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3.1 Minutes of the meeting held on 14 March 2018

**Minutes of Previous Meeting**

From: Stephen Smith, Director Policy  
Meeting: MLGG  
ECM: 659762  
Attachment: 659692

**Recommendation**

That the Metropolitan Local Government Group confirms the minutes of the meeting held on 14 March 2018 as a true and accurate record of the proceedings held.

**Discussion**

The minutes of the Metropolitan Local Government Group meeting held on 14 March 2018 are attached for confirmation as to their accuracy.
Draft Minutes of the Metropolitan Local Government Group meeting held on Wednesday 14 March 2018 at 4:00pm in the Boardrooms at Local Government House, 148 Frome Street, Adelaide.

1. Welcome, Present & Apologies

In the absence of the Chairperson Mayor Karen Redman, LGA Director Policy Stephen Smith opened the meeting at 4:03pm and in accordance with the Group’s Terms of Reference called for nominations for a Chairperson for the meeting from the principle members of those councils present.

Lord Mayor Haese nominated Mayor Evans to chair the meeting, which was seconded by Mayor Parkin and accepted by Mayor Evans.

There being no other nominations, Mayor Evans assumed the chair at 4.04pm.

The Chairperson welcomed members and staff.

1.1 Present

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lord Mayor Martin Haese</td>
<td>Adelaide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Operations Ms Beth Davidson-Park</td>
<td>Adelaide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor Bill Spragg*</td>
<td>Adelaide Hills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO Andrew Aitken</td>
<td>Adelaide Hills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor David Parkin*</td>
<td>Burnside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Lyn Townsend, Manager Governance</td>
<td>Campbelltown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor Angela Evans*</td>
<td>Charles Sturt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO Paul Sutton</td>
<td>Charles Sturt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO Henry Inat</td>
<td>Gawler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO Justin Lynch</td>
<td>Holdfast Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acting Mayor Janet Byram</td>
<td>Marion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acting CEO Vincent Mifsud</td>
<td>Marion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor Glenn Spear*</td>
<td>Mitcham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor Lorraine Rosenberg*</td>
<td>Onkaparinga</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.2 Apologies

CEO Paul Deb
Mayor Simon Brewer
CEO Paul Di Iulio
Mayor Karen Redman
Deputy Mayor Amanda Wilson
CEO Justin Lynch
CEO Matthew Pears*
Mayor Ann Ferguson*
CEO Andrew Stuart
Mayor Robert Bria
CEO Mario Barone
CEO Mark Dowd
Mayor Glenn Docherty
CEO Mal Hemmerling
Acting Mayor Cr Matt Osborn
Mayor David O’Loughlin*
CEO John Harry
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Holdfast Bay
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Mount Barker#
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Playford
Port Adelaide Enfield
Prosect
Salisbury
1.3 Vacancy of deputy member position of LGA Board

The Executive Director Corporate and Member Services advised of Mayor Robert Bria’s (City of Norwood, Payneham and St Peters) resignation from the Board. The current Deputy Mayor Angela Evans will be replacing Mayor Bria on the Board in accordance with the provisions of the LGA Constitution which results in a casual vacancy for the deputy member position.

The MLGG noted the following in relation to filling the casual vacancy:

- That the region needed to promptly act to fill the casual vacancy.
- That the members of the region may agree to not undertake a postal vote to fill the casual vacancy.

The MLGG considered whether to undertake a postal vote or seek nominations from the floor of the meeting to fill the position and through consensus undertook to seek nominations from the floor.

Mayor Evans called for nominations for the position of deputy member to the LGA Board.

Burnside nominated Acting Mayor Janet Byram (Marion), it was seconded by Salisbury and Acting Mayor Byram accepted the nomination.

There were no further nominations following three calls by the Chair.

Moved Salisbury, Seconded Adelaide that the Metropolitan Local Government Group appoints Acting Mayor Byram to the casual position on the LGA Board.

Carried

With the leave of the meeting the Chair brought Item 6.1 forward for discussion.

6.1 LGA Governance Review Update / Workshop

LGA Executive Director Corporate & Member Services Kathy Jarrett addressed the Group.

Moved Salisbury Seconded Adelaide that the Metropolitan Local Government Group provides feedback on the following draft Ancillary Documents (listed below) to the new LGA Constitution, prior to their referral to the April 2018 Ordinary General Meeting:

a. Membership Proposition
b. Terms of reference for the South Australian Regional Organisation of Councils (SAROC)

c. Terms of reference for the Greater Adelaide Regional Organisation of Councils (GAROC)

d. Terms of reference for the Audit Committee

e. Terms of reference for the CEO Advisory Group

f. Meeting procedures

Carried

4.28pm Mayor Rosenberg left the meeting.

2. Guest Speakers

LGA Executive Director Corporate & Member Services, Kathy Jarrett - Benchmarking and Big Data.

This was deferred to a future meeting.

3. Minutes of Previous Meeting

3.1 Minutes of the meeting held on 17 January 2018

Moved Walkerville Seconded Holdfast Bay that the Metropolitan Local Government Group confirms the minutes of the meeting held on 17 January 2018 as a true and accurate record of the proceedings held.

Carried

3.2 Resolutions and Actions from Previous Meetings

Moved Salisbury Seconded Adelaide that the Metropolitan Local Government Group notes progress with resolutions resulting from the meeting of 17 January 2018 and outstanding resolutions from earlier meetings.

Carried

4. Representative Reports

4.1 Report from the LGA President – March 2018

Moved Burnside Seconded Adelaide that the Metropolitan Local Government Group notes the report.

Carried
4.2 Report from the MLGG Chairperson

Moved Salisbury Seconded Walkerville that the Metropolitan Local Government Group notes the report from the MLGG Chairperson, which contains the notes from the MLGG Executive Committee meeting held 19 February 2018.

Carried

Andrew Aitken left meeting at 4:40pm.
Lyn Townsend left meeting at 4:43pm.

5. MLGG Annual Priority Reports

5.1 Smart Cities Future Directions

Moved Salisbury Seconded Adelaide that the Metropolitan Local Government Group:

1. receives the report 2018 Smart Cities Snapshot and adopts the definition of the smart city as contained on page 7 of the report “A city that uses technologies to make life easier for its citizens”;

2. undertakes as stage 1 the development of a MLGG Smart Cities Strategy and allocates a budget of $33,000 for its preparation;

3. supports in-principle the undertaking of a Capability Assessment and Gap Analysis and the development and implementation of a Smart Cities Roadmap following the completion of the Smart Cities Strategy; and

4. endorses the establishment of a Metropolitan Local Government Smart Cities Network and allocates $5,000 to assist in the operations of the network.

Carried

Andrew Aitken returned to meeting at 4:48pm
Lyn Townsend returned to meeting at 4:49pm.

5.2 Proposed MLGG Work Plan 2018

Moved Adelaide Seconded Salisbury that the Metropolitan Local Government Group:

1. endorses the proposed MLGG Work Plan 2018 as outlined in this report;

2. endorses the inclusion of the following two items on the MLGG Work Plan 2018:
   a. Development of a reinstatement of public infrastructure policy;
b. Desk top research on commercial activities within local government and opportunities for metropolitan councils; and

3. notes that for future projects, activities and events a project management fee of 10% will be included to enable the Secretariat to undertake the activity on behalf of the MLGG.

Carried

6. LGA Business

Item 6.1 was brought forward and dealt with after Item 1.3.

7. MLGG Financial Summary

7.1 MLGG Financial Summary as at 28 February 2018

Moved Walkerville Seconded Holdfast Bay that the Metropolitan Local Government Group notes the financial summary for the MLGG as at 28 February 2018.

Carried

8. Urgent Business Affecting Metropolitan Councils

Nil.

9. Upcoming MLGG related events

- MLGG Executive Committee, Monday, 16 April 2018, LG House
- Metropolitan Mayors’ Luncheon, Wednesday 9 May 2018 hosted by Mayor Parkin, City of Burnside

10. Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Metropolitan Local Government Group will be held on Wednesday 9 May 2018 at 4:00pm at Local Government House, 148 Frome Street, Adelaide.

11. Close

The meeting was declared closed at 4:50pm.
3.2 Resolutions and Actions from Previous Meetings

Minutes of Previous Meeting
From: Stephen Smith, Director Policy
Meeting MLGG 9 May 2018
ECM: 657947

Recommendation
That the Metropolitan Local Government Group notes progress with resolutions resulting from the meeting of 14 March 2018 and outstanding resolutions from earlier meetings.

Discussion
The attachment shows progress of resolutions from previous meetings of the Metropolitan Local Government Group.
### Resolutions from the meeting of the Metropolitan Local Government Group – 14 March 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resolution</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Action Taken / Progress</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Report ECM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.1 LGA Governance Review Update / Workshop</td>
<td>On Track</td>
<td>The ancillary documents have now been referred to the April 2018 Ordinary General Meeting. Note that the ancillary documents will be further consulted on between now and the October Annual General Meeting.</td>
<td>KJ</td>
<td>659655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Smart Cities Future Directions</td>
<td>On Track</td>
<td>A Project Brief has been developed to act as the Tender Document for a prospective consultant. The Project brief was circulated on Thursday 5 April for comment to the Smart Cities Council Contacts for the MLGG RDA Adelaide Smart Cities Snapshot. The first step will be to establish formally the Metropolitan Local</td>
<td>SH</td>
<td>659014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **6.1 LGA Governance Review Update / Workshop**
  - Feedback on the following draft Ancillary Documents (listed below) to the new LGA Constitution, prior to their referral to the April 2018 Ordinary General Meeting:
    - Membership Proposition
    - Terms of reference for the South Australian Regional Organisation of Councils (SAROC)
    - Terms of reference for the Greater Adelaide Regional Organisation of Councils (GAROC)
    - Terms of reference for the Audit Committee
    - Terms of reference for the CEO Advisory Group
    - Meeting procedures

- **5.1 Smart Cities Future Directions**
  - Receives the report 2018 Smart Cities Snapshot and adopts the definition of the smart city as contained on page 7 of the report "A city that uses technologies to make life easier for its..."
2. undertakes as stage 1 the development of a MLGG Smart Cities Strategy and allocates a budget of $33,000 for its preparation;

3. supports in-principle the undertaking of a Capability Assessment and Gap Analysis and the development and implementation of a Smart Cities Roadmap following the completion of the Smart Cities Strategy; and

4. endorses the establishment of a Metropolitan Local Government Smart Cities Network and allocates $5,000 to assist in the operations of the network.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government Smart Cities Network (MLGSCN) with a workshop to be held in June. The MLGSCN will also act as the Project Team with on-going consultation before, during and after completion. The Lord Mayors Smart City Summit was held on 11 April 2018 at the Adelaide Town Hall. With 90 attendees the event was a resounding success with very positive feedback about the presenters and the presentations. From the Smart Cities Council Australia Adam Beck set the scene, Assoc. Professor Nick Falkner from the University of Adelaide Australian Smart Cities Consortium presented the “Snapshot”, Tom Carlton State Manager TPG and Peter Auhl Assoc. Director Information management City of Adelaide explained the Ten Gigabit Adelaide plan and Shanti Ditter Assoc. Director Planning &amp; Development City of Adelaide mining community value from Big Data. Dignitaries included the Hon. David Pisoni Minister for Industry and Skills, The Lord Mayor Martin Haese and the President of the LGASA Lorraine Rosenberg. The Lord Mayor then hosted a reception with the Hon. Stephan Knoll Minister for Local Government speaking and the Deputy Lord Mayor Sandy Verschoor welcoming guests.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2 Proposed MLGG Work Plan 2018

that the Metropolitan Local Government Group:

1. endorses the proposed MLGG Work Plan 2018 as outlined in this report;

2. endorses the inclusion of the following two items on the MLGG Work Plan 2018:
   a. Development of a reinstatement of public infrastructure policy;
   b. Desk top research on commercial activities within local government and opportunities for metropolitan councils; and

3. Notes that for future projects, activities and events a project management fee of 10% will be included to enable the Secretariat to undertake the activity on behalf of the MLGG.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>On Track</th>
<th>Project Proposal for:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Innovation and investment in commercial activities, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Essential services reinstatement policy are provided for consideration with the May agenda.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPS</th>
<th>659011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resolutions from the meeting of the Metropolitan Local Government Group – 8 November 2017</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9.1 Alternative cost effective and efficient models for the replacement of an elected member</strong>&lt;br&gt;The MLGG asked that the LGA seeks to obtain from the Electoral Commission of South Australia, information relating to the number of supplementary elections held during the current term and the reasons these supplementary elections occurred.&lt;br&gt;It was moved that the Metropolitan Local Government Group requests that the Local Government Association investigate alternative cost effective and efficient models for the replacement of an Elected Member in the case of an Elected Member being unable to complete their term.</td>
<td>On Track</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.1 Report from the LGA President – May 2018

Recommendation

That the MLGG notes the report.

Rate capping

The new Liberal Government has reaffirmed its commitment to introducing rate capping legislation into Parliament within their first 100 days. It seems apparent that this will also include further restrictions on councils’ ability to set fees and charges. I have met with the Minister and confirmed that our sector remains opposed to this policy. We agreed it was possible to work constructively and concurrently on other issues while the government seeks to progress this legislation. The Government will require the support of either the Opposition or the crossbench to pass the legislation in the Upper House, and Labor, the Greens and SA Best took an anti-rate capping position to the 2018 state election. We believe there are better ways to drive local government efficiencies, and hope to partner with the Government on opportunities outlined in our local government reform proposal. While rate capping legislation is expected to be introduced by the government as a priority, the Minister has confirmed that they would not seek to cap council rates and revenue until the 2019/20 financial year. The ALP is reviewing its state election policy commitments including rate capping, and the LGA continues to work hard to ensure they maintain their position of opposing rate capping. All councils are encouraged to continue to keep their local MPs informed about their budget setting process for 2018/19, including details of new projects or services as well as external cost pressures.

China’s National Sword

The LGA continues to work with councils, the waste sector and state government agencies to identify opportunities to address the impact of China’s “National Sword” policy. Under this policy, China is no longer a viable export market for Australia’s recyclates, and this will have an impact on the cost of recycling in SA. A number of councils have already seen cost increases, and the LGA is undertaking a market analysis to better understand the impact and risks across the sector. Once this work is complete we will provide the State Government with a proposal for a support package for the sector. So far the Victorian ($13 million) and NSW ($47 million) governments have already committed funding support to help address the issue, and South Australia’s Waste Management Association has called for a $7.2 million support package for SA. While there’s an immediate financial impact that needs to be addressed, we have to also consider the opportunities for short, medium and long term solutions. The LGA has asked the Government to start by freezing scheduled increases to the Solid Waste Levy, and releasing funding previously collected through the Levy and stockpiled in the Green Industry SA Fund. In conjunction with Green Industries SA, the LGA will hold a Waste Pathways Workshop on 5 June that will explore the implications of the National Sword policy for SA’s recycling industry, and provide an opportunity to discuss how our sector can be part of the solution.
New LGA Constitution

It was pleasing to see members endorse the LGA’s new Constitution (with amendments) at our 2018 Ordinary General Meeting. A significant amount of work has gone into the development of this document, and I am confident it provides our Association with a modern governance framework that will serve us for many years into the future. The LGA will now consult with member councils on the ancillary documents that support the constitution, with the goal of presenting these documents for endorsement at our 2018 Annual General Meeting in October.

Value of membership

The LGA recently released its 2018 LGA Value of Membership report, which confirms that the average estimated annual benefit to members is just over $2 million per council. This is an increase from $1.5 million per council in 2017, which reflects the LGA better understanding how its services provide value to members, as well as several key advocacy wins. The Value of Membership report was undertaken by UHY Haines Norton, and will now be reviewed every year to ensure that the LGA is continuing to deliver value to its members.

Forced amalgamations

It was disappointing to see the Property Council once again call for forced council amalgamations in South Australia. However, I would like to acknowledge that the new Liberal Government responded by ruling out this possibility. The LGA supports communities determining how they are represented and governed at the local level, and we have worked closely with the State Government on boundary adjustment reform to provide a clear and independent process for councils that want to make changes to their boundaries. The Local Government (Boundary Adjustment) Amendment Act 2017 will commence on 1 January 2019, and the LGA is working with the Local Government Grants Commission to develop draft guidelines detailing the processes by which proposals for boundary change will be received, assessed and progressed under the Act. It is anticipated these guidelines will be provided to councils to provide feedback on later this month.

2018 Council Elections

The Electoral Commissioner has responsibility for arranging the promotion of council elections in South Australia, and recovers these costs from councils, along with the other costs associated with conducting the elections. In previous election years the LGA has run parallel promotional activities during the ‘nominate’ and ‘vote’ phases of the election which have been funded through the LG R&D Scheme, to increase the number of times that South Australians hear or see a promotional message. However, this year the Commissioner has asked the LGA to manage the promotional activities for all three phases of the 2018 council elections campaign (enrol, nominate and vote) on his behalf. All other aspects of the elections will be managed by ECSA, and all cost recovery, including the costs of the promotional activities managed by the LGA, will still be undertaken by ECSA.
4.2 Report from the MLGG Chairperson

Representative Reports

From: Mayor Karen Redman
Meeting: MLGG 9 May 2018
ECM: 660436

Recommendation

That the Metropolitan Local Government Group notes the report from the MLGG Chairperson, which contains the notes from the MLGG Executive Committee meeting held 16 April 2018.

Discussion

The MLGG Executive Committee met on Monday 16 April 2018 to discuss the Agenda for the May 2018 MLGG meeting. Following is a summary of the discussions held at the meeting.

1. Present

Mayor Karen Redman (Town of Gawler) – MLGG Chairperson
Mayor Kevin Knight (City of Tea Tree Gully)
Mayor Gillian Aldridge (City of Salisbury)  
Mayor Angela Evans (City of Charles Sturt)  
Lord Mayor Martin Haese (City of Adelaide)
Ms Lisa Teburea, Executive Director Public Affairs
Mr Stephen Smith, LGA Director Policy
LGA Secretariat present

2. Apologies

Mr Terry Buss (City of West Torrens) – CEO Representative
Mayor Lorraine Rosenberg (City of Onkaparinga) – LGA President
Mr Matt Pinnegar – LGA CEO
Mr Steve Nolis – Executive Director Commercial
Ms Kathy Jarratt – Executive Director Corporate and Member Services

3. Minutes of the previous MLGG Executive Committee meeting held 14 March 2018

Moved Lord Mayor Haese Seconded Mayor Aldridge that the minutes of the MLGG Executive Committee meeting held on 14 March 2018 are confirmed as a true and accurate record.

CARRIED
4. **Mayor Lorraine Rosenberg, recipient of the Joy Baluch Award**

Moved Mayor Evans Seconded Mayor Aldridge that the MLGG Executive Committee formally congratulates the LGA President, Lorraine Rosenberg on receiving the Joy Baluch Award and congratulates Mayor Rosenberg on her many years of service to local government.

CARRIED

5. **Guest Speaker Requests**

The MLGG Executive Committee approved the inclusion of a briefing from Tim Anderson QC, Chair of the State Planning Commission, and Anita Allen, DPTI, on matters relating to the implementation of the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act on the Agenda for the 9 May meeting.

6. **Draft agenda for the 9 May 2018 Metropolitan Local Government Group meeting:**

6.1 **Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act Implementation**

The MLGG Executive Committee discussed the paper provided, the Lord Mayor suggested that an additional section be added relating to heritage given the interest and benefit of the sector in adopting a sector-wide position. Heritage will also be included as a stand-alone discussion item on the next MLGG Executive Committee agenda.

**Action:** That the LGA Secretariat amend the paper by providing a status update relating to heritage legislation and policy.

**Action:** That heritage be included as a discussion item on the next MLGG Executive Committee agenda.

6.2 **Project Proposal: Essential Services Property Reinstatement Policy and Agreement**

The MLGG Executive Committee discussed the paper and was supportive of the project plan and recommendation.

6.3 **Project Proposal: Innovation and investment in commercial activities**

The MLGG Executive Committee discussed the paper and noted that this project would be of considerable benefit to councils. The Lord Mayor indicated that the current City of Adelaide 10gig City project could be used as a case study to support the project provide. The MLGG Executive Committee was supportive of the project plan and recommendation.

7. **Council Initiated Business**

Nil received.

8. **Any Other Business**

Nil received.

9. **Next Meeting**

The next meeting of the MLGG Executive Committee will be held on Monday 25 June 2018, 12 Noon at Local Government House.
5.1 Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act Implementation

MLGG Annual Priority Reports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From:</th>
<th>Stephen Smith, Director Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial Implications:</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting:</td>
<td>MLGG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECM:</td>
<td>660475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachments:</td>
<td>642929</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation

That the Metropolitan Local Government Group notes the report on the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act Update.

Discussion

The following report is aimed at providing MLGG with an understanding of the programs and projects being undertaken by the Department of Planning Transport and Infrastructure (DPTI) to implement the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016, (PDI Act).

The Chair of the State Planning Commission, Tim Anderson QC will be attending the MLGG meeting in May along with Anita Allen from DPTI to brief members on a range of matters relating to the implementations of the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act.

Partnership with DPTI

DPTI is continuing its partnership with the Local Government Association (LGA) during the implementation of the PDI Act.

For the next six months, Sarah Elding – Project Lead will be broadening her role within the reform program to act as the conduit between the two organisations.

Working closely with the Transition Team within DPTI, Sarah’s role will have a focus on preparing and delivering key communication strategies ensuring Elected Members, Council Chief Executives, Senior Managers and authorised officers, plus other relevant stakeholders associated with local government are well informed of the reform program, are supported during the transition and also key contributors to the overall implementation of the PDI Act.

Sarah has over fifteen years’ experience working in local government both in South Australia and Queensland and is a welcome addition to the LGA team over the next six months.

Blue Print for South Australia’s Planning and Design Code

The State Planning Commission has released the ‘Blueprint for South Australia’s Planning and Design Code’ paper. This presents the first formal outline to the Code and sets the scene for ongoing conversations with planners, developers, local governments and the community to engage
in its preparation. It provides a foundation for a series of policy and technical discussion papers that together will underpin the Code.

The Code will consolidate South Australia’s 72 existing development plans into one planning rulebook for the State.

The Introductory Paper can be viewed at ‘Blueprint for South Australia’s Planning and Design Code’ (PDF, 6588 KB) and more information is available on the Planning and Design Code page of the SA Planning Portal.

Accredited Professionals Scheme

An important element of the PDI Act is the introduction of an accreditation scheme for planners, building certifiers and other industry professionals involved in making development decisions.

DPTI has prepared a discussion paper which outlines how the scheme might operate most effectively in the new planning system. DPTI is seeking feedback from advocacy organisations, industry professionals, councils, educational institutions and other interested parties to inform preparation of the draft scheme prior to its finalisation.

The proposed scheme requires planning and building professionals to meet prescribed requirements for qualifications, experience and specialist knowledge relevant to the type of work they are performing. It also proposes that accredited professionals will need to participate in continuing professional development activities, and adhere to a clearly defined code of conduct.

It is important to note that it is recognised by the Department that some regional and remote local government areas can experience difficulties in attracting qualified planners. The proposed scheme may allow appropriate dispensation be given to these areas, particularly with regard to Assessment Managers and Assessment Panel Members accreditation.

It is anticipated that the scheme will be first applied to assessment panel members from mid-2019. Accreditation for planning professionals other than assessment panel members will be introduced concurrently with the new assessment pathways under the Act and launch of e-planning. This is likely to occur in 2020. Building certifiers will continue to operate as they do currently until this time.

The Accredited Professionals Scheme Discussion Paper is on consultation until 30 April 2018 and can be found at http://www.saplanningportal.sa.gov.au/our_new_system/accredited_professionals.

The LGA will be providing a submission and has sought feedback from councils on the discussion paper.

Joint Planning Boards Pilot

DPTI are continuing to work directly with the council’s participating in the Joint Planning Board pilot project. Input from councils to date has been invaluable in developing the process for initiating Planning Agreements and Joint Planning Boards that will be robust, fit for purpose and responsive to the needs of councils.

The next phase involves preparation of a business case for each of the participating councils (six are moving into this phase). A number of regional workshops have been held to confirm the objectives and functions of a potential Joint Planning Board, with the Riverland Councils, Eyre Peninsula Councils, Spencer Cities Councils as well as a session with the Limestone Coast LGA in
Mount Gambier. In early March representatives from all of the groups meet to commence preparation of the business cases using a template that has been developed for this purpose.

The Department is also developing a Planning Agreement template which will set the governance framework for each Joint Planning Board and a Toolkit to support Councils as they consider the formation of a Board.

In parallel with the Joint Planning Board project, the Department is also developing a set of guidelines for the preparation of Regional Plans. Any Joint Planning Board that is established must prepare a Regional Plan that will set a long-term vision for the relevant area, including provisions about land use, transport infrastructure and the public realm. The State Planning Commission is responsible for the preparation of Regional Plans for areas not covered by Joint Planning Boards.

The Department is seeking to build on the existing regional volumes of the Planning Strategy, and to do this they are being assisted by two Councils involved in the Joint Planning Board project – the Yorke Peninsula and the Riverland groups.

Heritage

In December 2014 South Australia’s Expert Panel on Planning Reform delivered their recommendations for a new planning system, including eight proposals designed to, in the words of the Panel, “place heritage on renewed foundations”.

The reform proposals sought to consolidate and improve heritage policy and management, and increase the planning system’s capacity to deal effectively and efficiently with Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal heritage in the context of broader planning and development objectives.

During the Expert Panel’s consultation process the LGA identified a number of key challenges for Councils in managing heritage and character through the planning system, including:

- A lack of consistency in heritage listing, leading to confusion, uncertainty and frustration regarding what is appropriate to list
- A heritage management process that is highly resource intensive and predisposed to conflict
- Poor understanding of what character is and how it differs from heritage value
- Poor and inconsistent expression of character in Development Plans
- Overall, current arrangements tend to create ongoing uncertainty and conflict around heritage and character issues, in turn impacting upon Councils’ efficiency, resourcing, and relations with their communities.

In March 2015 the South Australian Government officially responded to the Expert Panel’s recommendations, supporting the proposed heritage reform in principle, and committing to further investigations.

In September 2016 the State Government’s released the Local Heritage Discussion Paper *Heritage reform – an exploration of the opportunities*. The MLGG assisted the LGA in preparing a response to this discussion paper. While some reforms suggested by the Local Heritage Discussion Paper were supported, there were concerns with the processes and levels of consideration and consultation surrounding the local heritage reforms.

While the LGA and other bodies requested further discussions on heritage reforms prior to any legislation being developed a draft Heritage Bill was prepared in January 2017. The Minister for Planning at the time did not proceed with the Bill beyond the drafting stage and it was never publicly released.

The Liberal Party during the State Election provided its Built Heritage policy, which included:
• Funding for the redevelopment of Ayers House
• Establishment of a Heritage Grant Fund
• A proposal to make adaptive re-use easier
• Transfer titles of regional heritage properties to the National Trust
• Develop a heritage Tourism strategy
• Preserve important heritage buildings on Glenthorne Farm
• Review the role of the State Heritage Council
• Work with the National Trust

While some of these initiatives will benefit local government the policy does not outline how local heritage will be addressed in the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act.

The opportunity exists for local government to take a lead role and inform and reinforce the sectors position on heritage with both the new Environment Minister and Planning Minister.

Transitioning Councils to the new planning system

The implementation of a new planning system requires close collaboration and coordination between councils and the Department.

To enable a smooth transition from the existing planning system to the new planning system, the Department established a dedicated Transition Team to work closely with councils as they navigate their way to the new system. Each council has been assigned a dedicated Transition Manager as the single point of contact.

The transition process is being administered through an informal agreement called a Collaborative Work Program (CWP). This document allows for the identification of specific tasks, their milestones and opportunities for collaboration in implementing the new system.

Since its formation, the Transition Team has worked with councils across the state to finalise their work programs and complete a review of their Development Plans. Travelling over 27,000 km in just a few weeks, members of the Transition Team visited all 68 councils. Presently, more than half of councils in the state have signed their CWP and completed a review of their Development Plans.

Throughout 2018, the Transition Team will continue to work with councils focusing on a ‘top down’ strategic review of their council to identify key policy priorities for transition into the Code. Particular attention will be paid to areas within the council area that would benefit from future growth and change to meet local and state planning objectives.

A new online forum Council Connect has also been established which acts as a central point for transition information; a library for templates and guides; and a communication tool used by the Transition Team to engage with council staff. The site includes a series of interactive forums with messages, updates and general announcements for councils.


Financial and Resource Implications

This activity has been anticipated in the LGA’s work program and resources are available to progress this work.
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Executive Summary

As part of a significant program of reform of South Australia’s planning system, in August 2016 the Minister for Planning released a Local Heritage Discussion Paper for public consultation. The Discussion Paper identifies opportunities for reform around processes for identifying and managing local heritage through the Planning Development and Infrastructure Act 2016 (the PDI Act) and non-legislative mechanisms.

The Local Government Association of South Australia (LGA) intends for this Local Heritage and Character Position Paper to form a guide and resource for the Department for Planning, Transport and Infrastructure (DPTI) as it progresses these reforms in consultation with local government. The Position Paper has been developed through review of relevant documents, and engagement with metropolitan local governments.

Local governments are a key partner in government and are committed to being constructive partners in local heritage reform, as shown by the sector’s engagement with the Expert Panel on Planning Reform, and general support for the Panel’s heritage recommendations.

Local government is the level of government closest to the community, and experiences firsthand the great extent to which their communities value local heritage, and the value local heritage contributes to their streets, suburbs and beyond. Councils invest in local heritage through grants programs, advisory services, promotions and education, and research. The strength of this investment is borne out by studies that demonstrate the economic significance of cultural heritage and its important role in tourism attraction and expenditure.

As reform is implemented, local governments will continue to have substantial responsibilities both administratively and to their communities in the management of local heritage. Changes to local heritage arrangements will have physical, cultural, and economic impacts across Councils and communities, particularly within Greater Adelaide.

In terms of the statutory and strategic framework, the objects and principles of the PDI Act are consistent with the ongoing protection of local heritage and recognition of its social, cultural, and economic value, as is the draft update of The 30-Year Plan for Greater Adelaide. The latter highlights the need to carefully consider the approach to achieving objectives seeking both increased urban infill and the preservation of heritage and character value.

In this context, while some specific reforms and policy directions suggested by the Local Heritage Discussion Paper are supported by some councils, significant concerns exist about the processes and levels of consideration and consultation to date. Local government is of the view that prior to development of a draft Bill incorporating local heritage reforms, further consideration, clarification, and consultation is required in relation to:

- The relationship of local heritage reforms and the objectives of the planning system and planning strategy as expressed in the PDI Act and 30-Year Plan;
- How and why currently proposed reforms differ from the suite of recommendations of the Expert Panel on Planning Reform;
- The operation and implementation of reforms, in particular governance and roles and responsibilities for decision making;
- Reaching an understanding between the relationship between heritage conservation and character preservation;
- The role of contributory items in heritage conservation areas;
- Opportunities for economic benefits of heritage conservation to be realised, including holistic consideration of funding and incentives for economic use alongside policy reforms;
- New heritage listing criteria, particularly on the methodology for selection of themes, and issues of thresholds and over- and under-representation;
• Existing Historic Conservation Areas/Zones and how they will be identified and protected in the future;
• Interim demolition control for proposed local heritage listings;
• Mechanisms for policy clarity, effective guidance, and clear decision making roles in development assessment; and
• Effective engagement of the community in development and implementation of reforms.
• Amendment of sections 67(4) and (5) of the PDI Act to require the removal of the requirement for 51% of owners to agree on a proposed conservation area.

Importantly, appropriate consideration of these issues requires a program of consultation with sufficient time and information for council administrations to engage with their elected members and communities, and contribute constructive feedback to the reform process. This is likely to involve additional rounds of consultation to that currently underway.

Local governments will continue to seek further engagement with DPTI both directly and through the LGA to contribute to a local heritage reform package that appropriately reflects the aspiration, priorities, and values of the State government and metropolitan local governments and their communities.

1. Background

In December 2014 South Australia’s Expert Panel on Planning Reform delivered their recommendations for a new planning system, including eight proposals designed to, in the words of the Panel, “place heritage on renewed foundations”.¹

The reform proposals sought to consolidate and improve heritage policy and management, and increase the planning system’s capacity to deal effectively and efficiently with Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal heritage in the context of broader planning and development objectives.

In March 2015 the South Australian Government officially responded to the Expert Panel’s recommendations, supporting the proposed heritage reform in principle, and committing to further investigations.²

The Minister for Planning released a Local Heritage Discussion Paper for public consultation in August 2016. The Discussion Paper identifies opportunities for reform around listing of local heritage places, development assessment, and terminology. Proposed reforms would be undertaken via the new Planning Development and Infrastructure Act 2016 (the PDI Act), or non-legislative mechanisms.

No changes to the listing and assessment of State Heritage places under the Heritage Places Act are proposed.

2. Purpose

Planning system reforms proposed by the State Government to change the management of local heritage in South Australia will have physical, cultural, and economic impacts across Local Governments and communities, particularly within Greater Adelaide.

The Local Government Association of South Australia (LGA) intends for this Local Heritage and Character Position Paper to form a guide and resource for the Department for Planning, Transport and Infrastructure (DPTI) as it progresses these reforms in consultation with Local Government.

3. Methodology

Development of this Position Paper has involved:

¹ Our Ideas for Reform prepared by South Australia’s Expert Panel on Planning Reform, July 2014
• Review of documents including
  - Previous LGA and Council planning reform submissions and investigations relating to heritage and character;
  - Relevant sections of the PDI Act and draft update of The 30-Year Plan for Greater Adelaide;
  - The State Government’s Local Heritage Discussion Paper.

• Feedback on the Local Heritage Discussion Paper provided by officers of 18 Councils over two facilitated workshops held in August 2016.

• Joint LGA and Adelaide City Council, Local Government and Heritage Planning Forum held on 21 September

• Consultation with the Metropolitan Local Government Group and the local government sector on the draft position paper

• Submissions provided by councils

4. Context for heritage reform

Throughout the Expert Panel on Planning Reform, metropolitan Councils shared their views on a range of issues including heritage and character both through the LGA,3 and directly to the Expert Panel.4

During the Expert Panel's consultation process the LGA identified a number of key challenges for Councils in managing heritage and character through the planning system, including:

• A lack of consistency in heritage listing, leading to confusion, uncertainty and frustration regarding what is appropriate to list;
• A heritage management process that is highly resource intensive and predisposed to conflict;
• Poor understanding of what character is and how it differs from heritage value; and
• Poor and inconsistent expression of character in Development Plans.

Overall, Councils reported that current arrangements tend to create ongoing uncertainty and conflict around heritage and character issues, in turn impacting upon their efficiency, resourcing, and relations with their communities.

Following multiple stages of research, consultation and deliberation, the Expert Panel developed key planning reform ideas in relation to heritage and character in two iterations, as shown in Table 4.1.

It has been identified through reviewing the recommendations of the Expert Panels Report against the Local Heritage Discussion Paper that a number of the key recommendations as identified in Table 4.1 have not been considered. It is important to understand why the current proposed reforms as outlined in the discussion paper differ from the suite of recommendations made by the Expert Panel.

While the LGA’s subsequent consultation indicated general support amongst Councils for the key planning reform ideas, there was an awareness of the challenges and costs involved implementing the ideas, and a further concern that local character, heritage and design policy could be watered down or lost.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Our Ideas for Reform August 2014 (Reform 10)</th>
<th>The Planning System We Want December 2014 (Reform 8)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• 10.1 Heritage recognised as relating to place, culture and community development, not simply physical structures</td>
<td>• 8.1 Heritage laws consolidated into one integrated statute</td>
<td>Not proposed or canvassed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 10.2 Heritage laws consolidated into one integrated statute</td>
<td>• 8.2 Heritage terminology reviewed and updated as part of new statute</td>
<td>Identifies topic for discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 10.3 An integrated statutory body to replace existing multiple heritage bodies, e.g. based on the existing heritage council or a subcommittee of the planning commission</td>
<td>• 8.3 An integrated statutory body replacing existing multiple heritage bodies, with links to the state’s cultural institutions</td>
<td>Not proposed or canvassed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 10.4 Governance arrangements that embrace the capabilities and expertise of the state’s key cultural institutions.</td>
<td>• 8.4 The new body to be responsible for administering a single integrated register of heritage sites, including state and local listings, and have the power to add special landscapes and historic markers to the register</td>
<td>Not proposed or canvassed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 10.5 A new integrated heritage register to include existing state and local listings and have an expanded capacity to recognise special landscapes, building fabric and setting, and place historic markers</td>
<td>• 8.5 A legislated heritage code of practice to outline how listed properties should be described, maintained and adapted</td>
<td>Identifies topic for discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 10.6 A legislated heritage code of practice to outline how listed properties can be maintained and adapted</td>
<td>• 8.6 Legislative basis for accredited heritage professionals to undertake specified regulatory functions for private property owners on a similar basis to private certifiers</td>
<td>Identifies topic for discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 10.7 Legislative basis for accredited heritage professionals to provide advice and sign-off on changes to listed properties that are consistent with the code of practice</td>
<td>• 8.7 Audit of existing heritage listings to better describe their heritage attributes</td>
<td>Identifies topic for discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 10.8 Audit of existing heritage listings to better describe their heritage attributes</td>
<td>• 8.8 Stable, long term financing of heritage with discounts on property-related taxes and a heritage lottery providing the basis for heritage grants</td>
<td>Not covered, comment made outside of planning system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 10.9 Consideration of financial subsidies such as discounts on property-related taxes for private owners of listed properties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 Our Ideas for Reform prepared by South Australia’s Expert Panel on Planning Reform, July 2014
The Planning System We Want prepared by South Australia’s Expert Panel on Planning Reform, December 2014
Legislative and strategic context

4.1 Planning, Infrastructure and Development Act 2016

Emerging from the reform discussions generated by the Expert Panel on Planning Reform, the PDI Act was assented to in April 2016, and will be brought into operation over the next 3 to 5 years.

The primary object of the PDI Act is to

- support and enhance the State’s liveability and prosperity in ways that are ecologically sustainable and meet the needs and expectations and reflect the diversity, of the State’s communities by creating an effective, efficient and enabling planning system that …

- promotes and facilitates development, and the integrated delivery and management of infrastructure and public spaces and facilities, consistent with planning principles and policies; and

- provides a scheme for community participation in relation to the initiation and development of planning policies and strategies. 6

In association with this principal intention, the PDI Act intends to facilitate amongst other goals:

- Certainty as well as scope for innovation for developers;
- High standards of design quality in the built environment;
- Financial mechanisms and incentives to support development and investment opportunities; and
- Cooperation, collaboration and policy integration between State and local government.

Section 14 of the PDI Act further sets out principles of good planning to inform application of the legislation and functions of the planning system, as reasonably practicable and relevant. These principles relate to seven themes and those of relevance to the role of local heritage in urban environments and the planning system are summarised in Table 5.1.

Table 5.1: Principles of good planning under the Planning, Infrastructure and Development Act 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Summary of relevant principles</th>
<th>Links to local heritage management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long-term focus</td>
<td>Informed and equitable long term planning to address current and future challenges and priorities</td>
<td>The role of heritage conservation as a long term priority for the benefit of current and future generations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban renewal</td>
<td>Accommodation of urban growth in existing urban areas through renewal activities that make best appropriate use of the latent potential of land, buildings and infrastructure</td>
<td>Opportunities for realising latent potential in heritage places through conservation, continued use and adaptive reuse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6 PDI Act Section 12 (1)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Summary of relevant principles</th>
<th>Links to local heritage management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>High-quality design</strong></td>
<td>Development that: - Reflects local setting and context, with a distinctive identity that responds to existing character of the locality; and - Is durable and adaptive, and inclusive and accessible to people with differing capabilities</td>
<td>Contribution of heritage to local setting, context and character \How to enable heritage places to be inclusive and accessible through conservation works and adaptive reuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activation and liveability</strong></td>
<td>Promotion of neighbourhoods and buildings that support diverse economic and social activities, a range of housing options, active lifestyles and diverse cultural and social activities</td>
<td>Opportunities for heritage places to support economic activity and contribute to social and cultural life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainability</strong></td>
<td>Urban environments that are energy efficient and address the impacts of climate change</td>
<td>Embedded energy in heritage places and opportunities for sustainable adaptive reuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Investment facilitation</strong></td>
<td>Planning and design undertaken with a view to strengthening the economic prosperity of the State and employment growth, and coordinated approaches to planning that promote public and private investment toward common goals</td>
<td>Opportunities for heritage places to support economic activity through of conservation activities and adaptive reuse (multiplier effect) and contribution to tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Integrated delivery</strong></td>
<td>Coordination of policies within and outside the planning system to ensure efficient and effective achievement of planning outcomes</td>
<td>Role of local heritage to contribute to and complement desirable planning outcomes including those relating to economic development, streetscape and character, housing choice and sustainable urban form</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 The 30-Year Plan for Greater Adelaide

A draft update to The 30-Year Plan for Greater Adelaide was released for community consultation by the Planning Minister on 25 August 2016.

The update maintains the broad directions set out in The 30-Year Plan released in 2010, whilst streamlining the format of the strategy, revisiting some priorities (such as climate change and healthy neighbourhoods), and addressing challenges that have arisen from additional development within existing urban areas as envisaged by the original Plan.

The update presents a planning strategy for metropolitan Adelaide in the form of six strategic high level targets, 14 policy themes, 119 policies, and 47 actions.
Of the six targets, four of them (Targets 1, 2, 4 and 6) relate to concentrating new urban development in established areas of a more compact urban form. Policy themes, policies, and actions relevant to local heritage management are summarised in Table 5.2.

Table 5.2: Summary of heritage related content of the draft update of The 30-Year Plan for Greater Adelaide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy theme</th>
<th>Policies/Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Adelaide City Centre**  | **P13-24** Policies relating to character, streetscape, urban form and housing diversity  
P17 seeks to reinforce the special character of main streets through design responses that increase activity while preserving the elements that make these places special  
P22 seeks to sustain the heritage and character of North Adelaide and south west and south east residential precincts with appropriate well serviced development |
| **Design quality**        | **P29 – 31** Encourage development that is compatible and complementary of its context  
Support the characteristics and identities of different neighbourhoods, suburbs and precincts  
Recognise areas’ unique character by identifying valued physical attributes  
A 7, 9, 10  
Release guidelines for medium density urban development in local heritage and character areas  
Explore reviewing local heritage listing processes within an integrated strategic framework  
Ensure local area plans manage interface issues in the local context and identify appropriate locations for sensitive infill and areas of protection |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy theme</th>
<th>Policies/Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Heritage                   | P32 – 35  
Heritage is valued by communities and its conservation and adaptive reuse contributes to precinct revitalisation, energy efficiency and sustainability, and local economic development  
Ensure new development is sensitive and respectful of the value of heritage  
Ensure local heritage places and areas of heritage value are identified and their conservation promoted  
Promote economic development through innovative reuse of heritage places and older buildings  
Explore reviewing local heritage listing processes within an integrated strategic framework |
| Housing mix, affordability and competitiveness | P39/A15  
Provision of diverse housing options within the existing urban footprint  
Explore flexibility for ancillary residences in local heritage areas for social benefit and heritage protection |
| The economy and jobs       | P61  
The economy and jobs Linking people with jobs in employment centres and supporting new economic drivers such as services, information and communications technology, retail, and commercial sectors  
Provide for sustainable tourism development by protecting, enhancing and promoting valuable qualities, providing appropriate infrastructure and facilitating value adding activities |

5. Local Heritage Discussion Paper 2016

The State Government’s Local Heritage Discussion Paper *Heritage reform – an exploration of the opportunities* was released for public consultation in mid-August 2016. The Discussion Paper sets out to address the following issues:

- Clarity of criteria and inadequate hierarchy of heritage values (national, state, local);
- Poorly/inconsistently applied local heritage criteria;
- Uneven recognition of local heritage across the state;
- Lack of comprehensive review;
- Lengthy/unpredictable listing process;
- Consultation process that rely too often on ‘interim operation’;
- Sensitive consultation occurring too late in the process;
- Confusion between ‘heritage’ and ‘character’;
- Inconsistent Development Assessment procedures and policies; and
- A formal role for accredited heritage professionals.

The Discussion Paper excludes consideration of general heritage governance, funding arrangements, and listing and development assessment issues relating to State heritage (other than minor matters).
The Paper’s exclusive focus on local heritage is based on:

- The large and increasing numbers of local heritage places compared to State heritage places;
- The incompatibility of existing local listing criteria with national best practice; and
- The opportunity for immediate benefit from reforms managed solely through the new Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act.

Key aspects of the suite of reforms presented in the Discussion Paper include standardisation of processes for local heritage listing through practice directions prepared by the State Planning Commission, a role for accredited heritage professionals, and management of places through the state-wide Planning and Design Code and heritage overlay.

Development of the Discussion Paper included consideration of other Australian jurisdictions that have undertaken heritage reforms in the last ten years.

Tables 6.1 and 6.2 below summarise the reform opportunities raised in the Discussion Paper, along with potential benefits and challenges/risks of the proposed approach identified by the LGA. Reforms are grouped in relation to local heritage listing (reference L1 to L6) and development assessment (D1 to D7).

Table 6.1: Discussion Paper Reforms - Local Heritage Listing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Reform opportunity</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Challenges/Risks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>Statutory listing criteria with thresholds described in a practice direction</td>
<td>Provides clear guidance as to what constitutes different levels of heritage value</td>
<td>Achieving agreement amongst stakeholders of different levels of value and thresholds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local heritage criteria based on thresholds similar to State heritage criteria</td>
<td>Contributes to greater certainty in assessments of heritage value</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>under the Heritage Places Act 1993</td>
<td>Supports compliance with best practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inclusion/exclusion guidance for professionals and the community on what is likely to meet thresholds for heritage value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Discussion Paper suggests:

A place is deemed to have local heritage value if it satisfies one or more of the following criteria:

a) It is important to demonstrating themes in the evolution or pattern of local history; or
b) It has qualities that are locally rare or endangered; or
c) It may yield important information that will contribute to an understanding of local history, including natural history; or
d) It is comparatively significant in representing a class of places of local significance; or
e) It displays particular creative, aesthetic or technical accomplishment, endemic construction techniques or particular design characteristics that are important to demonstrating local historical themes; or
f) It has strong cultural or spiritual associations for a local community; or
g) It has a special association with the life or work of a person or organisation or an event of local historical importance.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Reform opportunity</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Challenges/Risks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| L2  | Implement a framework and practice direction that enables understanding, evaluation and presentation of objects, places and events in the context of broad historical themes | Integrated rather than piecemeal approach to preserving heritage across the state  
Enables comparison of multiple similar nominations  
Allows understanding of over and under representation in listings | Ensuring local values are incorporated in development of broader themes |
| L3  | Implement early engagement with communities and property owners from heritage survey to decision making stages through a heritage listing practice direction prepared by the Planning Commission  
Reduce public consultation timeframe | Potential to reduce conflict  
Potential to reduce consultation and listing process timeframes  
Shorter process reduces the need for interim operation | Responsibility for and monitoring of compliance with the practice direction  
Responsibility for dispute resolution where early engagement does not remove conflict |
| L4  | Simplify the process to amend the Planning and Design Code to incorporate a listing, involving the Planning Commission, experts, accredited professionals and community representatives | Shorter and more efficient process for listing | Perceived or actual reduced community input  
Options for challenging a listing  
Mechanisms to resolve conflict arising within or from outside the Commission led process |
| L5  | Require clear and comprehensive descriptions of listings, prepared by accredited professionals governed by a practice direction  
Review and update existing statements of heritage value and listed elements at some time in the future | Provides clarity for professionals and the community about the elements of a place that are important to heritage value  
Provides relevant information for any future development applications and appeals | May generate large quantities of material  
Requires monitoring and updating over time in relation to condition of places  
Providing descriptions for existing local heritage places may be time and cost prohibitive |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Reform opportunity</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Challenges/Risks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L6</td>
<td>Discontinue a traditional register of local heritage places, instead identifying listings by gazette as amendments to the Planning and Design Code, on a heritage overlay, and through the online planning portal</td>
<td>Avoids duplication through multiple instruments</td>
<td>Loss of dedicated repository of local heritage information</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.2: Discussion Paper Reforms – Development Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Reform opportunity</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Challenges/Risks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td>Clearly distinguish between ‘character’ and ‘heritage’ in the Planning and Design Code</td>
<td>State-wide clarity of interpretation across all planning policy</td>
<td>Developing a shared understanding of terms acceptable to all stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Distinguish between heritage and character value in translation of existing Historic Conservation areas into the Code via character subzones or heritage overlays(^8)</td>
<td>Appropriate planning controls for heritage and character protection respectively</td>
<td>Communicating the defined terminology effectively to all stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Considering stakeholder perceptions and community values in distinguishing between heritage and character for existing protected areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consistent use of terminology in new policy including local variations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td>Develop hierarchy of heritage values (national, state, and local places and areas)</td>
<td>Greater policy clarity and guidance in assessment pathways</td>
<td>Achieving agreement amongst stakeholders of different levels of value and thresholds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accommodating all forms of heritage value in a hierarchical system</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^8\) In reference to reform opportunity D1, the Discussion Paper notes the following distinctions:

**Heritage** is about retaining cultural ‘value’, not simply identifying with a history. It generally involves conservation of the fabric of a place to help reconcile its cultural value with its asset value.

**Character** is less about a ‘value’ and is more a tool to recognise the presence of, or desire for, particular physical attributes to determine how similar or different the future character of areas should be.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Reform opportunity</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Challenges/Risks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| D3  | Review definition of development relating to heritage places to reduce the number of potential applications | Reduced number of assessments relating to straightforward and minor matters  
Encourages improvement of heritage places | Actual or perceived dilution of heritage protections leading to loss of heritage value |
| D4  | Introduce ‘exempt’, ‘accepted’ or ‘deemed to satisfy’ assessment pathway for defined minor and low risk works | Shorter and more efficient process commensurate to the potential impact of proposed works  
Encourages improvement of heritage places | Actual or perceived dilution of heritage protections leading to loss of heritage value |
| D5  | Introduce statements of significance, descriptions of elements, and tables of controls for all heritage places (refer to example in Figure 5.1) | Greater clarity of relationship of physical fabric to heritage value  
Contributes to transparency and clarity in assessment process  
Provides information resources for heritage managers | May generate large quantities of material  
Requires monitoring and updating over time in relation to condition of places |
| D6  | Allow ‘on merit’ assessment of demolition of heritage places | State-wide consistency of demolition controls and public notification requirements | Actual or perceived dilution of heritage protections leading to loss of heritage value |
| D7  | Empower accredited heritage professionals to provide heritage equivalent of current Building Rules Consent Only | Expedites simple assessments  
Frees up Council planners to focus on more complex applications | Removes decision making power of Councils over local heritage places |
### Figure 6.1: Example table of controls from a Victorian planning scheme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PS Map ref</th>
<th>Heritage Place</th>
<th>External Paint Controls Apply?</th>
<th>Internal Alteration Controls Apply?</th>
<th>Tree Controls Apply?</th>
<th>Outbuildings or fences which are not exempt under Clause 43.01-4</th>
<th>Included on the Victorian Heritage register under the Heritage Act 1996?</th>
<th>Prohibited uses may be permitted?</th>
<th>Name of Incorporated Plan under Clause 43.01-2</th>
<th>Aboriginal heritage place?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HO112</td>
<td>Washingtonia Palm 78 Cowper St, Footscray</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The heritage place is the Washingtonia Palm tree and the land beneath the canopy of the tree for a distance of one metre beyond the drip line, root zone or canopy perimeter, whichever is the greater.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO113</td>
<td>Kipspringer 40-54 Cranwell St, Braybrook</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.1 Local government response

On 17 and 18 August 2016 the LGA held two local heritage and character workshops with officers of metropolitan Councils to facilitate local government responses to the Local Heritage Discussion Paper. Workshop participants were planning and heritage staff representing 18 metropolitan Councils.

These workshops were followed by broader consultation within the local government sector and culminated in the ‘Local Government Heritage and Planning Forum on 21 September.

Local governments have previously expressed general support for the recommendations of the Expert Panel on Planning Reform relating to heritage. However, while some reforms suggested by the Local Heritage Discussion Paper are supported, there are concerns with the processes and levels of consideration and consultation surrounding the local heritage reforms.

Table 6.3 summarises the main areas of concern and key messages communicated during the local government consultation process.

**Table 6.3: Reform areas and key messages from local governments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reform area</th>
<th>Key messages from local governments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reform context and process</td>
<td>The Discussion Paper reforms lack a strategic framework, clarity of detail, and clarity of governance arrangements. The information provided and consultation process underway is insufficient for Councils to effectively contribute on behalf of their communities. The basis put forward for the exclusive focus on local heritage is unclear, given the recommendations of the Expert Panel to consider State and local heritage on a holistic basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status of heritage areas</td>
<td>The future of Historic Conservation Areas/Zones must be clarified. These areas are highly valued by local communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic drivers for heritage protection</td>
<td>The economic benefits of heritage conservation should be encouraged and communicated. Funding and incentives are essential to getting the balance right in heritage protection and should be considered holistically with policy reforms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local heritage listings</td>
<td>Clear and consistent local heritage criteria are supported. Significantly more discussion and detail is required around thresholds, selection of themes, and overrepresentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing a framework document and practice direction</td>
<td>Uniform and clear guidance for consistent decision making is supported. The current system lacks the guidance material to promote consistent practice and evidence based decision making.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarifying the difference between ‘character’ and ‘heritage’</td>
<td>Support the need for improved clarity in the use of these terms and also the role of contributory items.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
With the current discussion relating to local heritage the opportunity also exists for the State Government to reconsider section 67 (4) and (5) of the Planning Development and Infrastructure Act:

(4) In addition, an area cannot be designated under an amendment to the Planning and Design Code as constituting a heritage character or preservation zone or subzone unless the amendment has been approved by persons who, at the time that consultation in relation to the proposed amendment is initiated under the Community Engagement Charter, constitute at least the prescribed percentage of owners of allotments within the relevant area (on the basis of 1 owner per allotment being counted under a scheme prescribed by the regulations).

(5) In this section—

*prescribed percentage* means 51% of relevant owners of allotments within a relevant area.

These sections of the Act require a plebiscite of property owners where a heritage character or preservation zone or subzone is proposed and for 51% of property owners to be in agreement with the proposal. The LGA strongly opposed this provision when it was proposed as an amendment during the debate on the bill.

### 6. Local Government Position

Local governments are a key partner in government and are committed to being constructive partners in local heritage reform, as shown by the sector’s engagement with the Expert Panel on Planning Reform, and general support for the Panel’s heritage recommendations (refer Table 4.1 above).

Local government is the level of government closest to the community and experiences firsthand the great extent to which their communities value local heritage, and the value local heritage contributes to their streets, suburbs and beyond.

Heritage has a significant local economic benefit. As well as implementing planning and heritage controls, Councils invest in local heritage through grants programs, advisory services, promotions and education, and research. The strength of this investment is borne out by studies that demonstrate the economic significance of cultural heritage and its important role in tourism attraction and expenditure.10 There is also strong evidence to demonstrate that heritage has a strong employment multiplier and creates jobs.

---

The State Government must fully understand, appreciate and take into account the strong economic benefits of heritage in any further thinking about reforms.

Local governments support the principles of good planning set out in the PDI Act, and see effective development and implementation of local heritage reforms in appropriate consultation with stakeholders as consistent with those principles, and as contributing to the objects of the Act.

The draft update to The 30-Year Plan for Greater Adelaide contains many policies that acknowledge the value of local heritage, character, and context, as well as many policies to support growth and development within existing urban areas. As consultation continues on the draft update, it will be important to understand how these strategic directions work together to provide for the best possible planning outcomes.

From a local heritage perspective, urban infill development is compatible with heritage conservation, and with good design offers opportunities for improving streetscapes and areas in ways that can benefit local heritage places and incentivise their restoration and use.

Conversely, such development also has the potential to impact negatively on local heritage, and clear policies and frameworks for decision making are required where heritage conservation must be considered alongside other objectives in pursuit of infill targets.

In this context, prior to development of a draft Bill incorporating local heritage reforms, local governments are of the view that further consideration, clarification, and consultation is required in relation to:

- The relationship of local heritage reforms and the objectives of the planning system and planning strategy as expressed in the PDI Act and 30-Year Plan;
- How and why currently proposed reforms differ from the suite of recommendations of the Expert Panel on Planning Reform;
- The operation and implementation of reforms, in particular governance and roles and responsibilities for decision making;
- Reaching an understanding between the relationship between heritage conservation and character preservation;
- The role of contributory items in heritage conservation areas;
- Opportunities for economic benefits of heritage conservation to be realised, including holistic consideration of funding and incentives for economic use alongside policy reforms;
- New heritage listing criteria, particularly on the methodology for selection of themes, and issues of thresholds and over- and under-representation;
- Existing Historic Conservation Areas/Zones and how they will be identified and protected in the future;
- Interim demolition control for proposed local heritage listings;
- Mechanisms for policy clarity, effective guidance, and clear decision making roles in development assessment; and
- Effective engagement of the community in development and implementation of reforms.

Amendment of sections 67(4) and (5) of the PDI Act to require the removal of the requirement for 51% of owners to agree on a proposed conservation area.

Importantly, appropriate consideration of these issues requires a program of consultation with sufficient time and information for Councils to engage with their elected members and communities, and contribute constructive feedback to the reform process. This is likely to involve additional rounds of consultation to that currently underway.

Local governments will continue to seek further engagement with DPTI both directly and through the LGA to contribute to a local heritage reform package that appropriately reflects the aspiration, priorities, and values of the State government and metropolitan local governments and their communities.
5.2 Project Proposal: Essential Services Property Reinstatement Policy and Agreement

MLGG Annual Priority Reports
From: Frances Beer, Policy Officer
Financial Implications: $28,000.00
Meeting: MLGG 9 May 2018
ECM: 660258 Attachment: Project Plan

Recommendation
That the Metropolitan Local Government Group:

1. notes the report on the project proposal for: Essential Services Property Reinstatement Policy and Agreement; and
2. allocates a budget of $28,000 to undertake this project.

Discussion
The City of Prospect introduced a Notice of Motion at the 2017 Annual General Meeting for the LGA to "liaise with essential service providers to establish an agreed policy on reinstating public infrastructure to the satisfaction of councils after completion of works and remediation improvements."

A similar motion was passed at the LGA Annual General Meeting in October 2014. Subsequently, the City of West Torrens received funding from the Local Government Research and Development Scheme to develop a Memorandum of Understanding and Road Reserve Reinstatement Work Quality and Intervention Standard; however the funding was later forfeited as it was understood that Austroads was undertaking a similar project.

Section 217 of the Local Government Act 1999 (‘the Act’) gives councils the power to order the owner of infrastructure on roads to carry out specified maintenance or repair work. This includes pipes, wires, cables and fittings installed in, on, under or over a road. Several South Australian councils have adopted their own reinstatement specifications to provide companies who are undertaking reinstatement work with clear expectations.

However, the Act also states that councils do not have the power to order the owners of electricity, public lighting or gas infrastructure to carry out maintenance or repair work if the Commission has determined, on application by the owner of the infrastructure, that there are reasonable grounds for not requiring the owner to take the action specified in the order. Consequently, unless this exemption is removed from the Act, any policy in relation to the reinstatement of electricity, public lighting and gas infrastructure would need the support of essential service providers to ensure its principles are upheld.

At its March meeting, the MLGG resolved to include this project in its 2018 work plan subject to considering a project plan.
Through the methods outlined in the attached project plan, this project will produce a report to the MLGG that:

- Determines whether legislative change should be advocated for;
- Identifies the appropriateness of developing a policy and partnership agreement for local government as a whole, or whether it would be more appropriate to develop a model policy and partnership agreement for each council to use independently; and
- Develops a policy and partnership agreement following the identification of what type of policy and partnership agreement is appropriate.

The LGA Secretariat has consulted with the Sustainable Urban Growth Working Group on this project plan. The group is formed by representatives from the Town of Gawler, District Council of Mount Barker, City of Playford, Light Regional Council, Adelaide Plains Council, and Barossa Council.

The LGA Secretariat has also consulted with interstate Local Government Associations and is aware that Victoria and Western Australia have or are in the process of developing similar policies with utility providers.

Subject to MLGG endorsement the project will commence in August 2018 and it is envisaged that it will take nine months to complete.

**Financial Implications**

The LGA estimates that this project will require a budget of $18,000 and an additional $10,000 for legal advice is recommended should it be required. This budget cost can be met from within the current MLGG budget.
### Project Plan

| **Objective** | The aim of this project is to establish an agreed policy for essential service providers on reinstating public infrastructure to the satisfaction of councils after completion of works and remediation improvements. The policy will seek to ensure high and consistent standards of reinstatement are achieved.

The project will also seek to strengthen the relationship between local government and essential service providers. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scope</strong></td>
<td>The scope of this project is limited to topic areas surrounding the project’s objective.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Background** | The City of Prospect introduced a Notice of Motion at the 2017 Annual General Meeting for the LGA to “liaise with essential service providers to establish an agreed policy on reinstating public infrastructure to the satisfaction of councils after completion of works and remediation improvements.” A similar Notice of Motion was made in 2014 and the City of West Torrens received funding to carry out the project, however the council returned the funding on the understanding that Austroads was undertaking a similar project.

Section 217 of the *Local Government Act 1999* (‘the Act’) gives councils the power to order the owner of infrastructure on roads to carry out specified maintenance or repair work. This includes pipes, wires, cables and fittings installed in, on, under or over a road. Several South Australian councils have adopted and published individual reinstatement specifications to provide companies who are undertaking the reinstatement work with clear expectations.

However, the Act also states that councils do not have the power to order the owners of electricity infrastructure, public lighting infrastructure or gas infrastructure to carry out maintenance or repair work if the Commission has determined, on application by the owner of the infrastructure, that there are reasonable grounds for not requiring the owner to take the action specified in the order. Consequently, unless this exemption is removed from the Act, any policy in relation to the reinstatement of electricity, public lighting and gas infrastructure would need the support of essential service providers to ensure its principles are upheld. |
| **Stakeholders** | • Metropolitan and regional councils
• Essential service providers
• State Government |
| **Risks** | • Unless the Act is amended to remove the exclusion for electricity, public lighting and gas infrastructure, the policy will not be legally binding in relation to those works, and essential service providers would need to voluntarily support the policy.
• There is a risk that essential service providers will not support the policy and will not enter a partnership agreement. |
| **Outcomes** | The project will:
• Determine whether legislative change should be advocated for;
• Identify the appropriateness of developing a policy and partnership agreement for local government as a whole, or whether it would be more appropriate for the LGA to develop a model policy and partnership |
• Develop a policy and agreement (whether a model policy and model agreement or a single policy and agreement between all councils and essential service providers).

### Project milestones and timeframes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Estimated time required</th>
<th>Estimated cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1    | • Desktop review of existing council reinstatement specifications  
      • Desktop review of DPTI process  
      • Consultation with councils via survey asking:  
        - What are council’s existing reinstatement policies?  
        - What is currently wrong with existing reinstatement policies/agreements?  
      • Collation of survey data | 50 hours | $2500 |
| 2    | Engagement with sector:  
      • 1 x workshop with councils (aim for at least 3 rural and 3 metropolitan)  
      • 1 x workshop with essential service providers  
      • 1 x combined workshop with councils and essential service providers  
      These workshops will aim to determine whether a model policy and model agreement or a single policy and agreement between all councils and essential service providers would be more appropriate.  
      Feedback from the workshops will be used to help determine whether legislative change should be advocated for. | 30 hours | $9000 + cost for facilitator (3 workshops) |
| 3    | Drafting of Policy and Partnership Agreement (either a model policy and model agreement for councils to use OR a single policy and agreement between all local government as a whole, and essential service providers) | 50 hours | $2500 |
| 4    | Draft Policy and Draft Agreement consultation (via Circular) and edits | 20 hours | $1000 |
| 5    | Release of final Policy and Agreement with recommendation as to whether or not legislative change should be advocated for. | 9 months from project commencement |
| Total | 150 hours | Project Cost = $15,000  
Project Management Cost = $1500  
Contingencies = $1500  
Total = $18,000  
Non inclusions = $10,000.00 for specialist legal and engineering advice. |
5.3 Project Proposal: Innovation and Investment in Commercial Activities

MLGG Annual Priority Reports

From: Frances Beer, Policy Officer
Financial Implications: $24,700
Meeting: MLGG 9 May 2018
ECM: 660259 Attachment: Project Plan

Recommendation

That the Metropolitan Local Government Group:

1. notes the report on the project proposal for innovation and investment in commercial activities; and
2. allocates a budget of $24,700 for the LGA Secretariat to undertake the project.

Discussion

The City of Adelaide introduced a Notice of Motion at the April 2017 LGA Ordinary General Meeting for the LGA “to explore local, national and international business models used by the local government sector to manage commercial operations and explore any current legislative barriers or opportunities that would enable greater innovation and investment in commercial activities, in order to offset the cost of council services for our community.”

This Motion follows the significant commercialisation of British local governments and other overseas/interstate councils that have become more creative in securing new income streams by commercialising their activities and by making significant commercial investments. Should rate capping be introduced in South Australia, the commercialisation of council activities and assets may become a necessity for councils.

The LGA operates a number of commercial business units itself and is supportive of councils undertaking commercial operations that are well managed in terms of risk and aligned to councils’ broad purpose. South Australian councils’ commercial activities are currently prescribed and restricted by the Local Government Act 1999, and the National Competition Policy prescribes that governments are subject to the principles of competitive neutrality.

At the March 2018 meeting, the MLGG resolved to include this project in its work plan for 2018 subject to seeing a project plan (please see attached). The LGA Secretariat proposes that a two stage project be undertaken in relation to the project. The LGA Secretariat is seeking funding for stage one of the project, and should the MLGG have interest following the completion of stage one, further resources will be required to complete stage two.

Stage one of the project will aim to identify current barriers to councils undertaking commercial activities and will inform councils of potential opportunities. As outlined in the project plan, stage one will involve a legislative review, a review of current methods used in Australia and overseas to
manage local government operations, and a consultation session with the sector. Stage one of the project will produce a findings report to the MLGG.

Project completion is envisaged nine months from the commencement of the project.

**Financial Implications**

The LGA estimates that this project will require a budget of $14,700 and an additional $10,000 for legal advice is recommended should it be required. This budget cost can be met from within the current MLGG budget.
## Project Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>This project will aim to identify potential opportunities for local government commercial activities by:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• exploring local, national and international models/methods used by the local government sector to manage commercial operations; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• comparing state, national and international local government, consumer, corporations and other applicable legislation to identify current legislative barriers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Scope | Stage one of this project will focus on identifying relevant overseas and interstate examples, barriers to South Australian local councils in commercialising their activities, and potential opportunities that councils could consider. |
|       | Stage two of this project would involve further research and advice regarding risks, the governance frameworks required, and exploration of required external resources. |
|       | The LGA Secretariat is seeking funds to carry out stage one of the project. Should the MLGG be interested following the completion of stage one, further resources would be required to complete stage two. |

| Background | The City of Adelaide introduced a Notice of Motion at the April 2017 LGA Ordinary General Meeting for the LGA “to explore local, national and international business models used by the local government sector to manage commercial operations and explore any current legislative barriers or opportunities that would enable greater innovation and investment in commercial activities, in order to offset the cost of council services for our community.” |
|           | To deal with funding constraints, local governments in jurisdictions such as Queensland and the United Kingdom have become more creative in securing new income streams and have increasingly commercialised their activities. Commercialising council assets and activities may especially be of interest to South Australian councils should rate capping be introduced. |
|           | The LGA operates a number of commercial business units itself and is supportive of councils undertaking commercial operations that are well managed in terms of risk and aligned to the broad purpose of councils. South Australian councils’ commercial activities are currently prescribed and restricted by the Local Government Act 1999, and the National Competition Policy prescribes that governments are subject to the principles of competitive neutrality. |

| Stakeholders | • Metropolitan and regional councils  
|              | • State Government |

| Project Risks | The identified opportunities and risks may be endless, so the project will require clear boundaries |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>This Project will focus on stage one of the Project by identifying:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• interstate and overseas examples of local government commercial activities;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• barriers to local government commercial activities in South Australia; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• potential commercial opportunities that councils may wish to explore.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Project milestones and timeframes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Estimated time required</th>
<th>Estimated cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1    | Review of the current methods used by the local government sector to manage commercial operations in:  
  • South Australia  
  • Australia  
  • Overseas  
  for the sake of comparison and to identify potential opportunities for SA councils. | 50 hours | $2500 |
| 2    | Desktop review of legislation in:  
  • South Australia  
  • Australia  
  • Overseas  
  for the sake of comparison and to identify legislative barriers for SA councils. | 50 hours | $2500 |
| 3    | Review existing research conducted on the commercialisation of local government activities | 30 hours | $1500 |
| 4    | Consultation with the sector on current commercial activities via a workshop | 10 hours | $3500 |
| 5    | Draft report to MLGG for consideration | 30 hours | $1500 |
| 6    | Final report to MLGG | 15 hours | $750 |
| Total | | 185 hours | Project Cost = $12,250  
  Project Management Cost = $1,225  
  Contingencies = $1,225  
  Total = $14,700  
  Non inclusions = $10,000 for legal advice. |
7.1 MLGG Financial Summary as at 31 March 2018

MLGG Financial Summary
From: Stephen Smith, Director Policy
Meeting: MLGG 9 May 2018
ECM: 660833

Recommendation
That the Metropolitan Local Government Group notes the financial summary for the MLGG as at 31 March 2018.

Discussion
The following table provides a summary of the MLGG’s finances to 31 March 2018.

MLGG Financial Position:
Opening balance: $193,422
Closing balance: $193,352

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MLGG - Metro Local Government Group</th>
<th>YTD Actual</th>
<th>YTD Budget</th>
<th>Variance Fav/(Unfav)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1411 - Grants, Subsidies &amp; Contributions</td>
<td>77,723</td>
<td>39,000</td>
<td>38,723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8522 - Transfer from Reserve</td>
<td>141,596</td>
<td>141,596</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUE</strong></td>
<td>219,319</td>
<td>180,596</td>
<td>38,723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3236 - Catering</td>
<td>1,880</td>
<td>1,880</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3244 - Meeting Costs</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>5,784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3312 - Consultant General/Projects</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3514 - MLGG Think Tanks/Events</td>
<td>22,500</td>
<td>22,500</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3841 - Venue Hire</td>
<td>1,341</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>1,659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3864 - Staff Travel - Taxi</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td>25,967</td>
<td>48,000</td>
<td>22,423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NET BALANCE</strong></td>
<td>193,352</td>
<td>132,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Outstanding</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Capacity Building Allocation</td>
<td>$39,777</td>
<td>Will appear next month</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$39,777</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Endorsed Activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 Smart City Snapshot report</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>invoice received from the University of Adelaide will appear next month</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smart Cities Network</td>
<td>$5000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smart Cities Strategy</td>
<td>$33,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$48,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential Services, Property reinstatement Policy and Agreement</td>
<td>$28,000</td>
<td>For consideration May meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation and Investment in Commercial Activities</td>
<td>$24,700</td>
<td>For consideration May meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$52,700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.1 2018/19 Special Local Road Program – Funding Recommendations

Urgent Business Affecting Metropolitan Councils

From: Lea Bacon, Director Policy
Financial Implications: Nil
Meeting: MLGG 9 May 2018
ECM: 660986 Attachments: 660981; 660982; 45554

Recommendation

That the Metropolitan Local Government Group:

1. notes the recommendations made by the Metropolitan Strategic Roads Committee to the Local Government Transport Advisory Panel for 2018/19 SLRP funding;
2. requests that the CEOs of metropolitan councils advise their staff of the recommendations made to the Local Government Transport Advisory Panel;
3. notes the SLRP approval process documented within the report; and
4. notes the process to fill the positions being vacated by Cr Mark Groote and Robert Tiggemann on the Metropolitan Strategic Roads Committee.

Discussion

SLRP process and funding recommendations

On 15 February 2018 the LGA issued Circular 7.13 advising that the 2018/19 funding round for the Special Local Roads Program (SLRP) funding was open. The Circular stated that Regional LGAs and the MLGG were to submit applications for their regions to the Local Government Transport Advisory Panel (LGTAP) by 11 May and that councils should contact their respective Regional LGA or the MLGG to ensure that they are aware of the application process and timeframes required by the region so the region can in turn meet the LGTAP timeframe. The Circular advised that metropolitan applications were due by 6 April so that they could be considered by the Metropolitan Strategic Roads Committee (MSRC).

The Metropolitan Local Government Group has established the MSRC to effect a formal regional assessment process for deliberation of strategic metropolitan road funding priorities.

The MSRC met on Monday 30 April 2018 to consider the eight (8) applications received by metropolitan councils. The recommendations made by the MSRC to LGTAP are attached for the information of the Metropolitan Local Government Group.

Approval Process

Councils are reminded about the approval process and indicative timeframe for the SLRP:

Step 1: The LGA will call for submissions (completed)
Step 2: Regional LGA’s and the MLGG will be provided with application deadlines (completed)

Step 3: Councils will complete applications (following LGTAP guidelines) which will be forwarded to their Regional LGA or MSRC (completed)

Step 4: The Regional LGA or MSRC will then assess and forward prioritised funding applications to LGTAP (completed for MSRC)

Step 5: LGTAP will make its recommendations to the LGA Board in July

Step 6: LGTAP will provide its recommendations and the LGA Board resolution to the Grants Commission for its consideration in June/July

Step 7: The Grants Commission will forward its recommendations to the State Minister for Local Government for his endorsement and the State Minister will forward the recommendations on to the Federal Minister for approval in July/August.

Step 8: The Minister will make formal announcement of projects via letter to Councils (August/September)

**Process to fill vacant position on MSRC**

The Metropolitan Strategic Roads Committee membership is comprised of five persons, consisting of:

- one Elected Member representative from metropolitan Councils north of the River Torrens (*Vacant, previously Cr Mark Groote, City of Prospect*);
- one officer representative from metropolitan Councils north of the River Torrens (*Vacant, previously Mr Robert Tiggemann, City of Port Adelaide Enfield*);
- one Elected Member representative from metropolitan Councils south of the River Torrens (*Currently Cr George Demetriou, City of West Torrens*);
- one officer representative from metropolitan Councils south of the River Torrens (*Currently Mr Russell King, City of Mitcham*); and
- one officer representative from the Adelaide City Council (*Currently Klinton Devenish, Adelaide City Council*).

Mr Robert Tiggemann has now retired from the City of Port Adelaide Enfield and Cr Mark Groote tendered his resignation from the MSRC on 23 March 2018. It is now necessary to seek nominations from metropolitan councils north of the River Torrens to fill the officer representative and Elected Member representative positions that are now vacant.

The Metropolitan Local Government Group is asked to note the following process in order to fill the vacant position:

- an email will be sent by the LGA Secretariat to the CEOs of councils north of the River Torrens, (being Campbelltown, Charles Sturt, Gawler, Norwood Payneham & St Peters, Playford, Prospect, Port Adelaide Enfield, Salisbury, Tea Tree Gully and Walkerville), seeking nominations for a council officer to sit on the MSRC;
- if one nomination is received for each position, those persons will be appointed to the MSRC;
- if more than one nomination is received for each position, the officers nominated will be asked to submit a brief summary of their reason for nominating and their qualifications;
• nominee summaries will be emailed to the CEOs of the abovementioned councils who will be asked to vote on the nominations received;
• the nominee for each position with the highest number of votes will be declared appointed to the MSRC.

The time commitment for members of the MRSC is low, with generally one meeting per year plus time to read SLRP applications. Meetings usually run for a period of two hours.

The Terms of Reference for the MSRC are attached for information.
### 2018/19 Ranking Table for Metropolitan Special Local Roads Program Funding Applications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MSRC Ranking</th>
<th>Council &amp; Purpose</th>
<th>Brief Description</th>
<th>Scope</th>
<th>Amount Sought</th>
<th>Council Contribution</th>
<th>Priority Score</th>
<th>Metro Roads Hierarchy</th>
<th>Staging</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>City of Port Adelaide Enfield</td>
<td>Bedford Street (Freight)</td>
<td>Problem Being Addressed: Severe asphalt pavement crocodile cracking, pothole, kerb damage and water ponding due to kerb undulation. Work proposed: Removal and reinstatement of existing asphalt with 250mm deeplift. Kerb and gutter maintenance repairs and reinstatement of Linemarking.</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>Second Tier Social Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>City of Port Adelaide Enfield</td>
<td>Church Street (Community)</td>
<td>Problem Being Addressed: Full reconstruction of the road section is required as per Council’s asset management program. Severe undulation, pavement failure and longitudinal cracking have occurred. Undulated kerb and gutter is creating water ponding issues on the road which may be hazardous to road users during rainfall events. The reconstruction will also address pedestrian and cyclist safety issues on the road. Work proposed: The scope of works includes the excavation of existing kerb and gutter and 100mm deeplift of the road pavement and to reinstate with new kerb and gutter. Kerb alignment will be regraded to minimise water ponding and mitigate future environmental sub-surface movement. Installation of new raised pavement pedestrian crossing to address pedestrian hazards and installation of new Linemarking.</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>First Tier Social Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSRC Ranking</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>Road Name &amp; Purpose</td>
<td>Brief Description</td>
<td>Scope</td>
<td>Amount Sought</td>
<td>Council Contribution</td>
<td>Priority Score</td>
<td>Metro Roads Hierarchy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>City of Port Adelaide</td>
<td>Osborne Road (Community)</td>
<td>Problem Being Addressed: Crocodile and longitudinal cracking were observed and asphalt failure on various sections of the road. Kerb and gutter damage creating water ponding in some areas. Work proposed: Removal and replacement of damaged kerb and gutter. Asphalt deeplift of 100mm on both carriageways and reinstatement of Linemarking.</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>$135,000</td>
<td>$135,000</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>First Tier Social Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>City of Onkaparinga</td>
<td>Justs Road (Community)</td>
<td>Problem Being Addressed: The road has suffered numerous sudden failures and requires reconstruction. The current pavement is deficient in terms of strength and width as it has become a Metropolitan bus route which it was not previously designed for. It carries in excess of 1300 vpd (2002 figures) including metropolitan and school busses and in addition to pavement strengthening, requires pavement and seal widening to improve safety and better cater for the increase in these vehicle types. Work Proposed: The work involves reconstructing, strengthening and widening the 2.23km section of Justs Road with a pavement that is suitable for longer term use by tourists, commuters, service vehicles, cyclists and busses.</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>$610,000</td>
<td>$610,000</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>First Tier Social Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSRC Ranking</td>
<td>Council &amp; Purpose</td>
<td>Road Name &amp; Purpose</td>
<td>Brief Description</td>
<td>Scope</td>
<td>Amount Sought</td>
<td>Council Contribution</td>
<td>Priority Score</td>
<td>Metro Roads Hierarchy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>City of Unley</td>
<td>King William Road</td>
<td>Problem Being Addressed: The road requires a full pavement reconstruction including a replacement of the road surface, which currently comprises of segmental concrete pavers. Work Proposed: The work proposed includes reconstructing a 600m section (Stage 1) of King William Road with a pavement that is fit for purpose and suitable to maximise the useful life and overall management of the asset. The reconstruction of the existing roadway will provide a catalyst to the redesign of the main street precinct, including opportunities to enhance the presentation, safety and appeal of the main street with the road replacement works.</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>$2,250,000</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>First Tier Tourist Access And Second Tier Tourist Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not recomm</td>
<td>City of Charles Sturt</td>
<td>West Beach Road</td>
<td>Problem Being Addressed: There are currently no dedicated turning lanes into sporting complex and numerous boats and caravans use the road to access nearby tourist and recreational facilities. Work Proposed: The proposal is to provide a divided road, with protected turning lanes, dedicated parking lane plus 2 on road cycle lanes, Water Sensitive Urban design options for stormwater drainage and up-graded landscaping. Due to extensive use of road by tourists staying in West Beach Caravan Park it is proposed to provide an off road shared use path.</td>
<td>Cont.</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>First Tier Tourist Access And First Tier Social Access And Second Tier Freight Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSRC Ranking</td>
<td>Council &amp; Purpose</td>
<td>Road Name</td>
<td>Brief Description</td>
<td>Scope</td>
<td>Amount Sought</td>
<td>Council Contribution</td>
<td>Priority Score</td>
<td>Metro Roads Hierarchy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>City of Onkaparinga</td>
<td>States Road (Community)</td>
<td>Problem Being Addressed: The road pavement has reached the end of its serviceable life and drainage is compromised due to movement in the pavement. The current configuration is not considered suitable for the volume of traffic currently using it. Road alignment is poor with traffic lanes currently deviating around midblock intersections. Work Proposed: Works proposed includes strengthen and widen road pavement to ensure suitability to provide a safer long term traffic solution that will cater for the expected increase in traffic generated from the new Hackham South East development.</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>$2,050,000</td>
<td>$2,050,000</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>First Tier Social Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>City of Salisbury</td>
<td>Pauls Drive (Community)</td>
<td>Problem Being Addressed: At present, flood levels exceed the maximum height of the culvert opening every year on average, resulting in closure of the road to local traffic due to this hazard to the community. To address this combined local area traffic management (LA TM), road safety &amp; flooding issue, the City of Salisbury will replace and widen a flood prone bridge with a new culvert structure to reduce flood hazard risk at this site. Work Proposed: A detailed design has been developed for the replacement of the existing structure with a large precast arch bridge structure that will accommodate a significantly greater flow capacity. Provision has also been made for the Dry Creek linear trail to be connected beneath the roadway, thereby removing the current need for trail users to leave the linear reserve and cross against the traffic along Pauls Drive.</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>$1,075,000</td>
<td>$1,075,000</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Not located on Hierarchy Maps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$5,945,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$7,445,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Memo

To: Patricia Coonan, Special Local Roads Program Coordinator
CC: Metropolitan Strategic Roads Committee (MRSC)
From: Lea Bacon, Director Policy, LGA, on behalf of MSRC
Date: 30 April 2018

Attachment: ECM 660981– MSRC Ranking Table

SLRP Road Funding 2018/19 Recommendations for Metropolitan Region

The Metropolitan Local Government Group has a Metropolitan Strategic Roads Committee (MSRC), which has been given delegated authority to determine and recommend to the LGTAP their priorities for SLRP funding on behalf of all metropolitan councils.

At a meeting held on Monday 30 April 2018, the MSRC considered eight (8) applications received from councils this year. The MSRC resolved to recommend to the LGTAP that funding be allocated as shown below and in the following order:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority recommended by MSRC</th>
<th>Road name / Year / Council</th>
<th>Amount Sought</th>
<th>Amount Recommended</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bedford Street Year 1 of 1 City of Port Adelaide Enfield</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>Recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Church Street Year 1 of 1 City of Port Adelaide Enfield</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
<td>Recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Osborne Road Year 1 of 1 City of Port Adelaide Enfield</td>
<td>$135,000</td>
<td>$135,000</td>
<td>Recommended</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4                            | Justs Road Year 1 of 2 City of Onkaparinga | $610,000 | $610,000 | Recommended subject to the receipt of relevant approvals in particular associated with any required vegetation clearances and/or cultural heritage impacts considering the proximity to the Washpool Lagoon
Note: the MRSC requested further information from Council on their consideration of the |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority recommended by MSRC</th>
<th>Road name / Year / Council</th>
<th>Amount Sought</th>
<th>Amount Recommended</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|                             |                             |               |                    | impact of the project on native vegetation. The Council has subsequently advised that they "consider the impacts to native vegetation as part of the initial project planning assessment phase prior to concept design being developed and revise as design matures. The impact on native vegetation along Justs Road is minimal as the road reserve is largely cleared already."
<p>| | | | | |
|                             |                             |               |                    |          |
| 5                           | King William Road Year 1 of 2 | $750,000     | $750,000           | Recommended |
|                             | City of Unley               |               |                    |          |
|                             |                             |               |                    | The MRSC has noted that the funds sought are 25 percent of the total project costs. MRSC has asked the Council to explain the reason and to advise if the Council is receiving funding from an alternative source. If the Council identifies a need, the MRSC would welcome LGTAP consideration of awarding a higher proportion of total project costs should funding be available in the 2018/19 SLRP. |
| 6                           | States Road Year 1 of 1     | $2,050,000    | $2,050,000         | Recommended |
|                             | City of Onkaparinga         |               |                    |          |
| 7                           | Pauls Drive Year 1 of 1     | $1,075,000    | $1,075,000         | Recommended |
|                             | City of Salisbury           |               |                    | subject to the receipt of relevant approvals in particular associated with any required vegetation clearances Note: the MRSC requested further information from Council on their consideration of the impact of the project on native vegetation. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority recommended by MSRC</th>
<th>Road name / Year / Council</th>
<th>Amount Sought</th>
<th>Amount Recommended</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Council has subsequently replied to acknowledge that “there will be a significant amount of tree removal as shown on Page No. 2 of 10 of the Conceptual Plans for this major upgrade project. However they have advised that because of the amount of tree removal for this project, there is an opportunity for Council to undertake a tree planting/replacement program at this site as part of a landscape design plan for this major culvert upgrade project. According to advice from Council’s external design consultant, a landscape design has not been undertaken because there is no funding available for this project.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** | **$4,945,000**  | **$4,945,000** |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other</th>
<th>West Beach Road Year 2 of 2</th>
<th>$1,000,000</th>
<th>$0</th>
<th>Not recommended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Charles Sturt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The MSRC noted that Stage 1 of the project had been delayed and the design phase has recently been completed. As such, the MRSC recommend that LTAP seek a formal progress report from the City of Charles Sturt, to ascertain work undertaken to date and the scope of works to be carried out in 2018/19.

If appropriate, council may seek to resubmit an application for Stage 2 of the project in the 2019/20 SLRP.
The above recommendations of the MSRC were made by firstly discussing the merit of each application, including progression of those projects seeking funds for works in Year 2. Projects were then assessed in accordance with the scoring allocated using the database developed by the SA Local Government Grants Commission and the Metropolitan Roads Hierarchy. Finally, consideration was given as to the amount sought for each project to ensure an appropriate level of funding has been sought. The prioritised projects will be presented for the information of the MLGG at its meeting on 9 May 2018.

The MSRC, through the Metropolitan Local Government Group, will request the cooperation of the Chief Executive Officers of the above councils to make relevant members of their staff aware of the MSRC’s recommendations. The MSRC will remind CEOs that recommendations will go to LGTAP, the LGA Board and ultimately to the federal Minister for final decision and announcement.

Please contact me should you require any further information on the recommendations from the MSRC.
METROPOLITAN STRATEGIC ROADS COMMITTEE

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Introduction
The Metropolitan Local Government Strategic Roads Committee (MSRC) is established to effect a formal regional assessment process for deliberation of strategic metropolitan road funding priorities. All metropolitan Council applications for funding submissions to Special Local Roads are to be submitted through the MSRC assessment format.

Metropolitan Council Membership
Reference to metropolitan Councils shall include those Councils which collectively constitute the Metropolitan Local Government Group as identified in the LGA Constitution and as amended from time to time.

Funding Process
Funding for strategic local roads in South Australia is made available under the South Australian Special Local Roads Program.

Funding for the Special Local Roads Program is provided from:
- 15% of Identified Local Road Grants; and
- 15% of Roads to Recovery 2.

Funding is also available under the Strategic Pool of Roads to Recovery 2.

The Local Government Transport Advisory Panel (LGTAP)
The Local Government Transport Advisory Panel (LGTAP) has previously been established to consider submissions for strategic road funding under the Special Local Roads Program (SLRP) and the strategic pool of Roads to Recovery 2 (R2R2).

The Local Government Transport Advisory Panel (LGTAP) annually calls for submissions from Regional Local Government Associations for projects to be funded under the Special Local Roads Program.

Regional strategic projects submitted are assessed under the “fit for purpose” categories of freight, tourism and social.

The Metropolitan Local Government Strategic Roads Committee (MSRC)
The Metropolitan Local Government Strategic Roads Committee (MSRC) is now established to provide advice to the Local Government Transport Advisory Panel (LGTAP) for the recommendation of strategic metropolitan road funding projects under SA Special Local Roads Program.

Process
Following written request from the LGTAP to the Metropolitan Local Government Group a call will be made to metropolitan Councils for strategic road funding applications.

The MSRC will consider applications from metropolitan Councils or consortiums of metropolitan Councils and propose a program of works across Adelaide for allocation of funding.

MSRC in making its recommendations will give due weight to
- The prioritisation scores awarded to individual applications through a computer based scoring system, originally developed by the SA Grants Commission. The scoring
The system provides a numerical score based on inputs including traffic volume and equivalent standard axle figures.

- The Strategic Roads Hierarchy for metropolitan Adelaide, developed in 2009/2010
- State Government planning documents.

Membership
The MSRC members will be appointed by the Metropolitan Local Government Group and/or the Metropolitan Local Government Group Executive Committee. The MSRC will have membership of five persons, consisting of,
- one Elected Member representative from metropolitan Councils north of the River Torrens;
- one officer representative from metropolitan Councils north of the River Torrens;
- one Elected Member representative from metropolitan Councils south of the River Torrens;
- one officer representative from metropolitan Councils south of the River Torrens; and
- one officer representative from the Adelaide City Council.

The MSRC may appoint its own Chairperson and determine its own meeting procedures.

Executive Support
Executive support for the Committee will be provided by the LGA. Executive support shall be non voting.

Reporting
The outcomes of MSRC deliberations will be provided to the Metropolitan Local Government Group.

Review
The membership and terms of reference of the MSRC will be reviewed from time to time as determined by the MLGG.

Reviewed and endorsed: MLGG 27 January 2011