; 300vpd)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Designated Freight Route (B Double and HML Route)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Social Importance
Social determinants are the conditions that we live, learn, work and play in. These conditions can influence the health and wellbeing of the community, and as such, our roads are assessed as to the access they provide to socially important aspects. They include things like:

- Access to education and educational facilities such as schools, childcare and tertiary education facilities
- Neighbourhood conditions that are close to playgrounds, sporting hubs, grocery stores, employment offerings and public transportation
- Access to health care and support services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCORE</th>
<th>FUNCTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>No social access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Limited social access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Low social access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Minor social access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Some social access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Medium social access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Medium/High social access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>High social access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>High/Very High social access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Very High social access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Critical social access</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Freight Use
Council roads are assessed for their freight use using the Department for Transport, Energy and Infrastructure Heavy Vehicle Access Framework (HVAF) 2011, and uses the following definitions:

- No commercial vehicle use
- Mainly residential occasional commercial vehicle
- Mixture of residential and commercial vehicles
- Commodity freight route – a road that provides access for the movement of commodity freight to or from farms or places of production or delivery
- Commodity freight – bulk primary product loads that are transported on an adhoc or seasonal basis from the place of production to the place of processing or delivery
- General freight route – a road that provides access for the movement of general freight of regional or local significance on a 24-hour basis
- Key freight route – a road that provides access for the movement of general freight of state significance on a 24-hour basis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCORE</th>
<th>FUNCTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>No commercial vehicle use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mainly residential occasional commercial vehicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mixture of residential and commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Commodity freight route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Commodity freight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>General freight route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Key freight route</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOURISM IMPORTANCE</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
<th>FUNCTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>No tourist importance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Low tourist importance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Some tourist importance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>High tourist importance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Very High tourist importance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Critical tourist importance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Buildings**

Due to the similarity of the structures/assets within the Buildings Class, the priority classifications can be applied across the entire Class. It is important to keep in mind that when we refer to “Cemeteries” for example, we are only referring to the building assets at the Cemetery, not the Cemetery itself.

**Utilisation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utilisation</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
<th>FUNCTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>No Usage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Usage up to 40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Usage between 41% and 60%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Usage between 61% and 80%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Essential Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Community Importance – Suitability rating criteria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMUNITY IMPORTANCE</th>
<th>SOCIAL IMPORTANCE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Unsuitable</td>
<td>- Does not meet current user requirements&lt;br&gt; - Poor disposition on the site&lt;br&gt; - No support facilities, eg parking&lt;br&gt; - Very high level of risk to public health and safety&lt;br&gt; - Major non-compliance with codes and regulations requiring major costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>- Does not meet current user requirements&lt;br&gt; - Poor disposition on the site&lt;br&gt; - Poor support facilities, eg parking&lt;br&gt; - High level of risk to public health and safety&lt;br&gt; - Minor non-compliance with codes and regulations requiring rectification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>- Just meets current user requirements&lt;br&gt; - Reasonable disposition on the site&lt;br&gt; - Adequate support facilities, eg parking&lt;br&gt; - Moderate level of risk to public health and safety&lt;br&gt; - May be minor non-compliance with codes and regulations, but requires minimal cost to rectify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>- Meets current user requirements&lt;br&gt; - Good disposition on the site&lt;br&gt; - Excellent support facilities, eg parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>- In excess of current user requirements&lt;br&gt; - Generous disposition on the site&lt;br&gt; - Excellent support facilities, eg parking&lt;br&gt; - Level of risk to public health and safety is negligible&lt;br&gt; - Compliance with codes and regulations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Sport and Recreation Facilities

### Usage – Oval Playing Surface Provision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCORE</th>
<th>SOCIAL IMPORTANCE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1     | Level 3           | Playing surface provision for:  
- HFL - Australian Rules Football (Mount Pleasant), BLCA - Low Grade Cricket (Moculta), Little Athletics, Equestrian, School Activities, Events (eg: Annual Shows, Car Rallies, Festivals) |
| 2     | Level 2           | Playing surface provision for:  
- BLGFA - A Grade & Lower Grade Australian Rules Football (SAAFL Standards)  
- BLCA - A1 Grade & Lower Grades Cricket (SACA/Cricket Australia Standards)  
- Turf Cricket Wicket (except Williamstown & Lyndoch) |
| 3     | Level 1           | Playing surface provision for:  
- SANFL - Pre-season or Minor Round Australian Rules Football matches as per agreement  
- SACA - Pre-season or Sheffield Shield Cricket matches as per agreement  
- BLGFA - A Grade & Lower Grade Australian Rules Football (SANFL Standards)  
- BLCA - A1 Grade & Lower Grade Cricket (SACA Standards)  
- Turf Cricket Wicket |

### Usage – Swimming Pools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCORE</th>
<th>FUNCTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt; 20% of total aquatic visitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>21% to 50% of total aquatic visitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>50% to 80% of total aquatic visitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>80% plus of total aquatic visitation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Community Importance – Sport and Recreation Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCORE</th>
<th>SOCIAL IMPORTANCE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1     | Unsuitable        | Does not meet current user requirements  
- Poor disposition on the site  
- No support facilities, eg parking  
- Very high level of risk to public health and safety  
- Major non-compliance with codes and regulations requiring major costs |
| 2     | Poor              | Does not meet current user requirements  
- Poor disposition on the site  
- Poor support facilities, eg parking  
- High level of risk to public health and safety  
- Minor non-compliance with codes and regulations requiring rectification |
| 3     | Adequate          | Just meets current user requirements  
- Reasonable disposition on the site  
- Adequate support facilities, eg parking  
- Moderate level of risk to public health and safety  
- May be minor non-compliance with codes and regulations, but requires minimal cost to rectify |
| 4     | Good              | Meets current user requirements  
- Good disposition on the site  
- Excellent support facilities, eg parking |
| 5     | Excellent         | In excess of current user requirements  
- Generous disposition on the site  
- Excellent support facilities, eg parking  
- Level of risk to public health and safety is negligible  
- Compliance with codes and regulations |

### Playgrounds

#### Function

The definition for each of the ratings can be found in the ‘Barossa, Light and Lower North Region Open Space, Recreation and Public Realm Strategy’. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCORE</th>
<th>FUNCTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ancillary open space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neighbourhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Regional</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Infrastructure Risk Management Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asset Description</th>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Risk Rating</th>
<th>Risk Mitigation</th>
<th>Residual Risk</th>
<th>Resources / Cost Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Footpaths in poor condition</td>
<td>Injury to pedestrian/cyclists</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Complete footpath condition audit complete reactive repair to footpaths as informed by the Customer request management system</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>2 x internal staff for approximately for four weeks Additional maintenance budget/maintenance staff required, Cost TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sealed roads in poor condition</td>
<td>Increased quantity and extend of road surface defects that could result in a vehicle collision and/or personal injury</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Undertake road condition audits at regular intervals reactive maintenance informed by Council’s Customer Request Management System</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>2 x internal staff for two weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road resurfacing renewal backlog</td>
<td>Roads continue to deteriorate leading to customer dissatisfaction, increased accidents or road closure</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Additional road upgrade projects, increased road infrastructure spend</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>$10M shortfall over forecast 10 year period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsealed roads in poor condition</td>
<td>Poor surface condition could result in vehicle collisions and possible injury</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Undertake regular road surface condition audits including material depthing and testing Reactive maintenance informed by councils customer request management system</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings and recreational assets in poor condition</td>
<td>Structural failure, flooding, loss of service</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Undertake condition audit to inform maintenance and renewal costs</td>
<td>tbc</td>
<td>Consultants have been engaged and report expected late 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building financial management</td>
<td>Increased financial pressure to adequately maintain the full building portfolio</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Annual budget and Long Term Financial Planning process. The Big Project new community assets financial modelling includes provision for maintenance and operations</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Asbestos</td>
<td>Risk of exposure to asbestos from disturbance</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Annual inspections, active asbestos register and warning signs in place</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building utilisation</td>
<td>Low utilisation for some community building facilities, Buildings not suiting the needs of service providers</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Documented service levels risk rating process and prioritisation for establishing future maintenance work</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road and footbridges in poor condition</td>
<td>Poor surface condition could result in vehicle collisions and possible injury</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Condition audit undertaken by professional engineering consultants in 2017</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Additional funding approved for FY20/21 financial year with further review during the annual budget and business plan review process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floods</td>
<td>Flooding caused by inadequate or lack of flood management systems</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Flood infrastructure is in place for Nuriootpa, flood operations and maintenance manual has been developed</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Waste water management system</td>
<td>Loss of service</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Preventive maintenance programme in place, SCADA system to advise faults, On-call staff and system Safety, Reliability Maintenance &amp; Technical Management Plan (SRMTMP) in place</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AGE PROFILES

The purpose of an Age Profile Analysis is to give a graphical view of when Council’s Assets were acquired or built. The data presented in the charts below has been extracted from Council’s Asset Management System (AMS), Conquest. This data should be considered at a high level only, as there is some discrepancies in how the data was originally entered.

Transport Assets

![Transport Assets - Road Assets](chart)
Transport Assets - Footpaths, Kerb & Gutter and Shared Walkways

Bridge Assets - Bridges, Culverts and Footbridges
Condition Rating Assessment Criteria
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Council’s bridge, major culvert and footbridge assets have been componentised into the following categories:

- Approaches
- Abutment
- Surface
- Substructure
- Superstructure
- Wingwall

Each category has been condition rated using methodology based on industry standard and best practice to ensure it is straightforward to implement, is auditable and repeatable.

The following images depict the assessment criteria for Council’s bridges and have been taken from the WSP Bridge Audit report conducted in February 2018 where available.

**Approaches**

Rating 1 – Very Good – only planned maintenance required.

Rating 2 – Good – minor maintenance required plus planned maintenance.

Rating 3 – Fair – significant maintenance required.

Rating 4 – Poor – significant renewal / rehabilitation required.

Rating 5 – Very Poor – physically unsound and/or beyond rehabilitation.

No image currently available for this condition rating.
Surface

Rating 1 – Very Good – only planned maintenance required.

Rating 2 – Good – minor maintenance required plus planned maintenance.
Rating 3 – Fair – significant maintenance required.

Rating 4 – Poor – significant renewal / rehabilitation required.

Rating 5 – Very Poor – physically unsound and/or beyond rehabilitation.
Superstructure

Rating 1 – Very Good – only planned maintenance required.

Rating 2 – Good – minor maintenance required plus planned maintenance.

Rating 3 – Fair – significant maintenance required.

Rating 4 – Poor – significant renewal / rehabilitation required.

Rating 5 – Very Poor – physically unsound and/or beyond rehabilitation.
No image currently available for this condition rating.
Abutment

Rating 1 – Very Good – only planned maintenance required.

Rating 2 – Good – minor maintenance required plus planned maintenance.

Rating 3 – Fair – significant maintenance required.

Rating 4 – Poor – significant renewal / rehabilitation required.

Rating 5 – Very Poor – physically unsound and/or beyond rehabilitation.
Substructure

Rating 1 – Very Good – only planned maintenance required.

Rating 2 – Good – minor maintenance required plus planned maintenance.

Rating 3 – Fair – significant maintenance required.

Rating 4 – Poor – significant renewal / rehabilitation required.

Rating 5 – Very Poor – physically unsound and/or beyond rehabilitation.

No image currently available for this condition rating.
Wingwall

Rating 1 – Very Good – only planned maintenance required.

Rating 2 – Good – minor maintenance required plus planned maintenance.

Rating 3 – Fair – significant maintenance required.

Rating 4 – Poor – significant renewal / rehabilitation required.

Rating 5 – Very Poor – physically unsound and/or beyond rehabilitation.
KERB AND GUTTER

Kerb and Gutter, is typically a concrete structure located at the edge of a carriageway or parking bay designed to provide stormwater drainage. It also acts as a separation barrier between the carriageway and footpath.

Defects associated with kerb and gutter include rotation, vertical displacements, cracking, breaks, spalling, depressions & ponding.

The overall condition of kerb and gutter is determined by the presence of these anomalies over the total length of the asset.

The following images depict the assessment criteria:

Rating 0 – As New

Rating 1 – Excellent Condition

Rating 2 – Good Condition, Minor Defects
Rating 3 – Isolated Deterioration / Displaced Sections / Ponding

Rating 4 – Sections Deterioration and Displaced / Ponding

Rating 5 – Full Deterioration / Displacement / Ponding

No image currently available for this condition rating
FOOTPATHS

A footpath and/or shared use path is a pavement strip of concrete, asphalt, pavers, bitumen seal or crushed rock, laid between the back of the kerb and the property boundary or within land acting as a thoroughfare from point A to point B for pedestrian and/or bicycle use.

Defects associated with footpaths include vertical joint displacements, cracking, panel displacement due to tree roots and spalling.

The overall condition of footpath is determined by the presence of these anomalies over the total length of the asset.

Rating 0 – As New

Rating 1 – Minor Defect, Good Service

Rating 2 – Moderate Defects, Reasonable Service

Rating 3 – Moderate Defects, Repair Needed to Maintain Serviceability
Rating 4 – Significant Replacement Needed

Rating 5 – Complete Replacement Needed
**UNSEALED ROAD**

An unsealed road is typically a road that has been formed and constructed but is not sealed with a hard pavement wearing course.

There are three main condition parameters that can be recorded against unsealed roads, including gravel depth/sheeting condition, drainage (including shape loss of cross section) and/or presence of potholes, roughness and rutting.

The overall condition of road is determined by the presence of these anomalies over the total length of the asset.

The following images depict the assessment criteria:

Unsealed Road Condition Rating 0 – As New

Unsealed Road Condition Rating 1 – Minor Defect, Good Service

Unsealed Road Condition Rating 2 – Moderate Defects, Reasonable Service

Unsealed Road Condition Rating 3 – Moderate Defects, Repair Needed to Maintain Serviceability
Unsealed Road Condition Rating 4 – Significant Replacement Needed

Unsealed Road Condition Rating 5 – Complete Replacement Needed
SEALED ROAD

A sealed road is typically a road that has been formed and constructed and has been sealed with a hard pavement wearing course of asphalt, pavers, spray seal or cold overlay.

A number of criteria is considered and individually assessed then weighted to calculate an overall condition assessment of the road. This criteria includes:

Deformation

Deformation is generally an indication of structural deficiencies of the pavement and can be categorised into the following types:

- Roughness (corrugation) is a transverse form of deformation and indicates the ride quality of road pavement
- Rutting is longitudinal deformation in a wheel path.
- Shoving or heave, refers to bulging or depression of the road surface.

Edge defects

This pavement anomaly usually happens along the edges of bituminous pavement surfaces and the shoulder or the kerb where the sealed surface is not fully supported. It could also occur on tight curves or where the edge of the pavement is vulnerable to traffic wear.

Delamination and stripping

Delamination is the loss of a discrete section of the wearing course layer (surface) in a way that the layer below is visible. Stripping refers to the loss of bitumen and/or aggregate from an asphalt or sprayed seal layer. These defects can lead to the development of potholes.

Ravelling

Ravelling or fretting refers to the progressive disintegration of pavement surface through the loss of both binder and pavement material fines, exposing the pavement aggregate.

Skid Resistance

Skid resistance relates mainly to surface texture or loss of texture. Surface irregularities that affect skid resistance include:

- Flushing or bleeding: this defect appear as excess bitumen on the surface of a pavement. This excess bitumen can be picked up on vehicle tyres during hot weather and may cause loss of skid resistance.
- Polishing: refers to smoothing and rounding of the pavement wearing course aggregate, and normally occurs in the vehicle wheel path. Polished areas look noticeably shiny.
Potholes

A pothole is a hole in a road pavement extending into pavement layers below the wearing course. Potholes are frequently round like in shape and result from the loss of pavement material under traffic due to ravelling, stripping, cracking and/or delamination.

Patching

A patch is a repaired section of pavement placed as a result of localised distortion and/or disintegration of the pavement surface. The presence of patches may be associated with either a loss of serviceability or loss of pavement structural capacity.

Cracking

- Load Induced

  These types of cracking generally indicate insufficient capacity of the pavement and subgrade to withstand the traffic loading and include;

  Block cracking: refers to interconnected cracks forming a series of large blocks approximately rectangular in shape.

  Crocodile cracking (or alligator cracking or crazing): is a type of cracking where a series of interconnected cracks forming small polygons resembling shape of crocodile skin.

- Environmental

  These types of cracking occur due to environmental factors or the age of pavement, and include transverse cracking, which runs across the pavement, diagonal cracking, which runs diagonally across the pavement, meandering cracking, which is unconnected irregular cracking varying in line and direction, crescent of half moon-shaped cracking, occurring in closely spaced parallel groups, and longitudinal cracking, which runs along the pavement.

Binder Age

As a pavement binder ages, its viscosity increases and it becomes more stiff and brittle. The hardening of binder results in various faults and defects becoming more prevalent, including ravelling, stripping or a crumbling of the pavement surface.

Whilst the actual construction date of the road surface is often unknown, provision has been made to rate the binder based on visual inspection of the surface and rating of the binder on a scale from lively to dead.

Aggregate

The aggregate hardness and resistance to wear affects the pavement surface life. Where the aggregate is showing signs of wear, crushing or is powdering, the pavement seal life will be reduced.
The overall condition of a road is determined by the presence of these anomalies and their weighted calculation conditions.

The following images depict the assessment criteria:

Sealed Road Condition Rating 0 – As New Construction

Sealed Road Condition Rating 1 – Minor Defect, Good Service

Sealed Road Condition Rating 2 – Moderate Defects, Reasonable Service

Sealed Road Condition Rating 3 – Moderate Defects, Repair Needed to Maintain Serviceability

Sealed Road Condition Rating 4 – Significant Replacement Needed

Sealed Road Condition Rating 5 – Complete Replacement Needed
COMMUNITY WASTEWATER MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (CWMS)

Gravity Drains (PVC)

The following images depict the assessment criteria for Council’s Gravity Drains (PVC):

0  New

1  Excellent

2  Good Condition, Minor Defects

3  Minor Defects No deformation

4  Defects Present minor deformation

5  Major Defect, Current near future Failure
Gravity Drains

The following images depict the assessment criteria for Council’s Gravity Drains:

0  New

1  Excellent

2  Good Condition, Minor Defects

4  Defects Present minor deformation

5  Major Defect, Current near future Failure
Pump Station Sumps

The following images depict the assessment criteria for Council's Pump Station Sumps:

0  New

1  Excellent

2  Good Condition, Minor Defects

Minor Defects and Corrosion
Manholes

The following images depict the assessment criteria for Council’s Manholes:

0  New

1  Excellent

2  Good Condition, Minor Defects

3  Minor Defects and Corrosion

4  Defects Present minor deformation

5  Major Defect, Current near future Failure

Other CWMS Components
There are a large number of other components in the CWMS and their condition rating is based on industry standards of life expectancy and operational performance.
STATE OF THE ASSETS

The State of the Assets report aims to provide an evidence based assessment of Council’s Assets, looking at their Condition, Functionality and Utilisation/Capacity. Council currently have limited data available, but are working towards updating the data to provide a better picture of the State of the Assets.

Transport

Roads (Pavement and Surface)
Kerb and Gutter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition / Function / Utilisation</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Utilisation / Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor / Very Poor (4, 5, 5+)</td>
<td>2.57%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair (3)</td>
<td>5.91%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good / Very Good (1, 2)</td>
<td>90.97%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Rated</td>
<td>0.54%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Footpaths

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition / Function / Utilisation</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Utilisation / Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor / Very Poor (4, 5, 5+)</td>
<td>7.13%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair (3)</td>
<td>41.74%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good / Very Good (1, 2)</td>
<td>51.05%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Rated</td>
<td>0.09%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bridges

State of the Assets - Bridges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition / Function / Utilisation</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Utilisation / Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor / Very Poor (4, 5, 5+)</td>
<td>2.24%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair (3)</td>
<td>9.14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good / Very Good (1, 2)</td>
<td>88.06%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Rated</td>
<td>0.56%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GLOSSARY

Annual service cost (ASC)
An estimate of the cost that would be tendered, per annum, if tenders were called for the supply of a service to a performance specification for a fixed term. The Annual Service Cost includes operating, maintenance, depreciation, finance/ opportunity and disposal costs, less revenue.

Asset class
Grouping of assets of a similar nature and use in an entity’s operations (AASB 166.37).

Asset condition assessment
The process of continuous or periodic inspection, assessment, measurement and interpretation of the resultant data to indicate the condition of a specific asset so as to determine the need for some preventative or remedial action.

Asset management
The combination of management, financial, economic, engineering and other practices applied to physical assets with the objective of providing the required level of service in the most cost effective manner.

Assets
Future economic benefits controlled by the entity as a result of past transactions or other past events (AAS27.12).

Property, plant and equipment including infrastructure and other assets (such as furniture and fittings) with benefits expected to last more than 12 month.

Average annual asset consumption (AAAC)*
The amount of a local government’s asset base consumed during a year. This may be calculated by dividing the Depreciable Amount (DA) by the Useful Life and totalled for each and every asset OR by dividing the Fair Value (Depreciated Replacement Cost) by the Remaining Life and totalled for each and every asset in an asset category or class.

Capital expansion expenditure
Expenditure that extends an existing asset, at the same standard as is currently enjoyed by residents, to a new group of users. It is discretionary expenditure, which increases future operating, and maintenance costs, because it increases council’s asset base, but may be associated with additional revenue from the new user group, eg. extending a drainage or road network, the provision of an oval or park in a new suburb for new residents.

Capital expenditure
Relatively large (material) expenditure, which has benefits, expected to last for more than 12 months. Capital expenditure includes renewal, expansion and upgrade. Where capital projects involve a combination of renewal, expansion and/or upgrade expenditures, the total project cost needs to be allocated accordingly.

Capital funding
Funding to pay for capital expenditure.

Capital grants
Monies received generally tied to the specific projects for which they are granted, which are often upgrade and/or expansion or new investment proposals.

Capital investment expenditure
See capital expenditure definition

Capital new expenditure
Expenditure which creates a new asset providing a new service to the community that did not exist beforehand. As it increases service potential it may impact revenue and will increase future operating and maintenance expenditure.

Capital renewal expenditure
Expenditure on an existing asset, which returns the service potential or the life of the asset up to that which it had originally. It is periodically required expenditure, relatively large (material) in value compared with the value of the components or sub-components of the asset being renewed. As it reinstates existing service potential, it has no impact on revenue, but may reduce future operating and maintenance expenditure if completed at the optimum time, eg. resurfacing or resheeting a material part of a road network, replacing a material section of a drainage network with pipes of the same capacity, resurfacing an oval. Where capital projects involve a combination of renewal, expansion and/or upgrade expenditures, the total project cost needs to be allocated accordingly.

Capital upgrade expenditure
Expenditure, which enhances an existing asset to provide a higher level of service or expenditure that will increase the life of the asset beyond that which it had originally. Upgrade expenditure is discretionary and often does not result in additional revenue unless direct user charges apply. It will increase operating and maintenance expenditure in the future because of the increase in the council’s asset base, eg. widening the sealed area of an existing road, replacing drainage pipes with pipes of a
greater capacity, enlarging a grandstand at a sporting facility. Where capital projects involve a combination of renewal, expansion and/or upgrade expenditures, the total project cost needs to be allocated accordingly.

**CARRYING AMOUNT**

The amount at which an asset is recognised after deducting any accumulated depreciation / amortisation and accumulated impairment losses thereon.

**CLASS OF ASSETS**

See asset class definition

**COMPONENT**

An individual part of an asset which contributes to the composition of the whole and can be separated from or attached to an asset or a system.

**COST OF AN ASSET**

The amount of cash or cash equivalents paid or the fair value of the consideration given to acquire an asset at the time of its acquisition or construction, plus any costs necessary to place the asset into service. This includes one-off design and project management costs.

**CURRENT REPLACEMENT COST (CRC)**

The cost the entity would incur to acquire the asset on the reporting date. The cost is measured by reference to the lowest cost at which the gross future economic benefits could be obtained in the normal course of business or the minimum it would cost, to replace the existing asset with a technologically modern equivalent new asset (not a second hand one) with the same economic benefits (gross service potential) allowing for any differences in the quantity and quality of output and in operating costs.

**CURRENT REPLACEMENT COST “AS NEW” (CRC)**

The current cost of replacing the original service potential of an existing asset, with a similar modern equivalent asset, i.e. the total cost of replacing an existing asset with an as NEW or similar asset expressed in current dollar values.

**CYCLIC MAINTENANCE**

Replacement of higher value components/subcomponents of assets that is undertaken on a regular cycle including repainting, building roof replacement, cycle, replacement of air conditioning equipment, etc. This work generally falls below the capital/maintenance threshold and needs to be identified in a specific maintenance budget allocation.

**DEPRECIABLE AMOUNT**

The cost of an asset, or other amount substituted for its cost, less its residual value (AASB 116.6)

**DEPRECIATED REPLACEMENT COST (DRC)**

The current replacement cost (CRC) of an asset less, where applicable, accumulated depreciation calculated on the basis of such cost to reflect the already consumed or expired future economic benefits of the asset. This is equivalent to the Written Down Value.

**DEPRECIATION / AMORTISATION**

The systematic allocation of the depreciable amount (service potential) of an asset over its useful life.

**ECONOMIC LIFE**

See useful life definition.

**EXPERIMENT**

The spending of money on goods and services. Expenditure includes recurrent and capital.

**FAIR VALUE**

The amount for which an asset could be exchanged, or a liability settled, between knowledgeable, willing parties, in an arms length transaction.

**HERITAGE ASSET**

An asset with historic, artistic, scientific, technological, geographical or environmental qualities that is held and maintained principally for its contribution to knowledge and culture and this purpose is central to the objectives of the entity holding it.

**INFRASTRUCTURE ASSETS**

Physical assets of the entity or of another entity that contribute to meeting the public’s need for access to major economic and social facilities and services, eg. roads, drainage, footpaths and cycleways. These are typically large, interconnected networks or portfolios of composite assets. The components of these assets may be separately maintained, renewed or replaced individually so that the required level and standard of service from the network of assets is continuously sustained. Generally the components and hence the assets have long lives. They are fixed in place and often have no market value.

**INVESTMENT PROPERTY**

Property held to earn rentals or for capital appreciation or both, rather than for: (a) use in the production or supply of goods or services or for administrative purposes; or (b) sale in the ordinary course of business (AASB 140.5)
Level of service
The defined service quality for a particular service against which service performance may be measured. Service levels usually relate to quality, quantity, reliability, responsiveness, environmental, acceptability and cost).

Life Cycle Cost **
The life cycle cost (LCC) is average cost to provide the service over the longest asset life cycle. It comprises annual maintenance and asset consumption expense, represented by depreciation expense. The Life Cycle Cost does not indicate the funds required to provide the service in a particular year.

Life Cycle Expenditure **
The Life Cycle Expenditure (LCE) is the actual or planned annual maintenance and capital renewal expenditure incurred in providing the service in a particular year. Life Cycle Expenditure may be compared to Life Cycle Expenditure to give an initial indicator of life cycle sustainability.

Loans / borrowings
Loans result in funds being received which are then repaid over a period of time with interest (an additional cost). Their primary benefit is in ‘spreading the burden’ of capital expenditure over time. Although loans enable works to be completed sooner, they are only ultimately cost effective where the capital works funded (generally renewals) result in operating and maintenance cost savings, which are greater than the cost of the loan (interest and charges).

Maintenance and renewal gap
Difference between estimated budgets and projected expenditures for maintenance and renewal of assets, totalled over a defined time (eg 5, 10 and 15 years).

Maintenance and renewal sustainability index
Ratio of estimated budget to projected expenditure for maintenance and renewal of assets over a defined time (eg 5, 10 and 15 years).

Maintenance expenditure
Recurrent expenditure, which is periodically or regularly required as part of the anticipated schedule of works required to ensure that the asset achieves its useful life and provides the required level of service. It is expenditure, which was anticipated in determining the asset’s useful life.

Materiality
An item is material if its omission or misstatement could influence the economic decisions of users taken on the basis of the financial report. Materiality depends on the size and nature of the omission or misstatement judged in the surrounding circumstances.

Modern equivalent asset
A structure similar to an existing structure and having the equivalent productive capacity, which could be built using modern materials, techniques and design. Replacement cost is the basis used to estimate the cost of constructing a modern equivalent asset.

Non-revenue generating investments
Investments for the provision of goods and services to sustain or improve services to the community that are not expected to generate any savings or revenue to the Council, eg parks and playgrounds, footpaths, roads and bridges, libraries, etc.

Operating expenditure
Recurrent expenditure, which is continuously required excluding maintenance and depreciation, eg power, fuel, staff, plant equipment, on-costs and overheads.

Pavement management system
A systematic process for measuring and predicting the condition of road pavements and wearing surfaces over time and recommending corrective actions.

Planned Maintenance**
Repair work that is identified and managed through a maintenance management system (MMS). MMS activities include inspection, assessing the condition against failure/breakdown criteria/experience, prioritising scheduling, actioning the work and reporting what was done to develop a maintenance history and improve maintenance and service delivery performance.

PMS Score
A measure of condition of a road segment determined from a Pavement Management System.

Rate of annual asset consumption*
A measure of average annual consumption of assets (AAAC) expressed as a percentage of the depreciable amount (AAAC/DA). Depreciation may be used for AAAC.

Rate of annual asset renewal*
A measure of the rate at which assets are being renewed per annum expressed as a percentage of depreciable amount (capital renewal expenditure/DA).

Rate of annual asset upgrade*
A measure of the rate at which assets are being upgraded and expanded per annum expressed as a percentage of depreciable amount (capital upgrade/expansion expenditure/DA).
Reactive maintenance
Unplanned repair work that carried out in response to service requests and management/supervisory directions.

Recoverable amount
The higher of an asset's fair value less costs to sell and its value in use.

Recurrent expenditure
Relatively small (immaterial) expenditure or that which has benefits expected to last less than 12 months. Recurrent expenditure includes operating and maintenance expenditure.

Recurrent funding
Funding to pay for recurrent expenditure.

Rehabilitation
See capital renewal expenditure definition above.

Remaining life
The time remaining until an asset ceases to provide the required service level or economic usefulness. Age plus remaining life is economic life.

Renewal
See capital renewal expenditure definition above.

Residual value
The net amount which an entity expects to obtain for an asset at the end of its useful life after deducting the expected costs of disposal.

Revenue generating investments
Investments for the provision of goods and services to sustain or improve services to the community that are expected to generate some savings or revenue to offset operating costs, eg public halls and theatres, childcare centres, sporting and recreation facilities, tourist information centres, etc.

Risk management
The application of a formal process to the range of possible values relating to key factors associated with a risk in order to determine the resultant ranges of outcomes and their probability of occurrence.

Section or segment
A self-contained part or piece of an infrastructure asset.

Service potential
The capacity to provide goods and services in accordance with the entity's objectives, whether those objectives are the generation of net cash inflows or the provision of goods and services of a particular volume and quantity to the beneficiaries thereof.

Service potential remaining*
A measure of the remaining life of assets expressed as a percentage of economic life. It is also a measure of the percentage of the asset's potential to provide services that is still available for use in providing services (DRC/DA).

Strategic Management Plan (SA)**
Documents Council objectives for a specified period (3-5 yrs), the principle activities to achieve the objectives, the means by which that will be carried out, estimated income and expenditure, measures to assess performance and how rating policy relates to the Council's objectives and activities.

Sub-component
Smaller individual parts that make up a component part.

Useful life
Either:

a) the period over which an asset is expected to be available for use by an entity, or
b) the number of production or similar units expected to be obtained from the asset by the entity.

It is estimated or expected time between placing the asset into service and removing it from service, or the estimated period of time over which the future economic benefits embodied in a depreciable asset, are expected to be consumed by the council. It is the same as the economic life.

Value in Use
The present value of estimated future cash flows expected to arise from the continuing use of an asset and from its disposal at the end of its useful life. It is deemed to be depreciated replacement cost (DRC) for those assets whose future economic benefits are not primarily dependent on the asset's ability to generate new cash flows, where if deprived of the asset its future economic benefits would be replaced.

Written Down Value
The Current Replacement Cost (CRC) an asset less, where applicable, accumulated depreciation calculated on the basis of such cost to reflect the already consumed or expired future economic benefits of the asset. This is equivalent to the Depreciated Replacement Cost (DRC).

Source: DVC 2006, Glossary Note: Items shown * modified to use DA instead of CRC Additional glossary items shown **
7.4.1.2 PROPOSED ROAD CLOSURE – 2021 DECLARATION OF VINTAGE
B9187 – 20/64947

**PURPOSE**
The Barons of Barossa have made application to The Barossa Council requesting a road closure for the 2021 Declaration of Vintage Parade.

**RECOMMENDATION**
That the Commissioner of Police be advised that The Barossa Council endorses the closure of the following roads on Sunday 21 February 2021:

- Murray Street, Tanunda between Young Street and the northern arch (approx. 50m north of Elizabeth Street), and
- Bilyara Road, Tanunda for a distance of approximately 25m from Murray Street, and
- Elizabeth Street, Tanunda for a distance of approximately 25m from Murray Street

from 11.00am up to 1.00 pm to stage the 2021 Barons of Barossa Declaration of Vintage event.

**REPORT**

**Background**
The Barons of Barossa were founded in 1975 and continue to proudly and enthusiastically support Barossa wine, viticulture, gastronomy, heritage and the arts. Membership of the Fraternity is by invitation and is offered to persons who have made an outstanding contribution to the Barossa.

New Barons are inducted into the Fraternity in a colourful ceremony and membership is for life.

**Introduction**
Approval was sought to close Murray Street, Tanunda between Young Street and the northern arch between 11.00am and 1.00pm on Sunday 21 February 2021.

**Summary and Conclusion**
Council has previously supported this event as a risk mitigation strategy to maintain the safety of the participants and the general public.
COMMUNITY PLAN / CORPORATE PLAN / LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS

Community Plan

- Community and Culture
- Health and Wellbeing

5. We are a strong community that is welcoming, safe and enjoys a quality lifestyle that celebrates our local identities, diversities, cultures and histories including our Aboriginal heritage.

5.1 Support the development of activities that celebrate the history, art and culture of the Barossa and its people.

10. Our region enjoys the benefits of sustainable community groups, networks and facilities that encourage everybody to participate in the community.
10.3 Build on the capacity of community members to participate in cultural, creative, recreational, sporting and learning opportunities.

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 estimated to be approximately $900.00 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.

COMMUNITY CONSULTATION
The community will be advised of the proposal by public advertisements to be placed in The Herald and Leader and also by placement of the SAPOL notice on Council’s website.
7.5.1. DEBATE AGENDA – DEVELOPMENT SERVICES REPORT

7.5.1.1
PLANNING, DEVELOPMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE ACT - BUSINESS READINESS

Author – Director, Development and Environmental Services

PURPOSE

To provide Council with an overview of the potential resourcing implications of the new planning system, and seek support for additional resources to enable Council to manage transition from the current to the new system.

RECOMMENDATION

That Council:
(1) Support the recruitment of a Development and Customer Support Officer to provide assistance as part of the business readiness strategy for the commencement of the Planning and Design Code for Phase 3 councils in 2021, and
(2) Allocate $52,900 for salary and on-cost to the 2020-21 budget as part of the Q2 review, and allocate a further $80,300 to base budget for 2021-22 financial year.

REPORT

Background

The Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016 (the PDI Act) seeks to deliver a significant modernisation of the planning system in South Australia in 25 years, including the introduction of a number of new tools and a 24/7 digital ePlanning system.

At a glance the new system includes:
• Accredited Practitioners
• Community Engagement
• ePlanning
• Performance Indicators
• State Planning Policies
• Assessment Pathways
• Design Standards
• Infrastructure schemes
• Legislation Practice Directions and Guidelines
• Building reform
Most notably the PDI Act will affect how development policy is formed and amended and how development applications are lodged, assessed, approved and publicly notified. The new Planning and Design Code will become the State’s single reference for assessing all development applications, removing Council specific Development Plans (https://code.plan.sa.gov.au/).

The PDI Act has undergone a five year implementation process that is due to be finalised when the Act is fully operational by mid-2021 (following the Government’s decision to extend the commencement date from 1 July 2020 for Phase 3 councils).

Due to the complexity and volume of legislative and regulatory requirements in which the Development and Environmental Services (DES) Directorate operates the workforce has been required to be adaptable and responsive to the legislative changes as they occur. The Directorate has been monitoring the implementation of the Act, particularly during the Review of the Operations of The Barossa Council’s Directorate for Development and Environmental Services (2017) (the DES Review) and the subsequent DES Administration Review and development of the Workforce Plan (2017 to 2027).

The DES Review and Workforce Plan resulted in the restructuring of the Directorate to create the Development Services business unit bringing together the planning and building functions. The review also examined the Directorate operations by service in terms of efficiency, effectiveness and customer experience improvement opportunities.

Many of the recommendations from the various reviews relating to the services within Development Services have been incorporated into the Lodgement to Inspection Project as part of the broader Change Program. Significant effort has been made to update and document the assessment process in Pathway and introduce ePathway for online lodgement and tracking of applications. This augers well for our readiness for the commencement of the online Planning Portal.

Introduction
The implementation of the PDI Act is seen to have implications upon the workforce, systems and processes of councils across the State. As with any new system there is a high degree of uncertainty as to the actual impacts until it actually commences.

Notwithstanding this, members of the DES, CCS, WES, KATS and ExS teams collaborated to undertake a risk analysis to identify issues that need to be addressed in the lead up the commencement of the new system. These were grouped under the following categories:

- Customer Service
- Governance
- Professional Accreditation
- Workloads
- Planning Portal

A full risk assessment (Attachment 1) was subsequently competed to identify which of the risks needed urgent attention by Council to ensure that the development assessment and compliance functions were maintained in line with the agreed Service Levels and new statutory requirements.
The risk assessment identified the potential need for additional resources to cover the transition period between the old and new systems, and allow Council to monitor the impact of the system over time.

A new initiative was proposed as part of the 2020-21 budget in response to the risk assessment, but this was put on hold due to COVID-19 pandemic and its impact in budget priorities.

Discussion
A PDI Act Transition Working Group has been monitoring the reform and completed a risk analysis and assessment as part of the business readiness transition of the new planning system. The risk assessment, and associated Transition Task List (Attachment 2) takes into consideration the following key outputs:

Output 1: Customer Service / Information
Output 2: Training and Development
Output 3: Professional Accreditation
Output 4: Governance
Output 5: Assessment Panel
Output 6: Assessment
Output 7: Strategic Planning
Output 8: Planning Portal

The Attorney-General’s Department has issued a Business Readiness Checklist (November 2020) for Phase Three Councils that address the following matters:

- User Training and System Familiarisation
- User set up
- Assessment Panels
- Assessment Managers
- Planning Officers
- Building and Compliance Officers
- Administration Officers
- Customer Service Officers
- Marketing and Communication
- Finance Officers
- Internal Referral Officers
- Fees and Charges
- Onscreen Assessment System Setup
- Reporting
- Development Assessment Processes
- Service Desk – Call Forward to Individual Councils

With recent discussions with Council on customer service and assessment outcomes, the Group identified a number of actions which were presented to Council on 18 August 2020 in relation to Output 1. Elements of the Council Resolution were:

- Agree to support messaging to redirect customers from Council’s website to the SA Planning Portal as the first point of contact for information regarding the planning system and assessment processes.
- Agree to utilise the existing Library public PC and scanning equipment for a Service Kiosk to allow applicants to lodge applications via the online Planning Portal.
Agree to waive the additional $80 processing fee for hard copy lodgements until 30 June 2021.

Only accepts applications (hard copy) and payment of fees at the Principal Office (Nuriootpa) for which the Barossa Assessment Panel, Assessment Manager or Council is the relevant authority.

At the November Council Workshop, Members were provided a training session on the new system from Victoria Shute of Kellyd Jones Lawyers and David Altmann of Development Answers. The session highlighted that there is significant implication for Council in managing the transition between the old and new system.

**Resourcing**

**Code Amendment:**

Council’s submission on the Planning and Design Code identified that Council was not given the opportunity to implement various recommended outcomes from recent strategic studies through the Phase 3 Code Amendment. The Code analysis had also identified additional matters for review. While the Phase 3 Code has undergone additional consultation, it is unlikely that major changes will be considered by the State Planning Commission (refer to separate agenda report on Code Submission).

Accordingly, it is considered that Council would still require resources to work in the strategy/policy amendment area to deliver on these outcomes, as well as working alongside the assessment team to identify errors/omissions in the Code that may have unforeseen or unintentional development outcomes.

With the departure of the Principal Planner, it is recommended that Council engage suitably qualified professional consultant to assist any future policy amendment/review, and allocate budget as and when the need is presented to Council for consideration via the Strategic Planning and Development Policy Committee.

A report will be presented to Council sometime in the New Year on the future arrangement of the Committee.

**Development Assessment:**

With the departure of the Principal Planner, the business unit intends to redirect resources to an additional Assessment Officer. As highlighted in the ‘what we heard’ response at the December Council Workshop, the additional resources will enable the assessment team to provide more of an “educative, supportive, collaborative case management approach” to applicants.

A consultative-style of service provision regarding general and pre-lodgement advice, including site inspections, and navigating statutory systems can be more effectively administered as the team manage workloads made up of applications under the old and new system for possibly a 12-18 month transition period.

**Compliance:**

The compliance function taken on by Council has shown to be well received by the community and has generated a level of compliance and development assessment activity. With the uncertainty of the new regime, there is a potential for additional activity.
To support this, the initial new initiative for 2020-21 budget had identified an additional Compliance Officer to assist in this area. Notably, this resource could be delayed until such time that the actual demand is warranted.

Customer Support/Education:

In the new initiative for 2020-21 budget, an additional resource Assessment Officer - Planning Assistant role was proposed that would assist the assessment team to deal with the assessment process. In addition, the Council Resolution from August addressed some of the risks associated with Output 1.

Within the context of the broader Council resourcing review being undertaken by the CEO, and the desire to have a customer-centric delivery of the development assessment function, the Director CCS and DES have identified a need to deliver quality service to our customers at the counter, especially in navigating the Planning Portal and Planning and Design Code.

Accordingly it is proposed that an additional Development and Customer Support Officer be budgeted for that can work across both Development Services and Customer Support but based at the front counter. The focus of this Officer would be the first point of contact with regard to the utilisation of the Planning Portal and navigation of the Planning and Design Code for applicants. When not servicing applicants etc, they would provide in other customer support services to alleviate identified pressures in the Corporate and Community Services Directorate.

As the first point of contact, this Officer will deal with the majority of planning and building related queries, and only refer to the assessment team when required. Enabling the assessment and administration teams to focus on assessment outputs, back of house and the case management approach.

Summary and Conclusion
Implementation of the new planning system will not necessarily bring about the efficient and effective system that was initially touted by the planning reform. Professional staff and community members will require a period of adjustment, and navigate their understanding of the new online portal and assessment pathways, while also maintaining workloads under the current system.

As part of the business readiness strategy through the transition period, it is proposed that in order to provide a customer-centric approach, more effort will be required to provide an educative, supportive, collaborative case management approach to the community at the front line, and ensuring that assessment timeframes are consistently met across the two systems. This approach also assists with some identified resourcing pressures in the Customer Support Team which are subject of continued consideration as part of the CEO resourcing review.

ATTACHMENTS OR OTHER SUPPORTING REFERENCES
Attachment 1 – Risk Assessment
Attachment 2 – Transition Task List
Attachment 3 – Phase 3 Council Check List

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.

1.12 Build and maintain relationships with other levels of government to ensure development strategies are responsive to regional needs and issues.

Legislative Requirements
Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016

FINANCIAL, RESOURCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT CONSIDERATIONS

Financial Management
For the majority of the resource changes proposed, existing salary budget allocations can be used to fund the positions and variations to existing roles.

Notwithstanding this, it is recommended that Council allocate additional budget for the proposed Development and Customer Support Officer. As a General Officer level 3, a budget allocation of $52,900 is required for salary and on-cost until the end of the 2020-21 financial year. A full year’s allocation for 2021-22 would be in the order of $80,300.

Risk Management
A risk analysis undertaken by staff identified issues that need to be address in the lead up the commencement of the new system. The analysis examined customer service, governance, professional accreditation, workloads, and the Planning Portal.

More recently, Council has raised its concerns over the performance of the development assessment function following an article published in The Advertiser. Key elements in that feedback included performance/quarterly reporting, team performance, complexity of assessment/customer outcomes.

In presenting a case management approach, each Officer would be required to have a truly manageable personal workload to give applicants due regard in dealing with Council, especially under the new system which has more stringent timeframes. Opportunities for case management and improving assessment times are achievable through the various actions being pursued by the working group and the resourcing initiatives identified in this report.

Legal advice has confirmed we are able to provide more customer focussed preliminary advice, attend site meetings, and case manage applications to a greater extent. This would require that two Officers are present at all times with the customer[s] to witness the advice given. In addition, subsequent assessment of the application would need to be undertaken by another independent Officer. The above described scenario would obviously require more resourcing to be administered so as not to delay current assessment times. The additional assessment officer would support this scenario.

COMMUNITY CONSULTATION

Nil
### 1. Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gary Mavrinac</td>
<td>Director Development and Environmental Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis Monteduro</td>
<td>Manager Development Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Mickan</td>
<td>Principal Planner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janine Lennon</td>
<td>Senior Assessment Officer – Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Xerri</td>
<td>Senior Assessment Officer – Building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Kaesler</td>
<td>Manager Engineering Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo Moen</td>
<td>Manager Executive Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Horsell</td>
<td>Manager Knowledge and Technical Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberley Rohan</td>
<td>People and Culture Advisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne Hampel</td>
<td>Coordinator Customer Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugiyya Martin</td>
<td>Governance Advisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2. Risk Assessment Development/Review Team

- **Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act – DES Implementation**

### 3. Related Support Documents

- Risk Matrix, Likelihood and Consequence Descriptors - 18/42058*
- Risk Management Policy - TBCPQC3100 - 13/47307[v1]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Risk / Description</th>
<th>Level of Consequence</th>
<th>Level of Likelihood</th>
<th>Level of Risk</th>
<th>Tag: L</th>
<th>What existing controls are in place now</th>
<th>Treatment Options: Reduce the risk</th>
<th>Person(s) Responsible</th>
<th>Date the control(s) to be implemented</th>
<th>When will the control(s) be reviewed – To determine Residual Risk</th>
<th>The Risk – Accept? Reduce? Substitute? Eliminate?</th>
<th>Risk Owner – Position Ultimately accountable for this risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>CUSTOMER SERVICE - Duplication of lodgement of applications into two systems (Portal and Pathway)</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>L7</td>
<td>L7</td>
<td>User Guides</td>
<td>Review tasks/functions Planners/Admin Technical Support to undertake this responsibility Training of officers in new requirements for lodgement stage.</td>
<td>MDS</td>
<td>September 2020</td>
<td>On commencement of PDI Act – 3, 6, 9 and 12 month reviews</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>MDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>CUSTOMER SERVICE - Pre-lodgement advice</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>L2</td>
<td>H16</td>
<td>L9</td>
<td>Existing service provided by Officers through CRM System to document advice as per agreed processes from L2 project.</td>
<td>User Guide Templates Training of officers</td>
<td>MDS</td>
<td>September 2020</td>
<td>On commencement of PDI Act – 3, 6, 9 and 12 month reviews</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>MDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>CUSTOMER SERVICE - Single person point of contact</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>L5</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>If required, Senior Officers to coordinate meeting with key personnel to identify all issues and potential solutions – agreed service level and process identified by L2 project Internal Referral System Pathway documents advice</td>
<td>DES Manual to address key position and task requirements for new system</td>
<td>MDS</td>
<td>June 2020</td>
<td>On commencement of PDI Act – 3, 6, 9 and 12 month reviews</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>MDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>CUSTOMER SERVICE - Insufficient information provided with applications at the lodgement stage to accurately assign assessment pathway/ relevant authority</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>H18</td>
<td>M13</td>
<td>Resources: 1 x Planning Officer 1 x Admin/Technical Officers User Guides Fact sheets</td>
<td>Preliminary check by a Technical Support Officer before lodgement to ensure adequate information and determine who the Relevant Authority is – requires confirmation of the assessment pathway. Senior Officer required for verification/allocation stage of</td>
<td>MDS</td>
<td>June 2020</td>
<td>On commencement of PDI Act – 3, 6, 9 and 12 month reviews</td>
<td>Reduce</td>
<td>MDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>Risk</td>
<td>Risk Identification (Describe the issue in detail, referencing the Consequence and likelihood statements)</td>
<td>Level of Consequence</td>
<td>Level of Likelihood</td>
<td>Level of Risk</td>
<td>What existing controls are in place now</td>
<td>Treatment Option(s) – Describe additional control(s) required to reduce the risk</td>
<td>Person(s) Responsible</td>
<td>Date the control(s) to be implemented</td>
<td>When will the control(s) be reviewed – To determine Residual Risk</td>
<td>Person(s) to review</td>
<td>The Risk - Accept? Reduce? Substitute? Eliminate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>CUSTOMER SERVICE</td>
<td>Lodgement of paper based development applications at Counter for scanning to the Planning Portal</td>
<td>Delays in processing applications. Requires resources to scan applications on behalf of ratepayers/developers to enable lodgement into the Portal. <strong>IMPACT:</strong> Minor to Moderate impact on service delivery to customers can be expected. Potential disruption to delivery of other services at the counter (i.e. rates processing). Additional costs to provide services (i.e. equipment).</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>L2</td>
<td>L4</td>
<td>L4</td>
<td>Resources: 1 x Planning Officer 1 x Admin/Technical Officers User Guides Fact sheets Should we follow our current practice of undertaking the lodgement procedure if a hard copy is brought in to Council? YES</td>
<td>What information do we provide to our customers to streamline this process? Provision of scanner at counter for self-service? Admin/Technical Support to scan applications? Review tasks/functions Admin Technical Support to undertake this responsibility Training of Officers</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>CUSTOMER SERVICE</td>
<td>Acceptance and lodgement of an application in another council area on the Planning Portal</td>
<td>How do we manage requests to lodge that relate to another council area? The expectation for one council to accept and lodge an application in another council is still to be confirmed. Potential for increased in service delivery by Council to provide support to ratepayers/developers. <strong>IMPACT:</strong> Minor to Moderate impact on service delivery to customers can be expected. Disruption to delivery of other services at the counter (i.e. rates processing).</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>L2</td>
<td>L4</td>
<td>L4</td>
<td>Resources: 1 x Planning Officer 1 x Admin/Technical Officers</td>
<td>Initial validation stage required to validate location that is in our area – by Admin/Technical Support User Guides Fact sheets Review tasks/functions Admin Technical Support to undertake this responsibility Training of Officers ACTION: Service Level decision by Executive as to</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## GOVERNANCE

Where the Assessment Manager and Assessment Panel are the Relevant Authorities, delegations/sub-delegations will have to be authorised by those relevant authorities and not Council. In addition, Council will have its own delegations instrument as a Designated Authority under the PDI Act.

Current system of delegation no longer the same under the PDI Act.

Need to ensure that powers delegated and sub-delegated have appropriate conditions and limitations so that the requirement for accreditation, where appropriate, is not being circumvented.

**IMPACT:**
Minor impact on service delivery to customers can be expected, and a moderate to major impact if delegations and sub-delegations are not finalised and adopted by the commencement of the PDI Act.

### Resources:
- 1 x GA
- 1 x Manager
- 1 x Director
- LGA templates
- Annual Review process – no longer required under the Local Government Act.

### New Delegation Instruments issued by LGA:
1. Council as Designated Authority and Entity
2. Council as Relevant Authority
3. Assessment Manager
4. Assessment Panel

Instruments will need to be adopted by BAP and Council respectively, at the latest, in August, and sub-delegation instruments to be issued thereafter.

New Instruments can be managed as per usual delegation/sub-delegation process and use the same resources/templates.

In terms of the actual delegations, Norman Waterhouse recommends that the BAP delegate most of its powers to the AM and the AM sub-delegates (as opposed to BAP delegating directly to officers). This is a cleaner model and allows greater efficiency.

Existing delegations under the Development Act to remain until all DA applications are complete.

Training planned for Panel members in March 2020

Training for officers to be scheduled

### Risk Identification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Level of Consequence

1. C5
2. L1
3. E25
4. \[ \]

### Level of Likelihood

1. C3
2. L5
3. L8

### Level of Risk

1. GA
2. August 2020
3. As needed
4. Accept
5. DOES

### Treatment Option(s)

- Describe additional control(s) required to reduce the risk

### Person(s) Responsible

- Date the control(s) to be implemented

### When will the control(s) be reviewed

- To determine Residual Risk

### The Risk - Accept? Reduce? Substitute? Eliminate?

- Risk Owner – Position Ultimately accountable for this risk

- Whether service is to be provided.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Risk Identification (Describe the issue in detail, referencing the Consequence and likelihood statements)</th>
<th>Level of Consequence</th>
<th>Level of Likelihood</th>
<th>Level of Risk</th>
<th>Targ et</th>
<th>What existing controls are in place now</th>
<th>Treatment Option(s) – Describe additional control(s) required to reduce the risk</th>
<th>Level of Residual Consequence</th>
<th>Level of Residual Likelihood</th>
<th>Level of Residual Risk</th>
<th>Person(s) Responsible</th>
<th>Date the control(s) to be implemented</th>
<th>When will the control(s) be reviewed – To determine Residual Risk</th>
<th>The Risk - Accept? Reduce? Substitute? Eliminate?</th>
<th>Risk Owner – Position Ultimately accountable for this risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>GOVERNANCE</td>
<td>Officers do not have delegations and sub-delegations under the Planning Code and Practice Directions</td>
<td>C5 L1 E25 L8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Resources: 1 x GA 1 x Manager 1 x Director Delegations not yet issued by the LGA</td>
<td>Adopt delegations and sub-delegate as appropriate as soon as delegation Instruments are issued, or at the latest prior to the commencement of the Act.</td>
<td>C3 L5 L8</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>August 2020</td>
<td>As needed</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>DOES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>GOVERNANCE</td>
<td>Acting Assessment Manager</td>
<td>C5 L1 E25</td>
<td>Eliminate</td>
<td>None needed – officers are able to act in any role under the Development Act (subject to qualifications etc.)</td>
<td>Norman Waterhouse has indicated that they will provide in-depth advice on how to deal with this matter. However, in the meantime, they have suggested that the AM delegate their powers to other officers in their absence. This delegation can be for a limited time period. Alternatively, the AM can have a standing delegation to a particular officer such as the CEO, and the CEO sub-delegates to relevant officers when needed – this would be better as it contemplates the AM taking emergency leave.</td>
<td>NA NA NA</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>August 2020</td>
<td>As needed</td>
<td>Eliminate</td>
<td>DOES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>GOVERNANCE</td>
<td>BAP Review of Assessment Manager Decision Policy Ensuring there is a mechanism for BAP to review AM Decisions</td>
<td>C4 L2 E21</td>
<td>Eliminate</td>
<td>No current policy/process – new requirements</td>
<td>Adopt new Policy based on LGA model Policy and Code of Conduct training should be provided to BAP members at induction</td>
<td>NA NA NA</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>August 2020</td>
<td>Policy review is generally every 4 years</td>
<td>Eliminate</td>
<td>DOES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>Risk</td>
<td>Risk Identification (Describe the issue in detail, referencing the Consequence and likelihood statements)</td>
<td>Level of Consequence</td>
<td>Level of Likelihood</td>
<td>Treatment Options</td>
<td>Date the control(s) to be implemented</td>
<td>When will the control(s) be reviewed</td>
<td>The Risk - Accept?</td>
<td>Risk Owner - Position Ultimately accountable for this risk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>GOVERNANCE</td>
<td>Policy of Notification – Accredited Professionals Ensuring Council has up-to-date records of accreditation</td>
<td>Accredited Officers are required to provide up-to-date records of accreditation, or notifiable events (changes to accreditation). <strong>IMPACT:</strong> Minor to moderate impact to service levels if Policy or other method of ensuring accredited officers provide their accreditation documents to the CEO, not adopted.</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>L5</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>Resources: 1 x PCA 1 x GA 1 x Manager 1 x Admin/Technical Officers ≤1 FTE</td>
<td>Decision needed on what model is to be adopted on extent of accreditation to be required by officers – minimum that AM is Planning Level 1, and Building Officer Level 1. Qualification of decision making? – Recommendation that all officers be accredited. The LGA has issued a new model policy setting out requirement for AO’s to provide up-to-date information as per the Act, New Policy to be adopted Policy training should be provided to BAP members at induction Utilise Skytrust to maintain record of competency requirements</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>June 2020</td>
<td>Policy review is generally every 4 years.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>DDES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>GOVERNANCE</td>
<td>Copyright Policy</td>
<td>Amendment to policy required. However, it is still necessary for the Development Act provisions in the Policy with respect to requests for information for matters prior to PDI Act commencement, to stay in place. <strong>IMPACT:</strong> Little impact upon service delivery or service levels to customers.</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>L5</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>Copyright Management Policy Resources: 1 x GA 1 x Manager 1 x Admin/Technical Officers ≤1 FTE</td>
<td>Review of Copyright Management Policy to ensure in line with PDI Act</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>June 2020</td>
<td>Policy review is generally every 4 years or as needed.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>MDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>GOVERNANCE</td>
<td>Review of Internal Review of Council Decisions Policy and Process under section 270 of Local Government Act</td>
<td>The Internal Review policy and process currently excludes decisions where other legislation governs review of specific type of decision. Norman Waterhouse recommends specifically excluding decisions made under the PDI Act from the scope of the 1270 review policy and process, as there is a legislative</td>
<td>TO BE VERIFIED – RE CONSENT/APPROVAL ISSUED BY COUNCIL</td>
<td>The Internal Review policy and process currently excludes decisions where other legislation governs review of specific type of decision, and includes the Development Act as an example.</td>
<td>At next review, include decisions under the PDI Act as an example of an excluded decision to ensure consistency.</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>At next review of policy and process.</td>
<td>Policy review is generally every 4 years or as needed.</td>
<td>Reduce</td>
<td>DDES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>Risk</td>
<td>Risk Identification (Describe the issue in detail, referencing the Consequence and likelihood statements)</td>
<td>Level of Consequence</td>
<td>Level of Likelihood</td>
<td>Level of Risk</td>
<td>Treatment Option(s)</td>
<td>Person(s) Responsible</td>
<td>Date the control(s) to be implemented</td>
<td>When will the control(s) be reviewed</td>
<td>The Risk - Accept?</td>
<td>The Risk - Reduce?</td>
<td>The Risk - Substitute?</td>
<td>The Risk - Eliminate?</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>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>GOVERNANCE</td>
<td>Appointment of Authorised Officers under the PDI Act – to inspect and obtain information</td>
<td>Moderate impact to service levels</td>
<td>Currently, the Building and Planning team are appointed as authorised officers under the Development Act.</td>
<td>Council to delegate power to appoint authorised officers to CEO. CEO to appoint authorised officers under PDI Act. TNA to capture requirements for officers</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>L5</td>
<td>M13</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>June 2020</td>
<td>As needed</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>MDES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>GOVERNANCE</td>
<td>Inability to appoint an Assessment Panel and Assessment Manager</td>
<td>Moderate to Major impact on service delivery to customers can be expected, if panel not established.</td>
<td>Resources: 1 x GA 1 x Manager 1 x Admin/Technical Officers (&lt;1 FTE)</td>
<td>Accreditation of officer(s) to enable appointment as Assessment Manager. Process of appointing a ‘temporary’ Assessment Manager</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>L7</td>
<td>L7</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>MDES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>GOVERNANCE</td>
<td>Deemed approval for building rules consent as a result of BAP being unable to refer the matter to Council within required timeframes due to timing of meetings</td>
<td>None required</td>
<td>None required</td>
<td>Norman Waterhouse Lawyers has recommended that the BAP have a standing referral to Council for all building rules consent matters – should be a decision made at first BAP meeting.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>Aug 2020</td>
<td>MDS</td>
<td>MDS</td>
<td>MDS</td>
<td>MDS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>Risk</td>
<td>Risk Identification (Describe the issue in detail, referencing the Consequence and likelihood statements)</td>
<td>Level of Consequence</td>
<td>Level of Likelihood</td>
<td>Level of Risk</td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Treatment Option(s) – Describe additional control(s) required to reduce the risk</td>
<td>Person(s) Responsible</td>
<td>Date the control(s) to be implemented</td>
<td>When will the control(s) be reviewed</td>
<td>The Risk - Accept?</td>
<td>Reduce?</td>
<td>Substitute?</td>
<td>Eliminate?</td>
<td>Risk Owner – Position Ultimately accountable for this risk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TO BE VERIFIED – NOT SEEN AS A RISK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Delegation of building rules consent provisions under section 110 can be made to relevant officers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>PROFESSIONAL ACCREDITATION</td>
<td>Officers not accredited</td>
<td>PDI Act requires accreditation of those who it confers powers to as Relevant Authorities in some cases (e.g. Assessment Manager). The PDI Accreditation Scheme requires ongoing CPD requirements – increased cost for training Council must seek advice from Accredited Building professional before issuing building consent. Building Surveyors will be required to hold an AIBS and PDI Accreditation and Registration. Who is likely to be accredited by 1 July? Should all council officers be accredited or just a select few with the remainder operating under delegation from the Assessment Manager? Do accredited council officers also require delegation, given that they may operate as a Relevant Authority for certain classes of applications? Can they also operate as a private services or as a shared service? IMPACT: Minor to Moderate impact on service delivery to customers can be expected. Ongoing financial cost to maintain accreditation (registration and training).</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>l3</td>
<td>l12</td>
<td>L7</td>
<td>1 x accredited level 1 planning 1 x accredited level 1 planning (PENDING) 1 x accredited level 1 building 1 x accredited level 3 building 1 x accredited level 3 building (PENDING) Training and Development opportunities provided through annual Performance Partnering and Training Needs Analysis Budget allocation for professional development</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>DOES MDS HR</td>
<td>June 2020</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>DDES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>PROFESSIONAL ACCREDITATION</td>
<td>Maintaining appropriate officer accreditation</td>
<td>We need to effectively support employee development in terms of accreditation, CPD from seminars, conferences and other training needs, staff resource levels need to be sufficient minimum so that staff absences do not result in undue workload pressures on remaining staff.</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>l3</td>
<td>l12</td>
<td>L7</td>
<td>No current position of accreditation requirement for officers. Performance Partnering Training Needs Analysis</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>DOES MDS HR</td>
<td>June 2020</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>DDES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>Risk</td>
<td>Risk Identification (Describe the issue in detail, referencing the Consequence and likelihood statements)</td>
<td>Level of Consequence</td>
<td>Level of Likelihood</td>
<td>Level of Risk</td>
<td>Treatment Option(s) – Describe additional control(s) required to reduce the risk</td>
<td>Date the control(s) to be implemented</td>
<td>When will the control(s) be reviewed – To determine Residual Risk</td>
<td>The Risk - Accept? Reduce? Substitue? Eliminate?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low level of existing staff accreditation. IMPACT: Minor to Moderate impact on service delivery to customers can be expected. Ongoing financial cost to maintain accreditation (registration and training).</td>
<td>L2</td>
<td>E2</td>
<td>M14</td>
<td>Resources: 1 x Assessment Manager 3 x Planning Officers [3FTE] 3 x Admin/Technical Officers [&lt;2 FTE] Admin-Technical Officers to undertake basic assessment (i.e. para professional) as per Workforce Plan. Recruitment of replacement officer? Training/upskilling of Admin-Technical Officers. Public PC available at library locations for community to access Planning Portal. Increase customer service/education Portal – dashboard – workload / workflow, Integration of data with Pathway – streamlining systems, Channel community to Portal via website, Review Task Guidelines for front line elements i.e. Pre Lodgement and Verification Stage, Job Design and Training for tasks. &gt; Admin-Technical Officers qualified/trained to undertake pre-lodgement check – requires reallocation of resource/potential additional FTE to backfill admin tasks. Review Job Design Development Services Team including • Admin and Technical Support • Assessment Officers – Planning and Building • Compliance Officers Temporary increase in Admin to support training and upskilling of Admin and Technical Support Officers</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>L4</td>
<td>M14</td>
<td>MDS</td>
<td>MDS SAO HR</td>
<td>March 2020</td>
<td>July 2020</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>MDS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.1 WORKLOADS Increase in planning assessments and procedural requirements under new system</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td>L2</td>
<td>E24</td>
<td>M14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1 WORKLOADS
Increase in planning assessments and procedural requirements under new system

Potential for more Performance Assessed application in the system – greater level of effort and process required.

Greater technical assessment of an application required at the Verification Stage (pre-lodgement) to ensure that the application proceeds efficiently for the remainder of the assessment pathway.

Current resources to be depleted with pending leave/retirement of senior officer and current vacant FTE (0.6). Recruitment of new officer – what requirements/skills are needed going forward? Where is the workload demand – strategic/policy/assessment/compliance/administration-technical?

Deemed Consent
Tighter statutory timeframes for planning assessment - risk for ‘deemed consent’ when timeframe not met. Likely that certain consultants will be active in this space.

Public Notifications
Required for all Performance Assessed applications. Increased tasks and costs: Statutory Signage - Who to install, check and remove, and where to store? May be some exemptions for rural/regional councils stipulated in the Code.

Assessment Panel
Potential for more reports being presented to the Panel. Potential need for more meetings – cost? Budget provision needed for
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Risk Identification (Describe the issue in detail, referencing the Consequence and likelihood statements)</th>
<th>Level of Consequence</th>
<th>Level of Likelihood</th>
<th>Level of Risk</th>
<th>Trg</th>
<th>Treatment Option(s) – Describe additional control(s) required to reduce the risk</th>
<th>Level of Consequence</th>
<th>Level of Likelihood</th>
<th>Level of Risk</th>
<th>Person(s) Responsible</th>
<th>Date the control(s) to be implemented</th>
<th>When will the control(s) be reviewed – To determine Residual Risk</th>
<th>The Risk - Accept? Reduce? Substitute? Eliminate?</th>
<th>Risk Owner – Position Ultimately accountable for this risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|     |      | Restricted Development  
Assessment by SCAP – resources to make submissions and monitor public notification.  
IMPACT:  
Moderate to Major impact on service delivery to customers can be expected, if there are delays to assessments. Potential for increased legal cost to Council if issues refusal to avoid Deemed Consents. Additional financial costs – Assessment Panel. Council reputation may be impacted and potential loss of planning functions. Potential added workload for planning staff. |                   |                  |               |     | Have an agreed Service Level (BAP policy position required) that applications refused if 'deemed consent' is flagged as pending.  
Having leave entitlements covered to maintain service level. Use of temporary resources.  
If required by Applicant for Council to undertake task: Service Agreement/ Resourcing to undertake installation/ maintenance of signage – DES, WES or Contractor. Budget provision needed for service from 2020-21 budget.  
Build capacity for Panel Members to receive all documentation electronically.  
Review BAP meeting schedule – process for additional meetings and scope for remote meetings.  
Decision by Council required on sitting fee per meeting or having a retainer for year member per year regardless number of meeting (to control costs).  
Require to confirm Service Level position on receiving and lodging application on behalf of customer within another council area, and assistance in navigating the Portal. |                   |                  |               |     |                                                                                  | C4                  | L4               | M14           | C4                  | L4                  | M14                  | DDES                  | March 2020 | July 2020                  | Accept                  | MDS                  |
### Impact of current operational environment

- Time when it is not back-filled. Current consultant budgets for this are low and rarely result in value for money.
- Increased record keeping requirements has increased administrative workloads across all positions in council.
- Shopping for opinions has increased steadily over the last four or five years resulting in advising officers explaining themselves to a number of different parties.
- Disregard for officer level advice. This results in more recording keeping, explanatory statements, etc. being necessary.
- Increasing level of unauthorised development and/or responding to oversight bodies. Compliance and enforcement matters are rarely expedient and it is taking longer and longer to gain cooperation or effective collaboration between the parties.
- General readiness to challenge council authority with respect to state, local, or other requirements. Responding to this creates downtime for officers when trying to provide routine advice or explain routine requirements for making an application.

**IMPACT:**
- Moderate to Major impact on service delivery to customers can be expected, if there are delays to assessments. Potential added workload for planning staff.

**4.3 WORKLOADS**

- Increase in building assessments, inspections and compliance requirements under new system.
- Region may suffer as not all councils have a Level 1 building officer, so Barossa may be called upon for shared services (if required).

**Resources:**
- 1 x Manager
- 2 x Building Officers [2FTE]  
- 2 x Admin/Technical Officers [2FTE]

**Review Job Design**
- **Admin and Technical Support Officers**
- **Assessment Officers Building**

**Person(s) Responsible**
- MOD
- SAO/s

**Date the control(s) to be implemented**
- June 2020

**When will the control(s) be reviewed**
- To determine Residual Risk

- Accept

**Risk Owner – Position Ultimately accountable for this risk**
- MOD

---

**Impact of current operational environment**

| Risk Identification (Describe the issue in detail, referencing the Consequence and likelihood statements) | Level of Consequence | Level of Likelihood | Level of Risk | Target | What existing controls are in place now | Treatment Option(s) – Describe additional control(s) required to reduce the risk | Person(s) Responsible | Date the control(s) to be implemented | When will the control(s) be reviewed | The Risk - Accept? Reduce? Substitute? Eliminate? | Risk Owner – Position Ultimately accountable for this risk |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Impact of current operational environment | Time when it is not back-filled. Current consultant budgets for this are low and rarely result in value for money. Increased record keeping requirements has increased administrative workloads across all positions in council. Shopping for opinions has increased steadily over the last four or five years resulting in advising officers explaining themselves to a number of different parties. Disregard for officer level advice. This results in more recording keeping, explanatory statements, etc. being necessary. Increasing level of unauthorised development and/or responding to oversight bodies. Compliance and enforcement matters are rarely expedient and it is taking longer and longer to gain cooperation or effective collaboration between the parties. General readiness to challenge council authority with respect to state, local, or other requirements. Responding to this creates downtime for officers when trying to provide routine advice or explain routine requirements for making an application. **IMPACT:** Moderate to Major impact on service delivery to customers can be expected, if there are delays to assessments. Potential added workload for planning staff. | | | | 1 x Assessment Manager 3 x Planning Officers [3FTE] 3 x Admin/Technical Officers [2 FTE] Admin-Technical Officers to undertake basic assessment (i.e. para professional) as per Workforce Plan, Training/upskilling of Admin-Technical Officers. FTE – Assessment Officer Planning Level 6 - Vacant Position | To backfill during period of leave. Review Job Design Development Services Team including:  - Admin and Technical Support  - Assessment Officers – Planning and Building  - Compliance Officers Temporary increase in Admin to support training and upskilling of Admin and Technical Support Officers Review current FTE/Budget allocation and scope for re-design of job roles to potentially include:  - Additional admin/ technical support, Level 3, Part time  - Assessment Officer, Planning, Level 5  - Strategic Planner, Level 7  - Compliance Officer, Level 3-4, Part Time | MOD SAO/s | | | | | Accept | MOD SAO/s |

---

**WORKLOADS**

- Increase in building assessments, inspections and compliance requirements under new system.
- Region may suffer as not all councils have a Level 1 building officer, so Barossa may be called upon for shared services (if required).

**Resources:**
- 1 x Manager
- 2 x Building Officers [2FTE]  
- 2 x Admin/Technical Officers [2FTE]

**Review Job Design**
- **Admin and Technical Support Officers**
- **Assessment Officers Building**

**Person(s) Responsible**
- MOD
- SAO/s

**Date the control(s) to be implemented**
- June 2020

**When will the control(s) be reviewed**
- To determine Residual Risk

- Accept

**Risk Owner – Position Ultimately accountable for this risk**
- MOD
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Risk Identification (Describe the issue in detail, referencing the Consequence and likelihood statements)</th>
<th>Level of Consequence</th>
<th>Level of Likelihood</th>
<th>Level of Risk</th>
<th>Target - What existing controls are in place now</th>
<th>Treatment Option(s) – Describe additional control(s) required to reduce the risk</th>
<th>Residual Level of Consequence</th>
<th>Residual Level of Likelihood</th>
<th>Residual Level of Risk</th>
<th>Person(s) Responsible</th>
<th>Date the control(s) to be implemented</th>
<th>When will the control(s) be reviewed – To determine Residual Risk</th>
<th>The Risk - Accept? Reduce? Substitute? Eliminate?</th>
<th>Risk Owner – Position Ultimately accountable for this risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|     |      | Level 3s are now restricted to only residential applications – Commercial no longer allowed. More time inspecting with higher inspection requirements will result in less time to assess applications. More inspections will result in more compliance action required and follow up action. Council must inspect ALL residential homes prior to issuing an occupancy certificate. Bushfire requirements likely to result in substantial compliance action. Issuing Occupancy Certificates will result in increased administration. Each Building Surveyor will be required to hold an AIBS and PDI Accreditation and Registration and ongoing CPD requirements – Resulting in increased cost for training. Increased inspections will result in increased demand for pool cars (Building officers only likely to have a ‘days’ notice) Likely significant increase of formal compliance e.g. Section 84/69 notices to be issued Building inspections are likely to increase with more mandatory inspections Need to document the standards that are to be accepted Timeframe response (but not the amount of inspections) may be extended for rural/regional councils. IMPACT: Moderate to Major impact on service delivery to customers can be expected, if there are delays to assessments. Council reputation may be impacted. |          |                          |                          | Compliance Officer  
 Admin tasks shifted from Assessment Officers and Compliance Officer to Admin and Technical Support to provide time for Officers to undertake inspections and compliance  
 Create new procedures and Task guides that relate to the PDI and how other areas in Council will interact with PDI requirements |                          |                          |                          |                          |                          |                          |                          |                          |                          |                          |                          |                          |                          |                          |
<p>| 4.4 | WORKLOADS | Planning Applications under assessment at 1/1/2019 = 121 Planning Applications under assessment at 1/1/2020 = 127 | C5 L2 E24 M14 | Resources = 3 x FTE Planners: Review Job Design | C4 L4 M14 | DDES MOD | September 2020 | Accept MDS |                          |                          |                          |                          |                          |                          |                          |                          |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Risk Identification (Describe the issue in detail, referencing the Consequence and likelihood statements)</th>
<th>Level of Consequence</th>
<th>Level of Likelihood</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>What existing controls are in place now</th>
<th>Treatment Option(s) – Describe additional control(s) required to reduce the risk</th>
<th>Residual Level of Consequence</th>
<th>Residual Level of Likelihood</th>
<th>Residual Level of Risk</th>
<th>Person(s) Responsible</th>
<th>Date the control(s) to be implemented</th>
<th>When will the control(s) be reviewed – To determine Residual Risk</th>
<th>The Risk - Accept? Reduce? Substitute? Eliminate?</th>
<th>Risk Owner – Position Ultimately accountable for this risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increase in planning assessments under new system</td>
<td>Total Planning applications lodged in 2019 = 645 Non-complying applications lodged in 2019 = 39 Res-code applications lodged in 2019 = 118 Building Rules Consent Only applications lodged in 2019 = 149 Under the P&amp;D Code, it is expected that 30 of the non-complying applications will become Performance Assessed, and therefore will not trigger a substantial change to workloads BUT Due to the various overlays in the P&amp;D Code, it is expected that most applications that are currently Res-Code and BRC Only in our area will become Performance Assessed – we sincerely hope that the Code will be amended to address this but as it stands this means that an additional 260 applications per year are likely to become Performance Assessed. This will effectively increase our Planning assessment workload by 30% (Building assessment workload is unlikely to change) Given that last year business unit only just kept pace with applications (with one Planner not using any annual leave) assessment under the new Code (as it is currently written) will swamp us IMPACT: Minor to Moderate impact on service delivery to customers can be expected. Delays in assessment.</td>
<td>C5 L2 E24 M14</td>
<td>Resources: 1 x Manager 2 x Building Officers (&lt;1FTE) 1 x Compliance Officer (1FTE) 2 x Assessment Officers Planning (&lt;2 FTE) Review Job Design • Admin and Technical Support Officers • Administration • Compliance Officer Create new procedures and Task guides that relate to the PDI and how other areas in Council will interact with PDI requirements</td>
<td>1 x Senior Assessment Officer 2 x Assessment Officers</td>
<td>Admin and Technical Support Officers Assessment Officers Planning Compliance Officer</td>
<td>SAO/HR</td>
<td>SAO/HR</td>
<td>2020-06-06</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>MDS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>WORKLOADS</td>
<td>Increase in compliance activity (planning and building) and appeals</td>
<td>Increase in compliance activity due to the extra emphasis on inspections. Impact of refusing under Delegation. Panel Reviews – Panel to “hear” a review of any decision by the Assessment Manager or their Delegate - 20 Business Days to present to the Panel. Process still</td>
<td>C4 L4 E14 M14</td>
<td>Resources: 1 x Manager 2 x Building Officers (&lt;1FTE) 1 x Compliance Officer (1FTE) 2 x Assessment Officers Planning (&lt;2 FTE) Review Job Design • Admin and Technical Support Officers • Administration • Compliance Officer Create new procedures and Task guides that relate to the PDI and how other areas in Council will interact with PDI requirements</td>
<td>1 x Senior Assessment Officer 2 x Assessment Officers</td>
<td>Admin and Technical Support Officers Assessment Officers Planning Compliance Officer</td>
<td>DDES MOD SAO/HR</td>
<td>SAO/HR</td>
<td>2020-06-06</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>MDS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Form: Corporate Risk Assessment Form**

The electronic version of this document is the controlled version. Printed copies are considered uncontrolled. Printed Copies are uncontrolled for 3 months from 11/12/2020 and then must be reprinted.

The Barossa Council © 2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Risk Identification (Describe the issue in detail, referencing the Consequence and likelihood statements)</th>
<th>Level of Consequence</th>
<th>Level of Likelihood</th>
<th>Level of Risk</th>
<th>Target - What existing controls are in place now</th>
<th>Treatment Option(s) – Describe additional control(s) required to reduce the risk</th>
<th>Residual Level of Consequence</th>
<th>Residual Level of Likelihood</th>
<th>Residual Level of Risk</th>
<th>Person(s) Responsible</th>
<th>Date the control(s) to be implemented</th>
<th>When will the control(s) be reviewed – To determine Residual Risk</th>
<th>The Risk - Accept? Reduce? Substitute? Eliminate?</th>
<th>Risk Owner – Position Ultimately accountable for this risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not clear, as appeal is against the Assessment Manager. IMPACT: Minor to Moderate impact on service delivery to customers can be expected. Increase in matters going to ERD court and taking formal compliance action – increased financial costs. Potential for loss of confidence as planning authority. Adverse reputation of doing business in the Barossa.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Officers and Compliance Officer to Admin and Technical Support to provide time for Officers to undertake inspections and compliance. Create new procedures and Task guides that relate to the PDI and how other areas in Council will interact with PDI requirements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>WORKLOADS</td>
<td>Capacity for Engineering Services to respond to internal referral for advice and assess changes to s221 permit process Uncertain as to whether these referrals will be done through the portal or internal systems requiring subsequent upload to the portal. Greater expectation that Engineering Services will need to turn around comments to enable statutory timeframes to be met. s221 LG Act: changes to description and process/less s221 if application through Assessment Panel, more if through a Private Certifier. Separation of decision making against strategic capital program vs collaborative model. IMPACT: Minor to Moderate impact on service delivery to customers can be expected. May impact on delivery of works/engineering projects. Adverse reputation of doing business in the Barossa.</td>
<td>C5 L2 E24 M14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Resources: 2 x Officers (&lt;1FTE) Budget allocation for cross purchasing of engineering services. Expertise and resourcing – opportunity for a dedicated Development Engineer in Development Services Review Job Design Engineering – including capacity to undertake dedicated Development Assessment</td>
<td>C4 L4 M14</td>
<td>DWES</td>
<td>DOES</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>June 2020</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>DWES</td>
<td>DDES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>WORKLOADS</td>
<td>Loss of strategic initiative by Council to undertake Policy/Code Amendments desired by Council not achieved, and limited or no capacity to respond to code amendments Capacity to influence the initial Code release to address character and primary production interest. Future Code Amendments: Kalbeeba study – policy amendments sought by Council not included within the initial code rollout. Therefore Council will be required to initiate a Code Amendment.</td>
<td>C5 L1 E25 Eliminate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Resource: 1 x Senior Officer (1FTE) Planning and Design Code – submission by 28 February 2020 Recruitment of replacement officer? Review Job Design – potential redesign to a Strategic Planner position.</td>
<td>NA NA NA</td>
<td>DOES</td>
<td>MDS</td>
<td>SAO</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>June 2020</td>
<td>Eliminate</td>
<td>DDES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Risk Identification (Describe the issue in detail, referencing the Consequence and likelihood statements)</th>
<th>Level of Consequence</th>
<th>Level of Likelihood</th>
<th>Treatment Option(s) – Describe additional control(s) required to reduce the risk</th>
<th>Residual Level of Consequence</th>
<th>Person(s) Responsible</th>
<th>Date the control(s) to be implemented</th>
<th>When will the control(s) be reviewed – To determine Residual Risk</th>
<th>The Risk – Accept? Reduce? Substitute? Eliminate?</th>
<th>Risk Owner – Position Ultimately accountable for this risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Current dedicated resource to be depleted with leave/retirement of senior officer. Resource/expertise needed to respond to initial roll out of the Code (first 6-12 months – errors/omissions etc), and subsequently responding to future Code reviews and amendments.</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>Finalisation of the Business case and seek formal endorsement by each of the participating Council to submit to the Minister to enter into a Joint Planning Agreement.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>DOES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>WORKLOADS</td>
<td>Level of commitment by each Council to finalise the Business Case for the Joint Planning Arrangements</td>
<td>L2</td>
<td>H16</td>
<td>Resource: 1 x Senior Officer (&lt;1 FTE)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Barossa, Light and Gawler Councils (and possibly Adelaide Plains)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>WORKLOADS</td>
<td>Council required to maintain dual systems [Pathway and Portal]</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>H17</td>
<td>Resource: 3 x Planning Officers (3FTE) 3 x Admin/Technical Officers (&gt;2 FTE) 1 x ICT Officer (&lt;1 FTE) Task Guides</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Reduce</td>
<td>MDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>Risk</td>
<td>Risk Identification (Describe the issue in detail, referencing the Consequence and likelihood statements)</td>
<td>Level of Consequence</td>
<td>Level of Likelihood</td>
<td>Level of Risk</td>
<td>Treatment Option(s) – Describe additional control(s) required to reduce the risk</td>
<td>Resource:</td>
<td>Person(s) Responsible</td>
<td>Date the control(s) to be implemented</td>
<td>When will the control(s) be reviewed – To determine Residual Risk</td>
<td>The Risk - Accept? Reduce? Substitute? Eliminate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>PLANNING PORTAL</td>
<td>Uploading/downloading from Portal/ system Integration/ Data management/ Mobility</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>L2</td>
<td>H16</td>
<td>Accep 1</td>
<td>Review Job Design Admin and Technical Officers and ICT to provide system support</td>
<td>1 x Manager 3 x Planning Officers (3FTE) 2 x Building Officers (2FTE) 1 x Compliance Officer (1FTE) 3 x Admin/Technical Officers (&lt;2 FTE) 1 x ICT Officer (&lt;1FTE)</td>
<td>DDES MDS MKATS HR</td>
<td>August 2020</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 6. Business Continuity Management Consequences

| Do these risks have Business Continuity Management consequences? | No | Yes – If Yes, description of BCM consequences |

### 6. Risk documentation to be developed or reviewed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Document Name</th>
<th>HPE Content Manager Record Number of Risk Document Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 7. Internal Office Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Has the appropriate Risk Register, Organisational or Strategic, been updated with the risks identified in this assessment</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Risk Register ID(s):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Has all identified treatment option(s) been entered into CAPA Register?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAPA Register ID(s):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Link:</th>
<th>Risk Management Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form Owner:</th>
<th>Previous Approval Date(s): 17/11/2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Control Officer:</th>
<th>Risk Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Approval Date: 28/06/2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
### Tasks

#### OUTPUT 1: CUSTOMER SERVICE / INFORMATION

- Review/Update Website content - Council websites include messaging to redirect customers to the SA Planning Portal
- Review/Update Development Information Guides/Fact Sheets - Printed and digital comms. material updated to reflect the PDI Act transition or removed/ Updated, PDI Act printed material (e.g. fact sheets) available on the front counter
- Review/Update Guide Tasks (L2IP) – align with new Assessment Pathways
- Financial reconciliation of payments
  - Process in place for recording fee payments that are not through BPoint (i.e. cash, cheque)
  - Council’s role in the disbursement process understood by council finance staff
- Review process for Section 7/12 certificate
- Host Industry Information Session

#### Tasks

#### OUTPUT 2: TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT

- Staff Communication on new system (access to Planning Portal Training Environment)
- Training for DES Officers – new system/process requirements
- Training/Orientation on new system for Customer Support Team/Library Staff - Process defined for answering enquiries, including escalation point to PlanSA Service Desk
- Training for Assessment Panel members
- Training for Elected Members
- Training Needs Analysis to capture Authorised Officer and Accreditation competency/requirement

#### Tasks

#### OUTPUT 3: PROFESSIONAL ACCREDITATION

- Determine level/number of officer accreditation under PDI Act required in addition to Assessment Manager Level 1 and Building Officer Level 1
- Obtain accreditation for nominated officers
- Maintain Accreditation Register within Skytrust with record of Core Competency requirements and ongoing Professional Development
- Ensure ongoing training and development opportunities for accredited officers
- CPD and Professional Accreditation Register for Assessment Panel members
- Accredited professionals - Indemnity scheme

#### Tasks

#### OUTPUT 4: GOVERNANCE

- **Powers and Functions/Delegations**
  - Assessment Manager appointed by the CEO with Level 1 Accreditation under the Scheme
  - Building officer accredited professionals with the relevant accreditations under the Scheme
  - Appoint Authorised Officers (who hold prescribed qualifications)
  - Council/Sub-Delegation from CEO Delegation - Delegations from council and sub-delegations from CEO to officers are in place for issuing development approval
  - Assessment Panel Delegation to Assessment Manager are defined and in place
  - Assessment Manager Delegation/Sub-Delegation to planning staff are defined and in place
  - Delegations from council to building officers are defined and in place
Tasks
Provide clarification on Powers and Functions of all parties. 

*Expectations that development assessment is ‘independent’ of Council* - Greater separation of roles and responsibility (less political intervention on decision making process)

Assessment Panel Terms of Reference
Assessment Panel Operating and Meeting Procedures

**Policy and Process Documents**

| Review Development Plan Consent Delegation Policy - Barossa Assessment Panel |
| Review/Update Development Fee Exemption for Community Organisation Policy |
| Review/Update Building (and Swimming Pool) Inspection Policy |
| Review/Update Building Fire Safety Policy |
| Review/Update Copyright Management Policy to ensure compatibility with PDI Act. |
| Create/Adopt Notification of Accredited Professionals Guideline |
| Create standing referral by BAP to Council for Building Rules Consent when a private certifier is not nominated by the applicant |
| Review/update Public Consultation Policy to specifically exclude PDI Act in its application – low priority as PCP already excludes other legislative mechanisms for public consultation. PCP scheduled for review following ceasing of COVID emergency (due to current Minister Notice not allowing consultation during PCP review) |
| Prepare Assessment Panel Review of Decision by the Assessment Manager Policy and Process (to be adopted by the Assessment Panel) |
| Create/Adopt mechanism by which Panels and Assessment Managers assign authority for determining how to progress and resolve appeals |
| Process for appointing a ‘temporary’ Assessment Manager |

**Fire Safety Committee**

Determine if Council or Regional Committee

| Adopt Terms of Reference |

---

**Tasks**

**OUTPUT 5: ASSESSMENT PANEL**

**Membership**

Call for Expression of Interest

| Short list candidates |
| Prepare Council Report |
| Determination of sitting fees and method (per meeting or retainer) |
| Appointment of Members under Section 83 of the PDI Act, with Independent Members with necessary accreditation and insurance in place |
| Notice of Appointment – Panel Members |
| Commencement of new Assessment Panel |

**Induction**

Terms of Reference

| Operating and Meeting Procedures |
| Review of Decision by the Assessment Manager |
| Minister of Planning’s Code of Conduct for Assessment Panel Members |

**Policy and Process Documents**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adoption of Delegations from CAP to Assessment Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adoption of Operating and Meeting Procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adoption of Assessment Panel Review of Decision by the Assessment Manager Policy and Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determination on standing referral to Council for Building Rules Consent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional arrangements in place for panel transition from Development Act to PDI Act</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda &amp; Minutes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review/Update Assessment Panel Report Template</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review Agenda/Minute preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review BAP Meeting schedule and requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review capacity for Online meetings and electronic receipt of agenda material (Planning Portal?)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OUTPUT 6: ASSESSMENT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prepare DES Manual – key position and task requirements for new system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare Task/Procedure Guide for PDI Act interaction with other Council requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing out of current applications/Phasing out of Development Act.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Option to actively close out applications to minimise numbers in system by September (or whenever Code takes effect in our area)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide assistance to customer on new code and assessment pathways and assist in determining optimum processing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre Lodgement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review Task/Functions between ATSO, Customer Support and Assessment Officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review process to record/track pre-lodgement request and advice given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decide whether we want to/how to link pre-lodgement advice with a subsequent application in ePlanning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lodgement/Verification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Determine agreed Service Level for customer support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Receipt/processing for applications in another council area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Receipt/processing of hard copy applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Receipt/processing of applications via email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Who is to undertake tasks (CS or DES) or DIY scanning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine who undertakes verification process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receipting of Payment of Fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconciliation of fees and charges</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Pathways</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review roles, responsibilities, and workloads of resources to pathways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Accepted Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Deemed to Satisfy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Performance Assessed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Restricted Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Referrals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review Job Design for Engineering Advice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Review of Resources – Engineering Advice</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prepare Notification of Application Policy and Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopt agreed Service Level for installation/maintenance/compliance of public notification signage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine who is to erect notice on land – council or contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine process for Notices to neighbours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine budget allocation for installation/maintenance of notice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine service charge for installation/maintenance of notice as part of Fees and Charges Register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance monitoring of notices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public access to view applications via Planning Portal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Decide if we assist customers to find applications for viewing on ePlanning. Resource : potential PC in foyer unless library PCs used instead]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outline Consents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Determine procedures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Determine procedures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deemed Consents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Determine procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review task timeframes to reduce risk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Restricted Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Create process to monitor notification and make submissions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inspections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory Inspections</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Approval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ensure that names and contact details of every relevant authority is listed on the final development approval (section 99(4))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Determine procedures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appeals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Determine any necessary financial, functional, organisational arrangements relating to the Barossa Assessment Panel and Assessment Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Essential Infrastructure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Determine procedures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regulation of Advertisement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Determine policy and process documents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### OUTPUT 7: STRATEGIC PLANNING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Code Amendments</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalbeeba Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Production and Character</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code Commencement - errors and omissions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Joint Planning Arrangements</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalisation of Business Case</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Planning Commission</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Growth Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OUTPUT 8: PLANNING PORTAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pathway/Portal Integration</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalise Pathway UX upgrade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review system integration for new Assessment Pathways</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Continuity Plan should the ePlanning system fail non-operational</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision on what information in ePlanning will be replicated in Pathway and put in place associated procedures (e.g. zoning and ongoing development authorisation conditions for seamless merging into search/property certificates) as opposed to any information in ePlanning that we want to replicate and maintain in our internal systems simply for convenience or the like? Decision to replicate information should be based on the potential and capacity for Pathway for example to seamlessly and automatically pull down data from ePlanning and to put it into Pathway. It is understood this currently happens with DACO data. We currently manually replicate land divisions lodged via EDALA in Pathway, and while doing this for 40 or so applications per annum is not a big task, to do it for 1200+ applications (planning, building, development approval) would seem to be counter-productive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Portal System Management</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardware and software to support the ePlanning system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Minimum equipment and hardware is in place (computer, scanner, printer)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Minimum software is installed and tested (internet browser, PDF editing software)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine desired user roles and access levels for ePlanning - e.g. read only, edit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User access set up for all staff and an administrator designated to manage users</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine key system management protocols (i.e. user register)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalise old EDALA land division applications under the Development Act, where possible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Systems Management</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process/Resource to update/maintain zoning data in Pathway and Exponare</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently manually create and maintain zoning data in Pathway (attached as a parcel condition) and in Exponare (a layer created by periodically downloading DPTI zoning data). Will need to maintain zoning in Pathway in order to populate search certificates but this will need to be updated to reflect new Code zones. What zoning and overlay information we want on Exponare given that the portal/ ePlanning will contain this information.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A budget for annual ePlanning contributions in place</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasks</td>
<td>Records Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Determine what documents are required to be retained in HPE Content Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Process to deal with documents generated or amended in Pathway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freedom of Information (FOI) requests process in place</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART A - High-level Readiness Checklist

The high-level business readiness checklist (Part A) supports the detailed checklists in Part B. The high-level list will assist tracking the progress at the top level and will provide visibility to what has been completed and outstanding for reporting purposes. For ease of use, each section heading is linked to the detailed checklist, which has further explanatory information and readiness items for consideration along with the ‘further information’ column which has hyperlinks to PlanSA materials and ePlatform environments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Readiness Measure</th>
<th>Further Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>User Training and System Familiarisation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Council staff have attended the relevant sessions pertaining to their role within PlanSA responsibilities</td>
<td>Learning and Resources Training registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Council staff can successfully log into the ePlanning platform training environment and can create Development Applications and understand the full end to end process</td>
<td>Training environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Council staff are upskilled in their role and responsibilities in readiness for Phase 3 go-live</td>
<td>Learning and Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Council staff are familiar with the various reports using the PowerBI tool within the training environment</td>
<td>Power BI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>User set up</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Full list of all users and roles confirmed in the ePlanning platform training environment</td>
<td>Training environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Full list of all users and roles can successfully log into ePlanning platform live environment</td>
<td>Live DAP (not yet available to Phase 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Council staff who require PowerBI access to generate reports are configured and can successfully login and run reports</td>
<td>Power BI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment Panels</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- A CAP or RAP has been established with panel members appointed</td>
<td>PlanSA Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- All members have their necessary accreditation and appropriate insurance in place</td>
<td>PlanSA Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- All members understand and comply with the conditions of their accreditation</td>
<td>PlanSA Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ongoing arrangements for panel member Continuing Professional Development (CPD) and annual accreditation costs are decided</td>
<td>PlanSA Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Panel meeting procedures, terms of reference and policies are in place</td>
<td>PlanSA Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Transitional arrangements in place for panel transition from Development Act to PDI Act</td>
<td>PlanSA Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment Managers</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- An Assessment Manager has been determined for council and their CAP or RAP</td>
<td>PlanSA Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness Measure</td>
<td>Further Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Assessment Manager is accredited at Planning Level 1 with appropriate</td>
<td>PlanSA Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>insurance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing arrangements for CPD and annual accreditation costs are decided</td>
<td>PlanSA Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An accredited backup for the Assessment Manager has been considered, when</td>
<td>PlanSA Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegations from the CAP or RAP to the Assessment Manager are defined and in</td>
<td>PlanSA Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>place</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Assessment Manager is trained in the ePlanning platform and is familiar</td>
<td>Learning and Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with the PDI Act 2016 and Regulations, Planning and Design Code, practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>directions and other instruments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Planning Officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Officers</th>
<th>Further Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If required by the Assessment Manager, Planning Officers are accredited in their</td>
<td>PlanSA Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>own right</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegations from the Assessment Manager to Planning Officers are defined and in</td>
<td>PlanSA Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>place</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegations from council to Planning Officers are in place for issuing</td>
<td>PlanSA Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development approval</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If necessary, consultants have been engaged to carry out planning functions</td>
<td>Accredited Professionals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Officers are trained in the ePlanning platform and are familiar with</td>
<td>Register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the PDI Act 2016 and Regulations, Planning and Design Code, practice directions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and other instruments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Officers have accessed the ePlanning platform training environment and</td>
<td>Training environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>know how to operate the system</td>
<td>PlanSA contact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Building and Compliance Officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building and Compliance Officers</th>
<th>Further Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If determined necessary by council, Building Officers are accredited</td>
<td>PlanSA Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegations from council to Building Officers are in place (Building Consent</td>
<td>PlanSA Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and full Development Approval)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least one authorised officer has been appointed to carry out inspections</td>
<td>PlanSA Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New, mandatory inspection requirements are understood (buildings and pools)</td>
<td>PlanSA Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ready to issue a Certificate of Occupancy as required, including detached</td>
<td>PlanSA Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dwellings (Class 1a)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If necessary, accredited consultants have been engaged to carry out building</td>
<td>PlanSA Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>functions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Register of mandatory inspections is ready to record inspections that have</td>
<td>PlanSA Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>occurred</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness Measure</td>
<td>Further Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Building and Compliance Officers are trained in the ePlanning platform and are</td>
<td>Learning and Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>familiar with the PDI Act 2016 and Regulations, Ministerial Building Standards,</td>
<td>Training environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>practice directions and other instruments</td>
<td>PlanSA contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Building Officers have accessed the ePlanning platform training environment</td>
<td>Training environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and know how to operate the system</td>
<td>PlanSA contact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Administration Officers**

| ☐ Administration Officers have activated logins and are trained in use of the     | Training environment              |
| ePlanning platform                                                              | PlanSA contact                    |
| ☐ The business process is defined for internal enquiry escalation               | N/A                               |
| ☐ Administration Officers are aware of changes to Section 7 process             | Learning and Resources            |
| ☐ Administration Officers are aware of, and are trained in, new data and reporting processes | Learning and Resources            |
| ☐ Administration Officers are aware of, and are trained in, new public notification processes | Learning and Resources            |

**Customer Service Officers**

| ☐ Customer Service staff have activated logins and are trained in use of the     | Training environment              |
| ePlanning platform                                                              | PlanSA contact                    |
| ☐ The business process is defined for answering enquiries, including escalation point to PlanSA Service Desk | N/A                               |
| ☐ The business process is defined for internal management of hard copy         | N/A                               |
| development applications                                                        |                                   |
| ☐ Frontline counters are resourced to handle PDI Act enquiries and staff are    | Learning and Resources            |
| trained                                                                          |                                   |
| ☐ FAQ’s or knowledge base articles are available to support frontline enquiries  | Learning and Resources            |
| ☐ Frontline counter staff are trained to accept and record payments             | Learning and Resources            |

**Marketing and Communication**

| ☐ Printed and digital communication material is updated to reflect the PDI Act transition | Learning and Resources PlanSA Resources |
| ☐ Council website is updated to include messaging to redirect customers to the PlanSA portal | PlanSA |

**Finance Officers**

<p>| ☐ Frontline counter / administration staff are aware of payment processing      | Learning and Resources            |
| ☐ Financial staff are aware of reporting processes and end-to-end process for disbursements from the Department | Learning and Resources            |
| ☐ Financial staff and Assessment Managers are aware of refund processes         | Learning and Resources            |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Readiness Measure</th>
<th>Further Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Staff who raise fees understand the functionality of ePlanning platform and understand the “Fees” Regulations</td>
<td>Learning and Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- A staff member has been provided financial delegation to approve refunds</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Fee waiving delegations have been updated and staff made aware of the changes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Financial delegations have been updated</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Bank account details have been provided to the Department</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Cash handling procedures have been updated to reflect any changes to Development Application payment</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Receiving codes are configured in council financial systems to support in-person payments</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Users have logged into PowerBI and confirmed they can access the reporting</td>
<td>Training environment PlanSA contact Power BI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Internal Referral Officers

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- An agreement with Development Assessment staff has been drafted to clarify what kinds of Development Applications will be considered</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Internal referral officers have access to PDF editing software to measure scaled documents onscreen</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Internal referral officers trained on how to use the ePlanning platform</td>
<td>Training environment PlanSA contact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Fees and Charges

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- The business process is defined for recording fee payments that are not in EPoint (i.e, cash, cheque, EFTPOS)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Internal fee policies determined and in place</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- A budget for annual ePlanning contributions in place</td>
<td>PlanSA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Onscreen Assessment System Setup

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Minimum equipment and hardware is in place (computer, scanner, printer)</td>
<td>Introductory Guide to ePlanning Online Tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Minimum software is installed and tested (Internet browser (Chrome is preferred), PDF editing software)</td>
<td>Introductory Guide to ePlanning Online Tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- User access set up for all staff and an administrator designated to manage users</td>
<td>Training environment PlanSA contact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Reporting

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Officers are aware of the reporting available in PlanSA</td>
<td>Power BI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Finance and Development Assessment Managers and any other necessary staff have access to the PowerBI reporting platform</td>
<td>Power BI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness Measure</td>
<td>Further Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Freedom of Information (FOI) requests and record management process in place</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Officers are aware of the Section 7 extract available within the DAP</td>
<td>Training environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Officers have updated Section 7 processes to include the download of the extract from PlanSA</td>
<td>Learning and Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development Application Processes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The business process is defined for managing applications submitted in hard copy or in person</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The business process is defined for verifying development applications within the legislated timeframe</td>
<td>Learning and Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The business process is defined for processing transitional Development Act applications</td>
<td>Learning and Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The business process is defined for public notification (sign production/errection, payable fees and photos)</td>
<td>Public Notification Practice Direction Learning and Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Forms and templates ready for use (AGD-prepared and council-prepared)</td>
<td>PlanSA Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Standard conditions and advisory notes saved into the ePlanning platform</td>
<td>Video Guide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The business process is defined for stamping plans (i.e. digital stamp used in PDFs)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service Desk - Call forward to individual Councils</strong></td>
<td>To be covered in individual weekly sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• PlanSA Service Desk call forward process to individual councils defined and agreed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Council phone numbers and people to answer calls confirmed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Process verified, validated and approved by both council and PlanSA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.5.1. DEBATE AGENDA – DEVELOPMENT SERVICES REPORT

7.5.1.2
REVISED DRAFT PHASE THREE AMENDMENT TO THE PLANNING AND DESIGN CODE

Author: Director, Development and Environmental Services

PURPOSE

To receive an overview of the State Planning Commission’s Revised Phase 3 Code Amendment together with key messages to deliver in Council’s submission. The report recommends that Council notes and adopts the analysis with delegation to the CEO to finalise the submission.

RECOMMENDATION

That Council:
(1) Notes the report and the initial submission (28 February 2020);
(2) Endorse the content to be included in the submission on the Revised Phase 3 Code Amendment;
(3) Authorises the Chief Executive Officer to finalise the submission and for this to be submitted to the State Planning Commission by the 18 December 2020.

REPORT

Background

Council provided a detailed submission on the Phase 3 Code, following consideration at its meeting on 18 February 2020.

MOVED Cr Boothby that Council:

(1) Notes the report and endorses the key messages to be included in its submission on the Phase 3 Code Amendment;
(2) Authorises the Chief Executive Officer to finalise the submission and for this to be submitted to the State Planning Commission by 28 February 2020;
(3) Commits to ongoing collaboration with the State Planning Commission, through the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure to formulate policies which
The State Planning Commission has provided the South Australian community further opportunity for feedback on the revised draft Phase Three Code. This follows the initial five-month period of public consultation on the draft Code from October 2019 to February 2020 which resulted in over 2,000 written submissions.

**Introduction**

The State Planning Commission has written to all councils advising them of the additional consultation (*Attachment 1*), and highlights the key areas of change to the revised Code that was released on 4 November 2020.

A transition table identifying how the original Barossa Development Plan zones have been transitioned to the new revised draft Code has been provided in *Attachment 2*. The correspondence also refers to elements of Council’s submission in *Attachment 3* and how these have been addressed.

The revised Code has been made available using a version of the Planning and Design Code online tool ([https://consult.code.plan.sa.gov.au/](https://consult.code.plan.sa.gov.au/)) enabling practitioners and the general public to navigate its functionality and experiment with the Code.

**Discussion**

During discussions with our Council (Code) Liaison Officer on the February Submission, reasons for why parts of our submission were not considered were confirmed as not meeting business rules set by the Commission for code amendment acceptance.

For instance, Council noted the inconsistent approach to zoning of ovals. Ovals in Lyndoch, Stockwell, Mount Pleasant and Williamstown oval which are currently in Township Zone and Recreation Policy Area 6 are proposed to be included in the Recreation Zone. This is a logical transition; however ovals (e.g. in Angaston and Tanunda) remain in a residential zone. Council's last Strategic Directions Report recommended the current mismatch of zoning approaches be addressed. The Code presented this opportunity.

In this scenario, it was stated that property owners adjoining these ovals would not have been consulted and therefore would need to undergo a Code Amendment process to ensure all community interests were considered.

What is disappointing, and should be raised in our submission, is the fact that these matters could have been included in the Revised Code that was released on 4 November; therefore giving the community the opportunity to comment, and be adequately considered by the State Planning Commission before adopting the final Code. In effect, Council will now need to consider future Code Amendments and allocate resources should it wish to pursue these matters.
Revised Code Submission

Council Administration engaged URPS to undertake an analysis of the Revised Code against the February 2020 Submission as a basis for the new submission. This analysis is provided in Attachment 4.

Below is a summary.

Resolved:

- Nuriootpa Town Centre now in a single zone: Township Activity Centre Zone
- Angaston: Town Hall and nearby properties back into the Activity Centre Zone (not Community Facilities)
- Lyndoch, Williamstown and Mount Pleasant Town Centre policy areas now in Township Main Street Zone
- Angaston, Tanunda and Lyndoch: areas in Historic Area Overlay now in Established Neighbourhood Zone
- Limited Land Division Overlay applied to Rural Zone and Adelaide Country
- Concept Plans: Cockatoo Valley and Gawler East transitioned
- Menge Road: Illapara precinct no longer in Deferred Urban Zone

Partially Resolved:

- Cromer and Mount Crawford rural living areas. Now same zone as surrounding but Adelaide Country

Remaining issues:

- Mount Pleasant: Melrose Street properties still split. Now Township Main Street and Recreation
- Tanunda: Elizabeth Street still in separate zone to adjacent: i.e. Neighbourhood surrounded by Established Neighbourhood
- Tanunda: Basedow Road properties still split into 2 zones: Neighbourhood and Established Neighbourhood
- Ovals in Angaston and Tanunda: not included in Recreation Zone
- Tanunda: Murray Street properties in Historic Area Overlay remain split
- Hazards (Flooding) Overlay: old mapping still shown for Nuriootpa. No additional flood mapping included. Flood mapping at Tanunda within Light Regional Council not included
- Major Urban Transport Routes Overlay: still adhoc application along Barossa Valley Way
- Resource Extraction Zone: Limited Land Division Overlay not applied as requested; Resource Extraction Protection Area not applied as requested
- Rocland/Highway Service Centre site:
  - Remains in Employment Zone contrary to submission, in fact the concerns are increased as the Rocland site is now split into 2: Employment for service centre site with Roadside Service Centre subzone and Strategic Employment for winery site.
  - Limited Land Division Overlay not applied (check if we raised this as an issue)
  - Maximum Building Height (Metres) TNV [22 m] and Maximum Building Height (Levels) TNV [6 levels] continue to apply contrary to our submission
  - Clumsy attempt to transition policies - e.g. a standalone shop of any time is possible under the Roadside Service Centre Subzone PO1.2
DTS/DPF 1.2 where there is no requirement for any of the listed uses to only take place where one of the 'mandatory' uses in PO 1.1 / DTS/DPV 1.1 exists

- Concept Plans: with exception of Cockatoo Valley and Gawler East, none transitioned as requested
- Minimum Site Area TNV not applied to Home Industry or Employment Zone
- Growth areas: existing policies including concept plans and policy area policies not transitioned at Tanunda, Lyndoch and Mount Pleasant.
- Dwellings on undersized allotments - i.e. where Minimum Dwelling Lot Size not met - appear to be Performance Assessed, not Restricted as requested

The above matters have been addressed in the associated tables provided in Attachment 4.

- Local Heritage Place Overlay: several mapping anomalies identified (from existing DP mapping and new ones in draft Code) have not been corrected
- Heritage Adjacency Overlay: still applied somewhat randomly applied and with varying width of buffers
- Minimum Side Boundary Setback TNV not applied to ‘growth areas’ at Lyndoch and Mount Pleasant

The above matters continue to require resolution.

New issues:

- Rocland site now split into two - see above

This matter has been addressed in the associated tables provided in Attachment 4. Not clear on why the split zone is retained, given its current zoning as Primary Production (BVR) Zone. Strategic Employment Zone section could be zoned Rural, given support provided within zone to the winery activities occurring on site.

- Adelaide Country for areas within watershed

The Adelaide Country Zone is essentially a translation of the Peri-Urban Zone content with a number of refinements. The key refinements worth noting include:

Policy
- DTS/DPF 4.1:
  - Buildings in association with industries, storage, warehousing, produce grading etc. – DTS/DPF floor area increased from 250m2 to 350m2.
  - New connection – directly related and ancillary to a primary production use on the same allotment or adjoining allotment
- New PO 4.2 – policy guidance relating to the expansion of, or establishment of new large-scale industry (e.g. beverage production), storage, warehousing etc. Connection to primary production primarily sourced from the same allotment and/or surrounding rural areas (No guidance on ‘surrounding rural areas’).
- New DTS/DPF 5.3 - policy guidance for the establishment of a second dwelling:
  - Within 20m of existing dwelling
  - Share same utilities as existing dwelling (e.g. wastewater)
  - Same access point from public road as existing dwelling
  - Location on an allotment with an area not less than 40ha (policy focused on the provision of second dwellings to facilitate ageing in place).
• Amended DTS/DPF 6.1:
  ○ Connection to land – shops sell produce or goods primarily sourced, produced or manufactured on same allotment or adjoining allotments (previously from region)
• Tourist Accommodation:
  ○ Refinement of DTS/DPF relating to DTS floor area – existing building 150m², new building 100m².
• DTS/DPF 13.1 – Agricultural Buildings:
  ○ Ag Buildings DTS floor area increased from 200m² to 350m².

Table 1 – Accepted Development Classification
• Agricultural Building listed as Accepted where achieving criteria. No trigger for exception to Accepted pathway where within Character Preservation District. Previously DTS or PA.

• Angaston: Character Area Overlays appears to be applied randomly.

Character Area Overlay still appears to be applied in a random fashion. For instance, in Angaston the Overlay has been applied to two Contributory Items however not applied to a number of other items. The reason for this is not clear.

Separately, the SPC has confirmed the reintroduction of ‘contributory items’ within the Code as Representative Buildings. It is understood that these buildings will be located within the Historic Area Overlay.

• Minimum Site Area TNV now applied to areas within existing PP(BVR)Zone; Primary Production Zone Barossa Range, Moculta and Concordia precincts, but not applied to land within Adelaide Country Zone or covered by the Significant Landscape Protection Overlay.
• Minimum Site Area TNV is confusing - e.g. valley floor is 25 ha but areas covered by existing Moculta precinct are 32 ha.

Limited Land Division Overlay applied to both Rural and Adelaide Country Zones.

Not clear why the Minimum Site Area TNV has been applied for:
  • Primary Production (BVR) Zone – currently land division is non-complying and no minimum site area indicated in the non-complying list
  • Primary Production Zone – Precinct 4, 6 or 7 – all note land division creating new allotments as non-complying and require any boundary adjustment to result in allotments within an area of not less than 32ha.

Application of Minimum Site Area TNV would be applicable for Primary Production Zone – Precinct 5 (40ha).

Changes that require consideration:
• Mount Pleasant: Mixed Use policy area is in Township Zone
• Nuriootpa: Low Density precinct: Established Neighbourhood Zone
• Lyndoch, Williamstown and Mount Pleasant residential areas: now in Township Neighbourhood Zone
• Contributory Items retention - only a handful of sites in Angaston captured
• Affordable Housing Overlay applied to selected areas in Tanunda and Mount Pleasant. Curiously it applies to the Tanunda East area, except to the Illapara Winery precinct
• Stormwater Management Overlay: applied to Established Neighbourhood Zone in Nuriootpa, Angaston, Tanunda and Lyndoch, and to Kalimna Road precinct in Nuriootpa
• Mount Pleasant and Williamstown: Established Neighbourhood Zone not applied to residential properties in existing Historic Character Area, different approach to Lyndoch
• Minimum Side Boundary Setback TNV applied to some parts of Lyndoch, Williamstown and Mount Pleasant
• Minimum Rear Boundary Setback TNV not applied to any areas
• Minimum Dwelling Allotment Size Overlay - need to review if existing provisions maintained

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Plan</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary Production Zone, Precinct 5 – Concordia – 32ha</td>
<td>32ha proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Production Zone, Precinct 6 – Moculta – 60ha</td>
<td>60ha proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Production Zone, Precinct 7 – Paper Town – 32ha</td>
<td>32ha proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Landscape Protection – 100ha</td>
<td>100ha proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Production BVR Zone – 25ha</td>
<td>25ha proposed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Infill Dwelling Sites: these allotments are not included in the new Minimum Dwelling Allotment Size Overlay. Need to review how they are addressed in the assessment provisions.

The infill dwelling sites have been accurately depicted within the Code, namely, these allotments are excluded from the application of the Minimum Dwelling Allotment Size TNV.

In considering the future DA process for a detached dwelling, it is important to consider both Table 3 – Applicable Policies for Performance Assessed Development and DTS/DPF 5.1. Namely, DTS/DPF 5.1 (a) requires dwellings to be located on allotments with a minimum area corresponding with the localised TNV. Clause 5.1(e) notes that where no value is returned for DTS/DPF 5.1(a), there is no minimum dwelling allotment size applicable.

The complexity arises when considering the associated PO 5.1 which talks of dwellings being established for the purpose of managing commercial scale primary production and rural related value adding activities.

Flood Mapping

As part of the finalisation for the Code, councils have been requested to provide additional information regarding known flooding, in addition to what is currently within the Development Plan. The response is provided in Attachment 5.

Community raised issues

Since the February Submission, other zoning matters have been raised with Council officers by community members. These residents have been encouraged to make their own submission on the Code, but are wanting Council to also make a submission.

A Williamstown resident is seeking Council support to rezone Lot 9 George Street, Williamstown (Figure 1) currently Township to Rural as they raise concern over a
possible sub-division of the site. The site has been zoned for residential purposes for some time, and has been the subject of a land division proposal in the past. The site contains a number of constraints that would need to be addressed by a developer before a land division is approved.

It is unlikely that the Commission would support a change to the zone without going through a formal Code Amendment process. However, if Council is prepared to, it can be included within the submission in the Revised Code.

Another resident seeks support for a zoning anomaly at 18 Gods Hill Road, Lyndoch (Figure 2). The site is currently Primary Production (Barossa Valley Region) and is proposed as Rural, but retains a Local Variation (TNV) minimum site area of 25 ha restricting opportunity to develop the site.

The removal of the TNV to allow a dwelling/structure on the site appears reasonable, and is questioned why it wasn’t included in the initial Development Plan Amendment that rezoned the adjacent land, now subject to a land division proposal.

It is suggested that this request be included within the submission.

**Contributory Items**

In the 2019 Code release, a decision was made not to include Contributory Items associated with our Historic Conservation Zones. In the 2020 Code release, these have been reinstated as ‘Representative Buildings’.

The State Planning Commission had written to the CEO seeking direct feedback on historic areas and proposed changes affecting council property (*Attachment 6*). The
site is the Angaston’s First Cemetery located at 8 Hannay Crescent, Angaston as shown in Figure 3.

The reinstatement of Contributory Items, be it as Representative Buildings, is supported. Therefore it is recommended that Council support the inclusion within the proposed Historic Areas. However, it is noted that only items for Angaston have been included. Items at Bethany, Krondorf, Moculta, Mount Pleasant, Stockwell, Tanunda, and Williamstown have not been reinstated, and should be pursued as part of the submission.

It is recommended that the zone boundary adjacent the Angaston’s First Cemetery located at 8 Hannay Crescent, Angaston reflect the boundary of the new Historic Area in order to encompass the Representative Buildings in the same zone.

Summary and Conclusion

The State Planning Commission had released a revised version of the Code for additional six week consultation.

Given the extensive nature of the Code, Council Administration has sort to undertake an analysis of the Code against our initial submission. It is intended that the submission reinforce the matters raised in the February submission and highlights key matters that had not been addressed through the Revised Code.

ATTACHMENTS OR OTHER SUPPORTING REFERENCES

Attachment 1 – Letter from State Planning Commission – Phase 3 Code
Attachment 2 – Transition Table – Zone/Sub Zone
Attachment 3 – Submission Summary
Attachment 4 – Submission/Code Analysis
Attachment 5 – Flood Mapping
Attachment 6 – Letter from State Planning Commission - Historic Areas

COMMUNITY PLAN / CORPORATE PLAN / LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS

Community Plan

Natural Environment and Built Heritage
Community and Culture
Business and Employment

Goal 1  The Barossa has sustainable farmland providing diverse and stable returns, while protecting the unique natural environment and biodiversity of the region.

Goal 2  The history of our region including aboriginal sites is reflected in our streetscapes and our historic buildings are maintained for future generations.

Goal 4  The Barossa fosters community resilience, connection and wellbeing through its social planning, recreation, safety, education, preventative health and social strategies especially for our youth and vulnerable people.

Goal 11  The Barossa has a strong local economy that adapts, innovates and thrives on change and strives for a diverse industry base that provides a sustainable range of business and job opportunities for people.

Strategy 1.1  Ensure land use planning and resource use protects the quality of the natural environment, the existing character of rural landscapes, historic significance and the high value of agricultural land.

Strategy 2.2  Ensure clearly defined townships are maintained to manage residential and commercial development that is sensitive to the natural environment and areas of historical significance.

Strategy 4.3  Embrace place-making principles when developing community infrastructure and regulate planning and development in public spaces and active recreation.

Strategy 11.2  Support proactive population growth that is incremental, well managed and is backed up by local planning and development opportunities.

Advocacy Plan

8  Ensure the best possible management of the land use and development framework to preserve the history, heritage and natural assets of the Barossa and support appropriate development.

Corporate Plan

1.1  Facilitate planned and appropriate development of our townships and district to maintain the character of townships and rural landscapes and to preserve properties and sites which have historic significance.

1.3  Work with community and State Government to manage township boundaries and growth within them to ensure development is planned and appropriate whilst ensuring opportunities for population growth and tourism development.

1.6  Apply development policies to protect places of environmental value and significance.

1.10  Ensure development policies are responsive to current trends through an active development policy review/amendment program.

1.11  Provide transparent, efficient and effective development assessment processes and regulatory activities.

1.12  Build and maintain relationships with other levels of government to ensure development strategies are responsive to regional needs and issues.
2.12 Ensure that development policies are responsive to housing needs (affordability and diversity of housing choice)

5.4 Participate in initiatives, or advocate for, investment in creative industries and cultural tourism.

5.5 Contribute to tourism industry capacity building through the facilitation of tourism infrastructure development, including eco and recreational tourism.

Legislative Requirements
Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016

FINANCIAL, RESOURCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT CONSIDERATIONS

Financial Management
As raised previously, Council will need to allocate appropriate funds for future strategic review and flood mapping projects. It is possible that external funding might be available for the flood hazard mapping but that would be subject to future State or Federal grant programs.

Resource Management
Additional resourcing from a consultancy may be required at some future stage if council wishes to pursue its own Code amendments (subject to approval by the State Planning Commission).

Risk Management
With any new system there is an element of risk arising from new processes. Staff have applied a risk analysis to the whole reform process which has identified areas for attention and monitoring.

COMMUNITY CONSULTATION
The Commission was responsible for consultation on the revised Code Amendment.
3 November 2020

Mayor Bla Lange
C/- CEO Martin McCarthy
Barossa Council
PO Box 867
NURIOOTPA SA 5355

Via email: barossa@barossa.sa.gov.au
/mmccarthy@barossa.sa.gov.au

Dear Mayor Lange,

The draft Phase Three Amendment to the Planning and Design Code (the Phase Three Code), which will complete implementation of the Planning and Design Code across the state, will be available for public consultation as of tomorrow.

This consultation will provide an opportunity for further feedback on the revised draft Phase Three Code and for users to experience the Code in the ePlanning platform. This follows the initial five-month period of public consultation on the draft Code from October 2019 to February 2020 which resulted in over 2000 written submissions.

Local government has contributed heavily to the content of the Code and we acknowledge this support and the continuing contributions from your teams.

In response, we have made significant improvements to the revised draft Code.

Key areas of change in the revised Code include:

- **More localised policy:**
  
The draft Code now provides for more local content through a greater number of zones to better reflect local characteristics, additional subzones, introduction of Concept Plans where required, introduction of Historic Area and Character Area Statements, and introduction of additional numerical local variations to reflect current development plans such as building height, minimum site area, frontage width, and setbacks.

- **Raising the bar on residential infill standards:**
  
The draft Code now provides additional requirements to address urban green cover, tree canopy, parking, water sensitive urban design, building façade design among other improvements.

- **Inclusion of Contributory Items as Representative Buildings:**
  
The draft Code now includes representative Buildings that will be referred to in Historic Area Statements and/or Character Area Statements and mapped in the South Australian Planning and Property Atlas. These buildings are examples that are representative of the characteristics of the local area identified in these Statements.

- **Introducing improved flood mapping:**
  
The draft Code now includes improved flood mapping that was created based on additional information provided by local Councils.

In relation to your submission, a number of key items have been addressed in the update of the draft Code and include:

- The Neighbourhood Zone has been spatially applied to residential areas of Nuriootpa, Angaston and Tanunda instead of the General Neighbourhood Zone.

saplanningcommission.sa.gov.au
- Minimum dwelling allotment size Technical and Numerical Variations (TNVs) have been added for relevant areas within the existing Primary Production Zone and Rural Landscape Protection Zone.

- The Springwood Residential Development adjoining the Town of Gawler has changed from the General Neighbourhood Zone to the Master Planned Neighbourhood Zone.

- The Rural Zone has been spatially applied to areas within the existing Barossa Valley Primary Production Zone instead of the Peri-Urban Zone.

To understand how these have been addressed please refer to the attached summary. A transition table identifying how the Barossa Development Plan zones have been transitioned to the revised draft Code has also been attached for information.

As of Wednesday 4 November 2020, you will be able to browse the full Code using a version of the Planning and Design Code online tool. This will be supplemented with an online 'Code Feedback' tool that will enable you to view and make comment on specific parts of the Code through a feedback form. These can be accessed by visiting http://consult.plan.sa.gov.au

We invite you to provide further feedback to the Commission as part of this next round of community consultation.

A range of supporting materials have been developed including the release of a "Summary of Post Consultation Amendments" which outlines the recommendations and key changes in response to the feedback received on the draft Phase Three Code. This and other materials will be accessible from the PlanSA portal (www.plan.sa.gov.au).

During November, a series of community ‘drop-in-sessions’ will be organised to provide the opportunity for everyone to learn more about the Code and the proposed changes. More information will be available at https://plan.sa.gov.au/have-your-say/events

Alongside the draft Phase Three Code, the Commission is releasing a Practice Direction - Site Contamination Assessment for public consultation. This Practice Direction sets out the procedural requirements that apply in relation to the assessment of potential site contamination when land use changes to a more sensitive use. More information is available on the PlanSA portal.

Since 31 July 2020, the new planning system – PlanSA – has applied across South Australia’s outback and rural areas with more than 1,450 online development applications successfully submitted into the planning system as at 1 November 2020.

We are keen to ensure this final phase of engagement presents users of the system with a clear understanding of the proposed refinements to the revised draft Code.

The PlanSA Service Desk is active should you have any queries regarding the Code or the ePlanning platform. Simply contact 1800 752 664 or email PlanSA@sa.gov.au

The new planning system will help shape the communities we want to live and work in. It will also assist our economic recovery post COVID-19.

Yours sincerely,

Michael Lennon
Chair
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council</th>
<th>Council Raised Issues</th>
<th>Commission Resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barossa</td>
<td>Request to change the proposed transition of residential areas of Nuriootpa, Angaston and Tanunda from the Code General Neighbourhood Zone to the Code Suburban Neighbourhood Zone.</td>
<td>The Commission resolved that areas of Nuriootpa, Angaston and Tanunda formerly proposed to transition to the General Neighbourhood Zone will instead transition to the Neighbourhood Zone. Areas of those townships subject to a Historic or Character Area Overlay will be transitioned to the Established Neighbourhood Zone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Request to incorporate minimum dwelling allotment sizes in the Code for areas within the current Primary Production Zone and Rural Landscape Protection Zone.</td>
<td>The Commission resolved that areas within zones containing guidance on minimum dwelling allotment sizes have been transitioned to the relevant TNV in the Code.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Request that the Code Master-Planned Neighbourhood Zone or Greenfield Neighbourhood Zone is spatially applied to the area of the Springwood Residential Development currently within the Residential (Gawler East) Zone.</td>
<td>The Commission resolved that the Code Master-Planned Neighbourhood Zone will be spatially applied instead of the General Neighbourhood Zone to this area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concerns raised regarding the loss of locally important policies, Desired Character Statements and Concept Plans.</td>
<td>The Commission resolved to retain one Concept Plan at Sandy Creek, with other locally important policies incorporated into the Code via a TNV where possible in the Zone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Request that the productive areas of the Barossa Valley Primary Production Zones transition to the Code Rural Zone instead of the originally proposed Code Peri-Urban Zone to ensure policy support is retained for a wide range of productive land uses incidental to primary production, viticulture and agricultural industries.</td>
<td>The Commission resolved to transition relevant areas to the Code Rural Zone instead of the Adelaide Country (formerly Peri-Urban) Zone.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**OVERVIEW**
The following provides both comments in response to amendments made to the P&D Code and a comparison between the submission made by The Barossa Council to the State Planning Commission on 28 February 2020, and the revised P&D Code as released for consultation on 4 November 2020.

**CODE ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**
Comparison between Submission made and November 2020 release of revised P&D Code. Elements not changed highlighted in **green**.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component/issue</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
<th>Response/Solution/Suggested change</th>
<th>Revised P&amp;D Code – November 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GENERAL COMMENTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Public notification of envisaged uses</td>
<td>As written, most classes of development will require public notification as land in the zone is adjacent land to land in a different zone. The Update Report indicates the Commission will review all notification tables including excluding from notification uses that are envisaged in the zone (e.g. shop in a centre zone) from notification, where the site of the development is not located adjacent to a dwelling in a neighbourhood zone.</td>
<td>Provide that all uses envisaged in a zone do not require public notification, even where adjacent to land in another zone</td>
<td>Structural changes made to the public notification tables to remove reference to ‘adjacent to land in a different zone’. Listed exceptions from notification do not reflect envisaged land uses for the zone.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2. Inconsistent primary road frontage setbacks in townships and with insufficient regard to waste water treatment needs. | Setbacks from primary road frontage for sites not connected to mains sewer need to allow installation of standard wastewater systems. Typically 6.5 m is required for the tank and prescribed setbacks; however the zones intended to apply to rural townships each specify different setbacks:  
- General Neighbourhood Zone: 8 m on arterial road, 5 m from any other road  
- Suburban Neighbourhood Zone: 8 m | Setbacks from primary road frontage to be a minimum of 6.5 m in areas not connected to mains sewer in order to cater for waste control systems in front yard | Proposed primary street setbacks as follows:  
Neighbourhood Zone:  
- average of existing buildings on adjoining sites, 5m if no building exists |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component/issue</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
<th>Response/Solution/Suggested change</th>
<th>Revised P&amp;D Code – November 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|                 | - Township Zone: 6 m  
- Rural Settlement Zone: 8 m | Established Neighbourhood:  
- average of existing buildings on adjoining sites,  
- where only 1 existing building on adjoining sites not less than the setback of the existing building,  
- in order cases no DTS/DPF applicable.  
Township:  
- average of existing buildings on adjoining sites, and where only 1 existing building not less than the setback of that building,  
- 6m if no building exists  
Township Neighbourhood:  
- average of existing buildings on adjoining sites, and where only 1 existing building not less than the setback of that building,  
- all other cases - 6m  
Note: The Design in Rural Areas General Module has been replaced by a generic Design module. This module retains generic on-site wastewater disposal requirements. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component/issue</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
<th>Response/Solution/Suggested change</th>
<th>Revised P&amp;D Code – November 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Aged care</td>
<td>Code seems overly focussed on 'retirement villages' with little attention to 'aged care' such as nursing homes - e.g. 'retirement facility' is defined, but not aged care facility</td>
<td>Review definitions, policies and assessment pathways for aged care facilities</td>
<td>Retention of Retirement Facility and Supported Accommodation definitions. Insertion of a new definition for 'Home Care' as follows – Has the same meaning as in the Commonwealth Aged Care Act 1997.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4. Tourism accommodation| It is considered reasonable for typical bed and breakfast operations in sensitive rural areas to require development approval however it may unnecessarily restrict this activity in townships. This especially the case if the current 'exemption' for use of an existing dwelling (as per Building Advisory Notice 04/16) is discontinued and in future offering a single bedroom on a booking platform is a change of use which requires development approval and public notification if adjacent to land in another zone. This requires review. | Review if different assessment pathways for tourist accommodation could apply for small scale facilities in established townships and urban areas from rural areas. | Within urban areas, the Revised Code proposes the following assessment pathway for Tourist Accommodation:  
Township Neighbourhood Zone  
- Performance Assessed – All Other Code Assessed Development  
- Notification required  
Township Zone  
- Performance Assessed – All Other Code Assessed Development  
- Notification required  
Neighbourhood Zone  
- Performance Assessed – All Other Code Assessed Development  
- Notification required |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component/issue</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
<th>Response/Solution/Suggested change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>What is considered 'rural' and 'urban'?</td>
<td>Clarity is needed as to what is considered 'rural' and 'urban'. For example, Rural Settlements are obviously regarded as 'urban area' in that the PAD Table 3 references Design in Urban Areas policies, despite these being in rural environments. Why does the Rural Living Zone pull up both urban and rural for outbuildings?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Design in Rural Areas module has been replaced with a new module 'Design'. Refinements made to policy cross-referencing within Tables 2 and 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component/issue</td>
<td>Commentary</td>
<td>Response/Solution/Suggested change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Design in Rural Areas is identical to the Design in Urban Areas module</td>
<td>As written the module policies provided limited guidance for rural type buildings such as farm and horticultural buildings. Policies for outbuildings in rural living areas are also lacking and confusing. On this basis it has not been possible to provide useful commentary on the Design in Rural Areas module. Given the anticipated broad application of that module it is requested that the Commission re-engages with all affected Councils on a revised module.</td>
<td>Re-engage with all affected Councils on a revised Design in Rural Areas module</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY LOCAL POLICIES NOT TRANSITIONED**

<p>| 7. Building Height (Metres) and Building Height (Storeys) TNVs applied to low density precinct in Nuriootpa | Precinct 10 Low Density has been transitioned in part with inclusion in the Suburban Neighbourhood Zone and application of a Lot Size Minimum TNV and Minimum Frontage TNV that correspond with existing provisions; however two storey development will be overtly encouraged through the proposed 9 m and 2 storey TNVs whereas currently 2 storey dwellings are only envisaged on large allotments | Remove Building Height TNVs from Precinct 10 Low Density | The Code originally proposed to replace Precinct 10 Low Density with the Suburban Neighbourhood Zone. The Revised Code nominates the following: - Established Neighbourhood Zone - Maximum Building Height (levels) TNV – 1 storey This TNV is applicable across a large portion of Nuriootpa. |
| 8. Residential policies in Nuriootpa, Angaston and Tanunda | General Neighbourhood Zone and associated TNVs represent a significant policy change - i.e. in Nuriootpa from 420 sqm/15 m frontage for detached dwelling to 300 sqm/9 m frontage, Transition existing residential policies through a combination of Lot Size Minimum TNV, Frontage Minimum TNV and zone policies. Additionally consider | | Nuriootpa Established Neighbourhood Zone - Minimum Site Area TNV: 600m for all dwelling forms |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component/issue</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
<th>Response/Solution/Suggested change</th>
<th>Revised P&amp;D Code – November 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>and in Angaston and Tanunda from 500 sqm/15 m frontage for detached dwelling to 300 sqm/9 m frontage</td>
<td>including all residential areas in Nuriootpa, Angaston and Tanunda in the Suburban Neighbourhood Zone with policies and TNVs aligning with existing local policy.</td>
<td>- Minimum Frontage TNV: detached 15m, semi-detached 12m, row 10m, group and residential flat 25m. The above is consistent with policies contained in Policy Area 10 Low Density. <strong>Neighbourhood</strong> - Minimum Site Area TNV: detached 420m², semi-detached group and residential flat 350m², row 300m² - Minimum Frontage TNV: detached 15m, semi-detached 12m, row 10m, group and residential flat 25m. The above is consistent with the policies contained in Council’s Residential Zone for Nuriootpa. <strong>Angaston</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component/issue</td>
<td>Commentary</td>
<td>Response/Solution/Suggested change</td>
<td>Revised P&amp;D Code – November 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The inconsistency in minimum site area and frontage remains as identified originally.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Neighbourhood**
- Minimum Site Area TNV:
  - detached 500m², semi-detached group and residential flat 400m², row 350m²
- Minimum Frontage TNV:
  - detached 15m, semi-detached 12m, row 10m, group and residential flat 25m.

The above is consistent with the policies contained in Council’s Residential Zone for Angaston.

**Tanunda**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established Neighbourhood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Minimum Site Area TNV:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- detached 500m², semi-detached group and residential flat 400m², row 350m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Minimum Frontage TNV:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- detached 15m, semi-detached 12m, row 10m, group and residential flat 25m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Neighbourhood**
- Minimum Site Area TNV:
  - detached 500m², semi-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component/issue</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
<th>Response/Solution/Suggested change</th>
<th>Revised P&amp;D Code – November 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>9 m Building Height (Metres) and 2 storey Building Height (Storeys) TNVs applied to Suburban Neighbourhood Zone where single storey development is envisaged</td>
<td>Although current lot size and frontage minimums have been transitioned via TNVs, increased building heights are facilitated</td>
<td><strong>Remove Building Height TNVs from Suburban Neighbourhood Zone and General Neighbourhood Zone where they apply to The Barossa Council</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Maximum Building Height (Levels) TNV – 1 storey has been applied across the areas previously zoned Suburban Neighbourhood and General Neighbourhood in Tanunda, Nuriootpa and Angaston.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Residential policy area policies not transitioned at Lyndoch, Williamstown and Mount Pleasant</td>
<td>Residential Policy Area 7 prioritises residential development including special allotment size and frontage policies. The proposed changes increase the minimum frontage policies from 12 m to 20 m. In order to maintain all existing policy the policy area should be transitioned as a sub-zone.</td>
<td><strong>Transition Residential Policy Area 7 into a sub-zone within the Township Zone in Lyndoch, Williamstown and Mount Pleasant</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Township Zone as originally proposed for Lyndoch, Williamstown and Mount Pleasant have transitioned across to the Revised P&amp;D Code as either Township Neighbourhood or Established Neighbourhood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No applicable subzone has been implemented as requested, however the following controls have been inserted:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Minimum Site Area TNV: 500m2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Minimum Frontage TNV: 12m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component/issue</td>
<td>Commentary</td>
<td>Response/Solution/Suggested change</td>
<td>Revised P&amp;D Code – November 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Zoning of Springwood/Gawler East development area</td>
<td>The existing Residential (Gawler East) Zone and Concept Plan Map Baro/15 - Gawler East have not been transitioned with the General Neighbourhood Zone proposed instead. The zone and concept plan apply to a small portion of the larger Springwood development located in The Barossa Council with the majority of the development area within the Town of Gawler. The current policies relate to a masterplanned community as opposed to a residential area in an established township and in this context suggests that the Masterplanned Suburban Neighbourhood Zone or Greenfield Suburban Neighbourhood Zone would be a more appropriate fit for the land. It is noted that the 'Masterplanned' zone is proposed for other locations which are subject to the same sort of envisaged growth and development at Gawler East including portions of Mount Barker, Playford Alive, Buckland Park, Virginia Grove and Blakes Crossing, and where a diversity of housing choice, envisaged activity centres and coordinated development of land under fragmented ownership within a greenfield development context is envisaged.</td>
<td>Include Springwood development area in the Masterplanned Suburban Neighbourhood Zone or Greenfield Suburban Neighbourhood Zone</td>
<td>These TNVs are consistent with the provisions contained in Councils Development Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component/issue</td>
<td>Commentary</td>
<td>Response/Solution/Suggested change</td>
<td>Revised P&amp;D Code – November 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Inclusion of 7 Belvidere Road Nuriootpa in Employment Zone; Sturt Highway Service Centre Policy Area not transitioned; Concept Plan Map Baro/18 - Sturt Highway Service Centre not transitioned; proposed Building Height (Metres) TNV and Building Height (Storeys) TNV; inclusion of land in Limited Land Division Overlay</td>
<td>Inclusion in Employment Zone. Loss of recently approved local policies; Inclusion in Limited Land Division Overlay limits division for service centre concept. 22 m building height and 6 storey will adversely affect visual and landscape amenity.</td>
<td>Remove 7 Belvidere Road Nuriootpa from Employment Zone and include in a sub-zone within the Rural Zone with existing local policies transitioned across. Remove Limited Land Division Overlay, Building Height (Metres) TNV and Building Height (Storeys) TNV from land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Belvidere Road</td>
<td>As proposed:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Split Zone – Employment and Strategic Employment Zone</td>
<td>7 Belvidere Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Subzone – Roadside Service Centre (Employment Zone area only)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- TNV – Maximum Building Height (Metres) 22m, Maximum Building Height (Levels) 6 levels.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In large part, the PDC’s of Policy Area 13 have been transitioned to the Roadside Services Subzone.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>However:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- there is no clear rationale for the zone split where the winery component could reasonably remain within the Rural Zone.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The retention of the winery in the Rural Zone is consistent with activities in the broader locality and more appropriate given the types of land uses envisaged and scale of land uses within the Strategic Employment Zone.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The policy is somewhat clumsy in its attempt to transition what were core services and facilities and those which were</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component/issue</td>
<td>Commentary</td>
<td>Response/Solution/Suggested change</td>
<td>Revised P&amp;D Code – November 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 13. Existing 25 ha minimum lot size for dwellings in Primary Production (Barossa Valley Region) Zone not transitioned | Confusing application of the Lot Size Minimum TNV (25 ha) in that this TNV is for land division, not dwellings. Council believes that the assessment pathway that best matches the current process is for dwellings on undersized allotments to be Restricted Development with the exception of dwellings on smaller allotments as recommended by the Rural Areas and Character Review - i.e. lots that are between 0.4 ha and 2.5 ha or 25 ha or more in the case of the Primary Production (Barossa Valley Region) Zone. | Remove the Lot Size Minimum TNV from the area within the existing Primary Production (Barossa Valley Region) Zone and replace with the new Minimum Dwelling Lot Size Technical and Numeric Variation Overlay with a value of "between 0.4 and 2.5 ha and 25 ha or more". List dwellings on allotments less than the minimum allotment area specified in the Minimum Dwelling Lot Size TNV as Restricted Development. | Revised P&D Code proposed:  
- Minimum Site Area TNV implemented across current Primary Production (BVR) Zone (now Rural Zone) – 25ha  
- Minimum Dwelling Allotment Size TNV implemented – 25ha  
- Limited Land Division Overlay implemented across Primary Production (BVR) Zone  
Dwellings remain Performance Assessed where on undersized allotments. Reliance on Minimum Dwelling Allotment Size TNV to limit their proliferation on allotments not meeting the TNV minimum. |
<p>| 14. Precinct 4 Barossa Range policies and associated 100 ha minimum lot size for dwellings not transitioned | Council believes that the assessment pathway that best matches the current process is for dwellings on undersized allotments to be Restricted Development with the exception of dwellings on smaller allotments as recommended by the Rural Areas and Character Review - i.e. lots that are between 0.4 ha and 10 | Apply the new Minimum Dwelling Lot Size Technical and Numeric Variation Overlay with a value of &quot;between 0.4 and 10 ha and 100 ha or above&quot; to land within the existing Precinct 4 Barossa Range. List dwellings on allotments less than the minimum allotment area. | Minimum Dwelling Allotment Size TNV of 100ha applied across entire Precinct 4 – Barossa Range with minor amendments recognise boundary of the Kaiserstuhl CP. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component/issue</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
<th>Response/Solution/Suggested change</th>
<th>Revised P&amp;D Code – November 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15. Precinct 6 Moculta policies and associated 60 ha minimum lot size for dwellings not transitioned</td>
<td>Council believes that the assessment pathway that best matches the current process is for dwellings on undersized allotments to be Restricted Development with the exception of dwellings on smaller allotments as recommended by the Rural Areas and Character Review - i.e. lots that are between 0.4 ha and 6 ha or 60 ha or more in the case of Precinct 4 Barossa Range.</td>
<td>Apply the new Minimum Dwelling Lot Size Technical and Numeric Variation Overlay with a value of &quot;between 0.4 and 6 ha and 60 ha or more&quot; to land within the existing Precinct 6 Moculta. List dwellings on allotments less than the minimum allotment area specified in the Minimum Dwelling Lot Size TNV as Restricted Development.</td>
<td>Underlying zone Rural – Dwellings remain listed as Performance Assessed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Precinct 7 Paper Town policies and associated 32 ha minimum lot size for dwellings not transitioned for Cockatoo Valley (Barossa), Angaston (Gravel Pit Road) and Taunton</td>
<td>Council believes that the assessment pathway that best matches the current process is for dwellings on undersized allotments to be Restricted Development.</td>
<td>Apply the new Minimum Dwelling Lot Size Technical and Numeric Variation Overlay with a value of &quot;32 ha&quot; to land within the existing Precinct 7 Paper Town. List dwellings on allotments less than the minimum allotment area specified in the Minimum Dwelling Lot Size TNV as Restricted Development.</td>
<td>Minimum Dwelling Allotment Size TNV applied – 60ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Note: Allotments identified in Table Baro/3 – Infill Dwelling Sites excluded from Minimum Dwelling Allotment Size TNV:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 798 Moculta Road, Moculta (CT:5806/149)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 711 Hutton Vale Road, Moculta (CT:5229/332)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Existing 100 ha minimum lot size for dwellings in current Rural Landscape Protection Zone not transitioned</td>
<td>Council believes that the assessment pathway that best matches the current process is for dwellings on undersized allotments to be Restricted Development.</td>
<td>Apply the new Minimum Dwelling Lot Size Technical and Numeric Variation Overlay with a value of &quot;100 ha&quot; to land within the existing Rural Landscape Protection Zone (proposed Rural Landscap...</td>
<td>Rural Landscape Protection Zone transitioned to Rural Zone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component/issue</td>
<td>Commentary</td>
<td>Response/Solution/Suggested change</td>
<td>Revised P&amp;D Code – November 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone/Significant Landscape Protection Overlay. List dwellings on allotments less than the minimum allotment area specified in the Minimum Dwelling Lot Size TNV as Restricted Development.</td>
<td>Dwellings remain Performance Assessed where on undersized allotments.</td>
<td>Transition updated Table Baro/3 - Infill Dwelling Sites as a TNV or other agreed approach</td>
<td>All identified infill dwelling sites have been carried over and are not subject to the Minimum Dwelling Allotment Size TNV. DTS/DPF 5.1(e) applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Table Baro/3 - Infill Dwelling Sites not transitioned</td>
<td>This table lists allotments that are not subject to the minimum lot size requirements. A number of allotments have been built on and can be removed however removal of the table is a significant policy shift.</td>
<td>Transition updated Table Baro/3 - Infill Dwelling Sites as a TNV or other agreed approach</td>
<td>All identified infill dwelling sites have been carried over and are not subject to the Minimum Dwelling Allotment Size TNV. DTS/DPF 5.1(e) applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Precinct 8 Kalimna Road and Concept Plan Map Baro/2 not transitioned. Inappropriate Lot Size Minimum TNV applied to precinct</td>
<td>Change of lot sizes from 1000 sqm average to 500 sqm is a significant policy shift which gives no recognition to the various constraints applying to the area. Application of a Frontage Minimum TNV is supported as currently no minimum frontage applies. Policy direction provided in the concept plan is still valid, in particular regarding access in several areas including Kalimna Road.</td>
<td>Transition Precinct 8 Kalimna Road and Concept Plan Map Baro/2 into Code. Apply 1000 sqm Lot Size Minimum TNV to land in the precinct</td>
<td>- Minimum Site Area TNV applied: 1000m² for all forms of dwellings - Minimum Frontage TNV retained - No Concept Plan proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Historic Conservation Guidelines not transitioned</td>
<td>Table Baro/2 - Historic Conservation Guidelines has not been transitioned. These guidelines currently assist applicants and assessing officers with new buildings, alterations, signage and the like and have potential for statewide application.</td>
<td>Transition Table Baro/2 - Historic Conservation Guidelines as a table within the Historic Area Overlay.</td>
<td>Local policy not transitioned</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component/issue</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
<th>Response/Solution/Suggested change</th>
<th>Revised P&amp;D Code – November 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21. No Lot Size Minimum TNV applied to Suburban Employment Zone at Lyndoch and Williamstown</td>
<td>Default 1200 sqm currently applies to the Light Industry Policy Area 4 in the Township Zone. Removal of minimum could see inappropriate smaller lots.</td>
<td>Apply Lot Size Minimum TNV (1200 sqm) to the Suburban Employment Zone in Lyndoch and Williamstown.</td>
<td>Suburban Employment Zone replaced with the ‘Employment Zone’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Minimum lot size in Precinct 31 Speck Road not transitioned.</td>
<td>Current minimum lot size is 6 ha. Proposed Lot Size Minimum TNV indicates 5 ha. Reducing to 5 ha increases potential additional lot from 3 to 7. Retain existing policy.</td>
<td>Amend value of Lot Size Minimum TNV applying to Precinct 31 Speck Road from 5 ha to 6 ha</td>
<td>Minimum Site Area TNV adjusted – 6ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Lot Size Minimum TNV not applied to Light Pass settlement</td>
<td>Acknowledged mapping inconsistency by Commission in that a Lot Size Minimum TNV of 2500 sqm is intended to apply. Request confirmation of this.</td>
<td>Apply Lot Size Minimum TNV with a value of 2500 sqm to the Settlement Zone at Light Pass.</td>
<td>Minimum Site Area TNV applied to Rural Settlement Zone at Light Pass – 2500m2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Lot Size Minimum TNV not applied to Rosedale settlement</td>
<td>Acknowledged mapping inconsistency by Commission in that a Lot Size Minimum TNV of 1200 sqm is intended to apply. Request confirmation of this.</td>
<td>Apply Lot Size Minimum TNV with a value of 1200 sqm to the Settlement Zone at Rosedale.</td>
<td>Minimum Site Area TNV applied to Rural Settlement Zone at Rosedale – 1200m2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Lot Size Minimum reduced in Historic Area Overlay at Lyndoch</td>
<td>A default 1200 sqm minimum lot size currently applies to land within the Lyndoch Residential Historic Character Policy Area 5 with a policy seeking to maintain the current allotment pattern. The Lot Size Minimum applied to this land is 1000 sqm which could result in smaller lots which would be out of character.</td>
<td>Amend Lot Size Minimum TNV of 1200 sqm to land covered by the Historic Area Overlay at Lyndoch in order to maintain existing policy.</td>
<td>Minimum Site Area TNV applied to Established Neighbourhood Zone (former HCPA 5) at Lyndoch – 1200m2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component/issue</td>
<td>Commentary</td>
<td>Response/Solution/Suggested change</td>
<td>Revised P&amp;D Code – November 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>26.</strong> Limited Land Division Overlay not applied to Bethany and Krondorf settlements</td>
<td>Acknowledged mapping inconsistency by Commission in that the Limited Land Division Overlay is to apply in order to maintain current policy</td>
<td>Apply Limited Land Division Overlay to the Settlement Zone at Bethany and Krondorf</td>
<td><strong>Limited Land Division Overlay has not been applied to the Rural Settlement Zone at Bethany and Krondorf.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>27.</strong> Current Home Industry Zone lot size, frontage and setback provisions not transitioned at Nuriootpa and Tanunda</td>
<td>Current dwelling lot size (1200 sqm) and frontage (18 m) and current land division sizes (1200-2000 sqm) not transitioned with zone seeking 750 sqm or in accordance with existing land division pattern, and 20 m frontage. Existing setback of 6.5 m has not been transitioned with DTS/DPF 3.1 referring to existing setbacks or 6 m where no dwelling located on adjoining site. This is inconsistent with the Suburban Neighbourhood Zone which seeks 8 m and is also insufficient in townships not connected to mains sewer.</td>
<td>Apply Frontage Minimum TNV (18 m) and Lot Size Minimum TNV (1200-2000 sqm) to Home Industry zoned land. Amend setback from primary road frontage to 6.5 m</td>
<td><strong>Home Industry Zone –Minimum Site Area TNV and Minimum Frontage TNV have not been applied.</strong> Primary Street Setback: - Average of existing dwellings on adjoining sites, and if only one such dwelling, the setback of that dwelling - Corner site or adjacent public space or thoroughfare: distance of existing dwelling on adjacent suite, or closest site away from corner, public space or thoroughfare that contains a dwelling facing the same primary street without crossing a street, public space or thoroughfare - At least 6m where no existing dwellings on same primary street frontage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>28.</strong> Zoning and policies for growth areas not transitioned with an inconsistent approach adopted</td>
<td>Locally driven and tailored policy approaches are currently applied to the four growth (development) areas in the council area. At</td>
<td>Transition existing local policies including concept plans for development areas at</td>
<td><strong>Gawler East</strong>&lt;br&gt;- Zoning update noted above&lt;br&gt;- No local policy transition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component/issue</td>
<td>Commentary</td>
<td>Response/Solution/Suggested change</td>
<td>Revised P&amp;D Code – November 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Mount Pleasant  | The growth area is in the Township Zone and Deferred Urban Zone with two policy areas applying to the relevant Township Zone; in Tanunda East the land is included in the Residential Zone with a policy area and precinct; in Lyndoch the land is included in the Township Zone with a policy area; and at Gawler East a special residential zone is in place. Each of these four areas have associated concept plans to guide development. The Code amendment completely discards the local policies prepared in consultation with the Lyndoch, Mount Pleasant and Tanunda communities with no policy areas or concept plans transitioned. While the underlying zonings at Lyndoch and Mount Pleasant have been transitioned, Tanunda East is to be split into two zones (Greenfield Suburban Neighbourhood Zone and Deferred Urban Zone) whereas Gawler East area has been included in the General Neighbourhood Zone. The proposed zoning arrangements will see higher density development on the Tanunda township fringe within the character preservation district than in the metro-edged Gawler East development area where lower density development is provided for. These arrangements appear to be a reverse of what should apply. | Lyndoch, Tanunda East, Mount Pleasant and Gawler East. | - Concept Plan Baro/15 not retained
- Lyndoch
  - Township Zone replaced with the Township Neighbourhood Zone and Established Neighbourhood Zone
  - No local policy transition
  - Concept Plan Baro/5 not retained
- Tanunda East
  - Split zoning replaced with the Neighbourhood Zone
  - No local policy transition
  - Concept Plan Baro/16 not transitioned
- Mount Pleasant
  - Township Zone replaced with the Township Neighbourhood Zone
  - No local policy transition
  - Concept Plan Baro/14 not transitioned |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component/issue</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
<th>Response/Solution/Suggested change</th>
<th>Revised P&amp;D Code – November 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29. Town Centre Policy Area 10 not transitioned at Lyndoch, Williamstown and Mount Pleasant</td>
<td>Town Centre Policy Area 10 currently directs retail and commercial development to specific areas in Lyndoch, Williamstown and Mount Pleasant, unlike in other smaller townships where non-residential uses are anticipated to be scattered through the township. Unlike the Light Industry Policy Area 4 and Recreation Policy Area 6 which have been transitioned into a zone, Town Centre Policy Area 10 has not been transitioned. A 1200 sqm minimum lot size currently applies</td>
<td>Transition Town Centre Policy Area 10 into Township Main Street Zone at Lyndoch, Williamstown and Mount Pleasant.</td>
<td>Town Centre Policy Area 10 transitioned to Township Main Street Zone.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Current Land Division control (1200m2) has not been transitioned to a Minimum Site Area TNV. |

| 30. Residential Lyndoch Policy Area 12 not transitioned | The Lyndoch development area is currently in the Township Zone with the Residential Lyndoch Road Policy Area 12 applying to the land. Local policies which acknowledge the land’s location within a character preservation district and which seek an appropriate urban/rural character interface including by requiring future housing to address the rural area have not been transitioned. It is also noted that although the existing lot size minimum (500 sqm) has been transitioned (via a TNV), under the zone policies the minimum frontage has been increased to 20 m (from 12 m) | Transition Residential Lyndoch Policy Area 12 and Concept Plan Map Baro/17 - Lyndoch Fringe into a sub-zone within the Township Zone | Residential Lyndoch Policy Area 12 transitioned to the Township Neighbourhood Zone.  
- Minimum Site Area TNV – 500m2  
- Concept Plan has not been transitioned  
- Minimum frontage controls have not been transitioned  
- Default site frontage of 20m retained |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component/issue</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
<th>Response/Solution/Suggested change</th>
<th>Revised P&amp;D Code – November 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31. Policy area and zoning for Tanunda East development area not transitioned</td>
<td>The Tanunda East development area is currently in the Residential Zone with the Menge Road Policy Area 11 applying to the land and Precinct 40 Illaparra Winery applying to winery buildings and infrastructure in the middle of the development area. Together the policy area and precinct address interface issues with the existing winery and adjacent railway, but importantly also seek an appropriate urban/rural character interface including by requiring future housing to address the rural area. The concept plan also seeks to recognise and protect the current winery use until such time the land is developed. The Code discards the current zoning and local policies but splits the area with the Greenfield Suburban Neighbourhood Zone in the north and south and the Deferred Urban Zone proposed for the winery site. The Greenfield Suburban Neighbourhood Zone provides for much higher density development than currently with no minimum lot size, no minimum frontage, and building heights of 3 levels and 12 m. This is considered inappropriate for a township location in a character preservation district. Transition of the existing policy area is sought. The proposed change to zoning of the winery site is considered unnecessary in that the existing policy area and precinct policies contain 'sunset' provisions for when the winery use is removed,</td>
<td>Remove the Tanunda East development area from the Greenfield Suburban Neighbourhood Zone and Deferred Urban Zone and transition the existing Menge Road Policy Area 11 and Precinct 40 Illaparra Winery and Concept Plan Map Baro/16 into a sub-zone within the Suburban Neighbourhood Zone. Menge Road Policy Area 11 and Precinct 40 Illaparra Winery replaced with the Neighbourhood Zone. The Code also proposes to insert the Interface Management Overlay to land currently within Precinct 40 Illaparra Winery. This is not proposed be applied to the balance of Policy Area 11 or surrounding land. The rationale for not applying this to the surrounding parcels is not clear, given the function of the Overlay to manage the siting of sensitive land uses in proximity to land uses which may create adverse environmental and amenity impacts. Concept Plan Map Baro/16 abandoned.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component/issue</td>
<td>Commentary</td>
<td>Response/Solution/Suggested change</td>
<td>Revised P&amp;D Code – November 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Mount Pleasant Policy Area 8 and Mixed Use Policy Area 9 and Concept Plan Map Baro/14 - Mount Pleasant not transitioned</td>
<td>The areas identified for development in Mount Pleasant are currently in the Township Zone or Deferred Urban Zone with the Residential Mount Pleasant Policy Area 8 applying to the majority of the Township Zone land and the Mixed Use Policy Area 9 applying to a small portion of the Township Zone. Concept Plan Map Baro/14 - Mount Pleasant accompanies the policy areas. Local policies which acknowledge the land's location within a low density scale township have not been transitioned. It is also noted that although the existing lot size minimum (500 sqm) has been transitioned (via a TNV), under the zone policies the minimum frontage has been increased to 20 m (from 15 m).</td>
<td>Transition Mount Pleasant Policy Area 8 and Mixed Use Policy Area 9 and Concept Plan Map Baro/14 - Mount Pleasant into a sub-zone within the Township Zone</td>
<td>Policy Area 8 – transitioned to Township Neighbourhood Zone  - Minimum frontage TNV – 15m  - Minimum Site Area TNV – 800m²  Consistent with DP controls.  Policy Area 9 (mixed use) – transitioned to Township Zone  This zoning results in an increase in the envisaged land uses to include previously non-complying land uses, including:  - Light Industry  - Shop  - Warehouse  Land Division now DTS where it:  - Reflects the site boundaries illustrated and approved in an operative or existing development authorisation under either Act where the lots are used or proposed to be used solely for residential purposes;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component/issue</td>
<td>Commentary</td>
<td>Response/Solution/Suggested change</td>
<td>Revised P&amp;D Code – November 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 33.             | Long standing local policies for wineries and ancillary development not transitioned | For several decades wineries have been afforded special status in the Barossa Valley region and other regions in order to facilitate their establishment. Grape processing and wine production is an industry and the special status has been to separately refer to 'winery' in zone policies and non-complying tables - e.g. listing winery as an exemption from non-complying whereas 'industry' remains non-complying. This approach has seen other forms of beverage production such as a brewery and chocolate making continue to fall under industry and typically being non-complying. These policies included minimum activities (e.g. crushing, maturation) that needed to be undertaken and minimum criteria (e.g. 4 ha vineyard, 20,000 litre production) to be satisfied in order to qualify for special status. These standards aimed to restrict the potential for wineries with no connection to a local region to establish. In a similar manner cellar doors and restaurants were encouraged but only in association with a winery. In the late 2000s Ministerial policy was introduced to relax policies in the Mount Lofty Ranges Watershed. | Transition existing winery policies into the Rural Zone in particular. The following is an example only with consideration of waste treatment, proximity to watercourses, proximity to sensitive uses and the like also required:

"Winery established on an allotment with at least 4 hectares of vineyard and involving at least one of the following activities: 
- grape crushing
- fermenting of grape product
- wine maturation,
and may include any of the following as accessory and subordinate activities:
- administration
- bottling
- packaging
- warehousing for the store of wine
- waste treatment, storage, reuse and disposal."

"Winery, brewery, cidery and distillery now separately listed land uses in Table 3 – Performance Assessed Development. Amendments made to Assessment Provisions DTS/DPF and PO 4.1 – 4.3 to remove reference to being directly related to and add value to primary production and/or commodities and materials sourced from rural areas. Updated policy within DTS/DPF 4.1 now references that such activities (inc. winery) are directly related to an ancillary to a primary production use on the..." | No localised policy has transitioned. No definition of winery or beverage production provided and reliance within Assessment Provisions to ‘Rural Industries’. Winery, brewery, cidery and distillery now separately listed land uses in Table 3 – Performance Assessed Development. Amendments made to Assessment Provisions DTS/DPF and PO 4.1 – 4.3 to remove reference to being directly related to and add value to primary production and/or commodities and materials sourced from rural areas. Updated policy within DTS/DPF 4.1 now references that such activities (inc. winery) are directly related to an ancillary to a primary production use on the..." |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component/issue</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
<th>Response/Solution/Suggested change</th>
<th>Revised P&amp;D Code – November 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|                 | to allow shops selling wine to establish on a site with no winery. The Code Amendment bundles winery in a new 'beverage production' group and appears to favour only small scale operations up to 250 sqm. Although the intent to relax policies for breweries and the like is welcomed, the changes means the long-standing special policies have not been transitioned with the minimum activities and criteria removed. Winery is once again treated as an industry and the concern is that we may see more wineries, bottling facilities, cellar doors and the like establishing with no connection to place. The focus on small scale winery facilities could also adversely impact on existing operations including limits on expanding. Again, while relaxation of policies is encouraged, the proposed changes appear to have been made with no evident consideration of long term impacts and should be deferred for further evaluation. | (a) do not store winery waste water in holding tanks  
(b) locate winery waste water treatment equipment, effluent dams, buildings containing wine-making activities or buildings containing bottling activities no closer than 300 metres to:  
(i) tourist accommodation (except where it is sited on the same allotment as the winery)  
(ii) residential development (except where it is sited on the same allotment as the winery)  
(iii) a residential zone  
(iv) a rural living zone  
(v) a recreation zone. "  
"Beverage production development provides that all structures involving wine-making, wine storage, packaging and bottling are housed within enclosed buildings."

DTS 4.2 now recognises new large-scale industry (inc. beverage production) which primarily involves commodities sourced from the same allotment and/or surrounding rural areas.  
No guidance on the definition of 'surrounding'. | same or adjoining allotment. This policy is particularly applicable where of a small-scale (500m2).  
Residential land adjacent linear park in Nuriootpa is to be zoned Neighbourhood.  
Minimum Site Area TNV applied which is consistent with the current DP policy. |
<p>| 34. | Local policy regarding medium-density residential development adjoining the Nuriootpa Linear Park not transitioned | Local policy seeks medium-density residential development on sites adjoining the Nuriootpa Linear Park to enhance the southern entrance to Nuriootpa. | Transition local policies regarding residential development adjacent to Nuriootpa Linear Park in an agreed manner |
| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component/issue</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
<th>Response/Solution/Suggested change</th>
<th>Revised P&amp;D Code – November 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35. Telecommunications facility height</td>
<td>In a number of zones local policy limits height of towers to 30 m. This has not been transitioned with towers of any height transitioned as Performance Assessed Development. Potential impacts on character.</td>
<td>List &quot;Telecommunications facility&quot; as Restricted Development with exclusion &quot;Except where it is 30 metres or less in height&quot; in all zones</td>
<td>Localised medium-density policy not transitioned. Additional policy inserted into select zone. For example, Strategic Employment Zone, Employment Zone, Employment(Enterprise) Zone: Telecommunications Facility in the form of a monopole: (a) Up to a height of 30m (b) No closer than 50m to neighbourhood-type zone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Concept Plan Map Baro/1: District Town Centre Zone not transitioned</td>
<td>Concept Plan removed. Currency/validity of plan questionable but should remain and be updated to reflect recent developments such as the Co-op and Mitre 10. Council will review the concept plan in due course to reflect recent developments such as the Co-op and Mitre 10</td>
<td>Transition Concept Plan Map Baro/1: District Town Centre Zone into Code</td>
<td>Concept Plan has not been transitioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Concept Plan Map Baro/2 - Nuriootpa Township not transitioned</td>
<td>Concept Plan not transitioned. Policy direction still valid, in particular regarding access in several areas including Kalimna Road; however various aspects require review to reflect recent land divisions and current strategic directions such as the future role of Tolley Road. In the meantime the concept plan should be transitioned.</td>
<td>Transition Concept Plan Map Baro/2 - Nuriootpa Township</td>
<td>Concept Plan has not been transitioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component/issue</td>
<td>Commentary</td>
<td>Response/Solution/Suggested change</td>
<td>Revised P&amp;D Code – November 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 38. Concept Plan Map Baro/8 - Rural Living (Cockatoo Valley) and accompanying policies not transitioned | Concept Plan Map Baro/8 - Rural Living (Cockatoo Valley) currently applies to portion of the existing Precinct 21 Cockatoo Valley within the Rural Living Zone with accompanying policies which guide the timing and staging of land division. These policies seek to restrict rural living development until existing intensive animal keeping within the concept plan area and mining activities on adjacent land are discontinued. Development while these uses remain could lead to future interface and amenity issues. The policies should be transitioned. | Transition Concept Plan Map Baro/8 - Rural Living (Cockatoo Valley) and accompanying policies relating to existing intensive animal keeping within the concept plan area and mining activities on adjacent land into a sub-zone within the Rural Living Zone | Concept Plan Map Baro/8 Cockatoo Valley now included within Code.  
No policy reference to mining activities or recognition of existing intensive animal keeping.  
Animal keeping policies within Code differ from DP:  
- Minimum allotment area for horse keeping reduced from 3ha to 1ha |
| 39. Concept Plan Baro/9 - Industry (Barossa Valley Region) Nuriootpa (Moppa Road South) not transitioned | Concept Plan Baro/9 applies to an industrial site adjacent to residential and primary production land and seeks to restrict development to low impact uses and to suitably address interface aspects. Retention of the concept plan and associated policies is warranted. | Transition Precinct 1 Moppa Road South Industry and Concept Plan Map Baro/9 - Industry (Barossa Valley Region) into a sub-zone within the Employment Zone | Concept Plan Map Baro/9 has not been transitioned.  
Revised Code proposes to zone this land Strategic Employment. This zone provides for the development of larger scale industrial, logistical, warehousing and storage land uses. The scale envisaged is at odds with that contained in Precinct 1 Moppa Road South. |
| 40. Concept Plan Baro/10 - Kroemer Crossing and associated policies not transitioned | Concept Plan Baro/10 - Kroemer Crossing and associated policies facilitate non-primary production development (e.g. dwellings, tourist facilities, commercial uses) in a cluster of small allotments between Tanunda and Nuriootpa. | Transition Concept Plan Map Baro/10 and accompanying policies into a sub-zone within the Rural Zone | Kroemer Crossing retained as Rural Zone with no sub-zone or Concept Plan:  
- Minimum site area TNV – 25ha  
- Limited Land Division Overlay |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component/issue</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
<th>Response/Solution/Suggested change</th>
<th>Revised P&amp;D Code – November 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>Concept Plan Baro/11 - Light Industry and Warehouse Area (Sturt Highway, Nuriootpa) and associated policies not transitioned</td>
<td>Concept Plan Baro/11 - Light Industry and Warehouse Area and associated policies apply to a site on the Sturt Highway, guiding the ongoing use and development of light industrial, warehouse and storage uses.</td>
<td>Transition Concept Plan Map Baro/11 and accompanying policies into a sub-zone within the Rural Zone Revised Code proposes to zone this land Rural. Concept Plan Map Baro/11 has not been transitioned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZONE COMMENTS</td>
<td>Caravan and Tourist Park Zone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>Restaurant scale not limited</td>
<td>While a shop above 300 sqm is Restricted Development a Restaurant of any size is Performance Assessed Development</td>
<td>Transition existing 150 sqm cap on Restaurant in Caravan and Tourist Park Zone Revised Code has increased Restricted trigger for a shop from 300m2 to 1000m2 and retained policy which does not limit the scale of a restaurant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Facilities Zone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>Shop scale not limited</td>
<td>Shop is transitioned to Performance Assessed Development with no limit on floor area</td>
<td>Transition Shop as Restricted Development with an exception for Shops with a gross leasable floor area less than or equal to 50 square metres Revised Code now includes Restricted trigger for a Shop unless: - GLFA &lt;1000m2 - Is a Restaurant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>Existing envisaged uses not transitioned</td>
<td>List of envisaged uses excludes a number of uses which are currently listed and which would typically be located in this zone - e.g. community centre, emergency services facility, hospital, public administration office - but inserts 'shop' as an envisaged use but without any corresponding direction as to scale or form</td>
<td>Transition all currently envisaged uses and incorporate into DTS/DPF 1.1, delete &quot;Shop&quot; from DTS/DPF 1.1 DTS/DPF 1.1 updated to include additional land uses: - Cemetery - Community Facility - Educational Establishment - Emergency Services Facility - Health Care Facility - Hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component/issue</td>
<td>Commentary</td>
<td>Response/Solution/Suggested change</td>
<td>Revised P&amp;D Code – November 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>- potentially could allow a supermarket in the zone                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        - Library</td>
<td>DTS/DPF 1.1 retains “Shop” and includes DTS/DPF 1.2 which relates to GLFA of shop up to 250m².</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Revised Code now includes Restricted trigger for a Shop unless:</td>
<td>GLFA &lt;1000m²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Envisaged uses requiring public notification</td>
<td>Existing public notification policies not transitioned. In the zone a number of envisaged uses fall under the &quot;All other Code Assessed Development&quot; umbrella (i.e. they are not specifically listed in Table 3) and therefore each will require public notification</td>
<td>All envisaged uses to be exempt from public notification</td>
<td>Majority of envisaged land uses will require notification.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Deferred Urban Zone**

<p>| 46. No envisaged uses listed | Existing Deferred Urban zone envisages broad-acre cropping and grazing however the proposed zone lists no uses as envisaged. Given that future rezoning and development of land in this zone could be decades existing use such as farming should be facilitated. | Transition existing policy by listing Farming and Low intensity animal husbandry under DTS/DPF 1.1                                                                                                                              | DTS/DPF 1.1. updated to reference Farming and Low Intensity Animal Husbandry.                                                                                         |
| 47. Limited list of Restricted Developments | Desired Outcome 1 indicates &quot;To safeguard land for future urban growth&quot; however activities that are likely to hinder urban growth are not listed as Restricted - e.g. industry, intensive | Transition existing non-complying development as Restricted Development                                                                                                                                                   | No change made.                                                                                                                                             |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component/issue</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
<th>Response/Solution/Suggested change</th>
<th>Revised P&amp;D Code – November 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>horticulture. In fact only two developments are listed as Restricted Development (Dwelling that results in more than one dwelling on an allotment, and Land division) which results in a large number of uses and developments that could prejudice future orderly development being established</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Zone</td>
<td>The Employment Zone lists classes of development generally anticipated in this type of zone however Shop is also envisaged which could be problematic.</td>
<td>Remove shop from DTS/DPF 1.1</td>
<td>Shop retained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Neighbourhood Zone</td>
<td>Outbuildings exceeding 60 sqm would be Performance Assessed Development and if adjacent to land in another zone would require public notification - this seems excessive and unfair in that a 200 sqm outbuilding in the middle of a General Neighbourhood Zone would not require notification but if on the edge of that zone it would</td>
<td>Review notification requirements for outbuildings so that the floor area of structures is the notification trigger, not whether or not it is adjacent to another zone</td>
<td>Table 5 – Procedural Matters updated to specifically exclude outbuildings from notification. Reference to adjoining zone removed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Zone</td>
<td>Is it intended that &quot;buildings&quot; includes light towers and fencing on ovals and tennis, netball or other courts? Do they warrant specific attention in the zone given they are more likely to impact on adjacent land than other buildings/structures? On the other hand is 50 m setback excessive for fencing?</td>
<td>Consider including specific policy regarding light towers and fencing for ovals and tennis, netball or other courts</td>
<td>Envisaged land use table updated, including the insertion of “Lighting for night use of facilities” Amendments made to PO 2.1 however no specific zone policies inserted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component/issue</td>
<td>Commentary</td>
<td>Response/Solution/Suggested change</td>
<td>Revised P&amp;D Code – November 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>51. Public notification</strong></td>
<td>A large number of Recreation Zones are adjacent to residential-type zones which means many developments within the zone would be notified which seems onerous.</td>
<td>Review public notification requirements and only require notification of developments likely to impact, such as light towers, but not minor developments</td>
<td>Reference to neighbouring zone trigger removed from Table 5 – Procedural Matters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resource Extraction Zone</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>52. Replacement dwellings</strong></td>
<td>Code imposes more restrictive policies than current in that a dwelling is currently merit if ancillary to and in association with mining operations and where located on the same allotment as the associated mine. The new zone provides that a dwelling would be Restricted Development except if a replacement dwelling. It is considered that a replacement dwelling should only be supported if there is a connection with mining otherwise there may be an incentive to overcapitalise. Existing policies for new dwellings should be transitioned and a replacement dwelling proposal should need to demonstrate a connection with existing or proposed mining operations.</td>
<td>Transition existing policies for new dwellings (where one does not exist) and strengthen replacement dwelling policy to ensure connection with mining operations</td>
<td>No amendments made to Table 4 – Restricted Development Classification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Peri-Urban Zone</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>53. Peri-Urban Zone concept</strong></td>
<td>The proposal to include parts only of the Barossa in a Peri-Urban Zone or similar is not supported, with the need for a separate zone questioned. Application of the proposed zone to only part of the Barossa Valley character preservation district but not to no part of the McLaren Vale character preservation district is inconsistent and illogical. Land use should be</td>
<td>Include land in the Primary Production (Barossa Valley Region) Zone and Watershed Protection (Mount Lofty Ranges) Zone in the Rural Zone, not the Peri-Urban Zone</td>
<td>Revised Code has transitioned the parts of the previously proposed Peri-Urban Zone to the Rural Zone or Adelaide Country Zone.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Current Watershed Protection (MLR) Zone transitioned to Adelaide Country
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component/issue</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
<th>Response/Solution/Suggested change</th>
<th>Revised P&amp;D Code – November 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rural Zone</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Dwellings and connection with farming or other primary production and impacts on adjacent uses</td>
<td>addressed through the Rural Zone, water quality aspects be addressed through the relevant catchment Overlays and character preservation aspects addressed through the Character Preservation District Overlay</td>
<td>- Rural Landscape Protection, Primary Production (BVR) Zone and Primary Production Zone transitioned to Rural Zone.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PO 5.1 refers to not compromising primary production but this is not carried forward into DTS/DPF 5.1 meaning that compliance with that DTS/DPF won't guarantee that existing primary production is protected. Curiously PO 5.2 refers to also not compromising value adding industries but this is only relevant for a second dwelling. A single dwelling on its own should also not compromise primary production and value adding industries and therefore this reference should be included in PO 5.1. In both cases there is also a loss of existing SAPPL reference to separation from existing intensive animal keeping operations. Additionally Barossa has policy regarding separation from winery operations which could be transitioned to cover all forms of beverage production.</td>
<td>Replace PO 5.1 with &quot;Dwellings are ancillary to farming, other primary production, value adding industries or other development that is in keeping with the provisions of the zone.&quot; In DTS/DPF 5.1 insert: &quot;(c) are located more than 500 metres from an existing intensive animal keeping operation unless used in association with that activity. (d) it is located more than 300 metres from beverage production waste water treatment equipment, effluent dams, buildings containing beverage production activities or buildings containing bottling activities; unless it is sited on the same allotment as and used in association with a beverage production facility.&quot;</td>
<td>DTS/DPF 5.1 has been refined, however core intent to ensure that dwelling is used for and ancillary to primary production and/or primary production related value-adding activities is retained. PO 5.1 has been amended considerably to provide greater emphasis on the need for a dwelling to be related to the management of the land for commercial scale primary production and rural related value adding. Further, emphasis is placed on the need to not compromise the use of the allotment, adjacent land or long-term purpose of the zone for primary production or related tourism values due to the proliferation of dwellings. No acknowledgement of the need for new sensitive land uses to be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component/issue</td>
<td>Commentary</td>
<td>Response/Solution/Suggested change</td>
<td>Revised P&amp;D Code – November 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>Use of “Residential development” term</td>
<td>In the following instances delete &quot;Residential development is&quot; and replace with &quot;Dwellings are&quot;: Peri-Urban Zone PO 5.1 Rural Zone PO 5.1 Rural Zone PO 5.3 Rural Horticulture Zone PO 4.1</td>
<td>Update made.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Rural Zone and Rural Horticulture Zone (and the recommended-to-be-removed Peri-Urban Zone) all include a policy that states &quot;Residential development is designed and sited so that it does not compromise primary production, horticultural or other land use activities supported by the Zone&quot;. &quot;Residential development&quot; is defined in section 7(18) of the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act (for Environment and Food Production Area purposes) and in character preservation legislation as &quot;...development primarily for residential purposes ... but does not include ... a dwelling for residential purposes on land used primarily for primary production purposes&quot;. In practice this is interpreted to mean that a 'farm house' on a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component/issue</td>
<td>Commentary</td>
<td>Response/Solution/Suggested change</td>
<td>Revised P&amp;D Code – November 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>farm within the EFPA or character preservation district is not 'residential development'. It is considered that use of this term in this policy could lead to confusion where an application is for a dwelling on 'vacant' land used for primary production. This is likely given that the subsequent policy in each of the zones uses the term &quot;Dwellings&quot;.</td>
<td>Explore potential for advertisements in the form of vineyard signage to be Deemed-to-Satisfy with accompanying performance requirements and standards.</td>
<td>No changes made to insert nuanced policy which would facilitate signage (Advertising) in the Character Preservation District Overlay as DTS – remains Performance Assessed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. Vineyard signage assessment</td>
<td>Transitioned as Deemed-to-Satisfy Development in Rural Zone unless within the Character Preservation District Overlay where all would be Performance Assessed Development. Opportunity exists to reintroduce policies for vineyard identification including a diagram of an appropriate sign and for these to be DTS even within the CPDO.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. Public notification requirements</td>
<td>Farm buildings will require public notification where adjacent to another zone which is considered unnecessary and onerous. Revise notification requirements so that envisaged uses such as agricultural buildings are not notified</td>
<td>Dwelling – no notification required Agricultural building – no notification required Horticulture – no notification required where meets DTS/DPF criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component/issue</td>
<td>Commentary</td>
<td>Response/Solution/Suggested change</td>
<td>Revised P&amp;D Code – November 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>58.</strong> Public notification of dwelling within proximity to beverage production facilities</td>
<td>Current Development Plan policy provides for Category 2 notification of dwellings located less than 300 metres from winery waste water treatment equipment, effluent dams, buildings containing wine-making activities or buildings containing bottling activities; unless it is sited on the same allotment as and used in association with a winery. This is not transitioned in the Rural Zone (our preferred zone), with the intent only for a detached dwelling to require notification under certain (incomplete) circumstances and where it is adjacent to land in a different zone. The intent of the existing policy has merit and should be transitioned and to apply to all beverage production facilities.</td>
<td>In the Rural Zone, Public Notification Table provide for a dwelling to be notified where located less than 300 metres from winery waste water treatment equipment, effluent dams, buildings containing beverage producing activities or buildings containing bottling activities; unless it is sited on the same allotment as and used in association with a beverage production facility.</td>
<td>As above – dwellings do not require notification under any circumstance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rural Living Zone</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>59.</strong> Precinct 32 Tanunda policies not transitioned in whole</td>
<td>Under Precinct 32 Tanunda within the Rural Living Zone creation of additional allotments is non-complying unless for the purpose of creating a linear reserve along the North Para River. These policies have not been transitioned, although the Limited Land Division Overlay has been applied. The linear reserve outcome has significant merit and should be transitioned.</td>
<td>Transition Precinct 32 Tanunda policies via a sub-zone in the Rural Living Zone</td>
<td>Localised policy has not been transitioned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>60.</strong> Policies regarding expansion of existing recreation and accommodation facilities not transitioned</td>
<td>Special policies relating to dormitory accommodation have not been transitioned. These policies relate to an existing facility which has impacted on local amenity over the years.</td>
<td>Transition policies regarding expansion of recreation and accommodation facilities in Rural Living Zone at Cockatoo Valley including listing Dormitory</td>
<td>Localised policy has not been transitioned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component/issue</td>
<td>Commentary</td>
<td>Response/Solution/Suggested change</td>
<td>Revised P&amp;D Code – November 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.</td>
<td>Outbuilding size inadequate</td>
<td>Community expectations are for that the existing limitations will remain.</td>
<td>accommodation at Cockatoo Valley as Restricted Development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

61. Existing policies for outbuildings have not been transitioned with the desired floor area reduced from between 135 and 200 sqm down to 100 sqm, total height increased to 5 m, wall height increased to 4 m, and the number of outbuildings increased to 2 outbuildings. Owners of rural living allotments typically seek larger outbuildings to accommodate specialised mowing equipment and the like and the reduction in floor will likely result in more applications undergoing performance assessment where the assessment panel is the relevant authority. In DTS/DPF 2.5 replace (b) with "have a total floor area that does not exceed 100 m2 for allotments 1 hectare or less, or 200 m2 for allotments more than 1 hectare in area;"

Revised Code outbuilding criteria: DTS/DPF 2.5:
- Allotments 1ha or larger – combined floor area that does not exceed 200m2
- Allotments less than 1ha – combined floor area that does not exceed 150m2

These DTS/DPF criteria provide a DTS pathway.

62. Non-residential development

Suggest a Store (contractor depot or similar) be recognised a potential land use

Expand PO 1.4 and 1.5 to include a Store (contractor depot or similar)

No changes made.

Rural Settlement Zone

63. Policies regarding setbacks of dwellings from winery or industrial uses have not been transitioned

Existing policies regarding setbacks of dwellings from winery or industrial uses have not been transitioned. These policies are particularly relevant in Barossa as each settlement in this zone is adjacent to zones where wineries either currently exist or are envisaged.

Transition into Code in an agreed manner

No changes made.

64. Policies regarding outbuilding floor area in settlements not transitioned

Existing policies for outbuildings have not been transitioned with the desired floor area reduced from 100 sqm down to 60 sqm. The reduction in

Transition into Code in an agreed manner

No changes made.

DTS/DPF 6.1 – Ancillary Buildings:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component/issue</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
<th>Response/Solution/Suggested change</th>
<th>Revised P&amp;D Code – November 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>floor area will likely result in more applications undergoing performance assessment where the assessment panel is the relevant authority. As the majority of lots in the Settlement Zone are adjacent to land in another zone there will also be a likely increase in applications requiring public notification.</td>
<td>- Retains 60m² maximum floor area as Performance Assessed trigger Notification cTable updated – Outbuilding does not require notification.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65. Policies regarding development height in settlements not transitioned</td>
<td>Existing policies restricting development to one storey in height in Rosedale, Light Pass and Bethany have not been transitioned with DTS/DPF 2.1 providing up to 2 building levels and 9 m building height. Although the Historic Area Overlay applying to Bethany refers to 'prevailing' attributes and characteristics removal of the policy is a significant policy shift with potential adverse impacts on character.</td>
<td>Transition into Code in an agreed manner</td>
<td>No changes made.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local policy for the Bethany and Krondorf settlements which seeks to maintain the traditional Huffendorf pattern and size of allotments has not been transitioned.</td>
<td>Transition into Code in an agreed manner</td>
<td>No localised policy inserted to maintain the Huffendorf pattern and size of allotments. Current non-complying trigger for the creation of new allotments in these settlements not transitioned to Limited Land Division Overlay. No minimum allotment size TNV inserted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component/issue</td>
<td>Commentary</td>
<td>Response/Solution/Suggested change</td>
<td>Revised P&amp;D Code – November 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67. Public notification requirements</td>
<td>Public notification policies have not been transitioned. The layout of the 4 villages in this zone sees most properties being adjacent to land in another zone meaning that most proposals would require notification which is considered unnecessary and onerous.</td>
<td>Revise notification requirements so that envisaged uses and small domestic outbuildings and the like are not notified</td>
<td>Amendments made – Outbuildings exempt from notification.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Suburban Neighbourhood Zone**

| 68. Consulting rooms and offices | Current Residential Zone - consulting room and office are non-complying except where less than 50 sqm and where the site does not front an arterial road. Code alters this to 200 sqm and seeks location on arterial road or adjacent a Main Street or Activity Centre Zone. A location on a main road has merit, but concern about the increase in floor area. | Restrict consulting rooms to 50 sqm in the Suburban Neighbourhood Zone | Suburban Neighbourhood Zone transitioned to Neighbourhood Zone or Established Neighbourhood Zone. |

- **Established Neighbourhood Zone**
  - DTS/DPF 1.2 - 50m2 GLFA where not located within proximity of a Centre
  - Consulting Room – Performance Assessed (specifically listed)

- **Neighbourhood Zone**
  - Consulting Room – Performance Assessed (All Other Code Assessed Development)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component/issue</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
<th>Response/Solution/Suggested change</th>
<th>Revised P&amp;D Code – November 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Suburban Employment Zone** | Envisaged uses omits anticipated uses but include retailing | All envisaged uses in the Light Industry Policy Area 4 have not been transitioned. Light industry and store are transitioned into the Suburban Employment Zone DTS/DPF 1.1 but not service industry or warehouse. Note: 'service industry' is not defined in the Code but 'Warehouse' is listed in Table 3 which suggests it is envisaged? A broad range of additional uses are also listed including Shop and Bulky goods outlet. Concern over scale of retailing and potential impacts on town centres | Include 'Service industry' and 'Warehouse' in DTS/DPF 1.1 Remove 'Bulky goods outlet' and 'Shop' from DTS/DPF 1.1 | Suburban Employment transitioned to Employment Zone.  
- Service Industry – not inserted  
- Warehouse – inserted  
- Bulky Goods Outlet – removed  
- Shop - retained |
| | Shop scale | 'Shop has been transitioned to Performance Assessed Development in the Suburban Employment Zone but also listed as Restricted Development with three exceptions. Currently a shop must be less than 80 sqm, ancillary to industrial development and on the same allotment, whereas under the Code any shop of up to 1000 sqm, any sized bulky goods outlet and any sized shop ancillary to light industry is Performance Assessed Development. This is a significant watering down of restrictions on retailing outside town centres | Transition existing limits on shops:  
"Shop that:  
(a) is ancillary to and in association with industrial development  
(b) is located on the same allotment  
(c) has a gross leasable area of less than 80 square metres." | DTS/DPF 1.2 – amended to ensure shops are a smaller element.  
- 500m2 GLFA reduced to 100m2 GLFA  
- Greater emphasis placed on a shop being ancillary to and located on the same allotment as an industry and primarily involves the sale by retain of goods manufactured by the industry. |
<p>| | Policies allow retailing at a scale which will impact on town centres | Existing policies in the Commercial Zone and Light Industry Zone only provide for limited retailing: In the Commercial Zone: other than for bulky goods, currently there is a cap of 150 sqm; In the Light Industry Zone: bulky goods is non-complying with a cap of 80 sqm on shops | Transition existing retailing policies from Commercial Zone, Light Industry Zone and Industry (Barossa Valley Region) limiting such facilities to small scale and only ancillary to industrial activities | Little translation of current policy content. DO 1 supports the zones intent for low-impact light industrial, commercial and business activities and complement other zones roles in |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component/issue</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
<th>Response/Solution/Suggested change</th>
<th>Revised P&amp;D Code – November 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with a requirement for them to be ancillary to, and on same allotment as light industry. The Suburban Employment Zone provides for a standalone shop, with no connection to industry or the like, up to 1000 sqm.</td>
<td>Restrict consulting rooms, offices and shops to 150 sqm in Suburban Employment Zone. List &quot;Warehouse&quot; in DTS/DPF 1.1</td>
<td>providing for shopping and business activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tourist Accommodation Zone</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72. Shop scale in tourist zone</td>
<td>Shop is listed as Restricted Development with exclusions for shop of 500 sqm except for bulky goods outlet and restaurant where no cap is listed. DTS/DPF 1.2 placing no cap on restaurant and 250 sqm for other shops. Suggest no cap on restaurant, shop of 500 sqm and all bulky goods outlets to be Restricted Development</td>
<td>In Table 4 delete &quot;; other than a bulky goods outlet:&quot; in exclusions column associated with &quot;Shop&quot;</td>
<td>Presumably this relates to the Tourism Development Zone. Table 4 – Restricted Development Classification updated to:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| | | | • Delete reference to an exclusion for bulky goods  
• Remove floor cap for restaurant |
| 73. Envisaged uses | Zone DTS/DPF 1.1 contains an expanded range of envisaged uses with accommodation uses merged into 'tourist accommodation'; however 'entertainment, cultural and exhibition facility' and 'nature or health retreat' have not been included. Shop is now listed as envisaged which is considered inappropriate. | In DTS/DPF 1.1 replace "Shop" with "Restaurant" and add "entertainment, cultural and exhibition facility" and "nature or health retreat" | No changes made to DTS/DPF 1.1 |
| 74. Restricted Developments too narrow | All developments currently listed as non-complying have been transitioned as Performance Assessed Development. These activities are considered unsuitable in a tourist focussed zone. | Transition existing non-complying uses in the Tourist Accommodation Zone to Restricted Development | No changes made to Restricted Table |
| Component/issue                                                                 | Commentary                                                                                                                                                                                                 | Response/Solution/Suggested change                                                                 | Revised P&D Code – November 2020                                                                 |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
<p>| <strong>Township Zone</strong>                                                              |                                                                                                                                             |                                                                                                |                                                                                                |
| 75. Retail policies for Town Centre Policy Area 10 not transitioned            | Transformed as Performance Assessed Development. DTS/DPF 1.2 provides for 250 sqm which is contrary to current policy and is a significant policy shift. Note: current policy results from the Ministerial Existing Activity Centres Policy Review DPA. Reinstatement of Town Centre Policy Area as a Township Main Street Zone where shops larger than 250 sqm are catered for. | Transition existing retailing policies for Town Centre Policy Area 10 into the Township Main Street Zone | Updates made to transition the previous Township Zoning to Township Main Street.               |
| 76. Potential for scattered non-residential development                        | In the absence of town centre policy areas in townships increased potential exists for scattered non-residential development. Under DTS/DPF 1.5 this scenario is more likely and in reality the first non-residential use will set the sequence for more with clusters being set up. Reinstatement of policy areas in the larger townships (in the form of zones) will help direct retailing etc to designated centres. | Transition Town Centre Policy Area 10 into Township Main Street Zone at Lyndoch, Williamstown and Mount Pleasant. | Zoning of town centre in Lyndoch, Williamstown and Mount Pleasant updated from Township Zone to Township Main Street. |
| 77. Restricted Developments too narrow                                         | Most developments currently listed as non-complying have been transitioned as Performance Assessed Development. These activities are considered unsuitable in a township area. | Transition existing non-complying uses to Restricted Development. List Industry as Restricted Development with Light industry and Service industry as exclusions | Minor amendment made to include Industry (excluding Light Industry) as Restricted.               |
| 78. Land use DTS/DPF 1.3 omits &quot;storage&quot;                                       | DTS/DPF 1.3 includes &quot;light industry, warehouse or store&quot; however therefore PO 1.3 omits reference to &quot;storage&quot;                                                                                     | In PO 1.3 delete &quot;light industry and warehousing&quot; and replace with &quot;light industry, warehousing and storage&quot; | Minor amendments made to PO 1.3 to reference ‘warehousing activities’.                           |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component/issue</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
<th>Response/Solution/Suggested change</th>
<th>Revised P&amp;D Code – November 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Township Main Street Zone</strong></td>
<td>&quot;Industry&quot; is the only listed Restricted Development type. The Township Activity Centre Zone excludes &quot;Light Industry&quot; from being Restricted Development which is reasonable considering that light industry includes activities typically found in regional town centres such as a bakery or dry cleaner. This exclusion should be extended to the Township Main Street Zone.</td>
<td>Exclude Light Industry from Restricted Development</td>
<td>Exclusion inserted for Light Industry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OVERLAY COMMENTS</strong></td>
<td>The existing Character Preservation District Overlay has been transitioned but expanded in both content and spatial extent. The Overlay now include townships which were curiously omitted previously despite being within a character preservation district; however despite the mapping now applying a 'value' indicating that land is either &quot;Township&quot; or &quot;Not in Township&quot;, there is no corresponding policy distinction in the written Overlay provisions. In this context it is noted that the Overlay policies refer to &quot;the Rural Area&quot; - is that intended to be the &quot;Not in Township&quot; areas? The importance of getting this Overlay right cannot be overstated. If written and applied inappropriately it has potential to stymie development and unnecessarily delay approvals - e.g. applying a different assessment pathway</td>
<td>Collaborate with Council on enhancing the draft Overlay to achieve better design outcomes and appropriate assessment pathways.</td>
<td>Updates made to Overlay, including the insertion of additional DO to emphasise the use of land outside of townships for primary production and associated value adding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Character Preservation District Overlay application, intent and potential role</strong></td>
<td><strong>Table 2 – Deemed to Satisfy Development Classification.</strong> It is...</td>
<td>Updates made to Table 1 – Accepted Development to ensure that minor development occurring within townships (e.g. carports) do not trigger consideration of the Overlay.</td>
<td><strong>A high-level review of zone content affecting townships shows that there has been retention of the trigger within Table 2 – Deemed to Satisfy Development Classification. It is...</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component/issue</td>
<td>Commentary</td>
<td>Response/Solution/Suggested change</td>
<td>Revised P&amp;D Code – November 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to a carport in the centre of a residential area. If it is too general in nature it will not assist in the assessment process and just another process; but if thoughtfully and creatively applied it could be used to facilitate character-appropriate development by applying a less onerous assessment pathway - e.g. vineyard signs constructed in accordance with design standards that were in previous iterations of the Development Plan could Deemed-to-Satisfy rather than Performance Assessed Development requiring public notification which is what is proposed under the Code. This approach could arguably be applied to a range of minor developments whereby owners benefit in a way by being in the character preservation district through a more certain pathway and the community benefits with better designed development. Despite assurances of Council being closely involved in the preparation of the State Planning Policy for the district and the replacement Overlay, this did not occur with a limited opportunity being given in respect to the Overlay late in the Code transition process. Council welcomes the opportunity to collaborate with the Commission on enhancing the draft Overlay to achieve better design outcomes and appropriate assessment pathways.</td>
<td></td>
<td>not clear how the Code has separated between Townships and Not in Township areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component/issue</td>
<td>Commentary</td>
<td>Response/Solution/Suggested change</td>
<td>Revised P&amp;D Code – November 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81. Significant Landscape Protection Overlay policies could align closer with</td>
<td>The Significant Landscape Protection Overlay policies are relatively weak compared to the Hills Face Zone which has a similar intent. Opportunity exists to strengthen the overlay policies to closer align with the HFZ, in particular relating to built form, protection of native vegetation, protection of skyline views, views from the Barossa valley floor and adjacent ranges and the like</td>
<td>Strengthen policies in the Significant Landscape Protection Overlay to closer align with Hills Face Zone policies</td>
<td>Very minor amendments made to PO2.1 and PO2.2, but no substantial change has been made to strengthen policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hills Face Zone policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82. Mount Lofty Ranges Water Supply Catchment (Area 2) Overlay, Stormwater DTS/</td>
<td>This policy applies to additions with no corresponding policy for new dwellings</td>
<td>In Stormwater DTS/DPF 3.5 delete &quot;Dwelling additions&quot; and replace with &quot;Dwellings&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPF 3.5 only applies to dwelling additions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>277</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component/Issue</td>
<td>Commentary</td>
<td>Response/Solution/Suggested Change</td>
<td>Revised P&amp;D Code – November 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising</td>
<td>DTS/DPF 5.2 is called up in all zones implying an intent for no advertisement to be illuminated anywhere in the State. This seems to be both unreasonable and unrealistic. Curiously PO 5.2 anticipates some illumination provided it is not &quot;excessive&quot; but DTS/DPF 5.2 says no illumination. There should be some differentiation between bright internal and subdued external illumination, between internal LED lighting and external LED spotlights on the basis that discrete spotlights would not be excessive and unlikely to create a hazard, yet under the DTS/DPF requires detailed assessment.</td>
<td>Review whether intent of DTS/DPF 5.2 is intended to prevent all illuminated advertisements.</td>
<td>Wording of DTS/DPF and PO unchanged. Review of policies contained in both Table 2 - Deemed-to-Satisfy Development Classification and Table 3 – Applicable Policies for Performance Assessed Development applicable to Township Main Street Zone and Township Activity Centre Zone (as examples) confirms:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal keeping and Horse Keeping</td>
<td>The Barossa Council Development Plan contains a policy regarding site features for horse Keeping and regarding fencing for animal keeping. Council considers the policy has merit for State wide application.</td>
<td>Include additional policy in Animal Keeping and Horse Keeping General policies: &quot;xx Stables and horse shelters should have dimensions of at least 4 metres by 4 metres per horse and an accompanying</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84. Site requirements for horse keeping and for Fencing for animal keeping - potential to incorporate into Code</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No change to Animal Keeping and Horse Keeping Module.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Infrastrucrure and Renewable Energy Facilities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component/Issue</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
<th>Response/Solution/Suggested Change</th>
<th>Revised P&amp;D Code – November 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 85. Visibility of roof mounted solar panels supporting structures | No specific policies are provided to guide roof mounted solar panels, including those on tilt frames. | Include in Infrastructure and Renewable Energy Facilities module or Design in Urban Areas and Design in Rural Areas modules relating to roof mounted solar panels and tilt frames in all locations but in particular in a Historic Area Overlay or Character Area Overlay. Example wording: 

>`xx Roof mounted mechanical plant and equipment, and their support structures, should be located and screened such that they are not visible from public places.` | No change to Infrastructure and Renewable Facilities module or Design Module in revised Code. |

**Interface between Land Uses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Commentary</th>
<th>Response/Solution/Suggested Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>86. Outcomes from PIRSA sponsored ‘Buffers Working Group’ final report</td>
<td>Although the General Interface between Land Uses module addresses many interface scenarios it is considered it does not adequately address interface between primary production uses - e.g. vineyards establishing adjacent to</td>
<td>Incorporate relevant recommendations from the Final Report of the PIRSA sponsored buffers working group in 2017.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amendments made to DO to include recognition of impact on new uses from existing uses ‘Development is located and designed to mitigate adverse...’
cropping land. A PIRSA sponsored buffers review undertaken in 2017 provides appropriate guidance relating to assessment and buffers.

Greater emphasis has been included in PO 9.1 to protect existing horticultural and farming activities from intrusion from sensitive land uses and the need for new sensitive land uses to not prejudice continued operation of these activities.

Listed activities and associated minimum separation distances in DTS/DPF 9.5 expanded.

Notwithstanding, suite of recommendations arising from the PIRSA rural interface/buffers workshop have not carried through to updated Interface between Land Uses Module in revised Code.

| 87. Inadequate policies regarding impact of sensitive uses on other uses | The policies in the Interface with Rural Activities section all rightly seek protection for new sensitive receiver from other activities but fail to recognise the potential impact that a sensitive receiver can have on existing operation - e.g. a vineyard (sensitive received) establishing adjacent to cropping land | Review Interface with Rural Activities policies to address sensitive receiver impacts on other activities in addition to impacts from other activities. | As above, greater guidance provided within PO 9.1 to the need for sensitive receivers to be appropriately sited to not prejudice the continued operation of lawfully established horticultural and farming activities. |
| Land Division in Rural Areas | Battle-axe allotments in rural areas | Battle-axe lots appear to be envisaged in rural areas according to the Design in Rural Areas module with a frontage of 3 m. It is noted that the Design in Rural Areas module is identical to the Design in Urban Areas module which is assumed to be a mistake; however Council requests that such form of land division would be inappropriate in rural areas. | The Design in Rural Areas module should not facilitate creation of battle-axe allotments. | Land Division in Rural Areas module replaced with generic Land Division Module. No reference to frontage minimum of 3m included. |
| ADMINISTRATIVE COMMENTS | Definitions | The definition of "Industry" included a new addition from existing to include "(selling by retail of goods manufactured on site provided the total floor area occupied for such sale does not exceed 250 square metres". This assumes to provide an automatic right to provide up to 250 sqm of retail with no additional development approval required. Activities of this scale should undergo assessment rather than be given assumed right to establish. | Remove item (e) from definition of "Industry" | Shop retained |
| | Industry definition allows shop automatically? | "Service industry" is no longer defined with one component of the old definition (relating to sales) being merged into the industry definition; however the service, repair and restoration activities appear to have been lost all together. | Transition existing definition of "Service industry" into Code | No change |
| | Service industry no longer defined | "Private open space" is defined in Part 8 and specifically excludes areas used for bin storage, laundry drying, rainwater tanks, utilities, driveways and vehicle parking areas. The exclusions should be extended to include areas | Expand the definition of "Private open space" to exclude areas for utilities and power generation and storage | No change |
for utilities and power generation and storage - e.g. ground based solar panels and battery storage facilities

1. **SPATIAL ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component/issue</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
<th>Response/Solution/Suggested change</th>
<th>Revised P&amp;D Code – November 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. ZONING AND OVERLAY ERRORS AND ANOMALIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Nuriootpa town centre split into two zones</td>
<td>District Town Centre Zone at Nuriootpa transitioned into two zone with no obvious rationale for how dividing line was determined, noting that the split bears no relationship to Concept Plan Map Baro/1</td>
<td>Include all Nuriootpa town centre land in Township Activity Centre Zone</td>
<td>Nuriootpa District Centre transitioned to Township Activity Centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Angaston (Town Hall) placed in Community Facilities Zone</td>
<td>Intriguing change in that this is the only Council owned facility selected for special zoning treatment</td>
<td>Include 8 Sturt Street Angaston (Town Hall) in Township Main Street Zone not Community Facilities Zone</td>
<td>8 Sturt Street Angaston zoned Township Main Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Angaston (former Council office and adjacent land) placed in Community Facilities Zone</td>
<td>Three privately owned properties (1 Fife Street, 3-7 Fife Street and 12-14 Sturt Street) proposed to be included in Community Facilities Zone. Residential use is not envisaged.</td>
<td>Remove 1 Fife Street, 3-7 Fife Street and 12-14 Sturt Street from Community Facilities Zone and include in Township Main Street Zone</td>
<td>1 Fife Street, 3-7 Fife Street and 12-14 Sturt Street zoned Township Main Street.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4. Land covered by Historic Area Overlay at Tanunda (Goat Square) placed in General Neighbourhood Zone | General Neighbourhood Zone which for higher density development is inappropriate for areas within a Historic Area Overlay, in particular for historic Goat Square which is proposed to be an island of General Neighbourhood Zone surrounded by the Suburban | Include land covered by Historic Area Overlay Baro10 (Goat Square, Tanunda) in the Suburban Neighbourhood Zone. Remove Building Height (Metres) TNV and Building Height (Storeys) TNV from the land covered by Historic Area Overlay Baro2 | Goat Square zoned Established Neighbourhood.  
Maximum Building Height (Levels) TNV – 1 level                                                      |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component/issue</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
<th>Response/Solution/Suggested change</th>
<th>Revised P&amp;D Code – November 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood Zone. Request confirmation of advice in the Commission's Update Report that the Suburban Neighbourhood Zone will apply.</td>
<td>Current policies speak against 2 storey development and therefore application of 9 m/2 storey TNVs is considered inappropriate.</td>
<td>Include land covered by Historic Area Overlay Baro2 (at Angaston) in the Suburban Neighbourhood Zone</td>
<td>Historic Area Overlay areas in Angaston zoned Established Neighbourhood and Township Main Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Land covered by Historic Area Overlay at Angaston placed in General Neighbourhood Zone</td>
<td>General Neighbourhood Zone which provides for higher density development is inappropriate for areas within a Historic Area Overlay. Request confirmation of advice in the Commission’s Update Report that the Suburban Neighbourhood Zone will apply.</td>
<td>Include all land covered by Historic Area Overlay Baro9 in (at Tanunda) in the Suburban Neighbourhood Zone</td>
<td>Historic Area Overlay areas in Tanunda zoned Established Neighbourhood and Township Main Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Pockets of land covered by Historic Area Overlay at Tanunda placed in General Neighbourhood Zone</td>
<td>Historic Area aligns with existing Historic Conservation Area; however General Neighbourhood Zone provides for higher density development. Request confirmation of advice in the Commission’s Update Report that the Suburban Neighbourhood Zone will apply.</td>
<td>Replace flood mapping with updated mapping to be supplied by Council</td>
<td>New Hazards (Flooding) Overlay and Hazards (Flooding – General) Overlay inserted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Hazards (Flooding) Overlay at Nuriootpa, Tanunda, Stockwell and Mount Pleasant based on outdated flood hazard mapping</td>
<td>Flood hazard mapping to be replaced with current mapping used by Council for development assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component/issue</td>
<td>Commentary</td>
<td>Response/Solution/Suggested change</td>
<td>Revised P&amp;D Code – November 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stockwell</td>
<td>Flood mapping inserted into Hazards (Flooding) Overlay for Stockwell is correct as per Council comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nuriootpa</td>
<td>Flood mapping proposed in Hazards (Flooding) Overlay reflecting dated flood data from 1990. Council has prepared updated mapping in 2009 maps the extent of flooding following flood mitigation strategies. Council requests the most up-to-date flood data be inserted to replace the existing mapping. Further, Council has mapped flood extent for Kalima Creek which was not previously included in mapping. This mapping is available, and Council requests its insertion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tanunda</td>
<td>The mapping as proposed in the Code which depicts flooding extent in Tanunda is correct, however only reflects flooding on the eastern (Barossa Council) side of the river. The mapping which has been prepared is detailed and depicts the full extent of flood exposure. This should be extended to depict the flood extent on both the Barossa and Light Regional Council side of the river. It is understood that Light Regional Council is supportive of this insertion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component/issue</td>
<td>Commentary</td>
<td>Response/Solution/Suggested change</td>
<td>Revised P&amp;D Code – November 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. <strong>Land covered by Historic Area Overlay at Lyndoch and portion of Historic Area Overlay at Tanunda also included in Character Area Overlay</strong></td>
<td>Land covered by Historic Area Overlay at Lyndoch and portion of Historic Area Overlay at Tanunda is also included in the Character Area Overlay. Request confirmation of advice in the Commission's Update Report that the Character Area Overlay will not apply.</td>
<td>Remove Character Area Overlay from land to be included in Historic Area Overlay at Lyndoch and portion of area at Tanunda</td>
<td>Character Area Overlay not applied within Lyndoch or Tanunda.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. <strong>Incorrect application of Lot Size Minimum TNV to Rural Zone in Eden Valley, Springton, Sandy Creek areas</strong></td>
<td>Confusing application of 30 ha Lot Size Minimum TNV in that there is no current minimum lot size given that additional lots are not envisaged.</td>
<td>Remove Lot Size Minimum TNV from Rural Zone in Eden Valley, Springton, Sandy Creek areas</td>
<td>Limited Land Division Overlay applied at Eden Valley and Springton. Minimum Site Area TNV retained and reflective of Development Plan policy – (e.g. 32ha).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Application of Limited Land Division Overlay and Lot Size Minimum TNV to land in Township within Character Preservation District Overlay</strong></td>
<td>Land in Moppa Road South, Peramangk Road, Old Kapunda Road area in Nuriootpa, and 3241 Eden Valley Road and Herriot Road in Mount Pleasant have been included in the Limited Land Division Overlay. These areas are within a Township within the Character Preservation District Overlay and not</td>
<td>Remove Limited Land Division Overlay and Lot Size Minimum TNV from indicated areas on Moppa Road South, Peramangk Road and Old Kapunda Road in Nuriootpa, and 3241 Eden Valley Road and Herriot Road in Mount Pleasant</td>
<td>Presumably this refers to 14 Peramangk Road, 6 Peramangk Road, 44 Moppa Road South – Limited Land Division Overlay retained: 3241 Eden Valley Road and Herriot Road, Mount Pleasant - Limited Land Division Overlay retained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component/issue</td>
<td>Commentary</td>
<td>Response/Solution/Suggested change</td>
<td>Revised P&amp;D Code – November 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Tanunda: 26-38 Basedow Road</td>
<td>Properties are currently entirely within the Residential Zone and partly within the Tanunda Historic Character Area 2: Precinct 11 Basedow Road. The Code split each property into two zones with the General Neighbourhood Zone applying to the rear of properties which is currently outside policy area and the Suburban Neighbourhood Zone applying to the front portion. One potential issue is that GNZ has a smaller lot size and frontage (300 sqm/9 m) than current (500 sqm/15 m). While unlikely, the new zoning arrangement could see the rear portions divided off?</td>
<td>Include entire allotments in Suburban Neighbourhood Zone</td>
<td>Revised Code – Split zone retained now Established Neighbourhood and Neighbourhood Zone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Major Urban Transport Routes Overlay - land adjacent railway corridor not captured</td>
<td>The Major Urban Transport Routes Overlay has been applied to land directly abutting Barossa Valley Way between Nuriootpa and Tanunda; however the rail corridor separates a number of properties from the road meaning they are not included in the overlay In line with the intent of the overlay to guide referrals and set policy for access etc it is considered the overlay should apply to those properties</td>
<td>Apply the Major Urban Transport Routes Overlay to allotments separated from Barossa Valley Way by the rail corridor</td>
<td>No change made. Overlay applies to Railway Corridor itself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component/issue</td>
<td>Commentary</td>
<td>Response/Solution/Suggested change</td>
<td>Revised P&amp;D Code – November 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUGGESTED ADJUSTMENTS TO ZONES AND OVERLAYS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Limited Land Division Overlay not applied to Resource Extraction Zone</td>
<td>The Limited Land Division Overlay should apply to the Resource Extraction Zone in order to maintain current policy.</td>
<td>Apply the Limited Land Division Overlay to land in the Resource Extraction Zone</td>
<td>No Change - Limited Land Division Overlay not applied.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Resource Extraction Protection Area Overlay not applied to any land adjacent to the Resource Extraction Zone</td>
<td>No apparent rationale for where this has been applied. It has not been applied to any land adjacent to the Resource Extraction Zone in our Council but has been applied to a single area in Mid Murray Council which is currently zoned Rural and where no buffer or anything similar applies. In order to protect strategic resources from sensitive uses the Overlay should apply to all land in the Resource Extraction Zone.</td>
<td>Apply Resource Extraction Protection Area Overlay to all land adjacent to Resource Extraction Zones</td>
<td>No change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Outcomes from Kalbeeba West Infill Study not incorporated into Code as anticipated</td>
<td>Council’s <em>Kalbeeba Infill Study</em> recommended a reduction in the minimum lot size for the ‘Kalbeeba West’ precinct together with other policy changes to facilitate and guide infill development. Council initiated a Development Plan Amendment but were instructed by DPTI to use the Code transition process to implement the changes which incidentally received strong local community support. Unfortunately Council was not given the opportunity to introduce these changes, and although all future land division is</td>
<td>Apply a 2500 sqm Lot Size Minimum TNV and 30 m Frontage Minimum TNV to land within existing Precinct 26 Kalbeeba West</td>
<td>Changes not made. Retention of 5000m2 minimum site area TNV and no frontage minimum TNV.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component/issue</td>
<td>Commentary</td>
<td>Response/Solution/Suggested change</td>
<td>Revised P&amp;D Code – November 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proposed to be Performance Assessed Development it sees benefit to use the current process to introduce the changes to allotment size and frontages proposed by the study.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Zoning of Moculta Recreation Park</td>
<td>Moculta Recreation Park currently in Township Zone, but unlike the approach taken in Stockwell and other towns this oval has not been included in the Recreation Policy Area. Opportunity to include it in Recreation Zone?</td>
<td>Include Moculta Recreation Park in Recreation Zone</td>
<td>Moculta Oval retained in Township Zone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Inconsistent approach to zoning of ovals</td>
<td>Ovals in Lyndoch, Stockwell, Mount Pleasant and Williamstown oval which are currently in Township Zone and Recreation Policy Area 6 are proposed to be included in the Recreation Zone. This is a logical transition; however ovals (e.g. in Angaston and Tanunda) remain in a residential zone (General Neighbourhood). Council's last Strategic Directions Report recommended the current hotch-potch of zoning approaches be addressed. The Code presents this opportunity.</td>
<td>Transition ovals and recreation parks at Angaston and Tanunda into the Recreation Zone</td>
<td>Angaston Oval – Established Neighbourhood Zone. Tangunda Oval – Established Neighbourhood Zone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Small area in Elizabeth Street, Tanunda placed in General Neighbourhood Zone</td>
<td>This an anomaly where an area wedged between an existing Historic Conservation Area and the Tanunda Historic Character Policy Area. The land currently has the same Residential zoning as the balance of Tanunda (500</td>
<td>Include 3-5, 7 and 9 Elizabeth Street in Suburban Neighbourhood Zone</td>
<td>Transitioned to Neighbourhood Zone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component/issue</td>
<td>Commentary</td>
<td>Response/Solution/Suggested change</td>
<td>Revised P&amp;D Code – November 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sqm etc) but is proposed to be in the General Neighbourhood Zone which</td>
<td>provides for higher density development. The area will also be an 'island' surrounded by the Historic Area Overlay. It is suggested it be included in the Suburban Neighbourhood Zone to maintain current policy and to recognise its location adjacent to a Historic Area Overlay.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Privately owned land at Tanunda included in Community Facilities Zone</td>
<td>Includes privately owned land at 127 Menge Road, Tanunda which owner has previously requested to be primary production/rural.</td>
<td>Remove 127 Menge Road from Community Facilities Zone and include in Rural Zone</td>
<td>127 Menge Road, Tanunda retained in Community Facilities Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Private properties at Tanunda included in Recreation Zone</td>
<td>Private properties at 1D, 1E, 2A Murray Street, Allot 442 Murray Street, 2A and 4 Maria St and Lot 476 Maria Street, Tanunda are currently in the Recreation Zone. There is no intention to acquire these properties for public recreation purposes. Council's last Strategic Directions Report proposed to address the issue via a DPA which was not commenced due to the planning reforms. The Code transition provides an opportunity to adjust these anomalies.</td>
<td>Remove 1D, 1E, 2A Murray Street, Allot 442 Murray Street, 2A and 4 Maria St and Lot 476 Maria Street, Tanunda from Recreation Zone and include in General Neighbourhood Zone or Suburban Neighbourhood Zone</td>
<td>Land retained in Recreation Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Inclusion of private land in Recreation Zone at Mount Pleasant</td>
<td>The Recreation Policy Area 6 at Mount Pleasant includes private land, either in whole or part. The policy area boundary was determined by applying a simplistic</td>
<td>Include 51, 53, 55, 57 and 59 Melrose Street and Allot 1 Talunga Park Road in the Township Main Street Zone; apply appropriate building height TNVs</td>
<td>Land retained in Recreation Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component/issue</td>
<td>Commentary</td>
<td>Response/Solution/Suggested change</td>
<td>Revised P&amp;D Code – November 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 m line from the River Torrens, presumably to address potential flooding and water quality issues. The policy area has been transitioned into the Recreation Zone.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is considered that private land should not be in the Recreation Zone unless there is a clear intent to acquire the land for future public recreation use. Water quality and flood hazard issues are adequately addressed through Overlay or General policies and accordingly a review of the zoning approach is justified. As the adjoining policy area is Town Centre Policy Area 10, it is requested that the allotments be included in the Township Main Street Zone (in accordance with a separate submission request that the Town Centre Policy Area 10 be transitioned into that zone).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Zoning of Altona CSR Landcare Reserve and adjacent land</td>
<td>Council's last Strategic Directions Report noted that the Recreation Zone associated with the land care reserve at Altona includes private land whether further investigations needed to be undertaken to determine whether this zoning is compatible with the intent of land care or whether rezoning to a Conservation Zone would be more appropriate. With the introduction of the Conservation Zone it is considered to</td>
<td>Transition land in Altona CSR Landcare Reserve and adjacent land from Recreation Zone to Conservation Zone</td>
<td>Land retained in Recreation Zone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component/issue</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
<th>Response/Solution/Suggested change</th>
<th>Revised P&amp;D Code – November 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>be an appropriate opportunity to change the zone to Conservation Zone; however any change to what properties are to be included in the zone should be considered in consultation with affected land owners.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Zoning of existing rural living areas at Mount Crawford and Cromer</td>
<td>Two areas within the Rural Living Zone and Watershed Policy Area 3 have been transitioned into the Rural Zone and Mount Lofty Ranges Catchment (Area 2) Overlay and Limited Land Division Overlay among others. The current policy intent is to prevent creation of additional allotments and to limit dwelling potential, in recognition of the location in the watershed. The proposed zoning and overlay mix will maintain this intent and accordingly is supported. In this context it is noted that inclusion of these areas in the Rural Zone results in the areas being 'islands' surrounded by Peri-Urban Zone which is considered an unusual approach despite this land and surrounding land all being within the watershed. As requested elsewhere in this submission, replacement of the Peri-Urban Zone with the Rural Zone would see all land in the rural parts of the watershed treated the same.</td>
<td>Transitioning of land at Mount Crawford and Cromer within the Rural Living Zone and Watershed Policy Area 3 into the Rural Zone is supported</td>
<td>Land rezoned Adelaide Country.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Development Plan Details</td>
<td>Overlay Details</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockwell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No change required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuriootpa</td>
<td>Request replacement of proposed mapping with the “Nuriootpa 100 year Flood Category 2009 POST MITIGATION” data for North Para River</td>
<td></td>
<td>Request introduction of flood hazard mapping for Kalimna Creek (Layer to be provided).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanunda</td>
<td>Flood mapping is shown on five separate Development Constraints maps i.e.</td>
<td>Code mapping for North Para River within The Barossa Council is correct. Existing Development Plan flood mapping of the North Para River extends into Light Regional Council.</td>
<td>Request Code mapping include the full extent of flooding in both The Barossa Council and Light Regional Council. Request introduction of flood hazard mapping for Basedow Creek (layer to be provided).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Pleasant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No change required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
November 2020

Martin McCarthy
Chief Executive Officer
Hannay Crescent Cemetery
PO Box 867
NURIOOTPA SA 5355

Dear Mr. McCarthy,

Consultation on the draft Planning and Design Code – Historic Areas and proposed changes affecting your property

South Australia’s current planning system, which sets out planning zones and rules in individual documents called Development Plans (based on council areas), is being restructured and transitioned into a singular statewide Planning and Design Code (the Code). The Code is already in place in our Outback and Rural areas, and is due to be switched on in our Urban Areas in early 2021.

I am writing to explain how these changes will affect you and to seek your comment on the proposal as it relates to your property at Hannay Crescent Cemetery.

As you may be aware, your property at Hannay Crescent Cemetery, is currently identified as a ‘contributory item’ in The Barossa Council Development Plan. This means that it has been previously identified by Council as having particular character attributes that make a positive contribution to the historic value of the local area.

In most cases, existing contributory items are located within Historic Conservation Zones, which means that there are special planning rules which seek to ensure that these places, and their special character, are retained into the future. This includes the need to gain planning approval if an owner wants to demolish the building or affect its appearance. Outside of these Historic Conservation Zones, demolition does not require planning approval and there can be greater flexibility regarding property appearance.

Currently, whilst your property is identified as a contributory item, it is not located within a Historic Conservation Zone. This means that whilst there was an intent that your property have demolition control applied to it, it currently does not.

Under the new Planning and Design Code, the Commission is working to correct these anomalies in the existing system. The Commission is proposing to include your property in the Historic Area Overlay (which is replacing Historic Conservation Zones), and to identify your property as a ‘Representative Building’ (the new name for contributory items). This would mean that you would need to apply for approval should you ever wish to demolish the building and that any new development would need to be undertaken in a way that fits in with the area.

The Code is now on public consultation, and I invite your feedback on this proposal to affect your property.

For specific detail on the planning rules proposed for your property, please visit http://consult.plan.sa.gov.au
where you can run a search for your property address. Additional information in relation about how the heritage and Representative Building rules work is provided on the PlanSA Portal (www.plansa.gov.au).

The PlanSA Service Desk is active should you have any queries regarding the Code or the ePlanning platform. Simply contact 1800 752 664 or email PlanSA@esa.gov.au

Yours sincerely,

Michael Lennon
Chair

saplanningcommission.sa.gov.au
7.5.2. DEBATE AGENDA – ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES REPORT

7.5.2.1 BAROSSA BUSHGARDENS URBAN DESIGN FRAMEWORK - POST CONSULTATION APPROVAL

Author: Director Development and Environmental Services

PURPOSE

To approve the 2020 update of the Barossa Bushgardens Urban Design Framework, post consultation.

RECOMMENDATION

That Council
(1) Note the submissions received during the consultation period, and
(2) Endorse the Barossa Bushgardens Urban Design Framework - 2020 Update.

REPORT

Background

At its meeting on 20 October 2020, Council resolved to endorse the draft Barossa Bushgardens Urban Design Framework for public consultation, and adopt the framework at the conclusion of the consultation in the absence of any written submission.

MOVED Cr Schilling that Council

(1) Endorse the Barossa Bushgardens Urban Design Framework - Draft 2020 Update for a period of public consultation in accordance with Council’s Public Consultation Policy.

(2) Adopt the Barossa Bushgardens Urban Design Framework - Draft 2020 Update at the immediate conclusion of the public consultation period, in the absence of any written submission being received, otherwise a report to be brought back to Council on the submissions received.

Seconded Cr Troup  CARRIED 2018-22/272
Consultation on the Urban Design Framework commenced 4 November and concluded on the 24 November 2020. The Urban Design Framework was made available to the public on the Your Say Barossa site.

Barossa Bushgardens is a regional native flora centre, conserving, promoting and supplying the Barossa region's unique local native plants. It is a model social enterprise that was founded nearly 20 years ago in context of 97% of native vegetation loss in the Barossa region. The site now features a multi-faceted seed orchard, display gardens, a greenhouse, volunteer centre, nursery and sales area. The Barossa Bushgardens are open to the public 365 days a year and entry is free.

The Urban Design Framework has been prepared to identify how the Barossa Bushgardens currently and potentially can connect with the urban context of Nuriootpa and the Barossa Valley. The Framework includes recommendations of:

- Enhancement of major pedestrian access
- New vehicular, pedestrian and bike access off Research Road
- Further development of community volunteer centre precinct area
- Shared path upgrade
- Signage and way finding

During the consultation period, a total of 47 people visited the Your Say Barossa page, with 22 downloads of the Urban Design Framework. A visitor summary is provided below.

A total of two submissions had been received, therefore requiring that a further report be presented to Council.
Discussion

A summary of the submissions is provided in Attachment 1. Overall, the two submissions are supportive of the Urban Design Framework and the proposed projects contained within it. A number of Action/Recommendations have been made, which will be presented to the S41 Committee for future consideration as it seeks to implement the Urban Design Framework.

Summary and Conclusion

The Barossa Bushgardens S41 Committee has prepared an updated of the Urban Design Framework to reflect the recent developments that have occurred, and identify new opportunities for further improvements to the site.

Post Consultation, no amendments are proposed to the Urban Design Framework Update (Attachment 2), and is therefore presented to Council for endorsement.

ATTACHMENTS OR OTHER SUPPORTING REFERENCES

Attachment 1 – Summary of Submissions Table
Attachment 2 – Barossa Bushgardens Urban Design Framework 2020 Update: Final for Endorsement

COMMUNITY PLAN / CORPORATE PLAN / LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS

Community Plan

Infrastructure

Corporate Plan

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 Management

Adoption of the Urban Design Framework enables the S41 Committee to priorities and seek funding for the various elements contained within the framework.

Risk Management

The Urban Design Framework allows for coordinated activity, and reduce likelihood of ad hoc development occurring at the Barossa Bushgardens site.

COMMUNITY CONSULTATION

Consultation has been conducted in line with Council’s Public Consultation Policy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submitter Number</th>
<th>Submitter</th>
<th>Point Number</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Action/Recommendation</th>
<th>Similar Submission Point Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Anonymous User</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td><strong>Barossa Bushgardens Urban Design Framework:</strong> The Barossa Bushgardens is a valuable resource within the Barossa region. It has proven success in many areas including: - Volunteering - Natural resource management - Environmental Education - Open Space Recreation - Community Connection and Wellbeing With a focus on upgrading and provision of facilities I believe that the Bushgardens could flourish as a regional hub, function centre and expand it’s identity as a showpiece of the Barossa Council's Infrastructure.</td>
<td>Noted</td>
<td>No action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td><strong>Provision of carpark:</strong> A formalised carpark will be a welcome addition to the functionality and maturity of the facility.</td>
<td>Noted</td>
<td>No action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td><strong>Redesign of Volunteer Centre/Relocation of Cool Room/Expanded office space:</strong> The Volunteer Centre is the epitome of a multi-functional space. While that is commendable, it is also at the detriment of each of the uses. Currently the centre lacks the provision of a defined, comfortable</td>
<td>Agree that the current multi-functional space does not necessarily provide suitable space for all activities. Indeed there is a need to make a separation between nursery and NRC activity, which at times are not compatible.</td>
<td>No change to the documentation is required at this stage.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submitter Number</td>
<td>Submitter</td>
<td>Point Number</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Action/Recommendation</td>
<td>Similar Submission Point Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>meeting space, capable of serving the needs of groups wishing to utilise the centre for functions. A formalised meeting/function space with amenities such as heating and cooling would attract more workshops/courses and educational events. Currently I am looking for a space to hold an Aboriginal Engagement Meeting. The BBG is ideal however the meeting is in August, and I don’t want people to freeze. Potentially, the additional area should be LARGER and operate as the meeting/function space. This needs to be large enough for a group of up to 50-100 people I would think.</td>
<td>Provision of a formalised meeting/function space to be considered in the detail design stage of the Volunteer Centre, and subject to available funding.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td><strong>Open up the borders:</strong> One of the best things to happen to the boundary of the Bushgardens, is the provision of the OPEN gate on the northern boundary. It has been encouraging to see this entrance utilised by walkers, runners and others using the adjacent Coulthard Parklands. It has created flow and an invitation to explore. I do not agree with the installation of a “kissing gate” at the pedestrian</td>
<td>Open access noted. Intention of the ‘Kissing gates’ is to restrict access to vehicles including motor bikes. Installation of gates (of any form) can be reviewed by the S41 Committee as they seek to implement the design framework.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Point Number</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Action/Recommendation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td><strong>Research Road Signage:</strong> Solar lights and signage is also a welcome addition to enabling and inviting people to explore the gardens. Can Council please remove the “tanking you” sign from the corner of Research and Penrice Roads and replace with a BIG BBG sign.</td>
<td>“tanking you” sign not located on Bushgardens site. New Community Event Signage (2000x1220mm) is to be installed by end of year at the corner of Research and Penrice Roads on the Bushgardens site (identified on Figure 4). Funding for the signage as part of a previous Open Space Grant.</td>
<td>Council to investigate if sign has appropriate approval. No change to the documentation is required at this stage.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td><strong>Electricity Points:</strong> The natural theatre spaces of the gardens would be incredible for outdoor cinema, entertainment and educational events. Provision of electricity points throughout the interior of the gardens would enable Fringe events, large outdoor talks, Reconciliation Day etc to be held within the gardens.</td>
<td>Noted. Electrical requirements can be factored into the development of the site by the S41 Committee.</td>
<td>No change to the documentation is required at this stage.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td><strong>Opening Hours:</strong> The centre needs to be accessible to the community at all times. Currently the nursery</td>
<td>The S41 Committee continually strive to increase visitation to the site, but is limited by the available</td>
<td>No change to the documentation is required at this stage.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submitter Number</td>
<td>Submitter</td>
<td>Point Number</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Action/Recommendation</td>
<td>Similar Submission Point Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>has limited hours. While I understand the practicalities of this, weekend trading alongside a web-based order and purchasing system is essential for the validity and maturation of the facility.</td>
<td>staff and volunteer resources. Currently capacity for weekend trading isn’t available, but will be monitored as the nursery activity increases.</td>
<td>Council staff work with the VIC to help promote the nursery and gardens. No change to the documentation is required at this stage.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8</td>
<td><strong>Tourism:</strong> The Barossa Council through the Barossa Visitor Centre are masters at engaging tourist and providing them with authentic experiences. We know that tourists are looking for family friendly, non-wine related experiences. Currently, the BBG has no single tourism focused brochure or any form of representation at the Barossa Visitor Centre.</td>
<td>New signage to be installed to help promote and direct visitors to the Bushgardens. Funding for the signage as part of a previous Open Space Grant.</td>
<td>No action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Anonymous User</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Car park looks well designed for volunteers and visitors.</td>
<td>Noted</td>
<td>No action</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Purpose

The urban design framework has been prepared to identify how the Barossa Bushgardens currently and potentially can connect with the urban context of Nuriootpa and the Barossa Valley.

Introduction

Barossa Bushgardens is a regional native flora centre, conserving, promoting and supplying the Barossa region’s unique local native plants. It is a model social enterprise that was founded nearly 20 years ago in context of 97% of native vegetation loss in the Barossa region. Now in 2019, the site features a multi facet seed orchard, display gardens, a greenhouse, Volunteers Centre, Nursery and Sales Area.

Idylically situated on a seven hectare site (being a Crown Reserve for which The Barossa Council has care and control, at Lot 100 Penrice Road, Part Section of Coulthard Reserve, Nuriootpa - Figure 1), this community project provides a reference point for anyone wishing to learn more about the region’s local native plants.

The Barossa Bushgardens Section 41 Committee (of Council) manages and maintains the land.

The Barossa Bushgardens partly generate funds through seed, and seedling sales hence the establishment of the nursery and sales area on the site is vital component of the site.

The Barossa Bushgardens are open to the public 365 days a year and entry is free.

The Barossa Bushgardens needs to be tied into the community to achieve full potential. The infrastructure to link this valuable community resource needs to be established but costs to do so are prohibitively high. The identity “Barossa Bushgardens” needs to developed and become a focus for local residents but also visitors and tourists to the area. Barossa Bushgardens has the opportunity to become an important destination and attraction in the Barossa mix.

Barossa Community Plan 2016-2036

The Barossa Community Plan is an aspirational plan that provides a 20 year vision for the community and guides strategic decision making by Council. Council’s Community Plan and
supporting corporate plans seek to provide direction on multiple objectives, so of which support the desire to protect and manage community land.

Community and Culture

2.7 Embrace place-making principles when developing community infrastructure and regulate planning and development in public spaces.

Infrastructure

3.1 Develop and implement sound asset management which delivers sustainable services.

3.5 Advocate for and seek out funding opportunities that support the development of community, health and other facilities and infrastructure from both state and federal government

3.6 Invest in, and advocate for, community facilities that support cultural and community participation.

Health and Wellbeing

4.4 Support sporting, recreational and community clubs and organisations to grow and be sustainable

4.9 Design our future developments and facilities to support active lifestyles and community health and wellbeing.

Community Land Management Plans

The Barossa Bushgardens site (being a Crown Reserve for which The Barossa Council has care and control) is governed by the Community Land Management Plans, namely:

- Management Plan 1 - Developed Reserves and Gardens (Version 1.0 / 8 June 2016)

This Community Land Management Plan identifies objectives, and performance targets and measures for the management of The Barossa Council’s developed reserves and gardens.

The Objectives and Performance Targets have been considered in the updating of the Urban Design Framework:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management Issues</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Performance Targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Toilets</td>
<td>To maintain existing public toilet facilities to be used by patrons of the property.</td>
<td>To ensure that the existing public toilets are serviced and maintained to a satisfactory condition and are kept in a tidy condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Areas</td>
<td>Provision of appropriate parking areas for use by patrons of the facilities.</td>
<td>To ensure that established designated parking areas can be accessed and utilised by all patrons and are in a reasonable condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driveways</td>
<td>Provision of appropriate driveways throughout the property for use by vehicles.</td>
<td>To ensure all existing driveways are easily accessible by vehicles and are in reasonable condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve Infrastructure</td>
<td>To provide reserve infrastructure which may include but is not limited to bins, benches, signage, lighting, monuments etc for the benefit of members of the public.</td>
<td>To ensure existing infrastructure is in reasonable condition, can be utilised adequately by patrons and does not pose a safety hazard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fencing</td>
<td>Maintain fencing throughout and around the perimeter of the property to bound the site from adjoining land and road frontages, where appropriate.</td>
<td>To ensure all existing fencing is maintained to a reasonable standard. To maintain the fencing surrounds and prohibit unsightly overgrowth and weeds against the fencing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape Character</td>
<td>To maintain existing lawned areas to be used by patrons of the property and provide lawned and landscaped areas to add to the appeal of the property.</td>
<td>To ensure established lawned and landscaped areas are maintained to a reasonable standard / appearance. This maintenance will involve the removal and control of weeds, watering, mowing and other ongoing general maintenance along with the planting of new trees / shrubs where required. To maintain the undeveloped areas of the property and prohibit overgrowth and weeds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings</td>
<td>To maintain existing buildings to be available for use by patrons.</td>
<td>Ensure that the buildings are maintained to a high standard by Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterway</td>
<td>Provision of a waterway running through the property.</td>
<td>To ensure the waterway remains unobstructed and free from pollution and does not pose a safety hazard.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Barossa Bushgardens Strategic Plan

The Urban Design Framework aligns with the directions contained within the Strategic Plan that has been prepared by the S41 Committee, and endorsed by The Barossa Council.

Key Result Area 1 - TO DEVELOP AND MAINTAIN A SUSTAINABLE RESOURCE THAT MEETS THE GROWING NEEDS OF THE REGION

Strategy 2 - Adopt and implement sound assets management principles

Action

1.2.1 Prepare a master plan taking into consideration requirements for community land under the Local Government Act

1.2.2 Manage and maintain facilities in line with sound assets management principles

1.2.3 Improve accessibility of the site, including requirements under Council’s Disability Access and Inclusion Plan

1.2.4 Develop sales, reception/cashier area in the community nursery

1.2.5 Improve plant signage/information within the Nursery

Regional Public Health Plan

Both the Strategic Plan and Urban Design Framework are also consistent with the Priority Areas contained within the Barossa, Light and Lower Northern Region Public Health and Wellbeing Plan

The priority areas are:

1. A Regional Framework for Public Health

   Our mission is to promote community and stakeholder ownership of public health priorities for the region through regional engagement and collaboration.

2. Community and Cultural Wellbeing

   Our mission is to support our community’s capacity to live a healthy lifestyle through community participation, knowledge and support.

3. Natural and Built Environment

   Our mission is to provide a regional environment that protects and improves the community’s health through planning, education and regulatory enforcement.

4. Economic Wellbeing

   Our mission is to support the health of our community through a thriving economy.
Disability Access and Inclusion Action Plan

The purpose of the Action Plan is to develop an integrated whole-of-Council approach to achieving equitable access and inclusion for everyone. This plan guides Council in making mainstream facilities and services universally accessible to all residents and visitors with disability. Council also recognises that better access and inclusion will benefit all Barossa residents and visitors.

The Urban Design Framework seek to facilitate actions contained within this plan, namely:

Accessible Communities

- Address disability access issues in relation to Council owned buildings, including community managed facilities.
- Provide DDA compliant access to all Council visitor services properties and facilities and apply the principles of the Barossa DAIP Action Plan.
- Improve access to public open spaces.

A Model of Sustainability and Wellbeing

The Barossa Bushgardens work in partnership with the community in all aspects of development and model sustainability through proactive seed collection, native plant propagation and garden development, and a focus for health and wellbeing initiatives.

The Barossa Bushgardens are focused on developing:

- a model natural heritage resource for the Barossa region and South Australia
- a vital human resource where people are valued for their contribution, knowledge and skills
- a place of learning, where knowledge is shared and practical skills are enhanced
- a model of sustainability through proactive seed collection, native plant propagation and garden development
- a Natural Resource Centre in conjunction with the Northern and Yorke Landscape Board.

To develop community access and use of the site the Barossa Bushgardens Committee has sought to identify common uses and benefits of the precinct both current and potential. These in summary relate to five key areas:

ENVIRONMENT

The Barossa Bushgardens is actively working to build community awareness and commitment to the regeneration and conservation of native vegetation in the region.

EDUCATION

Local school and community groups use the Barossa Bushgardens, typically schools utilise the facility to deal with aspects of their existing school curriculum.

HEALTH and WELLBEING

The creation of the Barossa Bushgardens has established an environment which supports health and wellbeing. The proposed scale of the development along with its accessibility to
existing bike and pedestrian pathways positions the precinct as a destination for recreation, exercise and general community activity.

CULTURE

The Barossa Valley Community has a strong history of celebrating their culture and heritage through festivals and community events. Community consultation has indicated their willingness to include the Barossa Bushgardens in this programme and develop unique events to be held within the Barossa Bushgardens.

TOURISM

The Barossa Bushgardens holds the potential to become an integral part of Barossa Tourism, due to the unique nature of the gardens. However on a fundamental level the site does not benefit from adequate signage directing to and within the site. More broadly there is a need to develop a comprehensive communications and marketing strategy or plan to enable the group to promote their facility within regular tourism channels and media.

Assessment of Urban Design Framework

Accessibility

A key aim of the urban design framework is to enhance accessibility to and through the Bushgardens site, as identified in the Strategic Plan taking into consideration Council’s Disability Access and Inclusion Plan.

Pedestrian networks should be planned to provide access to facilities and services, and designed with passive surveillance and good lighting to provide an attractive and safe environment.

Paths should be designed to accommodate users (i.e. walking, running, cycling), and avoid potential conflict with vehicular movements where possible.

Where possible, the concept of Universal Design should be considered. Universal design is the design of buildings, products or environments to make them accessible to all people, regardless of age, disability or other factors (Wikipedia, 2019).

Parking

In addition to pedestrian/cycling access, parking is also seen as a key element in the overall development of the site. Given the level of visitation, especially during events (i.e. nature play), it is considered that a formally car park, designed within the context of the gardens is required.

Facilities

The initial urban design framework (2011) identified the construction of two buildings – a volunteer centre and a future build for community gatherings. Elements of the future build have been included within the Volunteer Centre. The construction of the Volunteer Centre has enabled the Bushgardens to flourish in the years since the gardens was first established. As a focal point, the centre is a hive of activity providing information and activities to the community and volunteers. With the level of activity, and potential for growth, there is a need to expand the centre at some stage to accommodate volunteers and visitors to the centre.
In addition to the centre, the site contains the wholesale nursery and retail nursery components. Completion of the retail nursery is seen as a priority to enable service to the community. Improvements include the installation of a reception/cashier area.

Signage

Signage is required to enable visitors to navigate the site and access the required facilities and activities within the site. It is important to ensure the type and size of signs is appropriate for their location.

Map Post signs and directional signs have been installed at the key entry points (Figure 2), along with a main entry gate. An event promotional sign is to be installed at the corner of Research and Penrice Roads, along with directional signage through the site.
Visitors Welcome

Opening Hours
Monday
7am to 5pm
Tuesday
7am to 5pm
Wednesday
7am to 5pm
Thursday
7am to 5pm
Friday
7am to 5pm
Saturday, Sunday & Public Holiday
10 am to 5pm

Figure 2 Entrance Signage
Urban Design Framework

Enhancement of major pedestrian access

- The existing major pedestrian access point to the gardens sits directly on the linear park bike/walking path. It is proposed this entry be formally accepted as the main pedestrian/bike only entry point and hence be enhanced to better cater for traffic and be more appropriately constructed and sign posted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solar lighting to entry pavilion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>$991 + freight $300</td>
<td>$1,291</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total $1,291

New vehicular, pedestrian and bike access off Research Road

- Establish separation of exiting service vehicle and public vehicle access.
- Establish dedicated public/disability and staff/volunteer parking.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carpark construction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>$11,382</td>
<td>$11,382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 1 22mm Rubble OMC Blue</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>Tonne</td>
<td>$24.50</td>
<td>$10,535</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total $21,917

Community Volunteer Centre precinct area

- Provide safe and direct access from car park to and within the facility.
- As a destination there is a requirement to provide adequate public facility, pathways, rest areas and gathering space for the community.
- Redesign of the Community Volunteer Centre and office space.
- Expansion of the Nursery Space.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Directional signage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>$1,290</td>
<td>$1,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office refurbishment/Extension</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>$22,750</td>
<td>$22,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursery workspace Extension</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relocate Cool Room</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realign fencing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total $107,540
**Shared path**

- Safe controlled gate access to the perimeter of the Barossa Bushgardens.
- Safe bike riding opportunity especially for children.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kissing gates (at path entrances)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>$818</td>
<td>$3,272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solar lighting at gates</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>$991 + freight $300</td>
<td>$4,264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$7,536</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 3 Kissing gates*

**Signage and way finding**

- A physical sign system needs to be developed based on international standards.
- Specific physical signs directing visitors to the Barossa Bushgardens but also to the new Entrance gate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INTERNAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interpretive and directional signage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,770</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXTERNAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>large directional signage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,970</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$6,740</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Implementation Strategy**

Given the uncertainty of available funds, the implementation of the urban design framework is to be staged commensurate with funding opportunities (i.e. Grants) and budget processes.

Estimates costs provided in Table 1 are indicative only based on 2020 costs of construction. These costs will be subject to annual changes in the cost of materials and labour.

**Table 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solar lighting to entry gates</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>$991 + freight</td>
<td>$1,291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpark construction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>$11,382</td>
<td>$11,382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 1 22mm Rubble OMC Blue</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>Tonne</td>
<td>$24.50</td>
<td>$10,535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directional signage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>$1,290</td>
<td>$1,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office refurbishment/Extension</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>$22,750</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursery workspace Extension</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relocate Cool Room</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realign fencing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kissing gates (at path entrances)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>$818</td>
<td>$3,272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solar lighting at gates</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>$991 + freight</td>
<td>$4,264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interpretive and directional signage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pole signage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>item</td>
<td>$1,290</td>
<td>$1,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>large directional signage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>item</td>
<td>$1,640</td>
<td>$1,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$144,435</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Figure 4 Bushgardens Master Plan (approximate scale)
Figure 5 Proposed Car Park Design (not to scale)
7.5.2 DEBATE AGENDA – ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES REPORT

7.5.2.2 BAROSSA BUSHGARDENS – OPEN SPACE AND PLACES FOR PEOPLE GRANT ACQUITTAL B6512

Author: Director, Development and Environmental Services

PURPOSE
To finalise the budget allocation to enable acquittal of the Open Space and Places for People Grant funding agreement.

RECOMMENDATION
That Council approve a budget adjustment of $3167.00 to deliver the Open Space and Places for People- Barossa Bushgardens project.

REPORT
During the 2017-18 financial year, Council was successful in obtaining Open Space and Places for People Grant funding on behalf of the Barossa Bushgardens.

A copy of the Grant Agreement forms Attachment 1.

The completion date for the project had previously been extended and is now awaiting finalisation.

The Project goal was to provide greater connectivity and accessibility between key destination points and elevate the use of the Bushgardens as a destination for active and passive open space activities, delivering long-term cultural, environmental, social., educational, tourism and economic benefits to the region.

Whilst the external funding has been fully expended, $3,167.00 of Council’s agreed contribution remains outstanding, therefore a budget adjustment is requested to enable the purchase and installation of remaining signage, and for the project to be acquitted.

ATTACHMENTS OR OTHER SUPPORTING REFERENCES

Attachment 1: Open Space Places for People Grant Agreement
COMMUNITY PLAN / CORPORATE PLAN / LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS

Community Plan

Natural Environment and Built Heritage

Community and Culture

Corporate Plan

Natural Environment and Built Heritage
1.3 Build on the conservation of the region’s natural heritage including bush eco-systems, grassy woodlands, agricultural landscapes and recreational green spaces.
3.2 Collaborate with partners and our community to support innovative approaches to waste minimisation, and increase reuse and recycling opportunities.

Community and Culture
5.3 Create vibrant public spaces that provide places for creative development, cultural interaction and social connections.

Legislative Requirements
Local Government Act and Regulations
Development Act and Regulations

FINANCIAL, RESOURCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT CONSIDERATIONS
The purchase and installation of remaining signage is proposed to be funded by a budget adjustment of $3167.00.

COMMUNITY CONSULTATION
Not required by Council.
DEED OF CONDITIONS OF GRANT

BETWEEN

MINISTER FOR PLANNING
("Minister")

-AND-

The Council named and described in Item 1 of the Schedule
("Council")
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**SCHEDULE**

ANNEXURE A - COUNCIL APPLICATION/PROJECT TARGET TABLE
ANNEXURE B - MANNER OF PAYMENT
ANNEXURE C – FINAL REPORT
THIS DEED is made the 27 day of JUne 2017

BETWEEN:

MINISTER FOR PLANNING, a body corporate under the Administrative Arrangements Act 1994 of Level 11, 45 Pirie Street, Adelaide, South Australia 5000 ("Minister")

AND

The Council named and described in Item 1 of the Schedule (the "Council").

BACKGROUND

A. The Minister through the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure has agreed to pay to the Council the Grant for the purpose of the Project on the following terms and conditions set out in this Deed.

B. The purpose of the Project is for the Council to implement the Earossa Bushgarden Project, as per Council’s application.

1. DEFINITIONS AND INTERPRETATION

1.1 Definitions

In this Deed unless the contrary intention appears:

1.1.1 "ANTS GST Act" means the A New Tax System (Goods and Services Tax) Act 1999 (Cth);

1.1.2 "Business Day" means any day that is not a Saturday, Sunday or public holiday in South Australia;

1.1.3 "Commencement Date" means the date specified in Item 2 of the Schedule;

1.1.4 "Completion Date" means the date specified in Item 3 of the Schedule;

1.1.5 "Council’s Representative" means the representative of the Council specified in Item 7 of the Schedule;

1.1.6 "Deed" means this Deed of Conditions of Grant between the parties and includes the Schedule;

1.1.7 "Fund" means the Council’s open space trust fund established under section 50 subsection 10 of the Development Act 1993
1.1.8 “Grant” means the amount specified in Item 5 of the Schedule, which is exclusive of GST;

1.1.9 “Grant Account” means the Fund or other interest bearing account in the name of the Council;

1.1.10 “GST” means the tax imposed by the GST Law;

1.1.11 “GST Law” has the meaning attributed in the ANTS GST Act;

1.1.12 “Intellectual Property Rights” means any patent, copyright, trademark, tradename, design, trade secret, know how or other form of confidential information, or any right to registration of such rights and any other form of intellectual property right whether arising before or after the execution of this Deed;

1.1.13 “Minister” means the Minister for Planning;

1.1.14 “The Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure’s Representative” means the representative of the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure specified in Item 7 of the Schedule;

1.1.15 “Project” means the project described briefly in Item 4 of the Schedule and in detail in Annexure A;

1.1.16 “Repayment Amount” means:

(a) all amounts paid by the Minister to the Council under this Deed up to the Repayment Date; and

(b) interest on each of those amounts (or so much of it as remains unpaid for the time being) calculated at the common Public Sector Interest Rate applicable over the relevant period, from the date or dates on which the Minister pays the Grant to the Council, to the date on which the amount is paid in full;

1.1.17 “Repayment Date” means the date upon which the Minister demands payment of the Repayment Amount from the Council;

1.1.18 “Repayment Events”

The occurrence of any of the following events are Repayment Events:

(a) if the Council breaches any of its warranties or undertakings under this Deed; or

(b) any of its obligations under this Deed and has not rectified such breach within the time frame specified in a
notice given in writing by the Minister to the Council requiring rectification of the breach;
(c) if the Council breaches its undertaking to commit its own funds to the Project in the amount specified in Item 5 of the Schedule.

1.1.19 "State" means the State of South Australia;
1.1.20 "Tax Invoice" has the meaning attributed in the GST Law;
1.1.21 "Taxable Supply" has the meaning attributed to that expression in the GST Law;
1.1.22 "Term" means the period commencing on the Commencement Date and expiring on the Completion Date; and
1.1.23 "Termination Date" means the earlier of the following:
   (a) the Completion Date; or
   (b) if the Minister terminates this Deed pursuant to clause 6.1, the date on which notice of such termination is given to the Council.

1.2 Interpretation
In this Deed unless the contrary intention appears:
1.2.1 any word importing the plural includes the singular and vice versa;
1.2.2 any word importing a gender includes all other genders;
1.2.3 a reference to a person includes a corporation;
1.2.4 headings do not affect the interpretation or construction; and
1.2.5 a reference to a clause, Schedule or Item in a Schedule is a reference to a clause, Schedule or Item in a Schedule of this Deed.

1.3 Background Information
The parties acknowledge and agree that the Background is true and correct in every particular, and shall be read with and form part of this Deed.

2. GRANT

2.1 The Minister will make the Grant to the Council and the Council must apply the Grant for the purposes of the Project.

2.2 The Minister's obligation to make the Grant is subject to the provisions of this Deed.
2.3 The Minister shall not be obliged to make the Grant unless and until all authorisations, approvals, consents, licenses, exemptions, registrations and other requirements which are necessary for the undertaking of the Project have been obtained by or satisfied by the Council.

2.4 The Minister shall provide the Grant in the manner specified in Annexure B.

3. **GST**

3.1 The parties acknowledge that compliance with obligations or the grant of rights under this Deed by the Council is a Taxable Supply and the Council is liable to pay GST on this Taxable Supply.

3.2 The Minister will pay in addition to the Grant an amount ("GST payment") calculated by multiplying the Grant by the rate at which GST is levied at the time of this Deed.

3.3 The Minister is not liable to pay the GST payment or any instalment of the GST payment unless the Council has delivered to the Minister a valid Tax Invoice under the GST Law, referable to the Grant and associated GST payment.

4. **STEERING COMMITTEE**

The Council shall invite a representative of the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure to participate in the steering (or other agreed project control mechanism) committee which shall be formed by the Council to control and manage the Project.

5. **VARIATION TO SCOPE OF PROJECT**

5.1 The Council may at any time during the Term propose in writing to the Minister a variation in the scope of the Project and give details of any associated change in funding (i.e. budgetary) requirements.

5.2 The Minister may in his/her absolute discretion accept or reject the proposed variation and agree or refuse to increase the amount of the Grant to cover any related increase in funding requirements.

5.3 If the Minister’s accepts the Council’s proposal to vary the scope of the Project and any associated request for additional funding:
5.3.1 the Council will carry out the Project as varied;
5.3.2 the Minister will provide the additional funding requestec; and
5.3.3 the terms and conditions of this Deed will apply to the Project as varied.

6. **REPAYMENT**

6.1 If a Repayment Event occurs, the Minister may immediately terminate this Deed by notice in writing given to the Council then any obligation of the Minister to make any further payment to the Council shall cease and the Council may, in the Minister's absolute discretion, be required to pay the Repayment Amount to the Minister.

6.2 The Council enters into the obligation to pay the Repayment Amount pursuant to this clause 6 with the intention that it is a legally binding, valid and enforceable contractual provision against the Council.

6.3 The parties intend to exclude, to the extent permissible, the application and operation of any legal rule or norm, whether statutory or common law, relating to:

6.3.1 the characterisation as penalties of liquidated amounts payable under a contract on a breach occurring; or

6.3.2 the enforceability or revocability of such liquidated amounts.

6.4 Nothing in this clause prevents the Minister from recovering from the Council any other amount to which the Minister is or becomes entitled under this Deed.

6.5 If at the Completion Date, or the date of any earlier termination of this Deed, any part of the Grant or interest earned thereon remains in the Council's Grant Account pursuant to this Deed the Council must immediately repay this amount to the Minister.

7. **COUNCIL'S WARRANTIES AND UNDERTAKINGS**

7.1 The Council undertakes to the Minister:-

7.1.1 that except with the prior consent in writing of the Minister, it will not use the Grant for purposes other than the Project;

7.1.2 that at the Commencement Date no Repayment Event has occurred or is occurring;
7.1.3 that it will inform him/her in writing immediately on the Council becoming aware of or when the Council ought reasonably to have become aware of the happening of a Repayment Event;

7.1.4 that it will comply with Treasurer's Instruction 15 which can be accessed online at:

7.1.5 that it will keep separate accounts and financial records in relation to the Grant to which this Deed relates;

7.1.6 that it will provide the Minister with those reports specified in Item 6 of the Schedule and such other information as the Minister may reasonably require to enable him/her to monitor the Council's performance of its undertakings and obligations under this Deed;

7.1.7 that all records and other documentation required to be kept by the Council under this Deed and under any other legislation or statutory instrument will upon the giving of fourteen (14) days notice be available to the Minister for inspection at Adelaide at all times during normal business hours;

7.2 The Council must commence undertaking the Project within thirty (30) Business Days of the Commencement Date and must complete the Project by not later than the Completion Date.

7.3 The Council acknowledges that the warranties and undertakings made in this clause 7 have induced the Minister to agree to make the Grant to which this Deed relates.

7.4 The Council must disclose to the Minister the source and amount of any funding or financial assistance apart from the Grant that it has or does receive for the purpose of the Project.

8. **INSURANCE**

The Council warrants that it is a member of the Local Government Association Mutual Liability Scheme ("Scheme") and is bound by the rules of the Scheme pursuant to section 34(a) of the Local Government Act and in the event that the Council ceases to be a member of the Scheme it will forthwith pursuant to section 166(a) of the Local Government Act, effect public liability insurance to a minimum level of cover of $50,000,000.00.
9. **INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS**

9.1 The Council warrants that in undertaking the Project the Council is not infringing the Intellectual Property Rights of any person.

9.2 The Council shall indemnify and shall keep the Minister and the Crown in right of the State indemnified from and against all costs, expenses and liabilities whatsoever arising out of or in connection with any claim that in undertaking the Project the Council infringes the Intellectual Property Rights of any person.

10. **AUTHORISATION AND APPROVALS**

10.1 The Minister may authorise any person whom he/she selects to exercise any of his/her powers or rights under this Deed and may vary or revoke an authorisation at will.

10.2 The Minister may conditionally or unconditionally give or withhold his/her approval or consent in his/her absolute discretion unless this Deed expressly provides otherwise.

11. **PUBLICITY**

11.1 The Council must ensure that any media release or publicity material issued by the Council in relation to the Project or the Grant acknowledges the contribution made by the Minister.

11.2 The Council shall consult the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure before initiating any publicity, such as an official opening or similar ceremony and the content of any signage or other written publication must acknowledge the contribution of the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure in the manner specified by the Minister.

12. **GENERAL**

12.1 **No Assignment by the Council**

The Council’s rights and obligations under this Deed are not assignable.

12.2 **Entire Agreement**
This Deed contains the entire agreement between the parties with respect to its subject matter and it supersedes any prior agreement or understanding of the parties on the subject matter.

12.3 **Governing Law**
12.3.1 This Deed is governed by the laws in the State.
12.3.2 The courts of the State have exclusive jurisdiction in connection with this Deed.

12.4 **No Waivers by the Minister**
The Minister waives a right under this Deed only by written notice to that effect. Nothing else done or omitted to be done by the Minister in relation to the Minister's rights under this Deed will have the effect of a waiver.

12.5 **Modification**
12.5.1 It is acknowledged by the parties that the terms and conditions of this Deed may by agreement of the parties be modified.
12.5.2 Any modification of this Deed must be in writing and signed by each party.

12.6 **Severability**
If any part of this Deed is or becomes void or unenforceable or if this Deed would, if any part were not omitted, be or become void or unenforceable then:-
12.6.1 that part will be severable without affecting the remainder of this Deed and this Deed will then be read as if that part were not contained in it; and
12.6.2 the parties will attempt to renegotiate that part in good faith.

12.7 **Costs**
Each party will bear its own costs of and incidental to the negotiation, preparation and execution of this Deed.

12.8 **No Mutual Liability**
Nothing in this Deed constitutes a partnership, joint venture or association of any kind between the Council and the Minister or renders them liable for the debts or liabilities incurred by each other.

12.9 **Notice**
12.9.1 Notice must be in writing and signed either by the party or by the agent of that party.
12.9.2 Notice can be given to a party:-
(a) personally;
(b) by pre-paid post to the recipient's address set out in this
Deed, in which case the notice is deemed to be
received at the time at which it would be delivered in the
ordinary course of the post; or
(c) as permitted by the Corporations Law or any other
statute or regulation.

12.9.3 The addresses and numbers for service are:-

The Minister
(The Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure)
50 Flinders Street
Adelaide SA 5000

The Council
To the Council at the address or number specified in Item 1 of
the Schedule.

12.9.4 A party may from time to time change its address or number for
service by notice to the other party.

12.10 Rectification of Defects in the Deed
If any provision of this Deed is, or becomes defective, and the Minister
consequently is unable to enforce any of the Council's obligations
under this Deed, and the defect is capable of remedy, the Council
must do all things and sign all documents which the Minister may
reasonably require the Council to do or sign to remedy the defect.

12.11 Comply with Laws
12.11.1 When carrying out any activity in connection with the Project,
the Council must comply with all applicable laws relating to
that activity, including (but not limited to) laws requiring the
obtaining of approvals, consents, licences and registrations.

12.11.2 Where the Council becomes aware of any breach by it of any
law or laws in force in the State which breach arises out of or
occurs or in respect of any activity carried out by the Council
in connection with its use of the Grant, the Council must
forthwith notify The Department of Planning, Transport and
Infrastructure's Representative in writing of the occurrence of
that breach and as to the particulars of that breach.
12.12 **Auditor-General**

Nothing in this Agreement derogates from the powers of the Auditor-General under the *Public Finance and Audit Act 1987 (South Australia)*.

12.13 **Time is of the Essence**

Time is of the essence in respect of any time, date or period specified either in this Deed or in any notice served under this Deed.

---

**EXECUTED AS A DEED**

**SIGNED by** .......................................................... **) MATT LANG **) .......................................................... **

for and on behalf of the **MINISTER FOR** .......................................................... **)

**PLANNING** .......................................................... **)

as its duly authorised delegate in the presence of: .......................................................... **)

Witness

(Print Name: MEI-LIN SCHWARTZ )

**SIGNED by** .......................................................... **) MARTIN RAYMOND MCGARTY **) .......................................................... **

for and on behalf of .......................................................... THE BAROSSA COUNCIL **)

being a person duly authorised in that regard .......................................................... **)

in the presence of: .......................................................... **)

Witness

(Print Name: GARY MAURINAC )
SCHEDULE

Item 1
Council
The Barossa Council
43-51 Tanunda Road, Nuriootpa SA 5355

PH: (08) 8563 8444

Item 2
Commencement Date
Upon execution of this deed or such other date as is mutually agreed in writing by the parties

Item 3
Completion Date
31 December 2018 or such other date as is mutually agreed in writing by the parties.

Item 4
Project
Barossa Bushgardens Precinct

Item 5
Total Amount of Grant
The total amount of the Grant will not exceed 50% of the total cost of the Project listed in Annexure A, and in no circumstances will the total amount of the Grant exceed $36,500.

The Minister has made this funding commitment in granting approval for the Project based on Council's undertaking that when applying for the Grant that:

- the Council will pay $13,500, being 17% of the total cost of the Project listed in Annexure A;

- Other funding contributions (Friends of Barossa Bushgardens and Business sponsorship) will pay $23,000 being 32% of the total cost of the Project listed in Annexure A.
Item 6
Reports

1. The Council must provide the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure's Representative with the following reports:
   a. such reports as the Minister may by notification in writing require from time to time;
   b. a report no later than 30 Business Days following the Completion Date.

2. The reports must contain:
   a. in relation to the report referred to in 1(a), such material or information as the Minister may specify in the written notice given to the Council requiring provision of that report; and
   b. in relation to the report referred to in 1(b), a signed Final Report as specified in Annexure C.

3. At the request of the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure's representative, Council may be required to provide a report on the expenditure of the Grant including evidence of actual expenses incurred in relation to the project. At the Minister's option that report may be referred to an independent external auditor.

Item 7
The Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure's Representative

Matthew Lang

Council's Representative

..................................
## ANNEXURE A

### PROJECT TARGET TABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>TARGET OUTCOMES (brief description of activity)</th>
<th>COST P&amp;D FUND</th>
<th>COST COUNCIL</th>
<th>COST OTHER</th>
<th>COST TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bike Paths: including Northern Ped/Bike Access</td>
<td>Prepare site, supply, haul and spread rubble, compact and trim to final level, 2 pack spray seal, clean up site</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$13,500</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$33,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shade structure</td>
<td>Site prep, shade and wet weather structure</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture</td>
<td>Timber Tables</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td>Solar Lighting purchase and install</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation areas</td>
<td>Earthworks</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation areas</td>
<td>Signage</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation areas</td>
<td>Landscaping</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture</td>
<td>Benches</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping</td>
<td></td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Signage</td>
<td>Interpretive and directional signage</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Signage</td>
<td>Directional pole signage, large directional precinct signage</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$36,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>$13,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>$23,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$73,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: project to be completed as per Council's application
ANNEXURE B

MANNER OF PAYMENT

Manner of Payment of Grant

*Upfront payment*
The Grant shall be paid on receipt of:
- A signed deed of conditions of Grant which is to the satisfaction of the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure;
- A tax invoice in accordance with the GST Act for the amount of the Grant

Following receipt of the Grant, the Council must:
- pay the Grant into the Grant Account;
- apply the grant solely towards the Project specified in Annexure A;
- retain in the Grant Account all interest earned on the Grant and apply this money solely towards the Project specified in Annexure A;
- provide a Final Report on completion of the Project as specified in Item 3 of the Schedule.
ANNEXURE C – FINAL REPORT

OPEN SPACE AND PLACES FOR PEOPLE GRANT FUNDING PROGRAM 2017

Council: The Barossa Council

Project: Barossa Bushgardens Precinct

TOTAL PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT FUND CONTRIBUTION $36,500

Council contribution $

Contributions from other sources* (please specify) $

TOTAL PROJECT FUNDING $

TOTAL PROJECT EXPENDITURE $

* Including interest accrued (see Annexure B).

Certification
I hereby certify in accordance with the conditions under which this Grant was accepted that:

- The expenditure shown in this report and any attachments have been incurred.
- The expenditure relates solely to the work covered by the Grant.
- The rates, computations and costs shown in this Report are correct.
- None of the payments or any part thereof has been included on any previous Report.
- None of the payments or any part thereof has been sought from, or paid by any funding source other than those listed on this Report or attached table.

Project Manager

Signature

Name

Date

Chief Executive Officer

Signature

Name

Date
7.5.5 DEBATE AGENDA – WASTE SERVICES REPORT

7.5.5.1 PROPOSED MANDATORY GREEN ORGANIC SERVICE COMMUNITY CONSULTATION RESULTS
B10455

Author: Waste Management Officer

PURPOSE

To present Council with the results of the community consultation that was conducted between 6 - 27 October 2020 proposing that the kerbside Green Organic Service be moved to mandatory.

RECOMMENDATION

That Council:
(1) Receive and note the results of the public consultation for the proposed mandatory green organic service
(2) Authorise the Chief Executive Officer or his delegate to
   a) negotiate a contract variation with Solo Resource Recovery to convert the Green Organic Service to a mandatory service, shifting the service to weekdays aligning service day with other waste streams, increase the service level to weekly and provide a service exception for properties that are able to demonstrate that they effectively manage their green waste.
   b) amend the Waste Management Services Policy to align with the revised service levels.
(3) Contribute $24,472.16 (plus GST) to match Grant funds to be taken from the recyclables reserve which as of 30 June 2020 has a balance of $57,967.00
(4) Support further education in waste reduction strategies and best use of the kerbside services to minimise waste to landfill and contamination, with the intent to bring about the new service level by the start of the 2021-22 financial year.

REPORT

Background

Council have been offered a Grant of up to $24,472.16 (plus GST) in the Kerbside Performance Incentives Program, for distribution of a food waste disposal system for 5,200 households, being 50% towards the cost of the enclosed food waste containers (no compostable bags), delivery where required and associated education material.

To be eligible to claim the funding, Council needs to resolve to implement the roll out of a mandatory service within townships that includes a kitchen caddy for each household.
At the 19 May 2020 Council meeting, Council resolved to undertake a period of public consultation in accordance with Council’s Public Consultation Policy to determine the level of community support for the introduction of a mandatory Green Organic Service within the townships.

As identified in the Waste Management Services Policy the Green Organic Service is currently available on a voluntary basis within the townships of Angaston, Penrice, Tanunda, Springton, Mount Pleasant, Nuriootpa, Lyndoch, Williamstown and Stockwell.

Introduction

Community consultation was conducted from 6 – 27 October 2020. A survey was made available on Your Say Barossa with hardcopies available at the front counter for interested residents to complete.

The survey identified if residents were for or against the Green Organic Service moving to mandatory. Written submissions to Council were also received in addition to the survey. Two late submissions were accepted on 28 October as they were received before the survey was shut off.

Discussion

Survey Results

Council received 110 survey submissions through Your Say Barossa. 10 residents asked questions or submitted feedback via the questions section. The results of the survey and feedback received are presented in Attachment 1. Standalone survey results are in Attachment 2. Below is a summary of key components of the consultation.

The survey asked which town the respondent resides in. 93% reside in eligible townships with the other 7% in an area where the service is not currently available. The townships that delivered the most responses were Tanunda 25%, Nuriootpa 23% and Lyndoch 22%

60% (66 respondents) do not currently subscribe to the optional Green Organic Service. The current optional service is available to tenants so the survey asked if the resident is the property owner. 95% are property owners.

When asked if they support the introduction of a mandatory service for eligible townships 55% were in support of the introduction (as shown in figure 1). 56% of survey respondents would support the introduction if the service day moved to the weekday that their other bins are serviced.
Those in support of a mandatory Green Organic Service sighted environmental impact, reduction in material going to landfill and encouraging recycling as the main reasons for their decision.

Reasons for opposing a mandatory Green Organic Service focused on the cost to ratepayers or the need for the service with many indicating that they home compost or have low volumes of green waste.

For those that were in support, 79% also supported the use of a kitchen caddy. Reasons for this support included convenience and to encourage the collection of food scraps. It was suggested that Council should consider supplying compostable bags.

Reasons against the supply of a kitchen caddy included already having a kitchen caddy or similar container, scraps going directly to compost or worm farms and not encouraging the generation and use of plastic.

The Your Say Barossa platform also offered residents the opportunity to submit questions. 10 questions were submitted, with majority being statements rather than questions. Statements related to concerns around an extra charge for the service along with suggestions of changing service levels so that the green bin is collected weekly and the general waste fortnightly.

In the questions, it was asked if Council would consider expanding the service to townships that are not currently eligible namely Light Pass and Eden Valley. If the service is moved to mandatory in the townships that are currently eligible, it would give the opportunity to review the schedule and route for the Green Organic Service. The possibility of extending the route would be able to be discussed with Solo Resource Recovery as part of the review.

The suggestion of the change to service levels also came up on the survey results and through all feedback it was mentioned 10 times. The concern around cost was raised.
26 times with many suggesting they shouldn’t be penalised with a charge when they already manage their green waste through home compost, mulching or burning.

Burning was identified as both a solution and an issue in managing green waste with 4 respondents mentioning that they burn green waste and another 4 supporting the mandating of the service to reduce backyard burning.

Feedback received outside of Your Say Barossa (Attachment 3) included 1 hardcopy of the survey which was in support of the service and 3 written submissions that offered support of the Green Organic service but did not want to see it moved to mandatory due to cost and home composting systems already in place.

Comments received on social media also highlighted home composting systems as a reason for the service to remain optional. It was suggested that Council could provide free bags of compost to residents to acknowledge those that are using the service. Moving the Green Organic service to weekly was also put forward.

It was evident through the feedback gained in consultation that residents are keen to do more to support the environment and that education is highly important. Of those that were not in support, 34 respondents or 69% cited that they have home composting or suitable green waste systems outside of using the general waste bin.

The Green Organic bin can support home composting as items that are too large or take a long time to break down can be disposed of in the green bin. The Organic service can also assist in bushfire prevention as material can be cleared regularly from properties, minimising potential fire hazards.

Grant funding gives opportunity to further develop education material and disburse to all eligible properties.

The Australian Government’s National Food Waste Strategy requires each Australian State and Territory to achieve a 50% reduction in food waste by 2030. The objective of South Australia’s Waste Strategy is to outline actions that can contribute to the development of a circular economy that realises the best or full value from products and materials produced, consumed and recovered in South Australia.

A target of zero avoidable waste to landfill by 2030 is proposed to guide action during and beyond the lifespan of the 2020-2025 Waste Strategy. This target aims to stimulate action towards a circular economy.

Food waste continues to create significant greenhouse gas emissions, both at the end of its lifecycle when it produces methane if disposed to landfill and through lost embodied resources. Preventing organic material from going to landfill will preserve organic carbon and nutrients for more valuable uses in land management and food production.

At 30 June 2020, 3,921 properties had opted into the Green Organic service which is a take up rate of 61%. Some residents have opted to have additional green bins at their property. The total number of active services at 30 June was 3,994.

Below in figure 2 is a breakdown of the take up in each township. This breakdown looks at eligible properties and captures if a property is currently subscribed and includes properties where services are billed directly to tenants.
Revised Service Level Options

Having reviewed the survey results and submissions, with there not being an overwhelming majority view, there are a number of potential options for Council to consider.

**Option 1 – Retain optional service**

The pros are residents still have access to the service and this does still contribute to material being diverted from landfill. It relies on residents opting in and limits the amount of material that can be diverted from landfill. Supporting this option will mean the loss of Grant funding and impacts education opportunities.

**Option 2 - Make mandatory (leaving service on a Saturday)**

Gives greater opportunity for resource recovery. Grant funding can be retained and an education campaign can be developed. Solo Resource Recovery will need to assess the viability and sustainability of the Saturday service due to the sharp increase to service levels that will be required.

The cost of service could be a contentious issue for ratepayers with some not wanting the service and others who believe they already manage green waste effectively feeling penalised for their efforts.

**Option 3 - Make mandatory and shift to weekday aligning service day with other waste streams (alternate fortnight to Recycling Service)**

This option gives opportunity to discuss expanding the scope of the Green Organic System which could include investigating the option to have the service level increased to weekly or the inclusion of townships that are not eligible currently.

This could strengthen the sustainability of the Green Organic service and create opportunity long term to review service levels of all waste streams to maximise landfill diversion rates and create cost savings for ratepayers.
The downside of this option is that it will in the short term require a higher level of resources to ensure that residents that currently subscribe to the service are aware of the changes to the schedule.

Solo Resource Recovery would also need to be consulted on this option as it would require a variation to the Waste Management Services Contract.

**Option 4** – As option 3 but with a service exception for properties that are able to provide evidence that they effectively manage their green waste.

This option would still offer the opportunity to increase tonnages diverted from landfill and also addresses the issue of some ratepayers feeling penalised for already effectively managing their green waste.

It gives opportunity for residents to think about implementing their own systems to avoid the service charge which should still lead to a reduction in material going to landfill.

The challenge in this option is the additional administration and maintenance of this system that will be required both from Council and Solo Resource Recovery.

**Option 5** – As option 4 but moving the Organic service to a weekly collection with the view to reduce the General Waste service to a fortnightly collection.

This addresses concerns raised around the service level and will encourage residents to use the Green Organic Service for food waste as it is no different to placing food waste in the red bin each week and will help eliminate odours and issues with pests.

In moving the General Waste stream to fortnightly, costs will decrease as collection costs for eligible properties will halve. Tonnages should decrease as households will only be able to present 140 Litres of General Waste for collection each fortnight instead of each week.

Case studies interstate (attached) show that moving the Green Organic Service to weekly and the General Waste to fortnightly had a significant impact on diversion rates. The City of Boroondara achieved a landfill diversion rate above 70% and the Macedon Ranges Shire Council saw the diversion rate increase from 42% to 68%.

While this option addresses the cost of service and service levels, it is also the option most likely create backlash within the community as those who are opposed to mandating the Green Organic Service may see the decrease in the general waste service as a negative.

Moving the service to mandatory aligns with South Australia’s Food Waste Strategy (consultation draft) where proposed actions include working with Councils for more frequent collections of household organic bins and the continuation of the ‘Which Bin?’ campaign to increase and improve recycling, including food waste diversion through the green organics bin and home composting.

**Summary and Conclusion**
Despite the survey results and submissions not providing an overwhelming majority view, there are a number of benefits in shifting to a mandatory service.

As a transition, it is proposed that the Green Organic Service become a mandatory service, shifting the service to weekdays aligning service day with other waste streams, increase the service level to weekly and provide a service exception for properties that are able to demonstrate that they effectively manage their green waste.

It is proposed that the service level be reviewed again, in one to two years’ time to determine community support to bring the general waste bin to a fortnightly service.

**ATTACHMENTS OR OTHER SUPPORTING REFERENCES**

- Attachment 1 - Your Say Barossa - Consultation Report
- Attachment 2 - Your Say Barossa - Survey Results
- Attachment 3 - Feedback outside of Your say Barossa
- Attachment 4 - Case Studies Weekly Green Organics
- Attachment 5 – Estimated Costings Waste Collection


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

**Community Plan**

- Natural Environment and Built Heritage

3. We take a proactive approach in responding to key environmental challenges such as climate change, water security and waste management.

3.2 Collaborate with partners and our community to support innovative approaches to waste minimisation, and increase reuse and recycling opportunities.

**Advocacy Plan**

1. Working with the community, industry and government to build on the Barossa’s capacity to attract investment, improve services and encourage employment opportunities.

**Corporate Plan**

4.10 Facilitate access to hard and green waste facilities and associated recycling opportunities that reduce waste disposed to landfill and support the environment.

**Legislative Requirements**
FINANCIAL, RESOURCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT CONSIDERATIONS

The Grant funding is to be matched by Council and is to be used to assist in the roll out of kitchen caddies and the creation and disbursement of educational material.

It has been discussed with Green Industries that our current service includes a Kitchen caddy and that this cost is built into our Waste Management Services Contract. This would remain the case if the service moved to mandatory. Because of this, the Grant money can be used to cover some of the collection costs that will be associated with the additional services.

If the service is moved to mandatory, the Grant money needs to be applied this financial year. The roll out should take place in the final quarter of this financial year however, the service can commence FY 21/22. This allows for all waste services to be reviewed in line with the budget process.

In Attachment 5 the additional collection and disposal costs to Council are estimated based on the options discussed above where a rollout of a mandatory service is to occur.

The Green Organic disposal costs in Attachment 5 are based on a 40% increase in our current presentation rate which was at 66% for the first quarter. The decrease in disposal rate of general waste estimates the tonnages collected in Eligible township areas and applies a decrease of 15%.

Based on data from the Waste Audit that was conducted in September 2019 which indicated that 47% of material in the general waste bins was organic, a target of a 15% reduction should be achievable.

With the education material being included as part of the roll out, the presentation rate of the Green Organic Service may increase which would lead to a higher disposal cost for the green waste stream. This should also result in a diversion of material from landfill and a reduction in disposal costs for the general waste stream.

In the grant application for the Kerbside Performance Plus Food Organics Incentives Program, the budget for educational material, distribution and other expenses is set at $8914.91 with 50% of this cost covered by the Grant.

Taking this and the costs outlined in Attachment 5 into account, it is estimated that Council will be required to contribute $16,049.32 (plus GST). This amount could be taken from the recyclables reserve which as of 30 June 2020 has a balance of $57,967.00.

Option 5 does present the most cost effective scenario however, other factors should be considered such as the level of change to the services and the behavioural change that is required from residents to positively impact diversion rates. Education is critical to drive behaviour change.
If the introduction of the mandatory service is not supported, Council will be required to return the Grant funding as this was dependent upon a mandatory service including kitchen caddies being rolled out.

**COMMUNITY CONSULTATION**

Consultation completed in line with Council’s Consultation Policy.
Mandatory Green Organics Waste Service

SURVEY RESPONSE REPORT
06 October 2020 - 28 October 2020

PROJECT NAME:
Proposed mandatory green organic waste service
SURVEY QUESTIONS
Q1 Which Township do you live in?

**Question options**
- Angaston / Penrice
- Eden Valley
- Light Pass
- Lyndoch
- Mount Pleasant
- Springfield
- Stockwell
- Tanunda
- Williamstown
- Nuriootpa
- Not in a township
- Cockatoo Valley
- Kalbeeba
- Moculta
- Sandy Creek

*Mandatory Question (110 response(s))
Question type: Dropdown Question*
Q2  Do you currently have a green organics waste service subscription to your property?

**Question options**

- Yes
- No

*Mandatory Question (110 response(s))
Question type: Radio Button Question*
Q3  Are you the property owner?

- Yes: 104 (94.5%)
- No: 6 (5.5%)

Question options

Mandatory Question (110 response(s))
Question type: Radio Button Question
Q4 Do you support the introduction of a mandatory green organic waste service for eligible townships?

Question options
- Yes
- No

Mandatory Question (110 response(s))
Question type: Radio Button Question
Q5 Would you support the introduction of a mandatory green organic waste service for eligible townships if the collection day was on a weekday instead of a Saturday (service would remain fortnightly with collection likely the same day as the general w...
Q6 What factors have influenced your support or opposition to introduce a mandatory green organics waste service?

Better for the environment

We have always put food scraps and green organics in a compost pile which is used to fertilise our property. It is unfair to make it mandatory for people who dispose of their green organics properly. We object to having to have a green bin and pay extra rates for something we don’t want and don’t need. We have lived on our property for 33 years without the need to use the green organics easter service!

I don’t generate any green waste, it either goes to composting or feed for poultry

A mandatory green waste service would ensure all households have access to a green waste disposal option (eg. renters or those who may not be aware of the service) and would normalise the use of the green lid bin for food and organic waste.

I support this proposal however three bins per property collected on the same day would make walking around townships poorly serviced by footpaths even more difficult.

I agree that people should be more proactive and not empty their green waste into red bins. I think the barossa council should supply green waste bins FREE to consumers like other councils. If you were to introduce a green bin scheme, you would be saving money on landfill levy anyway and the trucks do the rounds anyway so no more fuel would be used... we personally compost our own green waste along with many others in the town so don’t need council to take it away. We carefully recycle and only have to have our red bin emptied every 3 or 4 weeks... I don’t want to have extra bills personally but also increasing rates for this when people have lost / are losing their jobs or had hours decreased due to covid is unjust and not necessary

Recycling is always a good thing and enjoy my weeds etc and kitty litter (pine pellets) going in green bins also

we either Mulch our green waster anything too large ie branches we take to Kuchels to be turned into mulch. Kitchen scraps etc are composted

I feel its a massive waste to place organic matter that can be reusable into a...
general waste dump. We could all do our bit. But, also think those opposed will be due to cost.

I strongly believe we need to reduce waste going to landfill and I compost nearly all food and garden waste. I mostly use the green bin for branches too large for my compost. But would love others to follow suit and help our environment.

I have chooks and a worm farm which take all our scraps and weeds along with mulching all other green waste for composting

We have little garden waste and what we do have is composted. Our organic waste (ie food scraps) is put to the worm farm. We have absolutely NO NEED for a green bin and should not be forced to pay for a service we will not use!

We need to reduce our organics going to landfill. We need this service weekly not fortnightly if you want it to be used to full extent. Organics will still go to landfill if emptied fortnightly due to people running out of space and concerns about smells developing.

We all need to be better informed and actively pursue better disposal of our waste. Currently a fortnightly collection of green waste is insufficient for us. Any meat waste etc we wrap in newspaper and store in the fridge until collection day. This is to stop matter putrefying in the bin, causing unpleasant odours,flies etc. If this was collected weekly I would not have to do this—it could be placed straight in the green bin. We ALL must learn to dispose of waste responsibly. The quickest way to encourage this is to make it mandatory (with education as well) to dispose of our waste material appropriately. All compostable materials should be placed in the green bins, household AND garden waste. Currently on occasion I have put garden prunings etc in the red bin as the fortnightly collection of green waste is insufficient. I absolutely support a weekly green waste collection but there must be education so people understand what is compostable and what is not.

I live in the township but don't require a green waste bin because of my business i am able to dispose of all greenwaste.

To save money on council rates and to encourage more residents to recycle their green waste

I'm in a rental property and asked for a green bin for waste but the owner said no because he didn't want to pay for it if it was optional. I asked the community if there was a compost I could share but no one offered. I don't want my food waste to go to general waste but I don't have another option. Green waste can be so useful and shouldn't just be thrown out.

Great way to recycle more. But I think it should be weekly collection as many properties are lawn and just lawn clippings fill bins without adding extra.
We have chickens and make our own compost and wouldn’t want to be part of a mandatory green bin. We’d support it if there were exemptions for those like us who don’t need a green bin.

its OK, if the general rubbish bin collection fees are drastically reduced, otherwise why would any normal person want an extra charge on there annual council rubbish fees, recycling or not!? 

We have chooks

If council is receiving a grant to implement this and will save 1000s each year in land fill levy why an additional levy to rates...every time you want to bring something in I have to pay from a limited budget

I don’t need another bin or cost. I do not have much green waste

We desperately need to reduce the amount going to landfill, and this is a simple way to help.

We ourselves have too much green waste for the current arrangement, and would welcome weekly green collection with fortnightly red bin collection

Even though I compost and wouldn’t use it, It’s disgusting so much green waste is still going to land fill, especially when there’s so much space to compost on individual properties in the Barossa. I compost and I only have a small block. Maybe people should be given the option of buying their own compost bin, if not, then mandatory green bin.

This would save me paying dump fees when i have my shrubs trimmed back.

About 40% of my waste is recyclables, 40% is green organics, 20% is rubbish, if I had space to compost at home I would but I don’t so I would prefer that someone comports it

It’s our responsibility to care for the environment and how we manage waste is a big part of that. 47% of landfill waste being organic matter is shocking! However I don’t think the cost should be added to our rates. I was very surprised when I moved to the Barossa that a green waste service wasn’t already included in our rates.

Cost. If you will save over $45,000 a year by reducing green waste in the red bin, then you can offer the service free of charge to rate payers. Don’t want to run a truck ???? I use to live in tea tree gully council area a few yrs back. They offered FREE greens dumping for all residents. They then turned it to mulch and used on their parks and gardens. Everyone was a winner. We live
in the country and you can’t manage to offer a free service similar. The other factor is, I compost and burn. There will be plenty of weeks I don’t need the green bin so I will be paying for something I don’t always use. I already pay for the red bin, might as well use it.

Screen Name Redacted  10/09/2020 09:04 AM

Our food scraps get composted into our vege garden & all our garden prunings get used as mulch or taken to a friends farm for disposal. We therefore would be paying for something that we do not need.

Screen Name Redacted  10/09/2020 11:37 AM

I don’t think that council should be mandating this. We already pay ridiculous rates and receive nothing for it. Not good enough!

Screen Name Redacted  10/09/2020 12:04 PM

Already recycling all our organic waste via compost, chickens or kuchels for the really big stuff.

Screen Name Redacted  10/09/2020 01:19 PM

I have been meaning to get a green waste bin for ages but haven't got round to it. I think all steps to better manage waste help our planet to thrive.

Screen Name Redacted  10/09/2020 01:27 PM

The 47% of organics that we are told still go to landfill. Had no idea.

Screen Name Redacted  10/09/2020 05:09 PM

I don't need it. Enough bins to move. I just wrap the little food scraps I have in plastic bag and put in red bin. Don't want to handle loose food scraps.

Screen Name Redacted  10/09/2020 08:39 PM

We already compost our green waste. Will the savings really be passed on, I doubt it. How about a hard rubbish day instead?

Screen Name Redacted  10/09/2020 10:36 PM

I dont need it. Enough bins to move. I just wrap the little food scraps I have in plastic bag and put in red bin. Don't want to handle loose food scraps.

Screen Name Redacted  10/09/2020 01:27 PM

The 47% of organics that we are told still go to landfill. Had no idea.

Screen Name Redacted  10/09/2020 01:27 PM

We already compost our green waste. Will the savings really be passed on, I doubt it. How about a hard rubbish day instead?

Screen Name Redacted  10/10/2020 10:01 AM

There are a number of households in our town who burn their green waste adding to air pollution

Screen Name Redacted  10/10/2020 11:01 AM

Environmental concerns, the impact of global warming and methane production from food waste in general waste bins

Screen Name Redacted  10/10/2020 11:37 AM

Waste of organic waste in red bins etc. better for the environment

Screen Name Redacted  10/10/2020 03:35 PM

We recycle all of our organic waste through the use of compost bins, worm farm and chooks. We own a large mulcher and would never have anything to put in a green waste bin.

Screen Name Redacted  10/10/2020 03:57 PM

I live on the outskirts and have enough land to be able to burn my green waste
Compost and burn green waste

Use organic waste on garden and in compost

Hate throwing organic greens in our normal rubbish bin, just a shame when it can be composted

Believe in green practices

I’ve tried several time to get this service but was declined due to living in Eden Valley

It's a much needed service, I don't have ne but would love to have one to reduce what goes into landfill.

Our household tries to have an environmental focus on all our waste. I believe that by doing this the council also shows leadership in looking after our environment

We compost everything either in the garden, give to the chickens or in our compost bin and have no need of this service. So we would not be happy having to pay for something we wouldn't use.

Self composting.

Penalizing rate payers who dont need it. Some people dont even have a garden. I wouldnt use it as I have compost bins and a mulcher and manage our green waste.

Im all for reducing food waste but if people already have something at home it shouldn't be mandatory. It should be included in our rates not an extra expense, things are hard enough as it is with how high the rates are and for what.

I support the idea of minimising useful products being sent to landfill however I do not support a compulsory scheme if there is a cost involved to individual ratepayers. We have invested considerable money and effort to compost all of our organic material for reuse on our own property.

I am thinking off getting a Green wast bin but will wait to see what happens here I use My trailer for green wast and take to kushils

It's important for households to better manage their organic waste.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Screen Name Redacted</th>
<th>10/12/2020 10:08 AM</th>
<th>Already have a green bin and find it useful.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Screen Name Redacted</td>
<td>10/12/2020 11:44 AM</td>
<td>I very much support re-using green waste, but disagree with the &quot;mandatory&quot; element in the proposed service. In our case, we compost all our green waste on our property - so we'll have no use for a council-provided green waste bin. Such bin should be offered to households as an opt-in service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screen Name Redacted</td>
<td>10/12/2020 08:13 PM</td>
<td>Live on a small farm. Compost my green waste in a worm farm. Burn larger material.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screen Name Redacted</td>
<td>10/13/2020 03:32 PM</td>
<td>Environmental benefit. Supports clean up of properties by owners/residents all year. (Fire, Vermin, Snakes) Reduce the need for backyard burning in townships. 100% of properties involved rather than ~50%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screen Name Redacted</td>
<td>10/13/2020 04:16 PM</td>
<td>The amount of green waste produced by my property might equal 1 green bin a year if I am lucky, which I am sure is the case for many. Therefore, increasing all ready high rates for a service that is pointless to many, is a cost that a lot could do without in the current times.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screen Name Redacted</td>
<td>10/13/2020 07:55 PM</td>
<td>Rate safe already to expensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screen Name Redacted</td>
<td>10/14/2020 08:55 AM</td>
<td>I think everyone should better manage their green and organic waste. However, outside of township boundaries (where I live) we already compost on our property so don't need a green waste service. So I wouldn't like a mandatory service for my circumstance, outside of a township (I live in Cockatoo valley)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screen Name Redacted</td>
<td>10/14/2020 10:28 PM</td>
<td>Some people already process greens in many ways including compost, worm farms and other mulching processes and therefore would be paying for something they are not using. A better idea would be request people not use the red bin for Organics and if they cannot process it all then have a free or small charge pick up point in the towns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screen Name Redacted</td>
<td>10/15/2020 08:36 AM</td>
<td>We need to keep eligible waste out of landfill. We already dispose of our own green waste through munching, chipping and composting then mulching - so we don't actually need it. Not every home is able or willing to do this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screen Name Redacted</td>
<td>10/16/2020 12:48 PM</td>
<td>We compost our green waste for our garden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screen Name Redacted</td>
<td>10/16/2020 03:49 PM</td>
<td>Land owners mulch, compost and burn ready for bushfire season.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screen Name Redacted</td>
<td>10/18/2020 01:10 PM</td>
<td>We have chooks, compost, grow our own veg, will also be staring a worm fam... This is where the future lies in educating people to deal with it onsite. Another idea would be to introduce soft plastic recycling locally as this fills up a heap of space in red bins. Although we do not have a green bin, changing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
pick up to a weekday would be great as it is a 7am pick up here.

I compost organic material and have a chook bin for my hens

We have always kept our own compost bin, which produces valuable composted material for our large garden. As a consequence of this we do not require an additional waste material service or extra bin; neither would it be fair to charge us for a bin which would not be used. The use of the word “mandatory” is going too far.

I believe a mandatory green waste bin should be coupled with a change to the red bin collection to fortnightly offsetting the cost. Could it be cost neutral?

It is a practical solution to a problem

The cost! As a pensioner I cannot afford to pay the extra for the optional service.

To help reduce green waste going to land fill. My bin is full every fortnight so know how much waste I am preventing from going to landfill.

Helping the Environment

As to much green waste goes into the red bins, however I dont believe there should be an additional fee for the green waste.

I can’t believe it's not mandatory already! Everyone needs to do their bit to look after our beautiful environment

Cost

My red bin is always overflowing because of garden waste

War on Waste - being smarter with disposal of food scraps. We have the receival facility in our Council area at Kuchel's, so lets do it!!

You need to make it a weekly pick up if this is what you want to do. Nobody wants rotting meat and food in their bins for two weeks especially in summer. Also you want to charge us for something that’s going to SAVE you money. We already pay ridiculous rates for barely any decent services. Stop trying to line your own pockets.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Screen Name Redacted</th>
<th>10/22/2020 02:53 PM</th>
<th>Environmental impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Screen Name Redacted</td>
<td>10/22/2020 02:59 PM</td>
<td>Environmental, to reduce landfill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screen Name Redacted</td>
<td>10/22/2020 06:08 PM</td>
<td>Savings would have to be passed on to homeowners for me to support this, if the council is going to save money it should be passed on to homeowners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screen Name Redacted</td>
<td>10/22/2020 06:11 PM</td>
<td>Not being charged for it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screen Name Redacted</td>
<td>10/22/2020 07:05 PM</td>
<td>We're a country area and people have gardens, compost bins and chook yards. I personally wouldn't put anything in one provided for my place. I think if it remains optional, that would be fine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screen Name Redacted</td>
<td>10/23/2020 07:32 PM</td>
<td>Our rates are to expensive now without adding an extra charge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screen Name Redacted</td>
<td>10/24/2020 10:41 AM</td>
<td>I WOULD LIKE THE GREEN WASTE TO BE COLLECTED WEEKLY AND RED BIN FORTNIGHTLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screen Name Redacted</td>
<td>10/24/2020 12:03 PM</td>
<td>I would not use a green waste bin as I recycle my own waste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screen Name Redacted</td>
<td>10/24/2020 04:45 PM</td>
<td>We recycle all our food, garden waste etc. Through composting and feeding to animals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screen Name Redacted</td>
<td>10/24/2020 08:12 PM</td>
<td>It would stop a neighbor burning his green waste. I know this is not allowed but he still does it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screen Name Redacted</td>
<td>10/24/2020 10:34 PM</td>
<td>We are outside of the physical township and compost all our green organic waste. The service would be redundant. For keen gardeners in the township this would be the same. You need to ensure the waste audit and results are available online to the rate payers to support your proposed position.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screen Name Redacted</td>
<td>10/25/2020 06:49 AM</td>
<td>It’s a positive environmental issue. However, I live outside a township and would like optional (not mandatory as many have facilities onsite to dispose) for farm owners too.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screen Name Redacted</td>
<td>10/25/2020 08:41 AM</td>
<td>All our green waste goes to our friends farm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screen Name Redacted</td>
<td>10/25/2020 09:13 AM</td>
<td>Green waste should be emptied weekly Red waste emptied fortnightly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screen Name Redacted</td>
<td>10/25/2020 10:34 PM</td>
<td>We have a green waste bin and use it regularly, we also have chooks so</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
scraps go to them as well. We also make use of the soft plastic recycling at Foodland. I know there are people who compost and have small amounts of red bin waste, so don’t think it would be fair on them to pay for something they don’t use. On the other hand I see many over flowing red bins, which could be reduced if people recycled better. Our red bin has maybe one bag of rubbish a week and there is 5 in our house. These are the people who need to be targeted but I think you would have problems with them putting the wrong thing in the bin and would contaminate the organic then it would end up in landfill. I think people who are interested and will be conscious will already have a green bin, maybe you could increase red bin cost, but have a discount for recycling and green waste bins? Not sure if our green waste bins need vents added to them, to help air them out as they get very smelly, especially when you have a pet.

Screen Name Redacted
10/26/2020 05:13 PM

There are too many bins already and it just adds to the confusion and hassle to add another one.

Screen Name Redacted
10/26/2020 05:40 PM

There are other green options that council could support for example compost bins are a one off cost for either the owner/resident or council could use the grant monies to wholly or partly fund this option - long term benefits for cost reduction future years and soil benefits for residents. 55% do not have a green bin indicating the majority do not want a mandated green bin. Education education and education repeatedly is a sound strategy to reduce organics in red bins - how to compost, how to reduce waste, preserving to reduce waste are a few ideas. I recall a previous survey failed so why are Council pursuing this option and appearing to ignore options put forward in the last survey?

Screen Name Redacted
10/26/2020 06:48 PM

We, like many others, use both a home compost system and our chooks to deal with the majority of green waste, combined with 2 or 3 trips to Kuchels per year to deal with pruning etc. So we don’t need a green waste bin, and would resent being penalised for it. The other thing that appears wrong is the mentality. It is clear from the proposal that as well as the environmental impact, which we also feel passionate about, the financial impact of this would be a reduction in cost to council by 45000, and yet the response is not to incentivise out of those funds, but take an effectively punitive action (including against those who like us simply take full responsibility rather than expecting council to do so). What’s more, it is my observation that this strategy doesn’t work. Some will not have green waste because of financial pressure- this proposal would impose that pressure on all. There are also those who because of time constraints (or laziness), lack of education etc already barely use the yellow bin which they are paying for. As an avid recycler i understand the frustration with those that don’t, and maybe even why those who are paying for a green bin now might see this proposal as good, however I believe it misses the point. This proposal appears on the face to be council not taking proactive leadership, but avoiding responsibility by making it ratepayers problem with the end result being reduction of council costs at the direct expense of ratepayers.
Any environmental steps forward are good, but this step forward does not encourage the production of less waste; Reduce should be our first step, not Recycle. However it is still a step forward in resource recovery. Home composting should be the first step which is what we do onsite here has no incentive or support from council. This step financial penalises green recycling behaviour whereas we should be financial penalising landfill behaviour. In changing our households waste behaviour we need the landfill collection every three weeks yet there is no financial incentive reflected in our rates. San Francisco council charge according to how much waste is produced, I would love to see the mandatory weekly landfill collection shifted to fortnightly, if needed the alternate collection being paid for as an extra by household utilising the service. This would do more to change community behaviour quickly due to social pressure to be more environmentally conscious as well as providing financial incentive to change, and saving the council money in the process due to reduced collections.

To hopefully reduce the ongoing burning of green waste in residential areas

I think the green organics service is great and can see the long term benefit for our environment from making the service mandatory.
Q7  Do you currently or would you use a kitchen caddy (supplied with kerbside green organics bin service)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>54 (49.1%)</td>
<td>56 (50.9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Optional question (110 response(s), 0 skipped)
Question type: Radio Button Question
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Screen Name Redacted</th>
<th>Date/Time</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10/07/2020 02:41 PM</td>
<td>Easier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10/07/2020 03:30 PM</td>
<td>We use an empty ice cream container as a caddy to take food scraps to our compost pile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10/07/2020 04:24 PM</td>
<td>I already use a kitchen caddy container for poultry food.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10/07/2020 04:35 PM</td>
<td>The caddy supplied with the green bin is too large for my family of 4 and takes up too much bench space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10/07/2020 05:28 PM</td>
<td>The caddy is great but there are real issues with the expense of compostable bags. The smell and maggot issue in green bins when bags aren't used is awful, and in summer I've put organic waste in the red bin simply because it's picked up more regularly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10/07/2020 06:26 PM</td>
<td>I use a self purchased kitchen caddy to increase my compost bins for my garden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10/07/2020 06:33 PM</td>
<td>It would encourage the placing of food scraps into the appropriate bin instead of just being put into garbage (red bin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10/07/2020 07:36 PM</td>
<td>Because we don't have a green organics bin service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10/07/2020 07:42 PM</td>
<td>I have chickens!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10/07/2020 07:54 PM</td>
<td>I use my own but the supply of a handy caddy would be great and would help take up i believe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10/07/2020 08:20 PM</td>
<td>We have chooks and worms take all our scraps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10/07/2020 10:51 PM</td>
<td>Already have one we purchased ourselves for the compost and worm farm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10/07/2020 11:44 PM</td>
<td>Already have my own. Don't waste more valuable resources. Encourage people to recycle an old ice cream container. Don't waste more resources producing them. Encourage reuse. This is the whole point of reduction to landfill.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We have our own compost system and so most of our waste in the caddy goes to our own system. Suggest for compostable bags be available for people to line their caddies OR us newspaper to make waste disposal easier. Marion Council do this.

if it comes with the green bin i wouldn't use it

I use the kitchen caddy as it is convenient to use in the kitchen for green waste

I would love to use a kitchen caddy but don't have one supplied.

Convenient to do scraps

We compost and have chickens

Rubbish is rubbish, kitchen waste rots quicker than general rubbish, so why have an extra bin?

We give our scraps to our chooks.

We already compost kitchen waste

Not needed

We have compost bins for our kitchen waste.

It's very convenient to put kitchen waste directly into a container ready for emptying into the green bin.

No brainer to use one

although have only very small amount of waste for caddy

I already use it because as previously advised I seek to avoid sending compostable waste to landfill.
Screen Name Redacted
10/09/2020 12:15 AM

I already have a compost bin in the kitchen but a dedicated green waste
caddy would be handy! Although your website said we would be provided
one with our green bin, we were not.

Screen Name Redacted
10/09/2020 06:40 AM

I already use one so there’d be no reason to stop.

Screen Name Redacted
10/09/2020 06:58 AM

I compost my own scraps from kitchen.

Screen Name Redacted
10/09/2020 09:04 AM

Already do for use as compost in our vege garden

Screen Name Redacted
10/09/2020 11:37 AM

My rubbish, my business. Council needs to pull your heads in, you are a
waste of money.

Screen Name Redacted
10/09/2020 12:04 PM

Our ice cream container on the kitchen bench has been a perfectly good
"caddy" for over ten years. But sure let's put more plastic out in the
community!

Screen Name Redacted
10/09/2020 01:19 PM

I already use one so it would not be change for me.

Screen Name Redacted
10/09/2020 05:09 PM

Better than handling loose food scraps but I still don't really want it. I am
happy to put food scraps in plastic bag and into red bin.

Screen Name Redacted
10/09/2020 08:39 PM

As above, we already compost organic waste.

Screen Name Redacted
10/09/2020 10:36 PM

Do not require one for the reason stated above.

Screen Name Redacted
10/10/2020 10:01 AM

To collect food waste to add to my green bin

Screen Name Redacted
10/10/2020 11:01 AM

Would love a kitchen caddy to make it easier to get my green waste to the
bin

Screen Name Redacted
10/10/2020 11:37 AM

I just use a special container for the job

Screen Name Redacted
10/10/2020 03:35 PM

We recycle all of our organic waste through the use of compost bins, worm
farm and chooks. We own a large mulcher and would never have anything to
put in a gre.

Screen Name Redacted
10/10/2020 08:39 PM

I have a compost system in place already
Already use own compost caddy

Have bin for greenwaste that goes to compost

Good useful item

Convenience and having a dedicated caddy for the purpose

I sure would use the caddy, think it's a great idea

The kitchen caddy needs to be metal and not plastic. We had plastic which encouraged mice. With a metal bin we haven't had mice issues

We have chickens, and they get our waste.

my scraps go to my worm farm.

Reason stated above, we already compost our own material for reuse.

We have chooks and ducks

I compost my scraps for my garden

Easy way to collect and transport scraps. It would be great if compostable bags could be supplied or made available for purchase through Council.

Icecream container works just as well.

We have our own kitchen caddy which we use to collect organic waste, for taking to our compost bins. We don't need a council-provided kitchen caddy

Dont need to use the bin
The amount of food waste generated is minimal and it would take a number of weeks to fill up one caddy, or just mean we generate more plastic (even if it is biodegradable) for a small amount of waste.

We have chicken and compost to feed

Already use

It's a great way to collect it and then process by wither using green bin or our compost or worms. More education needs to help people recycle

I don't have the green service so clearly I don't have their caddy! I use a kitchen caddy daily. It is emptied once a day or more as required into a large worm farm. Paper, Paper towels, tissues, kitchen green waste, light cardboard all in there. Perfect.

We have our own method of collection

We have 6 compost bays therefore we do not need a kitchen caddy

Have my own thankyou

Chooks

We already have the necessary compost bin and caddy

Cleanliness

because all our food scraps go to the chooks

I like to direct waste to appropriate recycling

Keep it on kitchen bench. All food scraps & eligible items go in there & I regularly empty it into the green waste bin. Too easy.
Screen Name Redacted
10/22/2020 10:56 AM

Convenient

Screen Name Redacted
10/22/2020 11:08 AM

Kitchen scraps go into home compost

Screen Name Redacted
10/22/2020 11:10 AM

Why wouldn't you?

Screen Name Redacted
10/22/2020 11:52 AM

If it's better for the environment - Why not!!

Screen Name Redacted
10/22/2020 12:38 PM

I have already purchased a plastic container with a lid that I prefer to a caddy

Screen Name Redacted
10/22/2020 01:12 PM

Needs to be emptied every use to the outside bin or gets flies and maggots and stinks

Screen Name Redacted
10/22/2020 02:59 PM

I already have a caddy and would not be supportive of plastic caddies being blanket distributed. A non-plastic version available on request might be OK though.

Screen Name Redacted
10/22/2020 06:08 PM

No they smell

Screen Name Redacted
10/22/2020 06:11 PM

We can reuse a plastic ice cream bucket to take it out an put into the green bin

Screen Name Redacted
10/22/2020 07:05 PM

My kitchen scraps go into my own scrap bucket for my compost and my crooks.

Screen Name Redacted
10/22/2020 07:32 PM

Forget that I have one, or forget to empty it

Screen Name Redacted
10/23/2020 07:32 PM

Our scraps go to our chickens

Screen Name Redacted
10/24/2020 10:41 AM

ITS HANDY AND WORKS WELL FOR MY HOUSEHOLD

Screen Name Redacted
10/24/2020 12:03 PM

I recyle my own waste already

Screen Name Redacted
10/24/2020 04:45 PM

Have our own which is more than adequate
I use mine all the time

All green and biodegradable waste is composted.

Convenient reminder

Have a worm farm. All our kitchen scraps go into this.

It's a little large, we empty the organic waste from the kitchen daily and we use an old ice cream container

Smell, I don't want the smell in the house.

I compost in the garden

Because we are not supporting this proposal

I disagree with using plastic is waste removal systems. Even biodegradable plastics still remain within our environmental system. If newspaper lining (which is what we do currently) was acceptable I could support a mandatory collection.

It's super handy to have in the kitchen where most of my green waste comes from.

Optional question (97 response(s), 13 skipped)

Question type: Single Line Question
Your Say Barossa
Proposed mandatory green organic waste service

Visitors Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aware Participants</th>
<th>181</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aware Actions Performed</td>
<td>Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visited a Project or Tool Page</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Informed Participants | 138 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informed Actions Performed</td>
<td>Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viewed a video</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viewed a photo</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downloaded a document</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visited the Key Dates page</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visited an FAQ list Page</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visited Instagram Page</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visited Multiple Project Pages</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributed to a tool (engaged)</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Engaged Participants | 110 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engaged Actions Performed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributed on Forums</td>
<td>Registered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in Surveys</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributed to Newsfeeds</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in Quick Polls</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posted on Guestbooks</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributed to Stories</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asked Questions</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placed Pins on Places</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributed to Ideas</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Highlights

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL VISITS</th>
<th>MAX VISITORS PER DAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>221</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW REGISTRATIONS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENGAGED VISITORS</th>
<th>INFORMED VISITORS</th>
<th>AWARE VISITORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ENGAGEMENT TOOLS SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tool Type</th>
<th>Engagement Tool Name</th>
<th>Tool Status</th>
<th>Visitors</th>
<th>Contributors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Registered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qanda</td>
<td>Ask a question</td>
<td>Published</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Tool</td>
<td>Mandatory Green Organics Waste Service</td>
<td>Published</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### INFORMATION WIDGET SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Widget Type</th>
<th>Engagement Tool Name</th>
<th>Visitors</th>
<th>Views/Downloads</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document</td>
<td>FAQ - Proposed mandatory green organic waste service.pdf</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document</td>
<td>Media Release - Proposed mandatory green organic waste service.pdf</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document</td>
<td>Waste Management Service Policy.pdf</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video</td>
<td>About the proposed mandatory green organic waste service</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INFORMATION WIDGET SUMMARY**

3 DOCUMENTS  0 PHOTOS  1 VIDEOS  0 FAQS  0 KEY DATES
QANDA

Ask a question

Visitors 16 | Contributors 9 | CONTRIBUTIONS 10

Q BarossaProud
22 October 20

Will Light Pass be considered for inclusion as a township for the organic waste service? We are smack bang in the middle of the three major towns.

A Publicly Answered

If the service is moved to mandatory in the townships that are currently eligible, it would give the opportunity to review the schedule and route for the green organic service. The possibility of extending the route to offer the service to other townships would be able to discussed as part of the review.

Q BarossaProud
22 October 20

Will Light Pass be considered for inclusion as a township for the organic waste service? We are smack bang in the middle of the three major towns.

A Publicly Answered

If the service is moved to mandatory in the townships that are currently eligible, it would give the opportunity to review the schedule and route for the green organic service. The possibility of extending the route to offer the service to other townships would be able to discussed as part of the review.
**QANDA**

**Ask a question**

**Q** Morganlj  
24 October 20  

I would like to see the green bin collected weekly and the red bin fortnightly as during the summer the green bin can become a bit of a hazard with blowflies and maggots

**A** Privately Answered  

Thank you for your suggestion to move the Organics bin to a weekly collection and the General Waste bin to a fortnightly collection. Your suggestion will be considered when all community feedback for the proposed mandatory green organic service is collated and reviewed.

**Q** jen  
25 October 20  

Has it been considered that green waste is emptied weekly and red waste emptied fortnightly?

**A** Privately Answered  

Thank you for your feedback. While it has not yet been considered to move the Organic service to a weekly emptying schedule or move the General Waste to a fortnightly empty, your suggestion will be considered when all of the feedback for the proposed mandatory green organic service is collated and reviewed.

**Q** Cyni  
07 October 20  

If this is made mandatory is good, but in some cases another bin to find a home for and more money to find to the already out of control rates is not fair to many. Unfortunately COVID has hit many, many people of our community and yes you do offer a payment plan. But in times like we have not seen since the depression it added more stress and hardship to many. How about offering this service for free or at a much reduced rate for 12 months to encourage people to use it?? I’m sure many would then try harder to be more environmentally friendly. I feel the fact that adding more money to rates for this bin is why majority of person don’t do it now. I know my street where there are a lot of rate payers will be lucky if two households have this bin. Way too expensive people.

**A** Privately Answered  

Thank you for your comments, These will be considered when all community feedback for the proposed mandatory green organic service is collated and reviewed.
QANDA

Ask a question

Q  Bethechange
27 October 20

We avoid plastic wherever possible...reduce... reduce. Can we use newspaper to line the caddy as we do with our current compost and rubbish bins.

A  Privately Answered

Hi, thanks for your enquiry. The answer is yes, you can use newspaper to line the caddy.

Q  Bethechange
27 October 20

We have already changed our households behaviour to significantly reduce our landfill waste so only need a collection of the red bin fortnightly. Can council provide the financial option for weekly or fortnightly collection of landfill bins on rates?

A  Privately Answered

Thanks for your comments. We don’t have a provision for this currently, as our service rates are based on current service levels, which is weekly collection of the red bin. The option to consider changing the red bin from weekly to fortnightly collection will be taken into account as part of the consultation feedback.

Q  [Redacted]
26 October 20

We live in a small unit with a small front and back garden. If I am composting my green waste why should I have a green bin that will never get used?

A  Privately Answered

Thanks for your comments, these will be included when the consultation feedback is collated. Please note the green bin can be a good overflow for those that home compost and it can also handle material that some home compost systems struggle to break down, such as dairy products, meat and bone.
QANDA

Ask a question

Q 07 October 20

It is unfair to make this a mandatory service which we have to pay for! We have lived at our property for 33 years and compost our food scraps and greens to fertilise our land. We live 1 km out of Angaston and have never used a green bin.

A Privately Answered

Thank you for your comments. These will be considered when all community feedback for the proposed mandatory green organic service is collated and reviewed.

Q Peter 09 October 20

I own 4 similar bins which I have at strategic location around my yard. When they are full I load into my trailer and take to Kuchel to recycle. Will I be forced to pay for a council service as well?

A Privately Answered

Thanks for your question. If the Green Organic service is moved to mandatory, it will only apply to properties within the townships that are currently eligible for the optional service. If your property is in one of these townships, the service charge would be applied. Your comments regarding how you currently manage your green waste will be taken into consideration when all the community feedback is collated and reviewed.

Q Nuriootpa residents 08 October 20

If we are forced to have an "extra charge", on an extra bin, to be emptied, we would expect nothing less than the "general rubbish" bin's annual fee to be dramatically reduced, otherwise there is no point in even mentioning this proposal "to us"; the rate payers. Leaves and trimmings will rot much quicker than general rubbish, does nobody even realize this? We do not need to be incurring another council charge on our rates.

A Privately Answered

Thank you for your comments. These will be considered when all community feedback for the proposed mandatory green organic service is collated and reviewed.
**ENGAGEMENT TOOL: SURVEY TOOL**

Mandatory Green Organics Waste Service

| Visitors | 124 | Contributors | 107 | CONTRIBUTIONS | 110 |

Which Township do you live in?

- 25 (22.7%)
- 24 (21.8%)
- 12 (10.9%)
- 7 (6.4%)
- 4 (3.6%)
- 3 (2.7%)
- 2 (1.8%)
- 2 (1.8%)
- 1 (0.9%)
- Not in a township

**Question options**

- Angaston / Penrice
- Eden Valley
- Light Pass
- Lyndoch
- Mount Pleasant
- Stockwell
- Tanunda
- Williamstown
- Nuriootpa

*Mandatory Question (110 response(s))*

*Question type: Dropdown Question*
Do you currently have a green organics waste service subscription to your property?

Question options
- Yes
- No

Mandatory Question (110 response(s))

Question type: Radio Button Question
Are you the property owner?

104 (94.5%)

6 (5.5%)

Question options

- Yes
- No
Do you support the introduction of a mandatory green organic waste service for eligible townships?

- Yes: 61 (55.5%)
- No: 49 (44.5%)

Question options

Mandatory Question (110 response(s))

Question type: Radio Button Question
Would you support the introduction of a mandatory green organic waste service for eligible townships if the collection day was on a weekday instead of a Saturday (service would remain fortnightly with collection likely the same day as the general w...

Question options

- Yes
- No

Mandatory Question (110 response(s))

Question type: Radio Button Question
Do you currently or would you use a kitchen caddy (supplied with kerbside green organics bin service)

56 (50.9%)
54 (49.1%)

Question options
- Yes
- No

Optional question (110 response(s), 0 skipped)
Question type: Radio Button Question
Proposed mandatory green organic waste service

1. Which township do you live in?
   
   Nuriootpa

2. Do you currently have a green organics waste service subscription to your property?
   
   Yes  No

3. Are you the property owner?
   
   Yes  No

4. Do you support the introduction of a mandatory green organic waste service for eligible townships?
   
   Yes  No

5. Would you support the introduction of a mandatory green organic waste service for eligible townships if the collection day was on a weekday instead of a Saturday (service would remain fortnightly with collection likely the same day as the general waste collection for your township).
   
   Yes  No

6. What factors have influenced your support or opposition to introduce a mandatory green organics waste service?
   
   The introduction of a mandatory green bin would reduce landfill and as our neighbour does, eliminate back yard burning.

7. Do you currently or would you use a kitchen caddy (supplied with kerbside green organics bin service)
   
   Yes  No

8. Why or why not would you use a kitchen caddy?
   
   To separate compostables from general waste
I have observed the volunteers looking after the roses/plants in the town streets putting green waste into the town bins.
From: Mayor Lange  
Sent: Sunday, 11 October 2020 11:21 AM  
To: Gary Mavrinac <gmvavrinac@barossa.sa.gov.au>; Marisa South <msouth@barossa.sa.gov.au>  
Subject: Fwd: Green Waste

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

Date: 11 October 2020 at 9:05:08 am ACDT  
To: Mayor Lange <mayor.lange@barossa.sa.gov.au>  
Subject: Green Waste

from Tanunda..Sorry if this is Not the Correct way to Answer your article on Green waste..please just forward to correct place if not.

I am a Passionate Gardner, and enjoy helping people become more sustainable, by creating onsite Composting solutions.  
I would LOVE the Barossa to become ‘Greener’ in their approach to waste. I think educating people to their options may help.  
We live on a standard house block with a very full garden. ALL our green Kitchen waste, except meat, is put into a very simple ‘Worm farm’ Bin, that is buried 1’ into the ground. It does not smell..and the worms break it down very quickly. We can choose to empty this onto our vege. plot or Garden once a year...or simply leave it, as it actually breaks down to basically a medium like Tea Leaves. Many of my friends DON’T do this, so all Their Kitchen scraps go into the Red Bin. Even someone Living in a small Unit with a paved back Yard, could use this method by taking out a couple of Pavers.
The cuttings and branches from the Garden NEVER leave the property, as They get chopped up, Then go onto a simple mulch heap. This also breaks down over a year and goes back on the Garden.
I’m sure if people were shown how simple it is to set up a couple of things, we could at least halve the amount of Green waste going to land fill?
Id be happy to ‘DO’ a little story? with pics to show what we have done, and show people How simple being Green really is.
If this could be helpful..please let me know!
Thanks Steve
Atttn Bim Lange,

We send all our organic waste through our own compost, chickens and worm farm. We will NOT pay for an organic bin we don't need and won't use. Our red lid bin is only ever half full, usually less (and that's a family of four) because we redirect compostable matter.

Green organic waste bins should not be mandatory. A more flexible solution, especially in a rural area, needs to be found.

Thanks
To Mr. Gary Mavrinac,
Director of Development and Environmental services.

CC: Mayor Bim Lange

I am writing to you in response to the community consultation invite on waste services and mandatory organic collection in the Barossa area as raised by the Leader. I am passionate about sustainable systems and environmental advocacy. I am a homeowner and ratepayer in Williamstown and our household in the past year has reduced our waste practices to the point where a landfill collection is not required weekly. We have a compost bin and practice vegetable and native gardening to ensure the reuse of resources and minimisation of environmental impact. I am aware that not all households are capable of the ideal onsite green waste recycling due to physical or space restrictions. Any step environmental steps forward are welcome but I have some reservations about the rollout of Mandatory green services and some suggestions that may make a more complete solution.

I cannot endorse using plastics in the waste disposal process, we use newspaper to line our bins once we have finished catching up on local news and events. This works well in the composting procedure as it helps to maintain the correct ratio of dry/wet constituents in the composting system. If we have a mandatory green bin, will it also be mandatory to use the plastic caddy liners. Even biodegradable plastics break down to smaller plastics and our first option is always Avoid. Can council endorse the use of newspaper in the caddy, which supports local business rather that a plastic product which will be an ongoing cost to the environment and a financial cost to the council.

I applaud the council for their move to reduce landfill, but the introduction of a mandatory service which costs ratepayers is a financial penalty rather than incentive and ratepayers will always disagree with an increase in financial burden. By halving the landfill(red bin) cost by halving landfill collection simultaneous to adding the green waste charge, you can reduce this change in financial burden on the community while improving community support for the proposed changes. As stated the reduction of 47% of volume in the landfill bin would reduce the necessity of weekly landfill collection. Councils elsewhere in the world charge higher rates based on waste produced, and Barossa council as a forward thinking council should be performing with the best in the world. In conjunction with the green bin introduction there should be a simultaneous reduction in landfill collection.

I propose a mandatory fortnightly collection of all three services with an optional collection of landfill for an additional charge on the alternate weeks. This would change community behaviour far faster than the green introduction alone. Social pressure to reduce waste would be a driver for change as well as the financial benefit of not paying for the second collection. More wasteful households would be easily visible kerbside with the second collection of landfill. This will help council to target education within that community, and the social pressure for environmental responsibility will drive behavioural change far faster that providing and the extra organics service alone.

Thank you for your environmental efforts and for seeking community consultation. May we move forward as a community in utilising resources more efficiently and continue as a leading council.

Warm Regards,
Hi Natalie

As per our conversation below are the comments captured on the 2 promotional posts, and the paid ad regarding the consultation.

Comments on 22 October post:

Would you have to pay for the green bins. 3d ***
We wouldn't have 1 bag a month. Doesn't seem fair if we have to pay

lived in Brissie several years ago and the council would arrange a collection of green waste a few times a year and - on the day it was collected - would leave a bag of compost (or two depending on how much waste was put out). As an acknowledgement for using green bins, I wonder if the Barossa council would be willing to provide free bags of compost (say 4 or 5 per year) from the waste that is collected in the green bins to rate payers...?
Brissie council also provided green waste (and general waste) vouchers to take their excess waste to the dump throughout the year...ie. no cost to rate payers...
There was also a hard waste collection week at least once a year...
I love living in the Barossa...just wonder if the Barossa Council could consider some of these options?

No. We have worms and our own compost...we would be paying to nothing removed.

MAYBE IT WOULD BE A BETTER IDEA TO COLLECT GREEN BINS WEEKLY ...obviously there IS a need !

Would like to know how big the sample was. 47% seems high
The Barossa Council: The audit was conducted over four collection days across four towns (Williamstown, Tanunda, Nurioopta, Lyndoch). The recycling and general waste (landfill) bins were collected from the same households wherever possible. A total of 100 bins for general waste and recycling bin materials were collected and audited.

Write a reply...

The Barossa Council: The sample was 3.03% of the bins in these townships.

Replied to by The Barossa Council: 100 doesn't sound like a big sample, how many bins are out each fortnight?

Sample probably from in the townships not those of us living on acreage. No need for green bins here. All waste goes to chooks, sheep, dog, firewood.

Comments on October 7 post:

Please don't make this mandatory. Those of us who have set up extensive green waste management systems on our properties put absolutely no greenhouse waste into our bins. Making green bins mandatory will not encourage others do compost, mulch, use chooks and worm farms and it will penalise those of us who create no green waste. I'm happy to be contacted for further comment.

would like to make the suggestion that Council consider recycling at the Springfield dump in a bid to support their commitment. At the moment their is no option available at all and everything goes to landfill.

Comments on the paid FB ad (which ran from Wed 21 – Tues 27/10):

organic matter going to landfill is a good thing, so it's a no from me.
A $45k saving to council, at a cost to ratepayers. Which could be passed on in the future. So what they’re saying is, we’ll charge you to save us some money. And we might give something back one day maby if it works or we’ll all forget. Sounds like council

We compost, and have compost worms. Why should I pay for something I never use. We are lucky if we put our red bin out every three weeks.

Sorry don’t agree with council over anything any more after pool fiasco

Mandatory green bins would be amazing

I agree with Maria Sheridan, we compost all of our organic waste or process it through a worm farm. Why should we have to pay for a compulsory service that we will not be using when we have invested quite a few hundred dollars to try and do the right thing and look after our own organic material.

I find the yearly fee a bit strange in Playford council there is a once of fee of around $60.

Kind Regards
Yonna
Case Study 1 – City of Boroondara Introduction of Food Organics Garden Organics.

The City of Boroondara is located in Inner-eastern metropolitan Melbourne

- 182,000 people/65,000 households
- Almost 30% born overseas
- 25% speak a Language Other Than English at home

City of Boroondara: Pre-FOGO Kerbside

- Weekly garbage – 120l/80l (some 240l)
- Weekly recycling – 120/240l
- Fortnightly opt-in green waste - 240l (44,000) properties

Average tonnages:
- Garbage 115 tonnes/day (35,000tpa) - landfilled
- Recycling 67 tonnes/day (20,000tpa) - recycled
- Green Waste 79 tonnes/day (20,000tpa) - composted

City of Boroondara: FOGO Kerbside – Phase 1

- Project planning, all-streams audit conducted December 2017
- Feasibility Study conducted early 2018
- Engagement with Council commenced mid-2018
- Provisional (then endorsed) budget approval February 2019
- Education program commenced May 2019
- Tendering and procurement of goods and services concluded November 2019
- Rollout of equipment to residents commenced March 9 2020
- Commencement of service May 4 2020

What is currently in the average Boroondara waste bin.
City of Boroondara: Post-FOGO Kerbside – Phase 1*

- Weekly FOGO collection
- Weekly recycling collection
- Fortnightly garbage collection
- Provision of education program to 47,000 properties
- Provision of caddies and liners to 47,000 properties
- Lid changes to 44,000 properties
- Provision of 120l bins to 20,000 properties

*Does not include MUDs, commercial, Council facilities

City of Boroondara: FOGO Kerbside – Best Practice Model

1. Food waste avoidance and FOGO education program
2. Weekly collection of FOGO
3. Fortnightly collection of garbage
4. Supply of caddies and liners – ongoing
5. Support and subsidise home composting

6. Engagement with community
7. Engagement with staff – the ‘BBQ stopper’ questions
8. Engagement with Councillors at regular intervals
The introduction of the mandated service and the change in service levels moving the Organic stream weekly and the General Waste to fortnightly resulted in a reduction in material sent to landfill with a diversion rate above 70%.
Case Study 2 – Macedon Ranges Shire Council – move to a four bin collection service

- Located 60km north-west of Melbourne CBD
- Peri-urban (mix of urban and rural)
- Population 50,000
- 20,000 kerbside serviced properties

Why change the service?

• Reducing organic waste to landfill:
  — Key strategic objective of Council
  — Opportunity to divert 2,400 tonnes/yr of food organics from landfill

• Kerbside glass service was a result of the recycling crisis:
  — Improve recycling outcomes and avoid landfilling of recyclables.
  — Minimising waste service cost impacts on the community.

What options did we look at? - FOGO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>FOGO</th>
<th>Garbage</th>
<th>Service Area</th>
<th>Cost $/yr above BAU</th>
<th>Tonnes CO2 avoided per year</th>
<th>FO Diversion rate* (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BAU</td>
<td>Fortnightly garden only</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>Townships</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>Fortnightly</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>$86,060</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 3</td>
<td>Fortnightly</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>$104,110</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 4</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>Fortnightly</td>
<td>Expanded</td>
<td>$274,720</td>
<td>1,160</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 5</td>
<td>Fortnightly</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>Expanded</td>
<td>$292,720</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 6</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>Fortnightly</td>
<td>Universal</td>
<td>$748,630</td>
<td>1,780</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 7</td>
<td>Fortnightly</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>Universal</td>
<td>$798,890</td>
<td>1,240</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Option 6 was the option that they proceeded with.

### Overview of service changes

- In February 2020 MRSC introduced a four-bin kerbside service:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous Service</th>
<th>New four-bin service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weekly general waste (140L)</td>
<td>Fortnightly general waste (140L)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortnightly comingled recycling (240L)</td>
<td>Fortnightly recycling (240L) + Four weekly glass-only (140L) + Glass drop off skips at transfer stations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortnightly garden waste (240L) – Opt-out service for township areas only</td>
<td>Weekly FOGO (240L) – Stage 1 includes all township areas. Stage 2 will expand to remaining areas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Option to upsize to 240L

### What we’ve seen so far

- Diversion rate increased from 42% to 68%
- Contamination rates:
  - 15-20% in recycling (slow but steady improvements)
  - 1% in glass
  - <1% in FOGO (monthly audits at Biomix)
Estimated Costings - Waste Collection 4th quarter
Current eligible townships gain weekly collection of green organic and general waste is moved to fortnightly.
*Aligns to Option 5

### Collection Costs - New Green Services Weekly Collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collections X Lifts per month X Cost per Lift</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 3751 X 4.4 X 1.0094</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 3751 X 4.6 X 1.0094</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 3751 X 4.4 X 1.0094</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 3751 X 4.4 X 1.0094</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 3751 X 4.6 X 1.0094</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 3751 X 4.4 X 1.0094</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$50,735.88

### Collection Costs - Existing Green Services Move to Weekly Collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collections X Lifts per month X Cost per Lift</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 3935 X 2.2 X 1.0094</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 3935 X 2.3 X 1.0094</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 3935 X 2.2 X 1.0094</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 3935 X 2.2 X 1.0094</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 3935 X 2.3 X 1.0094</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 3935 X 2.2 X 1.0094</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$26,612.33

### Collection Costs - General Waste Services Move to Fortnightly

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collections X Lifts per month X Cost per Lift</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 7686 X -2.2 X 1.0094</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 7686 X -2.3 X 1.0094</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 7686 X -2.2 X 1.0094</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 7686 X -2.2 X 1.0094</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 7686 X -2.3 X 1.0094</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 7686 X -2.2 X 1.0094</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$51,980.26

### Additional Collection Cost

$25,367.94

### Disposal Cost - Increase in Green Waste

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tonnage X Disposal Rate</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>167.66 X 37.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$6,238.63

### Disposal Cost - Decrease General Waste

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tonnage X Disposal Rate</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-130.17 X 104.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$13,604.07

### Additional Disposal Cost

$7,365.44

Collection and Disposal Costs $18,002.50
Less Grant Funding $9,001.25

Total Cost to Council $9,001.25
Estimated Costings - Waste Collection 4th quarter
All properties within townships gain weekly collection of green organic and general waste moved to fortnightly.
*Aligns to option 5 and also includes townships that are not currently in the scope

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection Costs - New Green Services Weekly Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection Costs - Existing Green Services Move to Weekly Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection Costs - General Waste Services Move to Fortnightly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional Collection Cost</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Take the average green waste tonnages collected in the first quarter and apply a 45% increase

- Average Tonnage of Green Waste for first quarter 416.19
- Increase by 40% 603.47
- Additional Tonnage 187.28

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disposal Cost - Increase in Green Waste</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tonnage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total general waste tonnages collected in the first quarter 1295.21
All townships generate estimated 80%
Estimated Tonnage of Township General Waste for first quarter 1036.17
- Decrease by 15% 880.74
- Additional Tonnage -155.43

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disposal Cost - Decrease General Waste</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tonnage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-155.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional Disposal Cost</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Collection and Disposal Costs | $26,291.21 |
| Less Grant Funding | **($13,145.61)** |
| **Total Cost to Council** | **$13,145.61** |
Estimated Costings - Waste Collection 4th quarter
Properties in current eligible townships that do not currently opt-in gain the fortnightly green organic service.
* Aligns to Option 2, 3 & 4

Collection Costs - New Green Services Fortnightly Collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Collections</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Lifts per month</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Cost per Lift</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>3751</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1.0094</td>
<td>$ 8,329.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>3751</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1.0094</td>
<td>$ 8,708.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>3751</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1.0094</td>
<td>$ 8,329.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Collection Cost $ 25,367.94

Take the average green waste tonnages collected in the first quarter and apply a 40% increase

Average Tonnage of Green Waste for first quarter 416.19
Increase by 40% 586.82
Additional Tonnage 167.66

Disposal Cost - Increase in Green Waste

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tonnage</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Disposal Rate</th>
<th>Additional Disposal Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>167.66</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>37.21</td>
<td>$ 6,238.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Collection and Disposal Costs $ 31,606.57
Less Grant Funding -$ 15,557.25
Total Cost to Council $ 16,049.32
Estimated Costings - Waste Collection 4th quarter
Properties in all townships that do not currently opt-in gain the green organic service.
*Aligns to option 2,3 & 4 and also includes townships that are not currently in the scope

Collection Costs - New Green Services Fortnightly Collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Collections X</th>
<th>Lifts per month X</th>
<th>Cost per Lift</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>5259</td>
<td>2.2 X</td>
<td>1.0094</td>
<td>$11,678.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>5259</td>
<td>2.3 X</td>
<td>1.0094</td>
<td>$12,209.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>5259</td>
<td>2.2 X</td>
<td>1.0094</td>
<td>$11,678.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Collection Cost $35,566.51

Take the average green waste tonnages collected in the first quarter and apply a 40% increase

Average Tonnage of Green Waste for first quarter 416.19
Increase by 45% 603.47
Additional Tonnage 187.28

Disposal Cost - Increase in Green Waste

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tonnage</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Disposal Rate</th>
<th>Additional Disposal Cost $6,238.63</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>187.28</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>37.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Collection and Disposal Costs $41,805.14
Less Grant Funding -$15,557.25
Total Cost to Council $26,247.89
7.5.5. DEBATE AGENDA – WASTE SERVICES REPORT

7.5.5.2 HARD WASTE DISPOSAL
B10455

Author: Waste Management Officer

PURPOSE

Provide Council with an update on investigations into hosting a Hard Waste ‘Pop Up’ event with suggestions to modify the Hard Waste disposal option.

RECOMMENDATION

That Council:

(1) Not proceed with the proposed Pop Up style Hard Waste Service on the basis of the identified risk and safety to operators and members of the community, and
(2) Implement and promote the alternate voucher system for Hard and Green Waste disposal as per Option 2 presented at the 16 July 2019 meeting for the remainder of the 2020-21 financial year.

REPORT

Background

At the July 2019 workshop, Elected Members were presented with options to supplement the existing waste service levels made available to residents. These options were:

Option 1A - Annual area-wide collection campaign for townships and voucher disposal for rural areas
Option 1B - On Call Service collection campaign for townships and voucher disposal for rural areas
Option 2 - Discount Voucher Disposal at commercial operators/other facilities
Option 3 - Council site skip bins
Option 4 - Increase service levels at Springton Transfer Station

At its meeting on 16 July 2019, Council resolved to provide a Hard Waste service to ratepayers through a ‘Pop Up’ type service.
Council administration had been working with various parties to identify suitable sites and logistics for providing the service. The Fathers Farm agreed to Council making use of their site at 110 Moppa Road South, Nuriootpa for the purpose of a Hard Waste disposal event.

Unfortunately due to Covid-19 restrictions, progress was halted as Fathers Farm temporarily closed and the proposed May and June 2020 dates for the event were no longer viable.

Consequently, a Hard Waste disposal event was not delivered for financial year 2019-2020. A Consensus Agenda report was presented to Council on 16 June 2020 stipulating that every effort will be made to stage an event in 2020-21.

Introduction
Council administration have been exploring the option to host the Pop Up event at Fathers Farm.

A number of concerns around risk and safety have been identified if Fathers Farm is to be utilised for the event. The safety concerns raised included:

- Manual handling of material
- Unacceptable material presented
- Adequate infrastructure, plant and personnel to manage the event
- Traffic management both within the site and on the access road
- Vehicle, plant and pedestrian interaction

Other risk factors include underestimating or overestimating the need for the service which could result in unnecessary cost to rate payers if the event is overestimated or frustration and disappointment if the event is underestimated.

Discussion
In order to provide a service for 2020-21 Council Administration has gone back to the initial options presented to Council and has pursued the voucher system option, noting the previous correspondence from Springton Progress Association calling for a Green Waste voucher.

The voucher system could incorporate both Hard and Green Waste disposal. Vouchers would be made accessible to all residents however, a limited number of vouchers would be available. This would allow Council to better manage resources and ensure budget is adhered to.
Attachment 1 includes further detail on how the voucher system would be implemented and the process for how vouchers would be dispersed to residents.

Summary and Conclusion

The risks to Council and the resourcing requirements to manage a Pop Up Hard Waste collection currently outweigh the benefits to the community.

The implementation of a voucher system would give the opportunity to assess the appetite of residents for a Hard Waste Service as well and give opportunity to strategically plan for Hard Waste management in the future.

ATTACHMENTS OR OTHER SUPPORTING REFERENCES

Attachment 1: Green Waste Voucher System Proposal and process
Attachment 2: Photo of Traffic at Springton Transfer Station

COMMUNITY PLAN / CORPORATE PLAN / LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS

Community Plan

Natural Environment and Built Heritage

3. We take a proactive approach in responding to key environmental challenges such as climate change, water security and waste management.

3.2 Collaborate with partners and our community to support innovative approaches to waste minimisation, and increase reuse and recycling opportunities.

Advocacy Plan

1. Working with the community, industry and government to build on the Barossa’s capacity to attract investment, improve services and encourage employment opportunities.

Corporate Plan

4.10 Facilitate access to hard and green waste facilities and associated recycling opportunities that reduce waste disposed to landfill and support the environment.

Legislative Requirements

Local Government Act 1999
Environment Protection Act 1993
Green Industries SA Act 2004

FINANCIAL, RESOURCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT CONSIDERATIONS

Financial Management

Funds of $50,000 were allocated to hard waste disposal in the budget for financial year 2019-2020. Funds have been rolled over to financial year 2020-2021. The
voucher system can be set to ensure expenditure does not exceed the current budget.

Risk Management

Pop up Event

Safety around manual handling of material for both residents and staff is a concern as the material would need to be transferred into skip bins at ground level. This will produce issues with pedestrian, plant and vehicle interaction as well as the efficiency to work through each disposal and move through the queue efficiently.

A list of unacceptable material would need to be provided to the community prior to the event and any loads including unacceptable material would be rejected. There is no provision for the handling of hazardous material and some materials such as tyres or mattresses attract additional charges which Council would be required to pay.

Traffic management is a concern both within the site and on the road that accesses the property. Within the site, vehicle, plant and pedestrian movements would need to be considered along with sufficient access and egress in the area. Exclusion zones would need to be set to limit interactions. Staffing levels would need to take into consideration the traffic management and exclusion zone requirements.

Half Price Dump Days at Springton have in the past lead to a line-up of cars attempting to access the site causing congestion on the road and roadside (Attachment 2). Fathers Farm is located on Moppa Road South, Nuriootpa and sees a higher level of traffic then Springton Road. It is also frequented by heavy vehicles.

As a Hard Waste event of this nature has not been held before it is difficult to gauge the level of participation and resourcing requirements.

No waste can be left on ground at the conclusion of the event and Council would need to ensure there is an adequate level of skip bins available to meet the needs of residents. Reaching capacity in the skip bins would lead to residents being turned away from the event.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMUNITY CONSULTATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Green Waste Proposed Voucher System

- Vouchers of a nominated value available through Council. Value would look to cover one trailer load of green waste ($25 - $30)
- Could be used at Springton Transfer Station or Kuchels Contractors
- Valid for one transaction
- One voucher per property
- Accepted material at each location advised on the voucher
- Terms and conditions clearly outline what is covered by the voucher and that any additional fees and charges incurred will be the responsibility of the resident

Process

1. Resident requests voucher
2. Officer checks that property has not previously been issued a voucher
3. Customer Request created
4. Resident advised that voucher will be available for collection from council where proof of residence can be sighted or resident can submit proof of residence via email and the voucher can be sent.
5. Voucher generated within the customer request which includes a unique voucher number.
6. Residents present voucher to venue of choice.
7. Venues are then compensated for vouchers redeemed.
   (Kuchels Contractors to submit an invoice for vouchers received each month with copies of vouchers or voucher numbers attached.)

Once value of the voucher is agreed upon and budget is set, the final number of vouchers available can be decided. Tracking the customer requests where the vouchers are generated will show how many vouchers have been issued and officers can ensure the number of vouchers available is not exceeded.

Expand Voucher System to Include Hard Waste

Add additional sites where vouchers can be redeemed suggest approaching sites in neighbouring Councils.

Consider the value of the vouchers, should it be increased so that the cost to dispose of one water level trailer load is covered or keep the same value as a subsidy which would allow a higher volume of vouchers to be distributed.
What happens when it’s half price day at the only transfer station in the Valley. We have been waiting about 40 minutes and still 4 cars away from unloading. 😞
REPORT:

The matter of the agenda item being the consideration of community nominations for Australia Day Awards pursuant to Section 90(3)(a) of the Local Government Act 1999 (“the Act”) being information that must be considered in confidence in order to ensure that personal information provided to Council disclosing personal information including relationships, contact details and merit for an award.

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 the disclosure of private information of an individual would be unfair or harmful by release of the information to the community.
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:

(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 Works and Engineering, Director Development and Environmental Services, Director Corporate and Community Services, Communications and Engagement Officer, ICT Administrator and Minute Secretaries in order to consider in confidence a report relating to Section 90(3)(a) of the Local Government Act 1999 relating to 8.1.1 Australia Day Awards 2021 – Citizen of the Year, being information the disclosure of which would involve the unreasonable disclosure of information concerning the personal affairs of any person (living or dead) being private information of nominees and those who nominated them for an Australia Day award including contact details, addresses and personal testimonials; and

(2) Accordingly, on this basis, the principle that meetings of the Council should be conducted in a place open to the public has been outweighed by the need to keep the information and discussion confidential.
8.1.2 – Australia Day Awards 2021
Young Citizen of the Year

REPORT:

The matter of the agenda item being the consideration of community nominations for Australia Day Awards pursuant to Section 90(3)(a) of the Local Government Act 1999 (“the Act”) being information that must be considered in confidence in order to ensure that personal information provided to Council disclosing personal information including relationships, contact details and merit for an award.

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 the disclosure of private information of an individual would be unfair or harmful by release of the information to the community.
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:

(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 Works and Engineering, Director Development and Environmental Services, Director Corporate and Community Services, Communications and Engagement Officer, ICT Administrator, and Minute Secretaries in order to consider in confidence a report relating to Section 90(3)(a) of the Local Government Act 1999 relating to 8.1.2 Australia Day Awards 2021 –Young Citizen of the Year, being information the disclosure of which would involve the unreasonable disclosure of information concerning the personal affairs of any person (living or dead) being private information of nominees and those who nominated them for an Australia Day award including contact details, addresses and personal testimonials; and

(2) Accordingly, on this basis, the principle that meetings of the Council should be conducted in a place open to the public has been outweighed by the need to keep the information and discussion confidential.
The matter of the agenda item being the consideration of community nominations for Australia Day Awards pursuant to Section 90(3)(a) of the Local Government Act 1999 ("the Act") being information that must be considered in confidence in order to ensure that personal information provided to Council disclosing personal information including relationships, contact details and merit for an award.

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 the disclosure of private information of an individual would be unfair or harmful by release of the information to the community.
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:

(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 Works and Engineering, Director Development and Environmental Services, Director Corporate and Community Services, Communications and Engagement Officer, ICT Administrator and Minute Secretaries in order to consider in confidence a report relating to Section 90(3)(a) of the Local Government Act 1999 relating to 8.1.3 Australia Day Awards 2021 – Community Event of the Year, being information the disclosure of which would involve the unreasonable disclosure of information concerning the personal affairs of any person (living or dead) being private information of nominees and those who nominated them for an Australia Day award including contact details, addresses and personal testimonials; and

(2) Accordingly, on this basis, the principle that meetings of the Council should be conducted in a place open to the public has been outweighed by the need to keep the information and discussion confidential.
CONFIDENTIAL
REPORT

15 December 2020
Council

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

8.1.4 – Australia Day Awards 2021
Community Project of the Year

REPORT:

The matter of the agenda item being the consideration of community nominations for Australia Day Awards pursuant to Section 90(3)(a) of the Local Government Act 1999 (“the Act”) being information that must be considered in confidence in order to ensure that personal information provided to Council disclosing personal information including relationships, contact details and merit for an award.

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 the disclosure of private information of an individual would be unfair or harmful by release of the information to the community.
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:

(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 Works and Engineering, Director Development and Environmental Services, Director Corporate and Community Services, Communications and Engagement Officer, ICT Administrator and Minute Secretaries in order to consider in confidence a report relating to Section 90(3)(a) of the Local Government Act 1999 relating to 8.1.4 Australia Day Awards 2021 – Community Project of the Year, being information the disclosure of which would involve the unreasonable disclosure of information concerning the personal affairs of any person (living or dead) being private information of nominees and those who nominated them for an Australia Day award including contact details, addresses and personal testimonials; and

(2) Accordingly, on this basis, the principle that meetings of the Council should be conducted in a place open to the public has been outweighed by the need to keep the information and discussion confidential.
The matter of the agenda item being confidential information of clubs and businesses including financial and personal details of a commercial nature therefore pursuant to Section 90(3)(a) and (d)(i) and (ii) of the Local Government Act 1999 (“the Act”) being information that must be considered in confidence in order to ensure that disclosure of sensitive financial and personal information.

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:

- the disclosure of certain information that would prevent the efficient and effective governance of the Council or committee;
- the disclosure of private information of an individual or club or commercial organisation that could be unfair or harmful;
• could result in damage to third parties or the flow of information for future grant programs that Council operates due to loss of confidence in Council in managing confidential personal and commercial information.

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, Information and Technology Officer and the Minute Secretary, in order to consider in confidence a report relating to agenda item 8.1.1 ‘COVID-19 Recovery Grant Program – Updated and Deferred Matters’ being information that must be considered in confidence in order to ensure that the Council does not disclose information that is considered confidential under the following provisions of the Local Government Act:

   i) Section 90(3)(a) being information the disclosure of which would involve the unreasonable disclosure of information concerning the personal affairs of any person (living or dead);

   or

   ii) 90(3)(d)(i) and (ii) being commercial information of a confidential nature (not being a trade secret) the disclosure of which could reasonably be expected to prejudice the commercial position of the person who supplied the information, or to confer a commercial advantage on a third party; and would, on balance, be contrary to the public interest;

(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 avoid disclosure of certain information that would prevent the efficient and effective governance of the Council or committee; disclosure of private information of an individual or club or commercial organisation that could be unfair or harmful; or could result in damage to third parties or the flow of information for future grant programs that Council operates due to loss of confidence in Council in managing confidential personal and commercial information.
8.2.1 WORKS AND ENGINEERING SERVICES - CONFIDENTIAL

MENGE ROAD - TANUNDA – NOISE COMPLAINT
LPA/6234 - 20/71434

The matter of the agenda item being Menge Road, Tanunda – Noise Complaint pursuant to Section 90(3)(h) of the Local Government Act 1999 (“the Act”) being legal advice.

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 contrary to the public interest are that Council has been provided with legal advice from Kelledy Jones Lawyers on instruction from Council Officers pertaining to a noise complaint.

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:
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 Engineering Services and the Minute Secretary, in order to consider in confidence a report relating to Section 90(3)(h) of the Local Government Act 1999 being legal advice; and

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 as Council has been provided with legal advice from Kelledy Jones Lawyers on instruction from Council Officers pertaining to a noise complaint.
The matter of the agenda item being consideration of customer service provision related to enquiries, pre-lodgment, lodgment, assessment and decision making related to planning and building development and compliance, pursuant to Section 90(3)(h) of the Local Government Act 1999 (“the Act”) being information that must be considered in confidence in order to ensure that Council maintains legal professional privilege.

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 the information must be considered in confidence in order to maintain legal professional privilege.

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, Manager, Development Services and the Minute Secretary, in order to consider in confidence a report relating to Section 90(3)(h) of the Local Government Act 1999, relating to 8.3.1 ‘Development Services – Customer Service Protocols’ being information that must be considered in confidence in order to ensure that the Council maintains legal professional privilege; 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 maintain legal professional privilege.