Notice of Meeting

Notice is hereby given that a meeting of the Metropolitan Local Government Group will be held on

Wednesday 9 November 2016 at 4:30pm

Boardrooms at Local Government House
148 Frome Street, Adelaide

Lisa Teburea
Acting Chief Executive Officer

2 November 2016
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7. Workshop
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9. Upcoming MLGG Related Events
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10. Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Metropolitan Local Government Group will be held on Wednesday 18 January 2016, 4:30pm at Local Government House, 148 Frome Street, Adelaide.

11. Close
2.1 Minutes of the meeting held 14 September 2016

Minutes of Previous Meeting
To: Metropolitan Local Government Group
From: MLGG Executive Committee
(LGA Contact – Danielle Bailey, Administration Coordinator)
Meeting: MLGG 9 November 2016
ECM: 644672 Attachment: 643128

Recommendation
That the Metropolitan Local Government Group confirms the minutes of the meeting held on 14 September 2016 as a true and accurate record.

Discussion
The minutes of the Metropolitan Local Government Group meeting held 14 September 2016 are attached.
Draft Minutes of the Metropolitan Local Government Group meeting held on Wednesday 14 September 2016 at Local Government House, 148 Frome Street, Adelaide.

2. Invited Guest Speaker

At 4:00pm, the Chairperson welcomed Hon Ian Hunter MLC, Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation; Minister for Water and the River Murray; Minister for Climate Change; Member of the Executive Council.

Minister Hunter discussed various issues, including:

- Carbon neutral cities agenda;
- LED street lighting;
- State and local government working together to build partnerships and deliver environmental programs;
- Zero Waste Local Government Program; and
- Industry Infrastructure grants.

The Minister then responded to questions from Members.

1. Welcome, Present & Apologies

The Chairperson officially opened the meeting at 4:35pm and welcomed members and staff.

1.1 Present

Lord Mayor Martin Haese  
Adelaide
Steve Harrison (Proxy for CEO)  
Adelaide
Mayor Bill Spragg*  
Adelaide Hills
CEO Andrew Aitken  
Adelaide Hills
Mayor David Parkin*  
Burnside
Mayor Simon Brewer  
Campbelltown
Mayor Angela Evans*  
Charles Sturt
Mayor Karen Redman  
Gawler
Mayor Stephen Patterson  
Holdfast Bay
CEO Adrian Skull  
Marion
1.2 Apologies

CEO Mario Barone  Norwood Payneham & St Peters
Mayor Glenn Docherty  Playford
CEO Mark Withers  Port Adelaide Enfield
Mayor Kevin Knight*  Tea Tree Gully
CEO Paul Sutton  Charles Sturt
3 Minutes of Previous Meeting

3.1 Minutes of the meeting held 13 July 2016

Moved Unley Seconded Mitcham that the Metropolitan Local Government Group confirms the minutes of the meeting held on 13 July 2016 as a true and accurate record.

CARRIED

3.2 Resolutions and Actions from previous meetings

Moved Prospect Seconded Adelaide that the Metropolitan Local Government Group notes progress with the resolutions resulting from the meeting of 13 July 2016

CARRIED

3.3 Business Arising

Nil.
4 Representative Reports and Updates

4.1 Report from the LGA President

Moved Unley Seconded Gawler that the Metropolitan Local Government Group notes the report.

CARRIED

4.2 Report from the MLGG Chairperson / Minutes of the MLGG Executive Committee meeting held 22 August 2016

Moved Unley Seconded Gawler that the Metropolitan Local Government Group notes the minutes of the MLGG Executive Committee meeting held on 22 August 2016.

CARRIED

4.3 Report from the Metropolitan CEOs Group Convenor

Moved Unley Seconded Gawler that the Metropolitan Local Government Group receives a verbal report outlining feedback from the Metropolitan CEOs Group session held on 24 August 2016 regarding the role and function of the Group during the MLGG workshop to be held during the meeting.

CARRIED

Moved Unley Seconded Gawler that items 4.1-4.3 be moved en bloc.

CARRIED

5 MLGG Annual Priorities

5:15pm Mayor Spear left the meeting

5.1 2016 Action Plan: Economic Development

Mayor Patterson from the City of Holdfast Bay gave a presentation on economic and tourism development initiatives that the council has undertaken.

Moved Prospect Seconded Playford that the Metropolitan Local Government Group:

1. notes the report;
2. endorses the key themes emerging from the Economic Development Think Tank meeting outlined in the report, being:
   a. Joint Advocacy
   b. Relationships
   c. Enabling Environment
3. identifies one priority action for each of the three themes of the Economic Development Think Tanks;
4. seeks a commitment from at least one council to pilot the implementation of each priority action and report to the Think Tank forum in November 2016 on the action undertaken;
5. discusses the presentation from the City of Holdfast Bay to identify opportunities for councils to undertake actions in partnership with businesses to advance tourism development activities; and
6. supports the priority projects of the Adelaide Metro Local Government Tourism Officers Network by:
   a. endorsing funding of $5,000 to support the South Australian Tourism Industry Council’s Local Government in Tourism Forum subject to the South Australian Tourism Commission confirming its contribution of $10,000, and
   b. requesting that the LGA Secretariat engage with the Adelaide Metro Local Government Tourism Officers Network to identify other ways for the MLGG to support their objectives.

CARRIED

9 Workshop – LGA Reviews Update and MLGG Input to Governance Review

5:25pm Mayor Clyne left the meeting.

6:07pm Mayor O’Loughlin and Cate Atkinson left the meeting

6:13pm Matt Pears left the meeting

Moved Gawler Seconded Campbelltown that the Metropolitan Local Government Group:

1. notes the update provided regarding the LGA Schemes & Governance Reviews;
2. notes that feedback concerning the role, purpose, function and structures of the LGA (including the MLGG) will be input to the overall LGA Board Governance Review; and
3. requests that the LGA Secretariat distributes the notes from the workshop.

CARRIED
5.2 Planning

Moved Adelaide Hills Seconded Walkerville that the Metropolitan Local Government Group:

1. notes the report;
2. receives the draft position paper ‘Local Heritage and Character’ that has been developed with input from metropolitan councils; and
3. requests that the LGA Secretariat undertake further consultation with the local government sector on the Local Heritage and Character position paper in order to develop a sector-wide LGA position on proposed local heritage reforms.

CARRIED

5.3 Improving Efficiency

Moved Gawler Seconded Adelaide that the Metropolitan Local Government Group:

1. notes the report; and
2. endorses the 2016 MLGG Annual Priority Report Improving Efficiency forward work plan.

CARRIED

5.4 Endorsed Activities: Precinct Planning / Cycling / Environment

Moved Adelaide Hills Seconded Salisbury that the Metropolitan Local Government Group:

1. notes the report; and
2. receives the final report titled “Alternatives to declaring a precinct under the Urban Renewal Act 1995”.

CARRIED

6 LGA Business

Nil.
7 MLGG Budget Position 1 July 2016 to 31 August 2016

Following the discussion in the workshop about the future of the Group, the meeting agreed to continue projects currently budgeted for as part of the 2016 Annual Plan.

Moved Walkerville Seconded Gawler that the Metropolitan Local Government Group notes the financial position of the MLGG from 1 July 2016 to 31 August 2016.

CARRIED

8 Urgent Business Affecting Metropolitan Councils

8.1 Heritage Forum

The Lord Mayor advised of the upcoming Heritage Forum on 21 September 2016 at the Town Hall.

8.2 Feedback on the new LGA website and location of meeting papers

Campbelltown queried why agendas are now password protected on the new LGA website. LGA Executive Director Corporate & Member Services, Kathy Jarrett responded to the question.

Gawler stated that minutes and agendas should be available to the public.

The Chairperson suggested that the Secretariat undertake a review of what parts of agenda could be publicly available on the website.

10 Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Metropolitan Local Government Group will be held on 9 November 2016 at 4:30pm in the Local Government Association Boardrooms, 148 Frome Street, Adelaide.

11 Close

The meeting was declared closed at 6:32pm.
Minutes confirmed

.............................................
Chairperson signature
Date .........................................


2.2 Resolutions from the meeting of 14 September 2016

Minutes of Previous Meeting
To: Metropolitan Local Government Group
From: MLGG Executive Committee
(LGA Contact – Danielle Bailey, Administration Coordinator)
Meeting MLGG 9 November 2016

Recommendation
That the Metropolitan Local Government Group notes the resolutions from the meeting held on 14 September 2016.

Discussion
The attached table shows progress of resolutions from the previous meeting of the Metropolitan Local Government Group
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resolution</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.1 2016 Action Plan: Economic Development</strong></td>
<td><strong>Ongoing</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor Patterson from the City of Holdfast Bay gave a presentation on</td>
<td>Unley, Prospect and Playford councils presented on their</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>economic and tourism development initiatives that the council has</td>
<td>projects being undertaken aligned with three themes to the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>undertaken.</td>
<td>MLGG Think Tank held on 13 October. Ongoing work will occur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>at each of these councils.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved Prospect Seconded Playford that the Metropolitan Local</td>
<td>The LGA Secretariat has participated in a meeting with the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Group:</td>
<td>South Australian Tourism Industry Council (SATIC) and the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SATC Wednesday 19 October 2016. The LGA Secretariat made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. notes the report;</td>
<td>the offer of the MLGG endorsed funding of $5,000 to support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. endorses the key themes emerging from the Economic Development</td>
<td>the South Australian Tourism Industry Council’s Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Think Tank meeting outlined in the report, being:</td>
<td>Government in Tourism Forum subject to the South Australian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Joint Advocacy</td>
<td>Tourism Commission confirming its contribution of $10,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Relationships</td>
<td>The SATC welcomed the offer and agreed to reply to the offer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Enabling Environment</td>
<td>in due course. Further, that SATIC will forward to the LGA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. identifies one priority action for each of the three themes of the</td>
<td>Secretariat an options paper as to how the remaining funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development Think Tanks;</td>
<td>could best be utilised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. seeks a commitment from at least one council to pilot the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>implementation of each priority action and report to the Think</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tank forum in November 2016 on the action undertaken;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. discusses the presentation from the City of Holdfast Bay to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>identify opportunities for councils to undertake actions in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>partnership with businesses to advance tourism development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>activities;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. supports the priority projects of the Adelaide Metro Local</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Tourism Officers Network by:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. endorsing funding of $5,000 to support the South</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Tourism Industry Council’s Local Government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Tourism Forum subject to the South Australian Tourism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission confirming its contribution of $10,000, and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>requesting that the LGA Secretariat engage with the Adelaide Metro Local Government Tourism Officers Network to identify other ways for the MLGG to support their objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>CARRIED</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td><strong>Workshop – LGA Reviews Update and MLGG Input to Governance Review</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moved Gawler Seconded Campbelltown that the Metropolitan Local Government Group:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. notes the update provided regarding the LGA Schemes &amp; Governance Reviews;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. notes that feedback concerning the role, purpose, function and structures of the LGA (including the MLGG) will be input to the overall LGA Board Governance Review; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. requests that the LGA Secretariat distributes the notes from the workshop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>CARRIED</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td><strong>Planning</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moved Adelaide Hills Seconded Walkerville that the Metropolitan Local Government Group:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. notes the report;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. receives the draft position paper ‘Local Heritage and Character’ that has been developed with input from metropolitan councils; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Completed</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consultation on the Local Heritage and Character position paper was undertaken across the local government sector and the LGA Board at its meeting on 29 September authorised the response to the State Government.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. requests that the LGA Secretariat undertake further consultation with the local government sector on the Local Heritage and Character position paper in order to develop a sector-wide LGA position on proposed local heritage reforms.

CARRIED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5.3 Improving Efficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moved Gawler Seconded Adelaide that the Metropolitan Local Government Group:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. notes the report; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. endorses the 2016 MLGG Annual Priority Report Improving Efficiency forward work plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CARRIED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5.4 Endorsed Activities: Precinct Planning / Cycling / Environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moved Adelaide Hills Seconded Salisbury that the Metropolitan Local Government Group:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. notes the report; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. receives the final report titled “Alternatives to declaring a precinct under the Urban Renewal Act 1995”.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CARRIED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7 MLGG Budget Position 1 July 2016 to 31 August 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Following the discussion in the workshop about the future of the Group, the meeting agreed to continue projects currently budgeted for as part of the 2016 Annual Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Completed

The Business Engagement paper was discussed at the MLGG Think Tank held on 13 October and a revised draft is being presented to the MLGG at the next meeting.

The MLGG will receive an updated forward work plan for this Priority at their meeting on 9 November 2016.

Completed

The MLGG received the report titled “Alternatives to declaring a precinct under the Urban Renewal Act 1995”. The report has been provided to councils and will be made available on the LGA website.

Completed

A further update on the budget position will be provided to the MLGG meeting in November.
Moved Walkerville Seconded Gawler that the Metropolitan Local Government Group notes the financial position of the MLGG from 1 July 2016 to 31 August 2016.

CARRIED

8.2 Feedback on the new LGA website and location of meeting papers
Campbelltown queried why agendas are now password protected on the new LGA website. LGA Executive Director Corporate & Member Services, Kathy Jarrett responded to the question.
Gawler stated that minutes and agendas should be available to the public.
The Chairperson suggested that the Secretariat undertake a review of what parts of agenda could be publicly available on the website.

After review of whether meeting agendas and minutes could be accessed by the public, these items have been moved to the LGA public website.
3.1 LGA President’s Report

Report from the LGA President

State Local Government Infrastructure Partnership

Following discussions with the LGA about opportunities to drive job growth and economic development through investment in infrastructure projects, the State Government recently announced a State Local Government Infrastructure Partnership. This is a ten year, $30 million program which is designed to bring forward infrastructure projects outlined in councils’ long term plans through provision of a 20% State Government grant, and a discounted borrowing rate through the Local Government Finance Authority. An application process for this program is being finalised, with applications to be assessed by the Treasurer, Minister for Local Government, and LGA. This is a terrific outcome for both councils, and their communities, which is going to generate jobs and provide residents with improved facilities.

Regional Youth Traineeship Program

Minister Brock recently announced a second round of funding for the Regional Youth Traineeship Program, which the LGA administers on behalf of the State Government. This $2 million program offers $14,500 a year to regional governance bodies across SA towards the cost of providing entry level employment for a trainee for two years. 57 trainees have been employed through the first round of the program, and it’s tremendous the program is going to be extended for a second round, and another group of young people in our regions will get their start in local government.

Boundary reform

A recent study commissioned by the Property Council on the potential benefits of council amalgamations has generated considerable media coverage. This study proposed cutting the number of South Australian councils from 68 to 32. The LGA’s policy position is we are opposed to forced amalgamations. Based on a number of academic studies, the LGA rejects the assertion that amalgamations will automatically yield economies of scale and lead to savings and better outcomes for communities. However, the LGA supports better processes for shared services and boundary reforms that are driven by councils in consultation with their communities, and we’re working with the Government to establish a clear and independent boundary adjustment process.

Expanded role for local government in emergency events

Recent changes to the State Emergency Management Plan have formally recognised the part councils play in emergency response, with the formation of the Local Government Functional Support Group. The extreme weather experienced across the State during September provided the first opportunity for councils to play a coordination role under this new structure, with representation inside the SES State Control Centre. The feedback we received from State emergency agencies was that our involvement was beneficial and we can build on this in the future, to provide an even better and more coordinated service to our communities during emergency events.
Conflict of interest provisions

The Government’s new regulations governing the contents of a council’s informal gatherings policy have been gazetted and will commence on Thursday 24 November 2016. The regulations also contain provisions which are intended to rectify problems councils have encountered in applying the new conflict of interest provisions which came into effect back in March, particularly in relation to council subsidiaries and committees. We will now monitor the implementation of these regulations, and wait to hear from councils as to whether all issues have been addressed.

Proposed Community Wellbeing program

The LGA has commenced discussions with SA Health about the possibility of establishing a co-funded Community Wellbeing program. This program would build on the strengths and successful outcomes of the OPAL program previously run in partnership between state and local government, and expand on it to encompass a whole of community approach including linkages between neighbouring councils. We are currently working on a proposal for this program which will be presented to the State Government.

Recommendation to the MLGG Committee

That the Metropolitan Local Government Group notes the report.
3.2 Report from the MLGG Executive Committee

Representative Report

To: Metropolitan Local Government Group  
From: MLGG Executive Committee  
(Contact – Mayor Lorraine Rosenberg, MLGG Chairperson)

Financial Implications: Nil

Meeting: MLGG  
9 November 2016

ECM: 844127

---------------------

Recommendation

That the Metropolitan Local Government Group notes the report containing the minutes of the MLGG Executive Committee meeting held Monday 17 October 2016.

Discussion

Following are the minutes of the MLGG Executive Committee meeting held on Monday 17 October 2016.

1. Welcome

   The Chairperson opened the meeting at 1:02pm and introduced members to the LGA’s new Senior Policy Advisor, Mr Sean Holden.

   1:04pm Mr Pears entered the meeting.

   Present:
   
   Mayor Lorraine Rosenberg (Onkaparinga) – MLGG Chairperson  
   Mayor Lachlan Clyne (Unley)  
   Mayor David Parkin (Burnside)  
   Mayor Karen Redman (Gawler) (from 1:11pm)  
   Mr Matt Pears (Mitcham) – Metro CEO Convenor (from 1:04pm)

   LGA Secretariat Staff in attendance:
   
   Ms Lisa Teburea, Executive Director Public Affairs  
   Ms Kathy Jarrett, Executive Director Corporate & Member Services  
   Mr Stephen Smith, Director Policy  
   Mr Sean Holden, Senior Policy Advisor  
   Mrs Danielle Bailey, Administration Coordinator (Minutes)

2. Apologies / Not Present

   Mayor Dave Burgess (Mid-Murray) – LGA President  
   Mayor Bill Spragg (Adelaide Hills)  
   Mr Matt Pinnegar, LGA Chief Executive Officer
3. Minutes of the previous MLGG Executive Committee meeting held 22 August 2016
Moved Mayor Parkin Seconded Mayor Clyne that the MLGG Executive Committee accepts the minutes of the meeting held 22 August 2016 as a true and accurate record.

CARRIED

4. Draft agenda for the 9 November 2016 Metropolitan Local Government Group meeting
The MLGG Executive Committee requested that all reports on 2016 MLGG Priorities and Endorsed Activities include a summary of the actions that have been achieved and any outstanding projects.

Action:
MLGG Annual Priorities and Endorsed Activities reports to be updated to reflect achievements and outstanding activities.

4.1. Economic Development
- Outcomes of the recent MLGG Economic Development Think Tank meeting to be added to the report. It was requested that the discussion about automatic re-enrolment of businesses for local government elections and opportunity for joint advocacy with the business sector on this issue be captured as an outcome of the Think Tank meeting.
- Mr Holden was asked to follow up with the City of Salisbury to confirm the Economic Development presentation for the November MLGG meeting.

1:11pm Mayor Redman entered the meeting.

Action:
- Update report to include outcomes of recent MLGG Economic Development Think Tank meeting.
- Follow up with the City of Salisbury to confirm their presentation to the November MLGG meeting about Economic Development initiatives.

4.2. Planning
- The MLGG Executive Committee requested that the 30-Year Plan submission include commentary about coastal management challenges and the pressure on stormwater infrastructure from higher density development.
- The Committee also raised concerns about the costs to councils to undertake Development Plan Amendments required due to changes in state government planning policy. Changes to Character Preservation Areas are an example of this.

Action:
- Update the 30-year plan submission to include stormwater management and coastal management issues.

4.3. Improving Efficiency
- Positive feedback was received about the Business Engagement document at the Economic Development Think Tank meeting.
4.4. Precinct Planning / Cycling / Environment
- Precinct Planning Project is now complete and has been circulated to councils.
- Mayor Parkin provided an updated on discussions with Rose Park Primary School about the cycling project.
- Energy Efficiency workshop has been delayed pending the Premier’s availability. The MLGG Executive Committee asked that options be presented to the MLGG about whether/how to continue with this action.
- Consider the inclusion of a presentation from the consultant in relation to building upgrade finance as part of an Energy Efficiency workshop.

**Action:**
- Mayor Parkin to provide an update to MLGG regarding cycling.
- Update recommendation in the report to include options in relation to progressing the Energy Efficiency workshop and a presentation on building upgrade finance.

5. Guest speaker requests received
Ms Teburea advised that DPTI staff have offered to present regularly to MLGG on the implementation of planning reforms and related matters. The MLGG Executive Committee felt that this is information is already being conveyed by the Secretariat but appreciated the offer for DPTI staff to be invited on an ‘as needed’ basis.

**Action:**
- Thank DPTI for the offer to present regularly at MLGG meetings and advise that an invitation will be provided on an ‘as needed’ basis.

6. Council Initiated Business Received
Nil received.

7. Outcomes of the MLGG Governance Forum and update on the LGA Governance Review
Ms Jarrett provided an update on the Governance Review consultations.

The MLGG Executive Committee noted that full implementation of changes resulting from the Governance Review will not occur until after the 2018 local government elections, however the MLGG could start to make interim changes to the current LGA Constitution and the Group’s Terms of Reference, in order to make changes to the way the Group operates, should it wish to do so.

Ms Jarret advised that an update on consultation on the governance review will be provided to the MLGG meeting in November.

Mr Pears advised that the CEOs will be meeting as an LG Professionals group in the future.

Ms Teburea noted that the MLGG’s budget requirements would need to be investigated should the structure of the MLGG change. Ms Teburea further advised the MLGG Executive Committee of the current process for MLGG funding through the LGR&DS Regional Capacity Building project and co-contributions by metropolitan councils.
Action:
- Include the following in a report to the MLGG November meeting:
  - Timeframes for governance changes to take place; and
  - Suggested way forward for the MLGG as a whole.
- Allow adequate time for discussion on this matter during the November meeting.

8. Planning for MLGG in 2017
- A budget report will be included in the agenda for the November MLGG meeting.
- Discussions will be commenced at the November meeting about the purpose and structure of MLGG in 2017, including whether there will be priorities and action plans.
- Election of MLGG Chairperson and Executive Committee to be put on hold until the January 2017 meeting as the election of metropolitan Board Members will still be in progress at the time of the November 2016 MLGG meeting.

Action:
- A report regarding the deferment of the election of MLGG Chairperson and Executive Committee to be included in the agenda.

9. Any Other Business
- Mr Pears was asked to call a meeting of the Metropolitan CEOs Group to provide further input into the Governance Review.

Action:
- Metro CEO Convenor to call a meeting of the CEOs to provide further input into the LGA Governance Review.

The meeting was declared closed at 2:25pm.

Financial Implications
Nil
4.1 Economic Development

MLGG Annual Priority Report

To: Metropolitan Local Government Group
From: MLGG Executive Committee 12 October 2016
(LGA Contact – Sean Holden, Senior Policy Adviser)

Financial Implications: Nil

Meeting: MLGG 9 November 2016
ECM: 643944 Attachment: 639397, 642690, 644765

Recommendation

That the Metropolitan Local Government Group:

1. notes the report;
2. notes the summary of the Think Tank forum held in October 2016;
3. notes that the November Think Tank has been deferred, pending a review process including Think Tank and MLGG members; and
4. receives and discusses the presentation from the City of Salisbury and recommends that member councils consider the application of similar economic development initiatives within their council.

Discussion

At the January 2016 MLGG meeting, the Group endorsed the MLGG 2016 Annual Priority Action Plan for Economic Development (attached) and the resources that will be required to deliver it.

This report provides an update on the outstanding projects and initiatives in the 2016 Action Plan.

Report to MLGG following the October 2016 Think Tank meeting

Four Think Tank forums have now been held; two in 2015, one in August 2016 and the most recent one in October 2016. The format of the forum has been revised to enable a more inclusive discussion between business leaders, Mayors and CEOs.

At the October Think Tank meeting, members considered and discussed Joint Advocacy (local government and business working together to achieve greater influence on State and Commonwealth Government issues), Relationships (ensuring councils take a productive approach to building partnerships and opportunities to collaborate with businesses) and Enabling Environment (creating the right conditions to support businesses in the local economy). The Think Tank discussed a range of topics during an open table discussion; notes from the Think Tank session are attached. A key issue identified during discussion was the issue of automatic enrolment of businesses on the voter role, there is the potential for joint advocacy between business and local government on this matter.
In consultation with the MLGG Chair and champion of the Economic Development priority, Mayor Lorraine Rosenberg, the Think Tank meeting that was tentatively scheduled for November has been deferred. Deferring the November Think Tank meeting provides an opportunity for the LGA Secretariat to undertake a review and seek feedback from Think Tank and MLGG members on the outcomes achieved from the forums held to date.

**MLGG members to report / present on a council initiative in economic development at an MLGG meeting**

A representative from the City of Salisbury Council will present to the MLGG on an economic development initiative. Following the presentation, it is recommended that MLGG has a discussion to identify opportunities for councils to undertake similar economic development initiatives within their council.

**Receive a report from the Metro Local Government Tourism Officers Network regarding their priority activities for 2016 along with any resource requirements**

The MLGG has endorsed a budget of $10,000 to support priority projects of this new network. To determine how this funding would be spent, the network was asked to identify their priority activities for 2016 along with any resource requirements. The network has identified the following five initiatives and has established working groups to progress these:

1. Local Government in Tourism Forum;
2. Adelaide Tourism Expo;
3. Standardised data collection and return on investment information;
4. Joint marketing; and
5. Industry capability / support for local tourism businesses (e.g. cultural awareness).

At the September 2016 MLGG meeting, the MLGG endorsed the provision of $5,000 (from within the allocated budget of $10,000) to support a Local Government Tourism Forum. This Forum is being held in 2016 and planning is underway.

As this stage it is not clear how the MLGG could best support the network’s other priorities through the allocation of $5,000. The LGA Secretariat will engage further with the network to identify other ways their objectives and the priorities of the MLGG can be mutually supported.

**Hold an economic development forum based on the Property Council's Mainstreet Best Practice guides (Priority 6)**

One of the priority objectives of the MLGG 2016 Economic Development Action Plan is to ‘Promote the importance of mainstreet amenity and streetscaping’, with an action to hold an economic development forum based on the Property Council’s Mainstreet Best Practice guides.

The Property Council of Australia (SA) recently released part two of its Mainstreet Best Practice Guide and both parts were strongly recommended by members of the Think Tank. As such, the MLGG Economic Development Action Plan endorsed $150 funding to host a forum for metropolitan councils, based on the guides.

The original plan was to hold a Mainstreet Best Practice Forum event in September or October. However, given the timing this is now being scheduled for December 2016. The chair of the Property Council of Australia (SA) has agreed to speak at this forum and Lord Mayor Martin Haese will also be invited to speak, given his involvement in the development of the guides.
The Mainstreet Best Practice Forum will be promoted to all metropolitan council staff and elected members once a date has been confirmed. This event responds to the Economic Development Think Tank’s recommendation that councils gain a better understanding of the value of main streets as a point of focus for council areas and to drive their performance with a focus on vacancy rates.

**Investigate ways metropolitan councils can facilitate and nurture business innovation, particularly start-ups, referencing the Australian Government’s National Innovation and Science Agenda**

The MLGG has allocated a budget of $10,000 to progress this work.

A Project Plan has been created to progress this initiative, but due to staff changes in the Secretariat, a tender process has not progressed.

This work will be progressed and reported to the MLGG in 2017.
The MLGG 2016 Economic Development Action Plan has been developed based on the work of the MLGG in 2015, including Economic Development Forums and the outcomes of the Economic Development Think Tank, as well as the State Government’s 10 Economic Priorities as an agreed priority for the Premier’s State-Local Government Forum, along with the LGA Economic Development Statement.

MLGG Economic Development Champion - Mayor Lorraine Rosenberg

Total MLGG Budget Allocation - $40,650 (+ $45,000 RDA Adelaide Metro funding for LG China engagement program - 2015-2016 & 2016-2017)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2016 Economic Development Priorities (8)</th>
<th>MLGG Meeting Date</th>
<th>Target Actions and Milestones</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Current Status</th>
<th>Next Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Investigate ways metropolitan councils can facilitate and nurture business innovation, particularly start-ups, referencing the Australian Government’s National Innovation and Science Agenda.</td>
<td>May 2016</td>
<td>Develop guidelines for councils to provide a supportive environment for new businesses.</td>
<td>$10,000 consultant budget</td>
<td>Project brief prepared, but no consultant engaged to date.</td>
<td>Engage a consultant and progress this work for completion in 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work with industry leaders to inform policy positions and undertake joint advocacy to ensure there’s an industry perspective.</td>
<td>March 2016</td>
<td>Prepare a directory of relevant State Government officers to facilitate improved connection and communication between councils and State Government agencies.</td>
<td>LGA Project Officer</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>July 2016</td>
<td>Work with industry leaders to develop policy positions and undertake joint advocacy – e.g. for funding for economic infrastructure projects.</td>
<td>Metropolitan councils</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>November 2016</td>
<td>Prepare a consolidated, prioritised list of major Adelaide economic infrastructure projects requiring funding.</td>
<td>$5,000 consultant LGA secretariat project manager</td>
<td>To be discontinued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop adaptable how-to guides on ways councils can engage with their local business communities to achieve tangible economic development outcomes.</td>
<td>September 2016</td>
<td>Develop adaptable how-to guides on ways councils engage with their local business communities.</td>
<td>$5,000 consultant budget Project manager – LGA Senior Policy Adviser</td>
<td>Transferred to Improving Efficiency Action Plan. Completed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Hold three **Think Tank**
   meetings to advance
   Local Government
   performance in these
   areas:
   1) Create new
      businesses
   2) Grow existing
      businesses
   3) Property
development

| Think Tank meeting dates have now been set: |
| 10 August |
| 13 October |
| 14 November |

| Report to MLGG following each Think Tank meeting: |
| September 2016 |
| November 2016 |
| January 2017 |

| LGA Senior Policy Adviser |
| $3,000 |
| $4,000 |
| $3,000 |
| $10,000 |
| LGA Secretariat /Events Assistant |

4 Think Tank meetings have been held.
3 Councils have volunteered to pilot actions arising from the Think Tank.

Review of the Think Tank to be undertaken by the Secretariat including electronic survey to constituent members.
Seek further volunteer councils to progress the actions arising from the Think Tank.

5. Share ideas and examples of leading and effective practice in economic development through forums and **case studies**.

| March 2016 |
| Develop an online resource of best practice case studies and relevant reference material of SA councils in economic development. |

| LGA Project Officer |

Completed
Source case studies and relevant reference material – ongoing.

6. Promote the importance of **mainstreet amenity** and streetscaping.

| May 2016 |
| Hold an economic development forum based on the Property Council’s Mainstreet Best Practice guides. |

| $150 meeting expenses |
| LGA Secretariat |

Planning underway
Event to be held in December date confirmed once speakers locked-in. Budget $3000 derived from the final Think Tank event no longer occurring.

7. Invite members to provide presentations/reports to the MLGG on the initiatives they implemented, including those that have not been

| May 2016 |
| July 2016 |
| September 2016 |
| November 2016 |

| MLGG members to report/present on a council initiative in economic development at an MLGG meeting. |

| LGA Senior Policy Adviser |

November – Salisbury invited
Salisbury to confirm participation
| 8. Support the newly formed Metro Local Government Tourism Officers Network to undertake projects of mutual benefit. | November 2016 | Receive a report from the Metro Local Government Tourism Officers Network regarding their priority activities for 2016 along with any resource requirements. | $10,000 project funding | The MLGG has allocated $5000 to support a Local Government Tourism forum. |
| | September 2016 | Inbound Mission | LGA Senior Policy Adviser | Ongoing coordination of activities. The business to business website (South Australia Shandong District) SASD Connect to be launched 8 November 2016. |
| | November 2016 | | | |

$10,000 project funding LGA Senior Policy Adviser

The MLGG has allocated $5000 to support a Local Government Tourism forum.

Planning for forum with the LG Network and SATIC is underway.

Local Government China engagement

Outbound Mission

Inbound Mission

Ongoing coordination of activities. The business to business website (South Australia Shandong District) SASD Connect to be launched 8 November 2016.
## MLGG Economic Development Think Tank – summary of recommendations and actions

### Theme 1: Joint Advocacy – local government and business working together to achieve greater influence on State and Commonwealth Government issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Think Tank Recommendations</th>
<th>Suggested Council Actions</th>
<th>Measuring Success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Local Government and business working together to jointly advocate for change – e.g. for continued investment in infrastructure promoted by Local Government as a collective, specifying needs and target projects. | Work with industry leaders to develop policy positions and undertake joint advocacy. Issues could include:  
- The review of the 30 Year Plan for Greater Adelaide  
- A consolidated, prioritised list of major Adelaide economic infrastructure projects requiring funding  
- Red tape reduction of State Government regulations  
- Electricity costs  
- Small bar licenses | • Local government and businesses are supporting each other in the media  
• Local government and businesses are making joint approaches to Ministers and other decision makers to influence change  
• Local government and businesses have successfully worked together to attract grant funding for a joint project  
• Local government and businesses have worked together to solve a problem. |
| Advocacy could include attracting more federal and state government grant funding to their regions, promote local government as a driver of economic development and promote the work that Councils do in economic development. | • South Australia has an enhanced reputation as an easier place to do business.  
• Business has a more positive view of local government and its role in economic development. | |
| Work with State Government on opportunities for red tape reduction conducive to business development. | Councils seek input from their business leaders on opportunities to reduce red tape and jointly develop an advocacy platform for the removal or streamlining of State Government regulation that impacts on local government and business sector efficiency. | |
| Pilot a working group of business and local government representatives to resolve an issue that is detrimental to local business and economic development, applicable to metropolitan Adelaide councils. | Identify an issue that would benefit from a joint local government- business response.  
Establish a working group and work together to identify a solution. | • Local government and businesses have worked together to solve a problem. |
**Theme 2: Relationships** – ensuring councils take a proactive approach to building partnerships and opportunities to collaborate with businesses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Think Tank Recommendations</th>
<th>Suggested Council Actions</th>
<th>Measuring Success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Open dialogue and listen to business. | Council CEOs/senior staff should make direct contact with, and visit local businesses to seek ideas and feedback about how local economic development can be improved. | • Council decisions are made with a better understanding of the needs of the business community.  
• Councils can target the attraction of businesses that complement and add value to existing businesses (clustering, smart specialisation) |
| Engage with your local business community | Identify and meet with your top 10 businesses and your top 10 start-ups / rising stars.  
Consider facilitating mentor relationships between the two groups – create a business networking hub. | • Council has a better understanding of its business community and is better positioned to promote the success stories in the area.  
• A stronger local business community has been created to drive and promote economic development in the area. |
| Come together with businesses to discuss relevant issues | Consult with local businesses on certain issues, invite them to participate in specific plans. | • Council decisions are made with a better understanding of the needs of the business community.  
• Greater ‘buy in’ and support from the business community.  
• Opportunity to better educate businesses about rates, governance requirements, council budgets etc. |
The value of developing clusters – clusters provide councils with the opportunity to differentiate from one another.

| Develop a policy to create a cluster. Identify why particular industries already choose to locate in particular regions and why (i.e. identify natural comparative advantages of regions). Clusters can be developed in two ways: either by growing existing businesses or bringing in existing businesses. In creating clusters, ‘Councils must not tread on each other’s toes’. Councils’ economic development officers are well positioned to identify the clusters most appropriate to their regions, obviously based on their competitive advantages that are attractive to particular industries. Facilitating the development and strengthening of clusters can be as simple as bringing the right people together to enable networking. Councils could do this really well, for example, by holding such events and providing industry-relevant expert speakers. | • Councils can target the attraction of businesses that complement and add value to existing businesses • Greater brand definition for the council • Growing the economy by diversifying industries and bringing in new businesses rather than competing to relocate existing businesses between councils. |
### Theme 3: Enabling Environment – creating the right conditions to support businesses in the local economy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Think Tank Recommendations</th>
<th>Suggested Council Actions</th>
<th>Measuring Success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop an environment that enables people to try things, fail quickly, learn, improve,</td>
<td>Develop guidelines to provide a supportive environment for new businesses.</td>
<td>• Increased number of successful start-ups within the council area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>succeed; for example, reducing costs for start-ups, which need cheap working spaces.</td>
<td>Reduce the cost of start-ups; review rigid zoning requirements; encourage trials.</td>
<td>• Enhanced council reputation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce compliance costs, e.g. consider a moratorium on some rules and fees to stimulate</td>
<td>Adopt a ‘streamline and simplify’ methodology to reduce red tape in council policies and</td>
<td>• Reduced costs for both councils and businesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development.</td>
<td>processes.</td>
<td>• Reduced approval times for planning consents and other permits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streamline planning assessments for minor development</td>
<td>Enable electronic lodgement of payments and documents (noting this has been achieved in</td>
<td>• Increased online interaction between businesses and councils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>many councils)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undertake regular red tape reviews.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Make removing red tape a KPI of CEOs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify the barriers to establishing a small business and develop strategies to reduce</td>
<td>Create a working group of council staff and elected members to establish a hypothetical</td>
<td>• Build a more practical understanding of the issues confronting small businesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>these. Educate councils to gain a better understanding of what it takes to establish a</td>
<td>small business as a way of identifying barriers that local government may be able to</td>
<td>and the role that councils can play in removing barriers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>small business.</td>
<td>remove.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage business people to run for council or attend council meetings</td>
<td>Do away with holding council meetings at night, antiquated meeting regulations, minutes,</td>
<td>• Council meetings are more accessible to all community members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>long-winded, poorly run meetings</td>
<td>• More members of the local business community are candidates in the 2018 council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Make meetings shorter and to the point to attract the business community</td>
<td>elections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hold webcam meetings, hold meetings at different locations across the council area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ask why you do ‘it’ that way and whether you really do need to do it that way. Is there a better way?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOTE- Councils are bound by the requirements of legislation in terms of how meetings are held and managed. NOTE- Most councils already employ the strategies that are being suggested</td>
<td>Red tape is usually there for a reason, need to work out how to work within those parameters. It’s not possible to remove red tape entirely. What people are really saying is that they need help to navigate their way through, e.g. via a concierge service or case management approach.</td>
<td>Undertake a project to experience standing in your customers’ shoes. Links to the ‘Case Management Roles’ project being undertaken as part of the MLGG Improving Efficiency Priority that will investigate the existing and potential use of ‘case management’ roles within councils to assist businesses and investors to navigate regulatory processes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Develop a more practical understanding of business engagement with council at various stages of the business lifecycle.  
- Evaluation of a case management style service that receives feedback from businesses on their engagements with council.
MLGG Economic Development Think Tank

Thursday, 13 October 2016, 12.00-2.00pm at the Hilton Hotel, Victoria Square

Meeting Notes

Meeting Theme: Growing New Business

Think Tank Members Present:
Mayor Lorraine Rosenberg (City of Onkaparinga); LGA President, Mayor Dave Burgess; Mayor Lachlan Clyne (City of Unley); Mayor Angela Evans (City of Charles Sturt); Mayor Glenn Spear (City of Mitcham); Trish Aukett; Richard Blandy; Melissa Bright; Andrew Cohen; Justin Commons; Penny Crocker; John Devine; Marty Gauvin; John Harry; Phil Harrison; Con Maios; Steve Maras; Louise Miller-Frost; John Moyle; Chris Newby; Matthew Pears; Bridget Ransome; Greg Sarre; Doug Strain; Kelvin Trimper; James Williams.

LGA SA staff present: Lisa Teburea; Stephen Smith; Lea Bacon; Tamsin Scholz; Sean Holden.

Apologies: Nick Begakis; Brenton Cox; Mayor Glenn Docherty; Helen Edwards; John Giannitto; Anthony Kittel; Mayor David O’Loughlin; Vincent Tremaine.

Mayor Lorraine Rosenberg from the City of Onkaparinga welcomed everyone to the final Think Tank for 2016

Council presentations followed exploring three themes that underpin “Growing new business”:

1. **Enabling Environment** (Creating the right conditions to support businesses in the local economy): Mayor Lachlan Clyne, **City of Unley**

2. **Relationships** (ensuring councils take a productive approach to building partnerships and opportunities to collaborate with businesses): **Chris Newby, City of Prospect**

3. **Joint Advocacy** (local government and business working together to achieve greater influence on State and Commonwealth Government issues): **Phil Harrison, City of Playford**
Agenda Item 1: Council Presentations: actions on Think Tank themes

Mayor Lachlan Clyne, City of Unley – Enabling Environment

The Mayor of the City of Unley Lachlan Clyne delivered a presentation on the “Enabling Environment” for business.

Key Messages:

Unley are in the process of surveying all businesses about the issues experienced when starting-up.

- They have held workshops on “digital literacy” where small business owners have learnt how to use Social Media.
- The “Business Hub/Incubator” idea for the Goodwood library received a 1000 signature petition from residents/business against the move.
- The CEO is currently investigating a case management service and if it is financially viable.
- The Unley City Council website contains information for businesses including: current commercial leasing opportunities, the multi-award winning digital platform ‘Find Your Everything – Unley Precincts’ Program, contacts for the four Traders Associations, listing and links to Business Training and Support via Business SA, Eastside BEC, DSD and Mainstreet SA.
- Unley Business Breakfasts
- Information on food and beverage businesses

Chris Newby Director Economic Development and Communications, City of Prospect - Relationships

Key Messages:

- The challenge for Prospect was to engage local businesses and encourage clusters.
- Engaging through traditional means was difficult and received little feedback, so the council had to go back and consider their approach and come up with something different.
- Council is not afraid of failure, and will quickly reframe the discussion if they don’t get a strong response when first engaging with business.
- Building relationships before asking businesses to do something for the council was important. Build a strong rapport and your businesses should respond better that way.
- They are encouraging the tenants (businesses) to ask more from landlords (ratepayers) in terms of engagement with council.
- The Network Prospect business support services provided by Council cover NBN and Small Business, Engagement with China, Eastside BEC, Funding options and various business networking events.
Phil Harrison, City of Playford – Joint Advocacy

Key messages:

- The City of Playford has an advocacy resource that sits in the economic development team and works across the council as well as working closely with the economic development team, providing a strategic focus.
- The advocacy approach tends to deal more on a political front with State and Commonwealth departments to resolve issues that are or potentially will impact on the Playford business community.
- An example is the Playford/Salisbury partnership of the Polaris Centre. The centre is focused on small business but offers a range of assistance to all businesses operating in the Salisbury and Elizabeth districts covered by the two councils or wanting to relocate to the North.
- Playford has a strong commitment to business support and getting the message out through our involvement in the Northern Economic Leaders (NEL) group and the Rotary managed Northern Business Breakfast (NBB).
- The Playford Advocacy & Economic Development Resources are employing a case management approach for business, providing support and information on navigating regulations and any other blockages that confront the Playford business community.
- Playford is currently involved through the State Government, Port Adelaide Enfield and Salisbury Councils in a unique framework in the guise of the Northern Economic Plan (NEP) and the Look North narrative.
- Local government can be involved in getting its community including its business community activated in the economic reform of the NDIS.
- For example, it could be as simple as partnering or attracting a Registered Training Organisation (RTO) to deliver a Certificate III in Disability, so residents have the skills and are job ready to work in the disability sector. Another practical example would be for Councils to run information sessions for business owners on what the NDIS is and what it means for their business and how they can become a registered provider so they can get a slice of the action.
- Procurement is a strong area where councils can pro-actively use their purchasing power to drive local economic growth. Revamping procurement policies to achieve this is a practical way councils can also support their business community.
- An area where Councils need to be vigilant in their dealings with business is their own internal processes that may work against business ventures. This could be in the form of a planning approval reliant on the growth of the business. A business waiting before it can expand or change operating hours can be counter-productive for business growth and local employment.

Discussion

- Concierge services should also take into consideration “State Government” issues – don’t focus only on the local government side of regulation.
- We should be creating the environment that gives start-ups the confidence to fail.
The voice of local government.

- The Renew Adelaide model has been a huge success in encouraging startups to take over empty buildings.
- Culture – there is a vast difference between councils around Australia and attitude towards business and the relationship between the two is heavily influenced by council culture. Development, growth and engagement etc. won't happen if the culture isn't fixed.
- Better planning philosophies and processes will assist business enormously.
- Constantly battling against car parking regulations and levies – huge barrier to change in land use.
- Be more open. Defend your planning policies, but be more open.

**Agenda Item 2: Feedback on ‘Business Engagement’ paper**

a. The document is a good start, a good 101.
b. Councils are incredibly opaque. Job titles mean nothing to the business community – and businesses want to know who they are speaking with.
c. There is a need for councils to understand their audience – they are busy earning a quid – while also helping business deal with council.
d. Engage on the terms and conditions of business – out of hours, child care, parking cost – it cannot be just on the council’s terms.
e. Ask the business community when and how they would like to be engaged.
f. Use your business leaders and existing networks to engage.
g. You have to close the loop – go back and tell people what you did with their feedback.
h. Use subject matter experts – draw the audience with a key note speaker etc. – and someone who can add value to the engagement, rather than someone with a limited knowledge of the subject at hand who cannot add value.
i. Social media – need to better link to our other guidelines.
j. Too focused on community. Leave out ‘community’ when you’re talking about the ‘business community’ – just say business!
k. The Property Council has an information/call centre set up to help tenants deal with councils specifically – they don’t want to have to do this.
l. Partnering v. engagement – engagement can have a conflict element.
m. Councils can make use of their Mainstreet committees etc. to reach their business communities. Business people listen to other business people.
n. Property franchise enrolment in local government elections- an opportunity for joint advocacy between local government and the business sector.

**Agenda Item 3: Growing New Businesses Table Topic Discussion**

The forum was divided into five tables and each table was given a question to explore. The idea was to glean from the participants what was “Front of Mind”.

---

---
The voice of local government.

**Topic 1 Examples of how planning or other policies which council implement can positively or negatively affect:**

a) The numbers of start-ups
b) Those being successful

Start-Ups find it difficult to navigate their way through planning philosophies, policies, processes and practitioners.

However, in some councils “Case Managers” and changes to the way planning is treated has helped start-ups be more successful.

Case Management can significantly affect the numbers of start-ups and the likelihood of them being successful.

Parking space levy is a levy on parking spaces in a prescribed district. It was introduced to discourage car use in business districts by imposing a levy on off-street commercial and office parking spaces. This of course a barrier to trade and the amount levied on each car park in each council varies greatly. The Holdfast Bay City Council reduced its levy significantly and the result was an invigorated business environment.

An alternative but complimentary interface with the community via a sub-committee, such as the Mainstreet Committee, can assist enormously in business growth.

The new ICAC Conflict of Interest laws and interpretations can stymie involvement in the political process.

The LGA SA could look at how Victoria supports their mainstreet associations and groups (Mainstreet Australia). This type of arrangement will assist with business engagement.

The Business Improvement District (BID) works independently of council. A business improvement district (BID) is a defined area within which businesses are required to pay an additional tax (or levy) in order to fund projects within the district’s boundaries. The BID is often funded primarily through the levy but can also draw on other public and private funding streams.

Technical and/or digital policies help businesses get online.

**Topic 2 Growing New Businesses can mean a) increasing the number of start-ups and b) assisting already established new businesses grow. Discuss how both meanings are handled by councils and allied agencies.**

a) Increasing the number of Start-Ups requires a focus from council that promotes the activity. This could mean a special focus that includes marketing, how-to tools, mentoring, tutoring and seed funding. For Start-Ups knowledge is king and if councils are concentrating more on administration issues (Planning, forms etc.) then most Start Ups won’t bother. There exists a plethora of programs and services for new business ventures but they are not coordinated into one place (virtual and/or physical).

b) Assisting already established businesses to grow is about councils working with RDAs or BECs to provide master-classes and forums on marketing, governance, human resource management, MYOB. It’s about connecting them with business organisations, government industry leadership
groups etc. It is about the same types of things as for Start-Ups. It's not about leaving them alone as invariably they need assistance as they go through the growth cycles.

**Topic 3 Business is all about profit and councils are about services. Recognising that both have a different goal how can business and councils work together to assist the other?**

It is clear that whilst for business the imperative is to make a profit and that for council the core business can be described as “Roads, Rates and Rubbish” both do much more and have more in common than otherwise. Both, for example, have stakeholders and customers to satisfy.

Businesses are reluctant to speak out about issues (planning policy etc.) because they don’t want to alienate their customers- which are the local residents.

Councils need to create a “safe environment” that encourages, promotes and values questioning and change.

Councils also should strive for “economic viability” just like businesses do.

The relationship should be more B2B or Business to Business.

Business needs council to provide an attractive and enabling business environment.

**Topic 4 What are the Top 5 things the LGA SA could do to assist with growing new businesses or supporting councils to assist business?**

The Top 5 things the LGA SA could do to assist with growing new businesses or supporting councils to assist businesses are:

1. Information Hub (Provide Best Practice Information)
2. Advocacy Role (Development Policies etc.)
3. Economic Development Strategies
4. Run the Business Support Centres
5. Maintain a network of Economic Development Officers
6. Business should have the ability to access appropriate LGA SA staff via an accessible electronic list such as SA Connect.

**Topic 5 How important is the relationships between the business sector and the local council in achieving their aims and objectives?**

Relationships are extremely important and they can vary from council to council, business to business as each council has its own “personality”.

The key is understanding each other’s needs and wants.

For business to invest, for people to spend there must be confidence. This confidence comes from the leadership, philosophies, practices and culture of the council. The council must have a clear and enunciated vision that captures current and future commercial activity. The business and general community form an opinion of the “brand” of the council, for example “Open for Business” etc.
The voice of local government.

The council must have a good working relationship with the State and Federal Governments. The community invariably looks to the council to be the voice of reason and the social conscience and at the same time the council needs to promote growth. The perception of councils can often be that they are “risk averse” but at the same time they need to ensure that best-practice and robust rigor is applied to initiatives.
4.2 Planning

MLGG Annual Priority Report

To: Metropolitan Local Government Group
From: MLGG Executive Committee
(LGA Contact – Stephen Smith, Director Policy)
Financial Implications: Nil
Meeting: MLGG 9 November 2016
ECM: 643946 Attachments: 633602, 643774, 643755

Recommendation
That the Metropolitan Local Government Group notes the report.

Discussion
Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016

The Statutes Amendment (Planning Development & Infrastructure) Bill 2016 was introduced in the House of Assembly by the Minister for Planning on 21 September 2016. This Bill provides the framework for the transition between the Development Act 1993 and the Planning, Development & Infrastructure Act 2016.

A report was provided to the LGA Board at its meeting on 29 September 2016, the Board was which advised that the LGA had received a copy of the Bill on a confidential basis prior to it being introduced in parliament and had engaged Wallmans Lawyers to review the Bill and provide advice.

The Transition Bill is largely procedural in nature and provides further detail about the timing and process of ‘turning on’ aspects of the new system. The first major implementation milestone will be the establishment of the State Planning Commission by April 2017. Once established, the Commission will then take responsibility for preparing and implementing other aspects of the system such as the Community Engagement Charter and the Planning and Design Code.

The briefing note to the Board highlighted the key issues with the Bill that the LGA has raised with DPTI and the Minister’s office. The LGA Secretariat will provide an update on the progress of the Bill at the November MLGG meeting.

Cost Impacts of the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016

The LGA is seeking to help the local government sector to understand the potential cost impacts (or benefits) of the new legislation when implemented, to enable councils to factor these costs into their annual and long term budget planning cycles.

The LGA has commenced this project by engaging consulting firm UHY Haines Norton to provide an analysis of the current costs to councils of implementing the current Development Act 1993, including development assessment, strategic planning and compliance.
The LGA has sought interest from four councils to work with our consultant to understand the activities required under the current Act, the types of costs and resources required and enable testing of data capture methods. The four councils to be involved are City of Onkaparinga, City of West Torrens, Coorong District Council and City of Port Lincoln. Following the testing of the methodology the project will be rolled out across all councils between now and the end of 2016.

**Regional Planning Boards**

Following on from the workshop held on 7 September 2016 relating to Regional Planning Boards, a revised Discussion Paper has been prepared and forwarded to participants for comment. Section 4.5 of the draft report has identified three possible actions being:

1. That further examination and clarification of what planning agreements can and cannot do be undertaken.
2. That an appropriate person from interstate with experience of operating RPBs or their equivalent (most likely from either Western Australia or New South Wales) be invited to present the case for RPBs to the Metropolitan Local Government Group, LGA and DPTI.
3. That a small number of pilot RPBs be undertaken. It would be desirable for these pilots to be set up in a way that allows for the testing of various scenarios or functions that RPBs would perform. To this end, a number of participant councils indicated their willingness to be involved in the establishment of pilot RPBs. In response, the LGA has indicated that it would work collaboratively with DPTI to progress this idea.

There is an opportunity for the MLGG to discuss these actions and consider the next steps. A copy of the draft Discussion paper is attached for information.

**Local Heritage**

The LGA Board at its meeting on 29 September 2016, authorised the LGA President and CEO to provide the Local Heritage and Character Position Paper prepared by the MLGG to the Minister for Planning as a sector-wide local government response to the State Government’s Local Heritage Planning Discussion Paper.

**Thirty-Year Plan for Greater Adelaide**

At the LGA Board meeting on 29 September 2016 the LGA Board authorised that the LGA Executive Committee finalise an LGA submission on the State Government’s draft 30-year Plan update at its meeting on 19 October 2016

The 30-Year Plan for Greater Adelaide was developed by the Government of South Australia in 2010 with a commitment to update the plan at 5 yearly intervals.

The Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure (DPTI) released an update to the Plan for public consultation for an eight week period, which closed on 21 October 2016.

A copy of the final submission is provided for information.

**Financial Implications**

Nil
The MLGG 2016 Economic Development Action Plan has been developed drawing from the sector’s work in and contribution to planning reforms.

MLGG Planning Champion - Mayor Bill Spragg

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of 2016 Priorities</th>
<th>MLGG Meeting Date</th>
<th>Actions and Milestones</th>
<th>Resourcing &amp; Budget Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In 2016, the MLGG seeks to achieve the following objectives in relation to planning:</td>
<td>March 2016</td>
<td>Receive a report on and discuss the progress of the Planning, Development &amp; Infrastructure Bill 2015 and implementation arrangements.</td>
<td>Report completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Remain informed on the passage of new planning legislation through the Parliament and work with the LGA to achieve influence for Local Government.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Receive a report and presentation from DPTI on the progress of the update of the 30-Year Plan for Greater Adelaide.</td>
<td>Report completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Work with the LGA and state government to remain informed on and participate in the implementation of planning reforms.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Recommence work on the ‘Heritage and Character’ project that was deferred in 2015.</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Undertake research and prepare policies, plans and strategies that will inform the implementation of planning reforms from a metropolitan local government perspective.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Seek interest and commitment from MLGG members to implement and report on planning culture and practice improvement initiatives.</td>
<td>Councils have been invited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Engage with the development sector and industry groups to strengthen relationships and resolve agreed issues.</td>
<td>May 2016</td>
<td>Receive a report on strategic activities to be undertaken in partnership with industry groups such as UDIA, PIA &amp; EDA.</td>
<td>Report completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Promote a positive planning and development culture</td>
<td></td>
<td>Receive a report on the implementation planning reforms and identify research, policies, plans and strategies that will assist metropolitan councils.</td>
<td>Report completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Report/presentation on council initiatives related to</td>
<td>Town of Gawler presenting under ‘efficiency’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Share ideas and examples about best practice in planning and explore opportunities to work together.
7. Invite members to provide reports to the MLGG on the new initiatives that they implemented, including those that have not been successful.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 2016</td>
<td>Depending on timing, the LGA Secretariat will provide an update report on consultation and negotiation activities undertaken following the introduction of a second planning Bill into Parliament.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Invite development sector representatives to address the MLGG.</td>
<td>Deferred to November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Report/presentation on council initiatives related to planning improvement.</td>
<td>Referred to joint LGA &amp; UDIA Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2016</td>
<td>Depending on timing, the LGA Secretariat will provide an update report on consultation and negotiation activities undertaken following the introduction of a second planning Bill into Parliament.</td>
<td>Deferred to November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Receive a report on strategic activities to be undertaken in partnership with industry groups such as UDIA, PIA &amp; EDA.</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Report/presentation on council initiatives related to planning improvement.</td>
<td>Nil received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Receive a final report on the ‘Heritage and Character’ project.</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Receive a report on the progress of the update of the 30-Year Plan for Greater Adelaide.</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2016</td>
<td>Report/presentation on council initiatives related to planning improvement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Receive a report on consultation and negotiation activities undertaken following the introduction of a second planning Bill into Parliament.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Receive a report on strategic activities to be undertaken in partnership with industry groups such as UDIA, PIA &amp; EDA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Receive a report on the progress of the update of the 30-Year Plan for Greater Adelaide</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Receive a report on the Regional Boards discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nil received</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October joint meeting between LGA and UDIA cancelled due to storm event to be reconvened</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The MLGG Executive at its meeting on 17 October requested that advice be provided on the progress of the priority and whether the priority would continue during 2017

2016 Priorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2016 Priorities</th>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In 2016, the MLGG seeks to achieve the following objectives in relation to planning:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Remain informed on the passage of new planning legislation through the Parliament and work with the LGA to achieve influence for Local Government.</td>
<td>The Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act was assented to in April 2016. The Statutes Amendment Bill is currently being considered by Parliament.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Work with the LGA and state government to remain informed on and participate in the implementation of planning reforms.</td>
<td>With the implementation of the new Act likely being between 2-5 years this will be an on-going objective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Undertake research and prepare policies, plans and strategies that will inform the implementation of planning reforms from a metropolitan local government perspective.</td>
<td>With the implementation of the new Act likely being between 2-5 years this will be an on-going objective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Engage with the development sector and industry groups to strengthen relationships and resolve agreed issues.</td>
<td>With the implementation of the new Act likely being between 2-5 years this will be an on-going objective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Promote a positive planning and development culture within metropolitan councils.</td>
<td>With the implementation of the new Act likely being between 2-5 years this will be an on-going objective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Share ideas and examples about best practice in planning and explore opportunities to work together.</td>
<td>With the implementation of the new Act likely being between 2-5 years this will be an on-going objective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Invite members to provide reports to the MLGG on the new initiatives that they implemented, including those that have not been successful.</td>
<td>With the implementation of the new Act likely being between 2-5 years this will be an on-going objective.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Response to the draft update to the Thirty Year Plan for Greater Adelaide

Introduction

A Draft Update to The 30-Year Plan Greater Adelaide was released for community consultation by the Minister for Planning on 25 August 2016. This submission arises from the Local Government Association of South Australia’s (LGA) consultation with planning staff from greater metropolitan councils on the draft Update.

Background

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, and addressing challenges that have arisen from strategies and targets set out in the original Plan.

The Local Government Association (LGA) convened three workshops with officers of inner, middle and outer ring metropolitan councils to explore responses to the 2016 update, including:

- Positive aspects and strengths;
- Challenges and concerns;
- Questions and issues for clarification; and
- Insights based on working with the current 30-Year Plan.

Given the diversity of views likely to arise amongst greater metropolitan councils, the initial purpose of the workshops was to provide a forum for discussion and a resource for council officers in preparing their own responses to the Draft Update.

However, the workshops revealed a suite of concerns consistent amongst inner, middle and outer ring metropolitan council staff which are the subject of this LGA submission. These concerns arise from local governments’ desire to be positive partners in the development and implementation of a strategy for the future of the greater metropolitan Adelaide area.

Across the three workshops, staff of the following Councils participated:

- Adelaide City Council
- City of Campbelltown
- City of Playford
- City of Salisbury
- City of Mitcham
- City of Onkaparinga
- City of Holdfast Bay
- City of Marion
- City of Norwood, Payneham and St Peters
• City of Prospect
• Town of Walkerville
• City of Burnside
• City of West Torrens
• City of Charles Sturt
• City of Unley
• City of Port Adelaide Enfield
• Rural City of Murray Bridge
• City of Victor Harbor
• The Barossa Council
• Adelaide Hills Council

1. Proposal

Local government is fundamental to the realisation of strategic planning objectives. Through their range of functions, councils develop, interpret and implement planning strategies and policies on a daily basis, experience the community’s involvement in planning decisions firsthand, and manage the impacts of planning decisions on the ground.

From this position, councils seek to be engaged, positive participants in the planning strategy, contributing their knowledge and experience to achieve the best possible outcomes for their communities and Greater Adelaide as a whole. In doing so, officers of metropolitan Councils have identified a number of shared concerns and questions arising from the Draft Update to The 30-Year Plan for Greater Adelaide.

On this basis the LGA seeks clarification and to facilitate further dialogue between councils and DPTI around:

- The purpose and strategic context of the 30-Year Plan within the new planning system;
- The nature and basis of the proposed targets, policies and actions; and
- How the Plan will be implemented, inclusive of governance arrangements, identification of priorities, and resolution of tensions between strategic objectives.

Purpose and strategic context

Clarity is required in relation to the intended purpose of this Draft Update in the context of a broader strategic planning framework, and further, in the context of the transition to the Planning, Infrastructure and Development Act (PDI Act).

Clear articulation of the role of the 30-Year Plan in the context of the PDI Act is particularly important given the information that the Draft Update removes from the Plan, specifically regional targets, and detailed spatial maps conveying important strategic information such as key freight routes.

The 30-Year Plan currently acts as the main reference point in the development and approval of all planning policy, and a guiding framework for councils’ strategic planning activities. The removal of significant regional detail in the Draft Update, causes councils to question whether this will continue to be the role of the Plan.
If the 2016 update of the 30-Year Plan will continue to play the role that the 2010 Plan currently does, councils are concerned that the relatively vague nature of the policies and actions, and lack of more specific guidance, could lead to poor outcomes.

If the 2016 update will play a different role in the strategic planning framework to the current 30-Year Plan, this should be clearly articulated and explained.

If information that has been removed from the Plan (e.g. regional targets) is to be housed in other documents (e.g. Regional and Sub-regional Plans) this link should be clearly presented within the Plan, and the information provided between documents consistent to a level to support decision making.

To contribute positively to the update of the 30-Year Plan and the transition to the PDI Act, councils must understand the specific ways in which the 30-Year Plan will interact with other policy and governance instruments such as the Planning and Development Code, Residential Code, Regional Plans, Sub-regional Plans, and Local Area Plans, what role Councils will play in developing and implementing these, and how the program of transition to new instruments will be implemented.

Better understanding the Plan in its strategic context will also assist in understanding how policy tensions presented by the Plan will be resolved. Council staff have identified the possibility of tensions arising in the pursuit of strategic objectives both within the 30-Year Plan, and between the Plan and other State directions. For example:

- How will policies promoting both densification and heritage protection, be reconciled in policy?
- How will the directions for increased diversity of housing form sit with an updated Residential Code?
- How do State Government Super-Schools correlate with walkable neighbourhoods, and what does this mean for educational infrastructure in communities and new development areas including infill areas?

Further work is required to consider a framework in which these types of policy tensions might be resolved, and strategic objectives prioritised.

There is a further need for clarification of the role the 30-Year Plan will play in the outer ring of metropolitan Adelaide. It is noted that none of the six targets are directly relevant to this part of the Greater Adelaide, and many of the policy themes have limited relevance to regional councils. While the Update notes that regional matters will be revisited as the planning system changes, an appreciation of how and when this will occur would inform a better understanding of the current Draft.

**Targets, policies and actions**

While the 2016 Draft Update is a more streamlined 30-Year Plan, the very broad nature of the remaining content raises opportunities for further consideration.

Greater metropolitan council planning staff have a view that while the intent of the policies in particular is positive, their general nature will create difficulty in implementation.
In terms of targets, while they may be straightforward to measure, there is a concern as to whether they are the appropriate indicators. In this context, an understanding amongst councils and other stakeholders of the methodology applied for the selection of targets would be of benefit. Specific comments in respect of each of the 6 Targets is provided in Appendix A.

Councils and other stakeholders would also benefit from an understanding of the methodology and data used to inform key aspects of the Update such as:

- Selection on a reduced population growth target. The LGA is concerned with the downgrading of the population targets from the existing Thirty Year Plan. The LGA has raised through the Premier’s State and Local Government Forum and through its State Budget submission the need for a Population Growth Strategy for the State, the reduction in future population growth identified in the current draft Plan supports the need for such a strategy.
- Selection of focus industries with specific policies under the Economy theme; and
- Climate change and hazard policies in the context of extensive regional adaptation planning recently undertaken by Councils. There appears to be limited recognition of the need for greater protection of remaining coastal open space for recreation and as a buffer against the effects of climate change. In addition Emergency Management and Hazard Avoidance should be better recognised in terms of neighbourhood safety and sustainable development than the current, rather single dimensional, measure of tree canopy cover under A Green Liveable City.

The 2010 Plan contained regional projections and targets and spatial representations that guided councils’ strategic planning. Councils themselves have invested in research and data collection to inform local area planning and strategic decision making around density, infrastructure, and other key issues, and would welcome the opportunity to contribute these resources to the broader metropolitan context.

Implementation

Unlike the 2010 30-Year Plan, the 2016 update makes no mention of annual implementation plans. While the governance and implementation framework set out in the 2010 Plan may not have been as successful as hoped, the lack of such a framework in the current update is a significant gap.

For the 30-Year Plan to effectively guide policy and decision making, a clear governance and implementation plan should be developed, covering:

- Roles and responsibilities for:
  - Decisions and approvals;
  - Involvement in development of subordinate/cascading strategies and policies;
  - Data collection; and
  - Monitoring for targets.
- Indicative timeframes for implementation toward a 30-vision; and
- Funding;
• Measures and methods for monitoring achievement in relation to policies and actions as well as targets; and
• Ongoing engagement and collaboration with key stakeholders, including local government.

2. Summary

In summary, to the LGA seeks clarification and to facilitate further dialogue between Councils and DPTI around:

• The purpose and strategic context of the 30-Year Plan within the new planning system;
• The establishment of a population growth strategy for the State, which supports a population increase in the greater Adelaide region consistent with the population growth forecasts in the current plan.
• The nature and basis of the proposed targets, policies and actions; and
• How the Plan will be implemented, inclusive of governance arrangements, identification of priorities, and resolution of tensions between strategic objectives.

In particular councils are keen to explore in collaboration with DPTI:

• The role of the 30-Year Plan, whether the role is changing under the PDI Act, and what the implications are for policy and implementation;
• The ways in which the 30-Year Plan will interact with a number of other policy and governance instruments under the PDI Act, what role councils will play in developing and implementing these, and how the program of transition to new instruments will be implemented;
• Detailed linkages between the Plan and other strategic documents to support decision making;
• A framework to guide resolution of policy tensions and prioritisation of strategic objectives both within the Plan and between the Plan and other State Government strategies;
• How research and data within the 2010 30-Year Plan and collected by councils can inform the targets, policies and actions in the 2016 update; and
• Development of an implementation plan including clear roles and responsibilities in relation to decision making, data collection, and the achievement of targets, as well as measures of success for policies and actions.
Support for Target 1 as locating new housing within established urban areas to reduce urban sprawl in Greater Adelaide will go some way towards reducing urban sprawl in metropolitan Adelaide. However, progress against this target will need to carefully managed in inner and middle-metropolitan Adelaide, to balance the increased pressure to facilitate the division of larger properties, against the loss of too many traditional ‘backyards’.

Support for locating new housing in close proximity to public transport
There is a concern that measuring dwelling density within specific catchments adjacent to public transport is too simplistic in that if this target is met, this alone would not guarantee that those residents living near ‘quality’ public transport will utilise public transport.

The reference in Target 2, to ‘quality’ public transport, requires further clarification. For example, is quality in this context a reference to frequency of service, amenity for users, usage rates, or a combination of these factors. The provision of ‘quality’ public transport should not be defined solely by proximity from residential neighbourhoods.

Target 2 will be measured by multi-criteria analysis – there is some concern that an MCA would not be widely understood within the community.

The emphasis in the 30-Year Plan to both physical and community/green infrastructure is considered positive and recognition that dynamic and resilient communities require social and community networks and facilities.

Support for increased use of active travel.

Further consideration needs to be given to how this will be achieved and the level of investment required by State and Local Government. Achieving this...
target may require a significant increase in investment for walking, cycling and public transport infrastructure.

Increasing public transport use to the levels identified in the Update will require significant investment in convenient public transport to compete with the accessibility of these workplaces via private motor vehicles.

The target measure does not apply outer metropolitan councils. The Plan notes that in regard to the target measure consideration is being given to an Outer Metro sub-region target. This target should be determined in consultation with outer metropolitan councils before the Plan is finalised.

The criteria used to measure Target 4, will incorporate access to open space, primary schools, frequent public transport and shops. However, there is a concern that one of the criteria against which Target 4 will be measured, is walkability to primary schools. It is unclear why this criteria is limited to primary schools with respect to walkability to educational establishments. The Target also lacks any criteria relating to access to social infrastructure for older people.

It is unclear as to how State Government intends to influence the walkability target for established neighbourhoods that do not meet the criteria of being a walkable neighbourhood currently. For example will State government intervene and provide public transport, primary schools and partner with Local Government to deliver new open space in these circumstances; or will the focus be on concentrating population growth in areas with good access to services (primarily inner suburbs of Adelaide)?
The target which is intended to take into account trees on private and public land, is strongly supported. However, infill development targets and public safety risks may threaten much of the existing tree stock within established neighbourhoods. This highlights a tension between Target 5 and Targets 1 and 2.

If the target is to be realistically met, there may be a need to elevate the importance of existing tree retention within the urban landscape and investigate mechanisms to achieve this through the PDI Act and other planning instruments, which will provide the ‘finer grain’ detail of how the 30-Year Plan will be implemented.

The measurement of Target 5, will not be able to discern the type of trees which will be planted to increase the tree canopy across metropolitan Adelaide. Whilst the bio-diversity related policies contained within the draft Update seek to encourage the planting of local indigenous species, there are a range of factors that are typically considered when selecting a tree for planting, including, but not limited to, disease resistance, maintenance requirements, aesthetics, longevity, tendency to drop limbs, nuts, leaves, biodiversity value etc. As such, whilst there may be an increase in the overall tree canopy, the measure is unlikely to address the quality and value of such an increase.

It is unclear how State Government will influence this target and balance this objective with new infill development, which generally results in increased site coverage and reduced tree coverage on private land. This could potentially require new funding initiatives for local government to plant trees, acquisition of
### Public Land for Tree Planting

Public land for tree planting in urban areas and amendments to the existing approach to Regulated Trees to achieve the target.

### Is Tree Canopy an Appropriate Measure?

Is tree canopy an appropriate measure of sustainability? This target misses a range of other aspects of sustainability. Measures of greening should incorporate lawns and green roofs etc.

### Concerns About Targets

There is a concern that these targets will become the main focus and source of funding incentives etc., and the policies and actions including Water Sensitive Urban Design may fade into the background.

Tree canopy cover is not a suitable target measure for biodiversity. The ‘maintenance of habitat for native fauna in fragmented landscapes’ is best achieved through other targets.

### Target Applicability

This Target is only applicable to urban areas of metropolitan Adelaide, there needs to be a measure that promotes sustainability across the Greater Adelaide region.

### Target 6: Greater Housing Choice

**Greater housing choice**

Increase housing choice by 25% to meet changing household needs in metropolitan Adelaide by 2045.

Target 6, which seeks an increase in housing diversity by 25% to meet changing household needs by 2045, is supported. It is recognised that the provision of housing diversity and choice are fundamental strategies to meet the multiple challenges of addressing a growing and ageing population, increased land and housing costs and an increase in demand for smaller dwelling types, due to the demographics of the City’s population.
Whether a house is detached or otherwise may not be the best measure of housing choice. Size, number of bedrooms, affordability and range of other factors may need to be considered. For example some semi-detached dwellings may have larger floor areas and more bedrooms than some small standalone detached infill housing.

Although stressed as an important component of the 30 Year Plan Update, no target in the Update measures design quality. A separate and specific measure should be included in the Plan.
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Regional Planning Boards

1. Introduction

Donna Ferretti and Associates has been engaged by the Local Government Association of South Australia (LGA) to prepare a Discussion Paper on the operation and potential advantages/disadvantages to metropolitan Councils of Regional Planning Boards (RPBs).

The recent passage of the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act (PDI Act) has signalled the potential establishment of RPBs across South Australia. This has generally been welcomed by the LGA with many Councils, especially those in regional areas of the State, having expressed an interest in forming RPBs. Indeed, a number of regional planning entities are currently in operation, having been created in response to what many regional Councils believe to be an excessively metropolitan focus of past and present planning arrangements in South Australia.

Metropolitan Councils, however, have been more circumspect in relation to RPBs given that there is little guidance provided in the new legislation on how RPBs are to operate and what role Councils are expected to perform within them. As argued by Szili et al (2014) these questions are important for Councils as their resolution will determine the responsiveness of the new planning system to the needs and aspirations of local communities, a primary concern of local Councils. Accordingly, this Discussion Paper seeks to uncover how RPBs are envisaged to be created and operate within metropolitan Adelaide and determine the extent to which local Councils could be involved in shaping the future development of their local areas.

1.1. Study objectives

The key objectives of this Discussion Paper are to:

- Establish a coherent understanding of the rationale underpinning the establishment of RPBs.
- Clarify the roles and functions of RPBs and how these relate to the roles and functions of Councils.
- Determine the likely opportunities and constraints associated with the operation of RPBs for Councils in the Adelaide metropolitan context.
- Recommend potential strategies for Councils to optimise their planning functions through the establishment and operation of RPBs.

1.2. Study approach

The study has been undertaken in three stages as follows:

- Preparation of a draft Discussion Paper distributed to Mayors and Chief Executives of the Metropolitan Local Government Group.
- Facilitation of an interactive workshop with Mayors and Chief Executives of the Metropolitan Local Government Group on the issues raised in the draft Discussion Paper.
• Development of the final Discussion Paper in response to the workshop outcomes.

The preparation of the Discussion Paper has been informed by a review of relevant documents, including those produced by the Expert Panel on Planning Reform, publications on the LGA website as well as reports focusing on the regionalisation of planning functions. A list of these documents is presented in Section 5 below.

Discussions were also held with staff of DPTI responsible for developing the instruments required for implementing the new planning system, including RPBs. The outcomes of these discussions are reported in Section 2.4 below.

The workshop with Mayors and Chief Executives of metropolitan Councils raised a number of additional questions concerning both the establishment and operation of RPBs, particularly in the context of Councils’ functions under the Local Government Act. These issues are discussed in Sections 4.2 – 4.5 below.

2. Regionalising Planning Functions

2.1. Background

The future potential establishment of RPBs has arisen from the State government’s recent review of the South Australian planning system and subsequent passage of the PDI Act on 21 April 2016. The following sections discuss the development of the Expert Panel’s support for the regionalisation of planning functions.

2.2. Expert Panel proposals

In its first report, the Expert Panel heard a range of concerns about the relationship between state-based and local Council-based planning functions and the need for a clear delineation of state and local roles in planning legislation. The Panel also met with the LGA’s Local Excellence Expert Panel which had produced a report recommending that planning functions be undertaken on a regional basis to enable a better integration of state and local community interests.

As a result of these deliberations, the Expert Panel (2013, 26) argued that a regionalised planning system offered a number of advantages over the existing state-local nexus, highlighting the potential for a more effective use of resources and an improved relationship between environmental management (or NRM) and the planning system.

In its second report, the Panel proposed a specific reform to **create a network of regional planning boards** (Expert Panel 2014a, 36-39). This proposal gained momentum from the experience of regional planning authorities in Western Australia and New South Wales which had significantly improved the alignment of state and local planning interests. The Panel envisaged RPBs providing a ‘middle
ground’ between the proposed State Planning Commission and local Councils in order to enhance interaction, collaboration and coordination between agencies and Councils. The Panel also emphasised the potential for RPBs to promote and enable greater regional autonomy amongst participating Councils.

RPBs were seen as a vehicle by which to:

- encourage regional collaboration among Councils (a key benefit identified by the LGA’s Local Excellence Panel);
- integrate planning with economic development and environmental goals;
- improve administrative efficiencies; and
- avoid costly delays in the planning process.

It was acknowledged nonetheless that establishing RPBs in the metropolitan area would be particularly challenging given the extent of infrastructure and service delivery that takes place across Council boundaries.

To optimise the potential benefits of RPBs, the Expert Panel also put forward a reform to reshape planning documents on a regional basis (Expert Panel 2014a, 54-57). Regional planning schemes were envisaged to combine a regional planning strategy (replacing regional volumes of the South Australian Planning Strategy) and a regional development plan for all Councils within a particular region. This was seen to provide Councils with significantly greater autonomy and control over strategic and assessment policy shaping the future development of each region. However, this proposal was not ultimately adopted.

In the Expert Panel’s third and final report, the proposals to create a network of RPBs across the state and reshape planning documents on a regional basis were formalised.

RPBs were envisaged to be constituted by the Minister with at least half of the members selected from nominations put forward by local Councils in the relevant region. The role of RPBs would be to work closely with Councils and state agencies to coordinate and deliver planning outcomes including:

- preparation of regional strategies/plans;
- assessment of Council proposals to change development plans;
- engaging with the public (including public hearings); and
- establishing regional development assessment panels.

In the metropolitan context, the Panel specified that there would be 3-5 RPBs within metropolitan Adelaide with each RPB comprising at least 2 Councils. While the proposed State Planning Commission was seen to be the most appropriate body for undertaking whole-of-metropolitan coordination, the Expert Panel argued that RPBs represented a more effective devolution of planning responsibilities to regional and local communities. Little guidance was provided, however, on the spatial delineation of regions within the metropolitan area.

Regional planning schemes were to comprise a regional strategy/plan and a regional development plan and these were to be developed and maintained by the
relevant RPB. Councils within the region would still be able to propose local changes but it would be the RPB, not the Minister, who would oversee the process (although the Minister would retain the capacity to amend regional schemes if required). Importantly, regional planning schemes were envisaged to incorporate a range of additional elements, including infrastructure, open space, public health and environmental (or NRM) considerations as a way of eliminating the duplication of resources amongst government agencies and the conflicts that often arise across different planning programs. Regional planning schemes would still be subject to Ministerial oversight – through the State Planning Commission – to ensure alignment with state-based policies.

The key rationale underpinning the Expert Panel’s proposals is that RPBs would provide Councils and regional communities sufficient autonomy to shape the future development of their region. By developing regional planning schemes tailored to local/regional economic, social and environmental conditions, RPBs would effectively perform most of the key strategic planning functions that currently reside with the Minister through the State government.

Accordingly, the new legislation was expected to flag a significant decentralisation of planning functions away from the state government and the Minister to regional bodies constituted in part by local Councils, to enable each region to be responsive to issues and resources specific to their local/regional circumstances.

2.3. Relevant PDI Act provisions

The PDI Act provides for South Australia to be divided into planning regions with one region to be formally designated as ‘Greater Adelaide’ (to replace the definition of Metropolitan Adelaide in the current Development Act). DPTI’s User Guide to the PDI Act states that the main purpose of a planning region is to define the area over which:

i. regional plans may be developed; and
ii. collaborative arrangements may be established for planning, service delivery and other relevant programs.¹

In order to establish a planning region, the legislation allows for the Minister (on the advice of the State Planning Commission) to enter into a planning agreement with a Council that has all or part of its area in the proposed region. In fact, the PDI Act specifies that the Minister must invite a Council to be part of a planning agreement if any part of its local area is within the proposed region. This renders void the concern expressed in the LGA (2015) submission to the PDI Bill that a planning agreement could see Councils excluded from the process.

The Minister may also enter into an agreement with another Minister or any other entity – such as the LGA for instance - that has requested to be a party to the agreement. There is no specification of what constitutes an entity, but it could be

reasonably expected that organisations with an interest in the proposed region, such as Regional Development Australia Boards and NRM Boards, would be such an entity.

It is also noteworthy that the establishment of regions will be subject to Parliamentary scrutiny and will not come into effect unless supported by both Houses of Parliament, providing Councils with further reassurance of their involvement in regional planning functions.

2.3.1. Local Council Participation

There are two (2) key elements associated with the creation of a planning agreement where participant Councils can exercise a degree of influence:

1. Setting of objectives, priorities and targets for the area/region covered by the agreement.
2. Establishment of a joint planning board (or RPB) to deliver the terms of the agreement and oversee its progress.

Both elements provide some certainty that Councils will be involved in processes shaping the future development of their local areas. In the setting of objectives, priorities and targets, Councils are universally recognised for having the best understanding of the factors driving and impeding the development of their local areas and are therefore well placed to advise on the most appropriate objectives and targets and which of these needs to be prioritised. This local knowledge was recognised by the Expert Panel as a key benefit of Council involvement in RPBs.

Membership of a joint planning board or RPB (hereafter simply referred to as RPBs) similarly affords Councils an opportunity to ensure local representation on the key planning authority for a particular area/region. While the legislation does not explicitly specify the criteria for membership of a RPB, it nonetheless requires that a board collectively has the necessary knowledge, expertise and experience to enable it to carry out its functions effectively. This provides a degree of flexibility for Councils that are party to an agreement to appoint people who can properly represent local community interests.

2.3.2. Role of RPBs

RPBs are envisaged to perform as wide a range of functions as necessary in order to meet the terms of the relevant planning agreement. The PDI Act specifies that a RPB may:

- set up committees to advise and assist the RPB in performing its functions (refer s38 PDI Act);
- establish subsidiaries to undertake specific activities and functions on behalf of the RPB (refer s39 PDI Act); and

---

delegate any of its functions and powers (refer s40 PDI Act).

DPTI’s User Guide indicates that the process of establishing RPBs has been purposively designed to be flexible enough to allow each board to decide what arrangements suit them best and which planning functions they ought to perform. RPBs have, in effect, been given a clean slate to determine what they have to do and how they choose to do it. This provides for a level of local/regional self-determination never before seen in the South Australian planning system and signals a new protocol for undertaking a host of regional planning functions beyond those required by the state.

**Regional Plans**

Of these functions, the preparation of regional plans is probably the most critical (refer s64 PDI Act). While the legislation specifies that regional plans are to be prepared by the State Planning Commission, this will only occur in areas where RPBs have not been established. Accordingly, RPBs are envisaged to be the primary authority for developing and implementing regional plans across the state.

The legislation is quite specific in terms of the required content of regional plans which must:

- be consistent with state planning policy affecting the relevant region;
- include a long-term (15-30 years) vision for the relevant region with maps and plans articulating the spatial pattern of this vision;
- provide for the integration of land use, transport infrastructure and the public realm;
- incorporate contextual information, statistical data, analysis and projections (to be determined by the Commission or by a practice direction);
- provide recommendations about how to apply and operate the Planning and Design Code in the region; and
- include a framework for the public realm or infrastructure in the region.

These requirements are not dissimilar to the content of existing regional volumes of the Planning Strategy. The legislation nonetheless allows for the inclusion of additional information tailored to the relevant region conditions which may subsequently shape the required content of regional plans. Recommendations about the application of the Planning and Design Code, for instance, may be influenced by particular local circumstances that could result in the Code being applied differently in some regions compared to others.

In this regard the experience of the Upper Spencer Gulf (USG) Common Purpose Group is salutary. The Group has effectively set up a planning region made up of the local government areas of Port Pirie, Port Augusta and Whyalla, avoiding the current division of the USG into 3 separate State Administrative Regions (and hence 3 different volumes of the Planning
Strategy) and providing an opportunity to craft planning strategies and policies that are better suited to the USG’s particular environmental, economic and social circumstances (Ferretti 2015).

Assessment Panels

Another important role of RPBs is the constitution and appointment of assessment panels. As designated authorities under the PDI Act, individual Councils and RPBs will be able to determine:

- the membership of assessment panels (with the caveat that only 1 elected Council member may sit on an assessment panel);
- the procedures to be followed in the appointment of panel members (including the presiding member), their term of office, remuneration and grounds on which a member may be removed from the panel.

RPBs will also be responsible for arranging and funding the staff and other support (such as training) required to operate assessment panels.

In its submission, the LGA expressed concern about the significant reduction in elected member representation on assessment panels and the Minister’s ability to dismiss and reappoint assessment panels (LGA 2015, 7). In the case of a regional assessment panel, however, the Minister’s powers are circumscribed somewhat in that s/he may constitute a panel only if:

- 2 or more Councils request the Minister to do so; or
- the Minister determines, after hearing from the relevant Councils, that it would be appropriate to set up a panel to ensure orderly and effective assessment of development in the areas of 2 or more Councils (or parts of such areas).  

Put simply, a RPB has been conferred a great deal of autonomy under the PDI Act to establish and run a regional assessment panel as it sees fit. Only panels established by individual Councils will be subject to Ministerial intervention under s86 of the PDI Act.

2.4. DPTI discussion

As noted, senior planning staff responsible for the roll-out and implementation of the PDI Act were consulted in relation to this study on 18 August 2016. Key points emerging from this discussion are summarised as follows:

- RPBs could have similar functions to the State Planning Commission. Subject to the terms of the relevant planning agreement, RPBs are able to delegate functions and set up subsidiaries to undertake particular functions/tasks.
- The State Planning Commission is likely to delegate planning functions to established RPBs. The precise terms of such delegations are likely to be

---

determined by practice notes or guides that are prepared by the Commission.

- RPBs are able to undertake strategic planning roles for the relevant region through the preparation of region plans.
- RPBs are able to oversee assessment tasks in the relevant region through the establishment of regional assessment panels.
- It is recognised that the State government cannot perform or take responsibility for every planning function/task. DPTI is keen for local Councils to take the initiative in establishing RPBs and determining what tasks these Boards should undertake and what outcomes they should work towards in order to maximise the benefits to local and regional communities.
- DPTI is also keen to assist participant Councils and, when established, RPBs in determining appropriate governance models for RPBs.
- There is considerable potential for RPBs to be involved in the establishment of infrastructure schemes. According to DPTI, the State Planning Commission is likely to issue a practice direction on the establishment and operation of planning agreements as a matter of priority.

It is evident from discussions with DPTI that the state is eager to break down the adversarial nature of South Australia’s existing planning system and, in particular, the tensions and conflicts that have arisen in the past between state and local government. DPTI believes that the new legislation provides such an opportunity and has agreed to continue working with the LGA and individual Councils during the roll-out of the PDI Act to ensure that local communities are properly represented and considered in the development of the new planning system.

3. LGA Considerations

While a strong supporter of the planning reform initiative, contributing regularly and positively to the Expert Panel’s work, the LGA has consistently raised a number of issues associated with the direction and intent of the PDI Act. The following sections discuss these issues and consider how the operation of RPBs could address them.

3.1. Reduced role of local communities in shaping the development of local areas

Councils are concerned that they will have limited capacity under the PDI Act to make decisions on local development matters. This limitation affects both strategic/policy and assessment matters in that:

1. there is no prescribed role for individual Councils (or their communities) to prepare important strategic and policy documents (such as state planning policies and the Planning and Design Code); and
2. Councils will have a substantially reduced role in the assessment of local development proposals.

3.1.1. Strategic/Policy Matters

As discussed, the new legislation envisages Council involvement in strategic planning matters as active participants in RPBs, in particular through the preparation of regional plans.

In relation to policy matters, the lack of Council input into the Planning and Design Code is of significance. One of the Code’s key roles in the new planning system is to enhance consistency of development policy and its interpretation/application across the state. In so doing, however, the Code may result in a loss of local planning policy provisions (or variations) that have long been implemented across local areas of the state to ensure that development reflects local and often unique spatial circumstances. It should be noted, however, that s66(4) of the PDI Act does provide for local variations.

3.1.2. Assessment Matters

The PDI Act allows for the appointment of only one (1) elected councillor on a Council assessment panel appointed by a RPB or a Council.⁴ There is no specific provision for the appointment of councillors on regional assessment panels (established by the Minister under s84) although this is countered somewhat by the power accorded RPBs to determine panel membership under s83.

However, there is no doubt that the new legislation calls for a substantially reduced level of elected member representation on assessment panels. This marks a significant break with past practices and reflects a sustained effort on the part of the government to reduce the influence of local political concerns on development decisions. Leaving aside the vexed question of local political influence for the moment, the key outcome of this provision is that panel membership will no longer have a democratic connection to their local communities (LGA 2015, 3).

A further factor limiting the capacity of local communities to have a voice in local development decisions is the intent under the PDI Act to substantially increase complying forms of development and simultaneously decrease the number of developments assessed on merit and subject to public notification.

3.1.3. Potential mitigating role of RPBs

There is no doubt that RPBs provide Councils with increased opportunities for developing planning strategies that are tailored to specific local/regional

---

⁴ It is salient that the initial version of the PDI Act called for the total exclusion of elected councillors on assessment panels. After debate in Parliament, the Act was modified to allow for the appointment of a maximum of one (1) elected councillor on a Council development assessment panel.
circumstances and are therefore more relevant to local communities than the current volumes of the South Australian Planning Strategy. RPBs also have a fair amount of autonomy in determining the content of regional plans. This fulfils the intent of the Expert Panel’s recommendations.

The role of RPBs in developing assessment policy, however, is more limited. The Planning and Design Code is likely to be a standardised set of policies universally applied across the state, leaving little room for local content. While RPBs can, through the regional plan, recommend how these policies are to be applied in the region, there is an expectation that development policy should be consistently applied and interpreted across all jurisdictions.

RPBs are able to exercise a significant level of autonomy in constituting regional assessment panels, providing opportunities for meaningful representation of local/regional interests when development proposals are assessed.

There appears to be only a small role for RPBs in determining the categories of development and what forms of development are considered to be complying or subject to more rigorous assessment. There may be opportunities to foresee the need for more rigorous assessment of proposals in particular areas/cases during the development of regional plans, although this is by no means clear from the PDI Act.

3.2. Consultation with LGA and Councils

The LGA has previously submitted that the establishment of sub-regions would not require consultation with Councils, but materials on the planning reform website, the PDI Act itself and discussions with DPTI indicate the opposite - that affected Councils must be consulted when creating a region or sub-region (refer s5 (5) (b) and s6 (3) (b) of the PDI Act).

However, it is the nature of this consultation that could be called into question. DPTI’s User Guide indicates that Councils will be provided with a proclamation notice proposing the creation of a new region or sub-region and a copy of the Planning Commission’s advice on the proposal, and will be given at least 28 days from the date specified in the notice to provide a response. Not only is this a very basic and generally undesirable form of consultation, it provides no opportunity for meaningful dialogue and discussion with affected stakeholders, individual Councils or local communities.

3.2.1. Potential mitigating role of RPBs

Given the autonomy accorded RPBs in the PDI Act, there are significant opportunities for Boards to encourage and enable more meaningful consultation and discussion with communities and affected stakeholders about the planning instruments to be utilised in each region.
The Act also requires the Minister to consult with the LGA when constituting the State Planning Commission and to ensure that the Commission’s membership includes a person with expertise in local government matters. Furthermore, DPTI has clearly indicated its intent to involve the LGA in deliberations on the implementation of the PDI Act, including the transitional arrangements. This will provide a raft of opportunities for ongoing consultation and engagement with individual Councils and the LGA as their representative body.

3.3. Resourcing

The LGA submission highlights the significant funding and resourcing commitment that would be needed to implement the planning reforms and realise its benefits, particularly the proposal for a digital e-planning system. It is worth noting, however, that the recent state budget allocated some $30 million over 4 years for both implementation of the PDI Act and the establishment of e-planning, with the caveat that Councils would contribute to this program via a development levy. The potential funding requirements are set out in s56 of the PDI Act.

3.3.1. Potential mitigating role of RPBs

The constitution and operation of RPBs and regional assessment panels would clearly require significant resourcing. There is very little information currently available on how RPBs might be funded although this is likely to become available as transitional arrangements are worked out. As a key stakeholder in the process, the LGA will consulted on how these matters are to be determined.

3.4. Uncertainties

The LGA has expressed some concern about how infrastructure schemes are to operate and the extent to which Councils and ratepayers will bear the costs of delivering infrastructure. The LGA has commissioned a paper by Wallmans Lawyers on this issue which calls for a thorough assessment of options for infrastructure coordination and funding to ensure that Councils and their communities do not pay more than is equitable.

3.4.1. Potential mitigating role of RPBs

Discussions with DPTI indicate that RPBs could play an active role in the establishment and operation of infrastructure schemes. Given that RPBs are likely to have Council representation, and will be able to exercise autonomy in the delivery of planning functions across the relevant region, their participation in infrastructure schemes should be encouraged to ensure that local communities derive their fair share of benefits from such schemes.
4. Metropolitan RPBs

4.1. Where to draw the line?

When the Expert Panel decided to formalise the establishment of RPBs as a key plank in their recommendations for a new planning system, it soon became clear that it would be foolhardy to prescribe the spatial delineation of regions in metropolitan Adelaide, arguing that this was for Councils to work out amongst themselves.

As discussed in Section 2.2 above, the Panel nonetheless suggested in its final report that there could be 3-5 RPBs in the metropolitan (or Greater Adelaide) area with each RPB comprising at least 2 Councils. The legislation has subsequently proven to be less prescriptive, with the delineation of regions to be determined through the process of establishing planning agreements.

This provides Councils within metropolitan Adelaide a great deal of flexibility to develop agreements with neighbouring Councils to establish appropriate regional associations or alliances. And it will be necessary for metropolitan Councils to take the initiative in forming such alliances if they are to derive the full benefits of creating and operating RPBs.

The main constraints to establishing regions within metropolitan Adelaide are:

1. There can be no overlapping of regions. In other words, a particular spatial area can only be subject to one planning agreement and hence one RPB. If a RPB is operational in a region and the Minister wishes to set up an infrastructure scheme within that region, then it is possible (as per s163 (3) (b) or s164 (3) (b)) that the scheme could be initiated under the auspices of the RPB. Again, this would confer significant planning powers to the relevant RPB.

2. The role of Adelaide City Council remains unclear in a metropolitan regional context, although it is pertinent that the PDI Act does not prohibit or prevent Councils or entities being members of more than one planning board or RPB.

3. Perhaps the most significant constraint is the capacity of Councils to:
   a. decide on the criteria on which to base potential regional groupings;
   b. organise into functional regional groupings without encountering administrative difficulties and uncertainties;
   c. agree on suitable governance arrangements for the operation of RPBs.

The following sections discuss these constraints together with several questions/issues raised during the course of the workshop with Mayors and Chief Executives (and/or their representatives) from the Metropolitan Local Government Group.

---

5 This possibility was discussed with DPTI staff who noted that further work may be needed to clarify how an infrastructure scheme would be established and operated under such circumstances.
4.2. Criteria for regional groupings

A diverse range of criteria on which to establish planning agreements and subsequently RPBs was identified by workshop participants. These criteria are shown in Table 4.1 below alongside related criteria and potential programs that could be developed and subsequently managed by Councils in the context of a RPB.

Table 4.1: Potential criteria for regional groupings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Related Criteria</th>
<th>Potential Issues/Programs for RPBs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communities of interest</td>
<td>Contiguous areas of a distinct and recognisable nature in which more than one Council has an interest, such as: - Adelaide Park Lands - Torrens Linear Park</td>
<td>Specific programs designed to manage the future development of such areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonalities of land use</td>
<td>Contiguous areas of a dominant land use that straddles Council boundaries, such as: - forestry - viticulture - industry - residential precincts</td>
<td>Specific programs designed to manage the future development of such areas Work of precinct authorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>Light rail</td>
<td>Infrastructure schemes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Road/rail corridors</td>
<td>Supporting infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cycling/pedestrian boulevards</td>
<td>Delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State facilities</td>
<td>Planning and management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C’wealth facilities (airport)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>Coast</td>
<td>Planning for sea level rise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hills face</td>
<td>Protecting hills face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mt Lofty Ranges</td>
<td>Water management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>River/creek catchments</td>
<td>Flood management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preservation areas</td>
<td>Food security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Character preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>Resilience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Air quality</td>
<td>Adaptation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heat island effect</td>
<td>Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Floods</td>
<td>Disaster management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bushfires</td>
<td>Carbon neutrality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economies</strong></td>
<td>Combined planning functions</td>
<td>Common economic bases resource sharing/efficiencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tourism</strong></td>
<td>Tourism routes</td>
<td>Shared programs offering: information for tourists, service provision, accommodation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Political</strong></td>
<td>Council affiliations based on particular issues</td>
<td>Specific programs developed to address particular issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Opportunities</strong></td>
<td>Councils could join forces to make the most of particular opportunities that may arise from time to time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should be noted that the above list of criteria and related criteria is preliminary only and not intended to be a complete list. That said, there are many potential criteria on which to base planning agreements and establish RPBs. Much will depend on individual Council priorities and willingness to work with other Councils in addressing these priorities collaboratively.

4.3. Administrative issues

The potential to set up regional groupings and develop planning agreements that all participant Councils agree to is not without its risks however. As discussed during the workshop, there is a possibility that in the course of working towards objectives associated with a planning agreement, individual Councils may disagree on the means by which to achieve such objectives. The PDI Act does provide for planning agreements to be varied or terminated if the parties to the agreement decide as such, but it is likely that mechanisms will need to be built into planning agreements that address the possibility that Councils may disagree on particular matters.

Workshop participants also expressed concerns over the appropriate representation of community interests on RPBs. As discussed in Section 2.3.1 above, the PDI Act appears to afford parties to a planning agreement the power to determine the membership of RPBs. It follows that if a group of Councils have agreed to enter into a planning agreement, they would have the capacity under the Act to constitute a RPB subject to the membership criteria specified in Section 35(3)(b) & Section 35(4) which does not specifically limit the appointment of Council elected members.

It would be fair to say that much of this discussion was based on a concern that the PDI Act limits representation on assessment panels to one elected member only. However, a RPB has the capacity to appoint more than one assessment panel provided it is clearly specified which class of development each assessment panel is
to assess. And while assessment panels are limited to a maximum of five (5) members, the relevant RPB may also appoint deputy members who could, conceivably, be people known by participant Councils as competent representatives of local community interests.

In summary, concerns over i) the procedures to be followed in instances of disagreement between participant Councils of a RPB, and ii) the extent of individual Council representation on RPBs and assessment panels would benefit from further clarification.

4.4. Principles of governance

Workshop participants were asked to identify the principles (or values) that should form the basis of governance arrangements of RPBs. The following governance principles were noted:

- **Independence** – specifically the independence of RPBs from constituent Councils.
- **Agreement** – having a consensus approach amongst participating Councils.
- **Best interests of region** – where regional interests are generally seen as being more important than interests of individual Councils.
- **Equity of financial commitment** – fairness in resource commitment amongst participant Councils.
- **Transparency** – of decision-making to participant Councils and their communities.
- **Simplicity** – avoid complex governance arrangements that create inefficiencies.
- **No duplication** – of effort so that the work of the RPB effectively replaces work undertaken by individual Councils. Participants are particularly concerned that RPBs should not introduce another layer of bureaucracy into the planning system.

In the course of discussing these principles, several unresolved questions were raised, including:

- How does the PDI Act interface with the Local Government Act? This is especially pertinent to the establishment and use of subsidiaries under the PDI Act and how these subsidiaries might differ from those established under the Local Government Act.
- Decision making powers of RPBs? For instance, what authority would the Planning Commission have over RPBs? What is the anticipated relationship between RPBs, Councils and the State Planning Commission?
- What role is envisaged for Adelaide City Council (ACC) within a metropolitan context and how would this affect ACC’s participation in planning agreements and RPBs?

---

It is anticipated that the State Planning Commission will, as one of its first tasks, issue a practice direction that clarifies these administrative concerns.

4.5. Where to from here?

In seeking to resolve these questions and better understand the potential benefits and dis-benefits associated with the establishment and operation of planning agreements and RPBs, participants suggested that the following pieces of work would be of benefit:

1. That further examination and clarification of what planning agreements can and cannot do be undertaken.
2. That an appropriate person from interstate with experience of operating RPBs or their equivalent (most likely from either Western Australia or New South Wales) be invited to present the case for RPBs to the Metropolitan Local Government Group, LGA and DPTI.
3. That a small number of pilot RPBs be undertaken. It would be desirable for these pilots to be set up in a way that allows for the testing of various scenarios or functions that RPBs would perform. To this end, a number of participant Councils indicated their willingness to be involved in the establishment of pilot RPBs. In response, the LGA has indicated that it would work collaboratively with DPTI to progress this idea.
5. Conclusions

There can be little doubt that RPBs offer local Councils the opportunity to have a significant role in planning for the future development of their local areas. However, Council involvement in RPBs is an essential prerequisite for them to perform this role. Councils who do not participate in RPBs will have less responsibility in the new planning system despite the intent of the PDI Act to devolve planning functions and responsibilities away from the Minister/State government.

An analysis of the Expert Panel’s work demonstrates its support for a regionally based planning system as a means of moving away from polarised state-local tensions being played out in decisions on planning and development matters. The panel also believed that a regional focus would provide for improved strategic planning outcomes that better reflected regional and local interests.

Implicit within the regional approach proposed in the PDI Act is a level of autonomy for RPBs and participant Councils to create regional planning strategies and programs that are better suited to their particular local/regional environmental, economic and social circumstances.

For metropolitan Councils, there is a significant challenge involved in constituting functional planning agreements leading to the establishment and operation of RPBs. To this end, it is recommended that as a first step, the LGA work with metropolitan Councils and DPTI to establish a number of pilot planning agreements and RPBs to experience and determine how these new planning arrangements would operate to the betterment of local and regional communities across Adelaide.
6. References

- Expert Panel on Planning Reform, 2013: *What We Have Heard*, Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure, Adelaide.
4.3 Improving Efficiency

MLGG Annual Priority Report

To: Metropolitan Local Government Group
From: MLGG Executive Committee
     (LGA Contact – Lea Bacon, Senior Policy Adviser)

Financial Implications: A saving of $10,000 unallocated from Project 3: State Government Regulation.

Meeting MLGG 9 November 2016
ECM: 643947
     Attachment: 639396, 642403, 643661 643955

Recommendation

That the Metropolitan Local Government Group:

1. notes the report;
2. considers the key issues identified as State government legislative ‘red tape’ and recommends that member councils voluntarily run a check on their individual council services, internal policies and processes;
3. requests the LGA Secretariat to seek input from member councils on the Business Engagement: Techniques for councils to engage with the business community paper; and
4. requests the LGA Secretariat to seek input from member councils on the Case management approach in councils: Background paper.

Discussion

At its September 2016 meeting, the MLGG endorsed a revised 2016 Annual Priority Action Plan for Improving Efficiency. This report provides a final update on the status of the Improving Efficiency priority and makes recommendations in order to finalise the work plan. A status update for each project is attached.

Specific updates for the ‘live’ projects being led by the MLGG are summarised below.

Project 3: State government regulation

As previously noted by the MLGG, a summary of council ideas for reducing State government red tape has been submitted to the Simpler Regulation Unit, which has committed to an ongoing conversation with local government as part of their ongoing work.

The Simpler Regulation Unit has confirmed that this submission will help inform their recommendations regarding the removal of red tape and duplication from government referral, reporting and assessment processes in advance of the ‘Removing outdated legislation - Simplify Day’. Following a Cabinet submission, the Government aims to table legislative changes in Parliament on 15 November 2016.
More broadly, while the issues identified by councils through this process will inform the development of future advocacy by the LGA on behalf of members, they are not advanced enough at this stage to further develop a targeted advocacy campaign. The LGA Secretariat has assessed the issues raised by councils as ‘State government’ red tape, however many of these appear to relate predominately to council policy and internal processes. The attached summary highlights the possible ‘internal’ issues.

In short, while the LGA has initiated a positive dialogue with the State government on reducing legislative red tape, more may be done by individual councils to consider efficiencies and improvements to the back-office processes they have in place.

It is recommended that the MLGG member councils consider the key issues identified as external ‘red tape’ and voluntarily run a check on their services, internal policies and processes. Doing so will give councils, and collectively the MLGG, the information needed to effectively build a case for reducing red tape through State legislation.

**Project 4: Business engagement techniques**

Building on the model framework outlined in the LGA’s *Community Engagement Handbook: A Model Framework for leading practice in Local Government in South Australia*¹, the MLGG wanted to explore techniques for engaging specifically with the business community. Supporting councils to effectively engage with the business community will ensure that councils and business alike get the most value out of community engagement activities.

The attached *Business Engagement: Techniques for councils to engage with local businesses* paper offers information, tips and strategies for councils in South Australia to consider when engaging with businesses in their local communities. To date, it has been developed with support and feedback from the MLGG Think Tank.

The MLGG Executive Committee advised that it would be valuable to seek broader input from councils to further inform the development of this paper. It is recommended that the MLGG requests the LGA Secretariat seeks input from member councils, which will be done by way of LGA circular. A revised draft will be presented to the MLGG at their next meeting in January 2017.

**Project 5: Case management roles**

In recognition that councils can work efficiently with business looking to locate and invest/develop in metropolitan areas, the MLGG sought to consider approaches to facilitate and coordinate engagement across council departments. The attached *Case management approach in councils: Background* paper examines examples of case management roles in both local and State government nationally, and offers an approach suitable for councils in South Australia.

It is recommended that the MLGG requests the LGA Secretariat seeks input from member councils, which will be done by way of LGA circular. A revised draft will be presented to the MLGG at their next meeting in January 2017.

**Financial Implications**

A saving of $10,000 unallocated from Project 3: State Government Regulation.

---

# MLGG 2016 Improving Efficiency Action Plan – forward work plan 2016

## Projects associated with 2016-17 LGA Board Priorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Next steps and proposed end date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Shared services</td>
<td>Build an understanding of past and existing arrangements and models for shared services, collaboration and partnerships in metropolitan councils and seek out best practice.</td>
<td>A collective understanding of the extent to which shared services can deliver efficiency for councils. An estimate of the value to ratepayers across South Australia of the extent of shared service provision in the SA local government sector.</td>
<td>To be undertaken as an audit of shared services and business reviews with economic analysis of efficiency outcomes.</td>
<td>$20,000 (MLGG) This funding has been fully committed to the project. $40,000 (LGR&amp;DS)</td>
<td>An update will be provided to the MLGG at the next meeting in January 2017 End date: June 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2018 state election strategy</td>
<td>Development of a strategy to inform and educate the community about the work being undertaken by councils to deliver quality services in the most efficient way.</td>
<td>Local government sector is able to provide a consistent and cohesive message on efficiency and reform to the South Australian community during the 2018 state election.</td>
<td>To be undertaken as a sustained evidence-based campaign for greater financial autonomy for councils (rate capping, rubble royalties, community housing, waste levy, NRM levy)</td>
<td></td>
<td>An update will be provided to the MLGG at the next meeting in January 2017 End date: June 2017 State election date: 17 March 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### MLGG Improving Efficiency Action Plan – individual projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3</th>
<th>State government regulation</th>
<th>Advocate for the removal/amendment of state government regulations that are impacting on local government efficiency.</th>
<th>Development of an advocacy platform for the removal or streamlining of state government regulation to achieve greater autonomy for councils and support local government as a driver of economic development.</th>
<th>1. MLGG members to review the LGA’s submission to the Simpler Regulation Unit to voluntarily run a check on their services, internal policies and processes.</th>
<th>$10,000 (MLGG) Remains unallocated</th>
<th>Complete: no further action required pending consideration of MLGG priorities for 2017.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Business engagement techniques</td>
<td>Report to the MLGG on techniques for engaging with the business community</td>
<td>Councils are able to effectively engage with the business community on a range of issues.</td>
<td>1. LGA Secretariat to seek input from member councils by way of LGA Circular. 2. MLGG to consider a revised draft at the January 2017 meeting. 3. Circulate the endorsed report to LGA member councils.</td>
<td>Revised report to go to MLGG in January 2017  End date: January 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Case management roles</td>
<td>Investigate the existing and potential use of ‘case management’ roles within councils to assist businesses and investors to navigate regulatory processes.</td>
<td>Businesses are attracted to locate and invest/develop in metropolitan areas as a result of increased certainty and assistance through facilitating access to relevant information and coordination of decision-making across council departments.</td>
<td>1. LGA Secretariat to seek input from member councils by way of LGA Circular. 2. MLGG to consider a revised draft at the January 2017 meeting. 3. Circulate the endorsed report to LGA member councils.</td>
<td>Revised report to go to MLGG in January 2017  End date: January 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Agenda Item</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Member case studies</td>
<td>The MLGG will receive presentations on new efficiency initiatives that councils have implemented, including any lessons that can be learned from initiatives that have not been successful.</td>
<td>Facilitating best practice and continuous improvement in councils, leading to ongoing reform, efficiency and innovation. 1. No further action for 2016. Complete: no further action required pending consideration of MLGG priorities for 2017.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Summary report</td>
<td>Update MLGG on the status of the priority at the end of 2016.</td>
<td>MLGG to receive a summary report on the initiatives that have been undertaken and reported on in 2016. 1. No further action for 2016. Complete: no further action required pending consideration of MLGG priorities for 2017.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total MLGG allocation</td>
<td><strong>$20,000 (fully committed)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Local Government ideas towards red tape reduction

The following table presents a list of ideas that have been submitted to the LGA from our members in preparation for the State Government’s consultation as part of Simplify Day. They are a broad snapshot of issues identified across the sector.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ideas that may also relate to council process and policy (internal red tape)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>Duplicated signage on arterial roads.</td>
<td>Electronic signage has another sign below it in case the electronic one is not working.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste</td>
<td>Complicated process for dealing with illegal dumping in public places</td>
<td>The process to expiate persons who illegally dump rubbish should be easier, particularly with respect to not requiring significant detailed evidence (i.e. witness the illegal dumping, personal documentation in the rubbish, etc). In addition to expiations, the further requirement of offenders having to clean up the rubbish and dispose of it properly (under Council supervision) should be available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal management</td>
<td>Time taken to deal with dog attacks is significant</td>
<td>Dog attacks and the subsequent legal processes can take considerable time and resources, with legal costs often being quite significant (particularly if the dog owner appeals any Orders). Where a serious dog attack has occurred the legal process to euthanase the offending dog (or dogs) should be simpler and happen fairly quickly – particularly with respect to public safety, public expectations, and the emotion/sensitivity of the matter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Management</td>
<td>Costly process for dealing with issues of Dairy crossings / livestock crossing roads</td>
<td>Dairy crossings and the issue of livestock crossing and damaging Council roads has been an ongoing issue (i.e. public safety, etc) for many years, with there seeming to be no simple solution – despite legal advice, advice from other Councils, advice from study lecturers, and/or advice from other relevant parties. Council can expiate offending farmers for damaging public roads, however financial assistance/grant funding towards constructing underpasses would provide some support/incentive to farmers for a longer term solution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>Complicated process for dealing with abandoned vehicles</td>
<td>There is no easy way to have an abandoned vehicle (that is clearly of little or no value) taken straight to a metal recycler – it must be brought back to the Council depot first and go through the process of locating owner, serve Notices, wait however many days, then (with double handling) the car ends up at the recyclers anyway – at double the cost to Council without taking into account all the paperwork and Officer’s time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permits</td>
<td>Unclear definition of ‘permit’ across legislation</td>
<td>Explore feasibility of reducing permit requirements to improve customer experience and making it easier to do business in South Australia. A consistent definition for what a permit is. Suggest a permit review take place across local government to identify whether they should be in this format or in some other format (such as an acceptance letter).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Records management</td>
<td>Onerous requirements</td>
<td>State Records Act – too onerous, and it not properly tailored to actual risk and LG environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHS</td>
<td>Significant administrative burden of the Return to Work Act</td>
<td>Explore ways of reducing the bureaucracy and administrative burden on council and organisations without reducing impacts on safety; it’s become another audit and paper war rather than true risk management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Management</td>
<td>Onerous requirements</td>
<td>Strategic Managements Plan / Plans Required By Other Acts - too many too onerous and cutting across each other each Council should have a strategic document for all strategy and finances only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community engagement</td>
<td>Lengthy processes and/or too prescriptive</td>
<td>Community engagement - could be reduced to 15 business days for some things eg. Community Land Management Plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>Modernise process for opening and closing roads</td>
<td>Modernise processes and recognise technology tools to rationalise cumbersome processes that were designed in the 1990’s when technology wasn't available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Lack of clarity regarding commercial use of public land</td>
<td>Commercial use of community land - s200 of the Act is quite broad on this topic. Would be good to have some clarity in the Act around what commercial use means, and what is required in terms of Council approval. This is of interest particularly with recent discussions on food trucks, and could have broader implications, such as personal trainers in parks etc, and also needs to consider the application of Community Land Management Plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Unclear definition of Aboriginal heritage</td>
<td>The Act should be revised so that its clearer as to what constitutes aboriginal “significance” (the current definition appears to include “anything”) remove the offence under the act for disturbing artefacts by accident, provided a responsible approach to their management is employed, and if monitors are considered desirable, enable the use of monitors under the act but not everywhere – only where there is an acceptable high risk of exposure of significant items. The obligation for Council to employ them merely where there is a slight risk of unearthing non-significant artefacts adds a significant on-cost and delay to Council’s operations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permits</td>
<td>Permit for any hot works should be managed by risk</td>
<td>Permits for any ‘hot works’ is unreasonable to manage the perceived risk. Anything that emits sparks such as grinding and welding. A permit is required for any of this work for each day and location this occurs. This is work that we may do across our urban environment every day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Markets, Community Gardens</td>
<td>Look at approval processes to streamline and avoid duplication. Short term or one off markets should be made easier to do, or with parameters enabling without approval in limited circumstances. Likewise, community gardens. For Council land, it’s possible that both a Council permit and a development application is needed, or for particular structures.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
People wanting to start a business who don’t know if there is legislation related to what they want to do and don’t know who to ask. For example if they want to open a child care centre. Is this federal, state or local or a combination. Who do they ring to find out? This boils down to needing a single Statewide advisory service for business. Also, business ideas that are new that fall into grey zones between current legislation get passed backwards and forwards from various state and local services. There needs to be a place to go for out of the box enquiries that no one knows what to do with. Build business confidence and provide a dedicated channel to manage legislative questions, and other complex questions. Also promotes cross government coordination to support business.

Business example: The extended and costly consideration that The City of West Torrens is required to give to a simple $3,000 Stratco veranda that a business owner is seeking to have erected at a property they own.

Remove any legislation that prohibits the widespread adoption by SA Councils of electronic lodgement, processing and communication

Revising regulation/practice such that all business tenants and property owners who are council rate payers are automatically registered to vote in council elections, i.e. remove the need for these to opt-in.

Local government is legislatively required to collect the NRM Levy at the present time. However, councils are uncomfortable collecting what is essentially a state tax through their rates notices, and the LGA has written to the Government and asked for this requirement to be removed.

We are particularly concerned as the planned increases to the Levy primarily relate to administrative costs which are passed on to the Department of Environment, Water and Natural Resources. It is unfortunate that local businesses, farmers and communities across South Australia will feel the brunt of the State Government’s levy increase at the same time as a decrease in services on the ground.

We are the government closest to the community and the community is telling us that they can't afford the State Government’s levy increase. Many of our community members are mistaking increases to the levy for increased council charges, because the levy is administered through their rates. There are also hidden administrative costs to councils collecting the levy, especially in relation to non-payment and rebates. We are committed to a meaningful and lasting partnership with DEWNR and the State's NRM Boards but don’t feel that councils should be responsible for raising their funding.

Suggestion: Utilise the ESL framework to collect it, that framework is effectively our rating systems.

The LGA asks the State Government to abolish “road rubble” royalties. The 2015 State Budget introduced a 55c per tonne royalty payment on road rubble from council 'borrow pits', and the first round of payments earlier this year indicate that about $1 million per annum is likely to
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Solution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liquor Licencing</td>
<td>Limiting the Small Bar Licence to Adelaide CBD restricts economic growth and social vibrancy of other places across the State. This is an officially adopted policy position.</td>
<td>Process for the granting of small bar licences for venues in metropolitan and regional areas. Currently, a small venue licence is available in South Australia to support small businesses such as bars, restaurants, art galleries and live music venues. The small venue licence aims to provide flexibility and a new streamlined process for small venue licence applications. This is to encourage entrepreneurs to develop small businesses without the potential difficulties and costs associated with existing licences. It also aims to encourage small venues to host live music. The new licences have enabled small venues to make the Adelaide CBD a more vibrant and interesting place, as well as provided a boost to jobs growth. However, it’s important to note that this licence is only available within the central business district, thereby preventing this opportunity from being shared in other locations in the broader metropolitan area. Solution: The approval of small venue licences in specific locations in the broader metropolitan and regional centres area where the associated benefits of providing vibrancy, job growth, economic development and tourism can be shared more broadly across the city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteering</td>
<td>Duplication of appropriate checks Children’s Protection Act 1993 (SA) Volunteers in sporting and community areas are subjected to duplicate police and DCSI checks. Many volunteers have three or four volunteering roles in their community. Red tape deters volunteers and so diminishes the capacity of sporting and community organisations.</td>
<td>Solution: Single police or working with vulnerable persons clearance that applies to all volunteering organisations Introducing a “Volunteer Card” that is recognised across jurisdictions and state borders such as the Queensland “Blue Card”. Pursuing opportunities for individuals to have the option of invoicing the cost of their police check to the organisation they are volunteering for.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteering and employees</td>
<td>Unclear screening process DCSI screening and prescribed roles are still unclear. Each organisation may be coming up with its own interpretation. Further, we have attempted to obtain screenings from DCSI only to be advised that the Police clearance is still current and therefore a DCSI clearance is not needed. This is adverse to our interpretation of the legislation. More clarity would be excellent.</td>
<td>A clearer process with respect to how all Councils should deal with various matters on Crown Land could be clarified. Suggestion through a single Agency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crown Land</td>
<td>Unclear processes</td>
<td>The requirement to obtain Ministerial consent for Leasing of Crown Land under Council’s care and control can be onerous, expensive and lengthy. Given most of these parcels of land are already subject to a Community Land Management Plan, Ministerial consent would already have been sought on the use of the land. Councils are still required to seek Ministerial consent a second time on land that has already had Ministerial consent granted once if they wish to Lease that land (i.e. sporting clubs, community organisations, etc). This second consent seems unnecessary and can be costly to the affected clubs and community groups and can add many months to the process of putting a Lease in place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Suggestion</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water management</td>
<td>Suggestion one consent process</td>
<td><strong>ESCOSA reporting requirements need to be reviewed.</strong> We fall under the minor and intermediate category. We have a water reuse scheme which has been implemented primarily for the irrigation of Council reserves. We currently sell reuse water for the irrigation of 2 school ovals and 1 Civil company for dust dampening and we are still required to comply with the reporting requirements of a water retailer with up to 500 connections. The purpose for allowing the schools and Civil business to access our reuse water is for environmental reasons, but the requirements under the retail licence are becoming increasingly onerous and question the decision to on-sell to other users.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water management</td>
<td>Onerous ESCOSA requirements</td>
<td>Requirements for separate hardship policy, registration with another Ombudsman, duplicative licensing requirements – Water Retail and LG Act - duplication and confusing to community – ESCOSA use the terminology of the commercial “consumer” market and totally inflexible in their approach to a community facing organisation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Management</td>
<td>Onerous registrations</td>
<td>Review need for registrations to occur every year for SA animals in accordance with section 36 of the Dog and Cat Management Act. Could SA be brought in line with other states such as NSW’s section 71 of the Companion Animals Act 1998 which states registration can be for life?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>Delays in DPTI approvals</td>
<td>Seeking inputs and approvals from DPTI regarding road and transport related initiatives (delegated authority). Councils experience has been that DPTI may assign a liaison person and as discussions progress in relation to the project / initiative, there appears to be agreement with the direction and the related detail. Then when the initiative is distributed to the relevant staff across the organisation there are often hurdles and barriers caused by others in the chain of command who may not agree with the liaison person or require more information. This causes unnecessary delays and increased project costs. Solution: The solution would be to have the right people around the table from the start of the project who can provide clear direction as to the requirements for information or compliance to standards OR to delegate authority to the liaison person for decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>Lengthy timelines at DPTI</td>
<td>Timeliness of inputs from DPTI into Council projects and initiatives requiring their approval (Customer Service standards). Councils have often experienced significant delays in approval turn-a-round from DPTI Transport section which has resulted in no decision and need to defer projects OR significant delays to projects resulting in increased costs. Solution: clearly define customer service standards (similar to Development Assessment timeframes) so that projects can be planned around these timeframes with some certainty. And ensure that sufficient resources are provided to achieve the service levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Lengthy timelines for State Heritage approvals</td>
<td>Early engagement with an appointed liaison officer provides opportunity for resolving issues and ensuring compliance of a DA with the State Heritage Act. However, often when the application is lodged with the Authority, the assessing officer will require additional information or have a different view and this can hold up processing times. Solution: As above – delegation and service standards are needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Finance</strong></td>
<td>Rates Legislation used to provide reverse mortgages</td>
<td>Quarantine, then eliminate, the postponement of Rates Legislation that enable retirees to effectively use Council's as a provider of reverse mortgages. Banks and financial institutions are better placed to assess and undertake the administration of this risk. The potential for this to precipitate a liquidity crisis in local government is enormous given our ageing demographic and current global financial uncertainties. It is also biased toward the elderly and transfers the burden to non-retirees who may have their own financial adversities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning</strong></td>
<td>Inefficient process for re-zoning industrial land</td>
<td>Process for re-zoning industrial land to accommodate more sensitive land uses (such as residential development). Currently, the EPA requires the preparation of a Preliminary Site Investigation (PSI) where it is evident that there exists or existed potentially contaminating land uses and activities on the subject land. This may lead to specific policy as part of the DPA and/or A Detailed Site Investigation (DSI) and/or a Site Contamination Audit at the development application stage. A PSI can incur significant up-front costs for those seeking to re-zone industrial land. One possible option might be to defer those costs until the development application stage, especially where there is some certainty that the land will need to be the subject of a Site Contamination Audit. This would streamline the re-zoning process while still require remediation at the development application stage by a developer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Finance</strong></td>
<td>Duplication of audits</td>
<td>Example from one council: Auditing coordination generally of Local Government e.g. in 18 months through either internal, external, federal or state authorities we have had audits around 16 different audits we have to find a better and more coordinated and efficient way as a raft of these cross over in some way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elected Members</strong></td>
<td>Burden of briefing our requirements</td>
<td>Elector Representation Review – LG Act - remove the briefing out requirement or Councils fund ECSA to do them and make the determination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning</strong></td>
<td>Onerous Gazettal of community land amendments</td>
<td>Community Land amendments - rationalise what needs/doesn't need to be gazetted or placed in public notices. i.e. A public notice is placed into the newspaper advising that the Community Land Management Plan has been amended. Is a government gazette notice needed too?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning</strong></td>
<td>Complicated approval processes</td>
<td>Create a single point for obtaining &quot;one approval&quot; eg. Land revocation community engagement process may be acceptable in some instances negating the need to conduct Category 3 notification for a Development Application. Impact: Better connection of processes, avoids conflict between legislation, rationalises number of community engagement processes with the same people, timeliness, manages expectations and removes hypotheticals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Transport** | Councils do not have powers to manage unmade roads | The Local Government Act and Road Traffic Act do not give Councils appropriate powers to manage unmade public roads, especially in rural areas. There are many “public roads” laid out in old rural subdivisions which have never been formed, or are no longer used, and over time have been occupied by adjacent landowners. In some cases, there is remnant “public” infrastructure still in place, including culverts and bridges. While some are required/used as fire trails, many are purely used for private access or private purposes. With the increase in use of four wheel drive vehicles and motor bikes, the public are insisting on using some of these roads as “challenges” for their driving. This leads to complaints from adjacent landowners, and exposes Council to a potential liability for the use/misuse, and damages to either user's vehicles or the road and infrastructure in the road. Clearer statutory provisions need to be provided so Council can effectively close a road to all, or certain classes of vehicles, and be able to effectively enforce these provisions. Even the provisions regarding closure of public roads under the Roads (Opening and Closing) Act are unnecessarily cumbersome and reflect
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roads</th>
<th>Outdated legislation regarding private infrastructure within the road reserve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The LG Act is now out of date and unclear regarding private infrastructure within the road reserve – eg crossovers, stormwater infrastructure and other private (non-critical infrastructure) services. The current permit provisions are unclear, inconsistent, and poorly managed by Councils. As a result, LG doesn’t have clear powers over who is responsible for their management. The penalties for damage to roads are also now truly out of date and meaningless and no disincentive for contractors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change the LG Act to clarify responsibility for management of private infrastructure on public roads – eg crossovers, so that it is clear that an owner has that responsibility – or alternatively add it to Council’s responsibility and enable Councils to recover the additional costs involved.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water management</th>
<th>Onerous provisions regarding management of drainage easements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The RP Act does not give Council sufficient control over management of encroachments. High density development is resulting in crowding of allotments, leaving the drainage easement as the only open space, and residents are demanding the right to encroach. This is resulting in a massive increase in cost of accessing easements for maintenance/renewal purposes. It is also not clear as to whether an easement infers a liability to Council for management of a drainage channel merely by existence of the easement. Introduction of statutory easements over drainage infrastructure (excluding watercourses, as per the NRM Board definition) would substantially reduce Council’s future liability for access costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suggestion to change the provisions in the Local Government Act to give Councils the same statutory powers over drainage infrastructure as SA Water has over its infrastructure, i.e. remove the reliance on the RP Act for control of easements for stormwater drainage, and introduce statutory easements. Take out the obligation for Council to consider easements over natural watercourses, or flow paths except when Council has infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water management</th>
<th>Treatment of councils under the regulation of Community Wastewater Systems (CWMS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|                   | The level of regulation does not differentiate between privatised infrastructure and government infrastructure provision despite the very pertinent difference in business models. Councils are effectively treated the same as a private company in a commercial setting making healthy profits from public infrastructure provision. The regulatory scrutiny is not modified for Councils in recognition of the fact CWMS provision is undertaken on a cost recovery basis only i.e. we maintain, improve and charge costs through CWMS rates accordingly but we do not have an income generating model from such services as would a SA Power Networks for electricity distribution services to provide a reasonable rate of return to shareholders. Furthermore there are 5 entities I reported to in 2015/16 in regard CWMS: ESCOSA, Office Technical Regulator, Dept Health (SA), EPA and ABS. Frustratingly ABS required me to complete a separate survey despite same information being provided to ESCOSA. For SA regulatory regime for Council CWMS we should look toward one stop shop if possible and not the 4 or 5 separate regulatory reports. Furthermore we should have modified reporting requirements that recognise the public sector provision of CWMS as public infrastructure and not require Councils to consider matters only pertinent in a privatised environment. For example our ‘Board’ is elected Members not Shareholders and our income is only to cover cost of providing a service not to return profit to shareholders. Hold Councils accountable for sound asset management but recognise that we are distinctly different to SA Water, SAPN, ElectraNet and other privatised or semi privatised businesses providing essential infrastructure. Unfortunately this red tape effects regional
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community care</th>
<th>Licencing of Supported Residential Facilities</th>
<th>Transfer roles of councils and licencing of Supported Residential Facilities to the state government.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Disposal of community land</td>
<td>Ministerial approval is needed for councils to dispose of community land. This is inconsistent with the notion of local government being a responsible level of government and could be removed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegations</td>
<td>Authorisation frameworks not aligned between Acts</td>
<td>The basic framework around Authorisations needs to be better aligned between acts. Some acts have Authorised Persons some have Authorised Officers. Why not pick one name and keep it the same for all acts with the exception of specific roles (ie: Dog Management Officer, Fire Prevention Officer etc.). Other examples are ID cards. The Dog Management Officer ID card has to be signed by the CEO, but no other Authorised Person cards have this requirement. Some acts you have to show the ID before taking action, some you only have to show it if asked.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegations</td>
<td>Unnecessary legislation of delegation to council CEOs</td>
<td>Most legislative powers are given to ‘the Council’ who can then choose to delegate to the CEO (or other staff). Most councils seem to delegate 99% of powers to the CEO. This is a time consuming process with delegations tables running upwards of 500 pages. Delegations are then reviewed quarterly and yearly through Council. Simpler process would be for all legislative powers to be given to the CEO unless otherwise decided by the Council. This would remove the administrative burden on councils who are going to delegate most powers to the CEO anyways. Councils who don’t want to delegate to the CEO would still be able to do this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Minor works on State Heritage</td>
<td>1. Review the mandatory referral to State heritage for ALL building works on State Heritage places. Some minor works are likely to be so minor as to not have any heritage impact so why refer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. As per Development Regs –Schedule 4, Part 2, the requirement for Building Rules Consent for all State Heritage applications. We need to review the need for building referral on every development application to reduce the time unnecessarily spent. Regardless of if they contain building work or not. E.g. Painting a State listed place requires a Building Rules Consent although painting is not building work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Benefits: Reduce the current mandatory referral requirement because it adds time to the process. Benefit is increase efficiency and timeliness for applicant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Minor changes post planning consent</td>
<td>Review Regulation 47A to enable at the building consent stage, minor changes that are different to the planning consent, are able to be simply accepted without the need for a formal Development Application. 47A process gets completely abandoned and we go back to doing what we used to do – accepting minor changes at Building Rules Consent prior to issuing Development Approval. If the changes are not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Heritage Listing Housekeeping</td>
<td>Make the process easier and more streamlined for doing corrections/updates to tables and maps that are the list of heritage listed places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>Signage for Temporary Events</td>
<td>Clarify in either a DPTI guide or in regulations the circumstances when a DA is needed for temporary signage. Every time someone does an event in the Squares that includes wrap on the hoarding fencing promoting the event and/or sponsors, we need to get a DA for it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Special Events</td>
<td>For Council land, it’s possible that both a Council permit and a development application is needed, or for particular structures. A review of this whole area could streamline both need for certain permits/approvals, the circumstances in which events are consulted about, as well as actual processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Minor Structures on Heritage Places, within Historic Conservation Zones</td>
<td>Structures when not visible from the street by being behind should be exempt from need for planning approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Signage regulations need clarification</td>
<td>Review Schedule 2 of Development Regulations to amend the definition of signage to improve clarity and understanding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Land Lord Consent</td>
<td>Where a public authority issues a permit such as outdoor dining, or a small business such as for visitors or recreation in the park lands, review the need for a DA to be lodged. This needs to be reviewed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Simplify and streamline, possibly remove need</td>
<td>SOI's are the start of a DPA process. And the current SOI process sometimes requires a lot of information rather than a simple outline of the intent, as was originally intended.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Planning | Remove the need for DA’s for murals | A number of benefits to support artists, including:
  - Will save time for ACC & artist (up to 6 weeks)
  - Artist will save money (no fee to pay)
  - Fall in line with other Councils (not required in suburbs)
  - Easier connection between artist and building owners
  - Easier for artists (form is complex as it deals with many more items than is required for a simple mural – it will stop artists being scared off)
  - Artists and building owners will be more likely to act on the creation of a mural
The Development Regulations (Schedule 2) need to change. Supports City of Adelaide 2016 - 2020 Strategic Plan, under the creative
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Review with Adelaide City Council the effectiveness of the open space levy and how it is applied. This is the system by which a residential development in the City that does not provide the required amount of open space on site pays a levy to the State Government instead which is used for open space developments (it is still distributed through a central fund that ACC and others apply for) The levy is charged per dwelling and adds significantly to the cost of development and is passed on to purchasers in the sale price. There’s also the perennial upset about the $$ raised not being spent to the immediate/obvious benefit of the particular development site that the $$ came from. It is a good idea because it should reduce dwelling costs to purchasers and make the city a more competitive residential location. Therefore State Government could (1) reduce the amount or (2) change how the $$ raised are distributed or (3) change what the $$ raised are applied to so a specific localised benefit is obvious. BUT: Consideration would need to be given to its impact to big projects that have sizeable community benefits and require significant funds i.e. Park Lands Trails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>Review conflict of interest legislative changes The introduction of the conflict of interest legislative changes may not be in the best interests of the business community. The impact to boards on main streets is potentially it will deter local businesses from getting involved and being represented. The legislation change limits businesses being involved in decisions affecting their areas. The very successful Business Improvement District system that operates all around the world relies on business involvement on Boards and decision making Authorities. (80% of Board members in the UK are businesses). In Rundle Mall for example levy payers would be in conflict making decisions about Rundle Mall because they may have a conflict. If Council ever adopt a system for the City or street precincts we would be limited in who can be represented on the Board. “Conflict of Interest” provisions that are acting to unfairly/inappropriately limit consultation/deliberation and actually impede an appropriate approach to organisational governance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting</td>
<td>Annual reporting requirements vary Streamlining legislative annual reporting processes that are under different pieces of legislation. For example, environmental health and community safety team annual reporting requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Management</td>
<td>Review the Impounding Act 1920 This Act is outdated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Business engagement

Techniques for councils to engage with local business

November 2016
Context

As part of its 2016 Improving Efficiency Action Plan, the Metropolitan Local Government Group (MLGG) is exploring the opportunities for councils to get the most value out of community engagement activities. Building on the model framework outlined in the LGA’s Community Engagement Handbook: A Model Framework for leading practice in Local Government in South Australia¹, it was proposed that techniques for consulting specifically with the business community be explored.

This paper offers information, tips and strategies for councils in South Australia to consider when engaging with businesses in their local communities.

Background

Community engagement is increasingly acknowledged as a valuable way of improving the relationship between councils and their community, as well as providing a channel for community members to participate in the decisions that affect them. Recognising that local government is a significant driver of economic development, councils are becoming increasingly engaged with their local business communities.

The Community Engagement Handbook and a study by the Municipal Association of Victoria² both found that business people are sometimes considered to be ‘hard to reach’ sectors of society. While they are not traditionally disadvantaged, as is the case with other ‘hard to reach’ groups, they are considered to be time poor. It is therefore important to understand the audience, and to ask businesses when it is convenient for them to participate in consultation rather than simply when it is convenient for council. Ensuring there is value in businesses taking the time to engage will also help to encourage their participation.

However, it should not be assumed that businesses are uninterested or will not take the time to engage with council. For these reasons, specific strategies to engage with the business community are important to ensure effective communication.

1. Principles

The following principles are suggested to provide a meaningful and genuine approach to engaging with the business community. They seek to frame engagement with businesses as a proactive activity (moving away from a reactive or ‘have to do’ activity), that has a clear purpose for all parties and adds value to the issue at hand.

Keeping these principles at front of mind as engagement strategies are designed, implemented and evaluated will place councils on the front foot when interacting with business leaders.

1. **Be proactive** – seek out opportunities for meaningful engagement on relevant issues and plans, rather than just reacting to issues that arise within the community.

2. **Have purpose** – know why you are consulting and what the engagement is trying to achieve.

3. **Add value** – ensure engagement adds value to the issue and is not engagement for engagement’s sake, which can frustrate the local community.

4. **Close the loop** – always let stakeholders know how their input has been used (or why it has not) to build trust with businesses.

2. **Things to consider before engaging**

The *Community Engagement Handbook* is a large resource for councils in this area. It contains a wealth of information on how to most effectively engage with local communities. In particular, there are two areas covered in the handbook that councils should play close attention to before they attempt to engage with the business community. Councils should ask themselves:

1. What is the purpose of engagement?
   a. Why are you engaging with the community?
   b. What are they being asked to engage about?
   c. What decision-making can be influenced by the community through the engagement process?

2. What level of engagement do you wish to have? For example, do you want to:
   a. Inform;
   b. Consult;
   c. Involve;
   d. Collaborate; or
   e. Empower?

For more information and to access the handbook, please go to www.lga.sa.gov.au/engage

3. **Developing relationships with the local business community**

Effective engagement with local business people can improve the relationship of the council with the community. However, the opposite can also be true if engagement is ineffective.

Sending council employees engaged in the business/economic development space to meet local business is an important way of building these relationships. However, there are several things to consider that can help encourage a positive outcome from these meetings. The range of services provided by councils is not always clear to community members, so it is important to explain what the role of the employee is (and not just their job title). It is also important to remember that the purpose of the meeting is to build a relationship or a partnership, and businesses should be approached with that view in mind.

‘Closing the loop’ with businesses following engagement is also important – informing them how their input has been used (or why it has not) shows their input is valued. This increases the chances of them continuing to engage.
4. Strategies for engaging

There are a range of strategies for community engagement outlined in the LGA’s Community Engagement Handbook which could be adapted to reach the business community. For example, online engagement through social media can be a great tool for reaching different groups within the community. However, while online engagement can be very effective and should be used where relevant, there are also several strategies that are focused specifically on reaching business people.

4.1 Using existing networks and meetings

This involves using an existing group to reach particular members of the community who may be considered ‘hard to reach’ – in the case of business people.

Using business networks or groups can allow council to reach ‘time poor’ members of the community who may not attend or respond to other types of engagement by the council. Businesses are also an effective way of reaching other businesses. However it is important to engage with representative groups where possible – not all networks will represent the attitudes of the broader business community.

**The Purpose**

- To gain an understanding of the needs, issues and ideas of various groups in the community.
- To obtain input in planning from the broad community and achieve representative engagement.
- To further create networks and links across the community.

**Preparation**

- Make contact with a key representative of the group to arrange the meeting.
- Prepare notes, displays, information as appropriate. It may be advisable to send some information in advance to prepare meeting participants.

**Feedback**

- Give contact and project process details to enable further involvement if desired.
- Take contact details of all those who wish to be involved in the project / issue. Ensure that contact details are in the correct format for inclusion on the contact register.
- Forward any summaries or relevant outcomes of the meeting to the group contact person for distribution.
- Encourage any general feedback on the approach or project process.

---

Helpful Hints

- When joining an existing meeting, you generally need to be concise and quickly generate interest and discussion - ensure there is some interest in the topic when arranging the meeting.
- Personal contact is best to arrange the meeting. This can be followed up by a formal letter of confirmation, with details.
- It is generally best to meet in the group’s normal meeting place, even if holding a special session. People know where to go and feel comfortable.
- Do not overload people with information. Make any presentation interesting and visually appealing.
- Endeavour to be placed on the agenda as the only or main speaker for the meeting.
- Give a brief outline of the topic and why seeking people’s views, to create interest and awareness. However, spend most of the time listening.
- A more informal approach can often generate greater discussion, e.g. inviting people to talk about particular needs, issues or values.

4.2 Using informal networking events

This involves council holding business networking events such as breakfasts, lunches, or even after-work drinks. This method is a more informal way of engaging with local businesses, which can often generate greater discussion.

It also has several benefits beyond traditional consultation, with an informal event allowing businesses to network with one another as well as the council and build relationships in a less structured setting.

It is important to communicate the value of attending these events, to encourage businesses to participate.

The event can be used to better understand the issues affecting local businesses more broadly, but can also be used to highlight specific issues where the council would like input from businesses.

The Purpose

- To gain an understanding of the needs, issues and ideas of various groups in the community.
- To inform the community of ideas and initiatives council is considering/currently undertaking.
- To create networks and links across the community.
Feedback

- Provide contact details of key council officers involved in the space.
- Take contact details of all those who wish to be involved.
- Encourage participants to share their ideas and the issues affecting them.
- Encourage any general feedback on the event or council projects.
- Keep participants informed of council projects and potential outcomes from participant feedback.

Helpful Hints

- Remember the event is a more informal setting, and should not be structured like a meeting.
- Do not overload people with information. Make any presentation interesting and visually appealing.
- Most of your time should be spent listening – give a brief outline of the topic and why you are seeking people’s views to create interest and awareness, but focus on listening to the views of participants.
- Provide information for participants to contact the relevant person/people at council after the event.
- Engage personally where possible to build relationships.

4.3 Key Stakeholder Engagement

Early engagement with key stakeholders at a broader strategic level can assist councils to build relationships with their local business community. This can then assist council when issues do arise, as relationships have already been built. It can also bring existing issues to light, which can in turn inform council policy and approach to specific matters.

Interviews with key stakeholders with relevant expertise are one way of doing this, and are lengthy meetings designed to elicit relevant and specific information. The interviewer needs to have a certain level of skill to use the time effectively and get the desired information from the participant.

This technique may be of use to gain broader knowledge of the position of local business people on certain issues, and can help inform council decisions or further engagement with the community.

The Purpose

- To target specific stakeholders who have knowledge about an issue.
- To elicit detailed information and opinions on a specific issue/issues.
- To inform as well as be informed.

---

1 Department of Sustainability & Environment (Victoria) 2005, “The engagement toolkit”, p. 47

Preparation

- Identify your key stakeholders – what criteria are you basing your targets on?
  - Big employers?
  - Providing high dollar value?
  - Large landowners?
- Ensure you fully understand what information you are seeking, to focus the interview on those topics.
- Ensure you have prepared notes/questions and have a quiet place to conduct the interview.

Feedback

- Provide contact details of key officers involved in the issue.
- Provide a copy of notes to the participant where appropriate.
- Keep participants informed of responses/outcomes resulting from the engagement and their feedback.

Helpful Hints

- This technique can be time consuming, and requires skilled interviewers.
- Keep the interview on track – if you are looking for information on one specific topic, attempt to keep the participant on that topic. If you are looking for a broader range of information, try to encourage the participant from narrowing in on one issue.
- Take any supporting material on the issue that may aid the facilitation of the interview.
- Ensure there is a suitable method of recording/noting the interview to guarantee all the relevant information is captured.
Case management approach in councils

Discussion Paper
October 2016
1. Context

Local government is taking an increasing role in economic development, and councils are seeking to develop new and innovative ways of stimulating and facilitating local business in their area. This is because councils are operating in a globally competitive market, and must compete with other areas and regions to attract and retain local business.

As part of its 2016 Improving Efficiency Action Plan, the Metropolitan Local Government Group listed exploring the role of case management in councils as one of its priorities. Specifically, the aim was to:

"Investigate existing and potential use of 'case management' roles within councils to assist businesses and investigators to navigate regulatory processes."

This paper examines examples of case management roles in both local and State government nationally, and offers an approach suitable for councils in South Australia.

2. Background

Case management is a commonly used practice for government departments and organisations to facilitate both existing and potential businesses to navigate regulatory processes. The service is part of the business attraction proposition for government organisations, and local government can significantly increase the attractiveness of their area to prospective businesses by simplifying the regulatory process through case management.

Many State government departments provide different levels of support for different projects, depending on the size and complexity of the opportunity. For example, the following all offer a form of case management for prospective businesses and investors:

- the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure;
- the Department of State Development (Queensland);
- Investment Attraction South Australia; and
- Minerals Development Victoria

There are also councils in South Australia which provide similar services, though on a reduced scale, and both the City of Adelaide and Wattle Range Council provide useful examples of the role of case management in facilitating business on a local level.

While it is seemingly less common for councils to offer this service, it does have significant potential if practiced effectively.

3. A potential approach for councils

To attract and retain businesses to their local areas, councils must be aware they are operating in a globally competitive marketplace. Case management is an opportunity for councils to facilitate economic development in their region by simplifying the process for business development and working with businesses to achieve outcomes. It can improve the council’s business attraction proposition, by showing local government’s willingness to work with business rather than as a stifling regulatory body.

However, there are also challenges to the use of case management by councils. With limited resources compared to larger organisations, the services offered by council will be heavily dependent on their own capabilities – for example, the service may only be offered to development over a certain value.

It is therefore important for council to closely consider their own capabilities and what they are able to provide to businesses to ensure they do not over-promise and underachieve.

The case studies listed in this paper provide a foundation for councils to build their own case management processes upon. Several key features of case management are listed, which councils may wish to take into consideration when developing their own approach.
1. The process is designed to give businesses as single point of contact into the development process, providing assistance and guidance to the client to navigate the system as well as information about the area/site.

2. The use of a system to determine the level of support provided to a project, or whether it qualifies for case management at all, clearly defines what council will and will not offer.

3. An integrated approach to meeting the various requirements of the project, such as planning approval and operational licensing requirements ensures businesses are not delayed unnecessarily.

4. Clear lines of communication between the case manager and the relevant parties needed for approval, such as internal planning departments or outside bodies, minimises potential delays throughout the process.

5. Depending on the size of the project, council may take a more involved approach by providing support for attracting investment, acquiring grants and facilitating introductions with local companies and service providers.

While the development of this service by local government offers great potential opportunity to encourage and attract business, it must be used effectively. The service must ensure it does not simply add another layer to an already complex process, but streamlines it for business development.

4. Case studies

There are clear examples of the advantages of case management when used effectively; both in the local government sector and State government, and local areas can significantly benefit from council case management services facilitating economic development.

City of Adelaide – ‘Streamlining Live Music Regulation’

In February 2016 the Premier announced an industry-led red tape reduction review aimed at the live music industry in Adelaide. This 90 day project resulted in a paper, ‘Streamlining Live Music Regulation’, which outlined a range of different ways to improve the process.

Many different issues were raised by the industry during this 90 day period, with many having a direct impact on their ability to operate as businesses. Of these issues, several were particularly relevant in regards to case management:

- There is no clear single point of entry;
- The system is complex; and
- Pre-lodgement meetings

In relation to these issues it was recommended that the City of Adelaide commit to delivering a case management service, in liaison with Consumer and Business Services, to better facilitate the development approvals process. The function of the service is to provide:

- access to a collaborative and coordinated process to assist in preparing applications;
- guidance for proponents through the regulatory system;
- a single accountable point of contact;
- assistance in navigating the planning, building assessment and liquor licensing system; and
- an efficient and integrated approach in which planning approval is consistent with operational licensing requirements.

The desired result from providing this service is to encourage both existing and prospective venues to showcase live music in Adelaide, strengthening the local industry by offering the potential for businesses to diversify their offering. This not only increases the vibrancy of the city, but also potentially increases employment and productivity in the State. It also builds on Adelaide’s recognition as a UNESCO City of Music.

---

Wattle Range Council – The Midfield Group

In 2016 the Midfield Group, in partnership with Louis Dreyfus Company Dairy Asia Pte Ltd, announced they would construct, develop and manage a dairy processing plant in Penola, South Australia.

This announcement came after considerable work by the Wattle Range Council, which supported the development of the project through an in-depth case management process. The Midfield Group ran the project through the council planning process because of the council’s obvious commitment to the project and broader economic development.

Wattle Range was heavily involved in facilitating the development of the project, and made a concerted effort to make the process as streamlined as possible while meeting the company’s timelines. Critically, the council was involved in several areas that impacted the overall success of the project.

- Council was involved in discussions with Midfield Group from the beginning.
- The company understood the commitment of the council to the project, and council worked with them to understand their timelines and requirements. Wattle Range also facilitated a potential site visit and provided key information to the company regarding the region (power, transport corridors etc.).
- Council involved the relevant State Government departments such as DPTI, EPA etc.

By involving the key players early in the process, the council negated potential difficulties later in the referral process by keeping all relevant parties engaged.

- Council worked with its internal planning team to prioritise project applications.

This further streamlined the process by removing potential internal delays caused by a lack of communication.

In addition to their case management of the approvals process, Wattle Range also assisted the company with the writing of an application for a PIRSA grant which they were successful in obtaining.

The process was completed within the timeframes identified as ‘best case scenario’, largely due to the willingness of council to work with the Midfield Group to achieve the desired outcome and their broader case management approach to facilitate approvals in a timely manner.

This achieved a significant economic development outcome for the region, with the building of a plant creating employment opportunities and further diversifying the region’s industries.

Queensland Department of State Development – Case Management Support

Though as a state body the Department of State Development in Queensland has far more resources at its disposal than a local council, it is still useful to examine their case management process.

Case management services are provided as part of the state’s ‘project attraction and facilitation’ charter to drive economic development. However, the service is only offer to ‘approved’ projects – whether or not a project is approved depends on the type, scale and complexity of the proposed project.

The support provided through case management services includes:

- streamlining approvals and access to Queensland Government contacts;
- negotiating and identifying resources and linkages within the Queensland Government to overcome obstacles;
- identifying opportunities to progress projects including approval pathways, resource availability, site selection, workforce solutions and access to economic data and business tools;
- facilitating introductions with local companies and service providers;
- advice and assistance to attract new project investment and facilitating investment to support major projects; and
- engagement with communities, local governments and landholders across Queensland.
One case manager is appointed to each project, and it is their responsibility to provide support and advice for the project as well as directing the client to the correct departments/areas that need to be dealt with to achieve the project’s objectives.

The services provided are similar to those provided in the previous examples, but on a much larger scale.
4.4 Endorsed Activities: Precinct Planning / Cycling / Environment

MLGG Annual Priority Report
To: Metropolitan Local Government Group
From: MLGG Executive Committee
(LGA Contact – Stephen Smith, Director Policy)
Financial Implications: Nil
Meeting: MLGG 9 November 2016
ECM: 843945 Attachment: Nil

Recommendation
That the Metropolitan Local Government Group:
1. notes the report; and
2. provides a direction in relation to the preferred approach for the Energy Efficiency forum, either
   a. Proceed with an Energy Efficiency forum during the early part of 2017; or
   b. not proceed with the forum, or
   c. incorporates presentations from councils into the LGA ‘showcase’ event in April 2017 which highlight examples of energy efficiency initiatives being undertaken by councils.

Discussion
Precinct Planning
This project has been completed. A copy of the final report endorsed by the MLGG has been provided to metropolitan councils.

Cycling
Mayor David Parkin to provide an update report at the meeting.

Energy Efficiency Audit & Grant and Investment Tool Project
The MLGG Executive Committee at its 18 April 2016 meeting requested that the LGA Secretariat undertake:
- A high level audit of councils to provide an indication of the extent that they have been able to benefit from energy efficient technologies and procedures.
- An investigation into current grant and investments sources suitable to generate the upfront capital costs of funding energy efficient projects.
The LGA Secretariat developed a scope of work consistent with the MLGG request and commenced a tender process. After the evaluation of proposals received, ‘Lucid Consulting Australia’ was chosen as the preferred consultant to undertake the tasks outlined in the scope of work.

The project commenced on 11 October 2016 and is due for completion by the end of April 2017.

Energy Efficiency Workshop

At the same meeting (as above) the MLGG Executive Committee requested that the LGA Secretariat host a ‘Carbon Cities’ Forum where councils can present on their energy efficiency activities and share information and knowledge.

The LGA Secretariat recommended that the forum be held in November 2016. However, due to on-going discussions with the Premiers office regarding the willingness of the Hon. Jay Weatherill, MP to attend the event, it is likely that it will now be held in December 2016 or January 2017.

The MLGG Executive at its meeting on 17 October 2016 discussed this matter and asked the Secretariat to provide the MLGG with the following three options:

1. Proceed with an Energy Efficiency workshop during the early part of 2017;
2. Not proceed with the forum, or
3. Incorporate presentations from councils into the LGA ‘showcase’ event in April 2017 which highlight examples of energy efficiency initiatives being undertaken by councils.

Building Upgrade Finance

The Building Upgrade Finance (BUF) Mechanism represents a practical investment option for building owners to access commercial loans for energy efficiency upgrades that they will then pay back through council rates. The mechanism will be of particular advantage to councils that have commercial and industrial buildings.

It is anticipated that councils will require information on the mechanism and assistance in determining if they would benefit from opting in to the mechanism, based on the range of land uses that exist in their council areas.

The LGA and project partners (the Department of Premier and Cabinet (DPC), Department of Environment, Water and Natural Resources (DEWNR) and Adelaide City Council (ACC)) have recently commenced a project to develop a ‘BUF Value Proposition and Decision Making Tool’ to provide councils with the information required to make an informed decision.

‘G & C Sheridan Pty Ltd’ was chosen as the preferred consultant to develop the value proposition and decision making tool. The materials are expected to be available to councils by the end of March 2017.
5.1 Deferment of Election of MLGG Chairperson & Executive Committee

To: Metropolitan Local Government Group
From: MLGG Executive Committee
(LGA Contact – Lisa Teburea, Executive Director Public Affairs)
Financial Implications: (Nil)
Meeting MLGG 9 November 2016
ECM: 844359 Attachment: Extract from LGA Constitution; 615678

Recommendation

That the Metropolitan Local Government Group defers the election of the MLGG Chairperson and Executive Committee until the first meeting following the conclusion of the current election process for metropolitan representatives to the LGA Board.

Discussion

The Metropolitan Local Government Group (MLGG) is established by Part 21 of the LGA Constitution. Clause 116.3 of the LGA Constitution states that The Group must elect a chair for a period up to 12 months from its members…The Chair must be the principal member of an Ordinary member in the Group.

The current Terms of Reference for the MLGG Executive Committee states:

Membership of the Executive Committee will comprise the following:

1. Chairperson of the Metropolitan Local Government Group (MLGG);
2. Convenor of the MLGG Chief Executive Officer Committee;
3. The LGA President; and
4. Four Mayors who are members of the MLGG.

The membership of the MLGG Executive Committee will be appointed on an annual basis at the first meeting of the MLGG following the LGA’s Annual General Meeting. When appointing the Executive Committee consideration will be given to include at least one woman and one man, and at least one representative from both ‘inner’ and ‘outer’ metropolitan councils.

The Chairperson of the Metropolitan Local Government Group should be a member of the LGA Board at the time of their appointment.

Mayor Lorraine Rosenberg has been Chair of the Metropolitan Local Government Group for past years. As Mayor Rosenberg will take office as LGA President in December 2016, she is not seeking re-nomination as Chair of the MLGG.

The MLGG Executive Committee determined at its meeting held on 17 October 2016 that it would recommend to the Metropolitan Local Government Group that the election for the positions of MLGG Chairperson and MLGG Executive Committee Members be deferred until
the first meeting following the conclusion of the current election process for metropolitan representatives to the LGA Board. This election result will be known by mid-December 2016. The current Chairperson and members of the MLGG Executive Committee are happy to continue in their roles until this time.

The MLGG Executive Committee currently comprises the following members:

- Mayor Lorraine Rosenberg, Onkaparinga (LGA Board Member / Vice President) – MLGG Chairperson
- Mayor Dave Burgess, Mid Murray (LGA President)
- Mayor David Parkin, Burnside (LGA Board Member)
- Mayor Lachlan Clyne, Unley (LGA Board Member)
- Mayor Bill Spragg, Adelaide Hills (LGA Deputy Board Member)
- Mayor Karen Redman, Gawler
- Mr Matt Pears, Mitcham (Metro CEO Group Convener)

The MLGG is asked to endorse the recommendation of the MLGG Executive Committee to defer the election of a new MLGG Chairperson and Executive Committee for 2017.

Financial Implications

Nil
PART 21 - METROPOLITAN LOCAL GOVERNMENT GROUP

114. **Status of the Group**

The Metropolitan Local Government Group (*Group*) constitutes a Region for certain Ordinary Members.

115. **Support to the Group**

The LGA may continue to provide administrative support to the Group for such charge (if any) as may be agreed.

116. **Group meetings**

The Ordinary Members in the Group agree the following in relation to their meetings:

116.1 The Group must meet at least six times per year at such time and place as determined by the Chief Executive Officer.

116.2 At least 7 clear days before the date fixed for the holding of meeting of the Group, the Chief Executive Officer must send to Ordinary Members in the Group a notice of the date, time and place of the meeting and of the business to be transacted at the meeting, so far as known to the Chief Executive Officer.

116.3 The Group must elect a chair for a period up to 12 months from its members. When the chair is absent from any meeting, an acting chair for the purposes of that meeting must be elected from members present at the meeting. The chair must be the principal member of an Ordinary Member in the Group.

116.4 The Group may consider and discuss any matter affecting an Ordinary Member in the Group, and if necessary refer any matter to the Board.

116.5 The principal member and the chief executive officer of an Ordinary Member in the Group, or their respective proxies duly appointed under this clause, are entitled to attend and participate in all meetings of the Group.

116.6 An Ordinary Member in the Group has 1 vote at meetings of the Group. To avoid doubt, the Chief Executive Officer does not have a vote.

116.7 The principal member of an Ordinary Member in the Group is a voting member of the Group. That principal member may appoint a proxy authorised to vote, speak or participate on their behalf at a meeting. A proxy appointed by the principal member must be an Elected Representative or employee of the relevant Ordinary Member.

116.8 The chief executive officer of an Ordinary Member in the Group is a non-voting member of the Group. That chief executive officer may appoint a proxy authorised to speak and participate on their behalf at a meeting. A proxy appointed by the chief executive officer must be an employee of the relevant Ordinary Member.

116.9 Elected members and officers of Ordinary Members of the Group that do not fall within clause 116.5 are entitled to attend (but not vote) at meetings of the Group.
117. **Group committees**

The Group may establish sub-committees to assist it in the performance of its function. Such sub-committees will be of an advisory nature only and may comprise persons who are not elected members or officers of Ordinary Members of the Group. A person appointed as a member of a sub-committee established pursuant to this clause may themselves appoint a proxy to attend at, speak and participate on their behalf at any meeting of the sub-committee that they are unable to attend.
**METROPOLITAN LOCAL GOVERNMENT GROUP**
**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**
**TERMS OF REFERENCE**
(Approved by MLGG on 11 November 2015)

**Name of Committee**
Metropolitan Local Government Group Executive Committee

**Role**
1. To provide advice to the LGA Secretariat concerning matters under consideration by the Metropolitan Local Government Group.
2. To provide advice to the Chief Executive Officer Committee concerning matters under consideration by the Metropolitan Local Government Group.
3. To approve the LGA Secretariat’s suggested agendas for the Metropolitan Local Government Group, and suggest additional agenda items when appropriate.
4. To undertake other duties and functions as may be directed by the Metropolitan Local Government Group from time to time.

**Membership**
Membership of the Executive Committee will comprise the following:
1. Chairperson of the Metropolitan Local Government Group (MLGG);
2. Convenor of the MLGG Chief Executive Officer Committee;
3. The LGA President; and
4. Four Mayors who are members of the MLGG.

The membership of the MLGG Executive Committee will be appointed on an annual basis at the first meeting of the MLGG following the LGA’s Annual General Meeting. When appointing the Executive Committee consideration will be given to include at least one woman and one man, and at least one representative from both ‘inner’ and ‘outer’ metropolitan Councils.

The Chairperson of the Metropolitan Local Government Group should be a member of the LGA Board at the time of their appointment.

**Meeting Frequency**
The Executive Committee will meet approximately three weeks prior to each meeting of the Metropolitan Local Government Group, if required (at the discretion of the MLGG Chairperson). In lieu of a formal meeting, or to advance matters between meetings, the MLGG Chairperson or the LGA Secretariat may decide to communicate with Committee members via email, telephone or some other suitable method.

**Meeting Procedures**
1. The Committee will operate on an informal basis, and will not be subject to formal meeting procedures.
2. Agendas will be prepared for each meeting, and circulated to members in advance.
3. Detailed minutes will not be taken, but a list of agreed actions will be prepared and circulated to members after each meeting, if required and will form the report from the MLGG Chairperson to the following MLGG meeting.

**Executive Support and Implementation**
The Local Government Association will provide executive support to the Committee.

**Review**
The Committee’s Terms of Reference shall be reviewed annually, following the LGA’s Annual General Meeting each year.
INTRODUCTION

These guidelines have been developed to assist the MLGG Executive Committee to determine items to place on the MLGG agenda in line with the agreed role and responsibilities of the broader MLGG group.

The MLGG has determined that its role is to:
1. To provide advice to the LGA Board on matters affecting Local Government from a metropolitan Adelaide perspective;
2. to provide a forum for discussion of issues which are of common interest to its member Councils;
3. to achieve mutually held objectives and to address Local Government issues and opportunities relevant to metropolitan Adelaide;
4. to provide a strong representative basis for working with State and Federal governments;
5. to provide a vehicle for governments to consult, engage and negotiate on policy decisions that affect metropolitan Adelaide and its communities.

GUIDELINES FOR APPROVING MLGG AGENDA ITEMS

The MLGG Executive Committee will evaluate the relevance of any item forwarded for agenda inclusion against the following guidelines:

- The relevance of the issue to the achievement of the MLGG's responsibilities, objectives and/or schedule of priorities outlined in the MLGG Annual Priorities;
- The likely support for the consideration of the issue by metropolitan Councils;
- The degree to which the issue has relevance to metropolitan Councils as opposed to being an issue for rural and regional Councils;
- The degree to which the metropolitan response to sector wide issues will differ to the likely response from rural and regional Councils; and
- Whether the issue is “strategic” in nature as opposed to “operational”. The MLGG will strive to include strategic issues as far as is practical.
- The relevance of the issue to the achievement of the LGA’s Strategic Plan and Annual Priorities.

Note: Matters referred by Member Councils for inclusion in the MLGG Agenda would have the possible outcome of:
1. a report to MLGG with recommendation that the issue be brought to the attention of the LGA Executive Committee (metro-wide) (see attached information re: Referring MLGG Matters to the LGA Board
2. a report to MLGG with recommendation that the MLGG nominate a sub-committee to progress the issue (sub-regional)
3. advice to the initiating Council that the issue is not a matter suitable for MLGG attention (local issue)
METROPOLITAN LOCAL GOVERNMENT GROUP
THE LGA BOARD

Referring matters to the LGA Board - Reports

Reports to the LGA Board are formatted to link with the LGA’s Strategic Plan through reference to Key Result Areas and Strategies within the LGA Strategic Plan. This enables the LGA Board to continually review its Strategic Plan and to ensure its relevance to issues arising for debate and decision. To support this requirement, the MLGG’s Annual Priorities should establish links to the LGA’s Strategic Plan, Key Result Areas and Annual Priorities.

LGA Organisational Decision Making Structure

The LGA Board conducts the business between Annual and General Meetings.

Councils have the opportunity to raise issues directly with the Secretariat, through regional associations, SAROC, the Metropolitan Local Government Group and during the Annual General Meeting or General Meeting of the Association.

The LGA Secretariat, headed by the Chief Executive Officer, provides advice to and implements the decisions of the LGA Board. The LGA Secretariat does not implement the decisions of MLGG or SAROC unless these are supported by a decision of the LGA Board.
5.2 Evaluation of the Metro Cycling Strategy

LGA Business

To: Metropolitan Local Government Group
From: MLGG Executive Committee
(LGA Contact – Bethany Loates, Senior Policy Officer)
Financial Implications: Nil
Meeting: MLGG 9 November 2016
ECM: 643948 Attachment: Nil

Recommendation

That the Metropolitan Local Government Group notes the report and notes that a further report will be provided to the MLGG in March 2017.

Discussion

At the 9 September 2015 Metropolitan Local Government Group (MLGG) meeting, the Metropolitan Cycling Strategy (the Strategy) was endorsed. It was resolved at that time that a review of the Strategy’s outcomes would be undertaken after the first 12 months. This report outlines the initiatives that have been undertaken by councils that are consistent with the Strategy.

The intention of the Strategy was to create a coordinated framework for metropolitan councils to prioritise their own investment in cycling infrastructure and programs. The implementation of the strategy is dependent on the decisions made by individual councils.

Within the Strategy three key priority areas are highlighted. These priorities are:

1) identify key strategic priority routes to improve connectivity of cycling infrastructure across council boundaries;
2) grants available for the development of cycling infrastructure; and
3) encouraging children to cycle to school.

To help ensure the progression of the actions within the Strategy, it was proposed the following next steps be taken:

- the LGA, through the MLGG, was to facilitate metropolitan council involvement in the development of the State Government cycling strategy to achieve consistency between the strategies;
- the LGA to host a Cycling Forum in 2016 for councils to attend to discuss innovative and collaborative ways of increasing cycling outcomes;
- provide annual reporting to the MLGG to evaluate actions against the success indicators outlined in the strategy; and
- The LGA, through the MLGG, continue to facilitate relationships between the Way2Go program and councils.
It is understood that the State Cycling Strategy is under review and that local government will be consulted on the draft once it becomes available.

The LGA did not host a cycling forum in 2016 specifically for MLGG members. There were a number of cycling forums held in Adelaide to discuss cycling matters throughout the year in which staff and members for metropolitan councils were participating. As such, it was determined that it would be more prudent to postpone the Cycling Forum and give further consideration to a clear purpose for an MLGG Forum. This is a matter for consideration in planning for the MLGG in 2017.

An additional key measure within the Strategy was for all metropolitan councils to participate in the Way2Go program. At this point in time all metropolitan councils, barring one, are participating in the Way2Go program. It should be noted that, while the one council may not be participating, it is understood that there are three schools within the council boundaries that participate in the program.

Within the Strategy grant funding was identified as a key priority to help improve cycling infrastructure and outcomes. Since the development of the Strategy, grants for the State Bicycle Fund and the State Black Spot Program have been combined into a single program for simplicity. It is understood that the allocation of the funding has been decided; however, it has not yet been announced by the state government. It is hoped that the announcement will be made in the week leading up to the MLGG meeting.

**Cycling Connectivity Outcomes**

Cycling routes in the Strategy were identified and put into two separate categories. Category 1 routes are those routes where two or more councils have identified them as a priority and/or where the route aligned with state government priorities. Category 2 routes are those which were identified as the highest priority of one council.

A significant amount of work has been undertaken on category 1 cycling routes since the inception of the Strategy. The work undertaken is included in the table below.

Table 1. Category 1 cycling routes where either two or more council have identified and/or align with state government priorities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority cycling route</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marino Rocks Greenway</strong></td>
<td>New shared use path installed along Railway Tce from Daws Road to Sixth Av, Ascot Park (Marion)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sharrows installed on Mitchinbury Tce, Marion (Marion)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coast Park</strong></td>
<td>Council and state government endorsed designs for sections between Third Ave, Semaphore Park and Terminus St, Grange (CCS, DEWNR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Belair-City Bikeway</strong></td>
<td>Crossing signals installed at Greenhill Rd / Porter St and Cross Rd / Rugby St (DPTI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community consultation for Rugby St, Malvern and Porter St, Parkside (Unley)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Funding announced for Frome St and Frome Rd (ACC, DPTI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Norwood-Magill Bikeway</strong></td>
<td>Bike lane gap fixed on Rundle St, Kent Town (DPTI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Levels-City Bikeway</strong></td>
<td>Construction Community consultation for crossing signal at</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regency Rd / Galway Av and traffic calming Robert Av, Broadview (DPTI, PAE)

Community consultation for bike lane improvements on Galway Av (Prospect)

Construction started on Hackney Rd shared use path and new bridge over River Torrens (DPTI)

Table 2. Category 2 cycling routes identified as the highest priority of one council.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority cycling route</th>
<th>Council</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St Morris Bikeway</td>
<td>Campbelltown City Council</td>
<td>Campbelltown’s draft bike plan is currently out for consultation and the St Morris Bikeway is part of the draft plan. Consultation closes on 11 November 2016 and the results and plan will then be considered by Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-Bahn Shared Use Path</td>
<td>City of City of Tea Tree Gully</td>
<td>City of Tea Tree Gully were successful in receiving funding to re-construct the O’Bahn from Reservoir Road to Baymor Reserve, approximately 1100m of 2.5m wide hotmix path was replaced with 3.0m concrete path. The City of Tea Tree Gully also funded the construction of approximately 470m of concrete shared use path at 2.5m wide on the western side of the O’Bahn from Baymor Reserve to Grand Junction Rd.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A number of other key cycling routes and priorities are being undertaken simultaneously across the metropolitan area. A further update of cycling outcomes will be provided to the MLGG in March 2017.

Financial Implications

Nil

Attachment:

Nil
5.3 Changes to Stronger Regions Fund

LGA Business

To: Metropolitan Local Government Group
From: MLGG Executive Committee
(LGA Contact – Lisa Teburea, Executive Director Public Affairs)
Financial Implications: Nil
Meeting: MLGG 9 November 2016
ECM: 644413 Attachment: Nil.

Recommendation

That the Metropolitan Local Government Group notes the report and receives a verbal update on the ALGA position on the Building Better Regions Fund.

Discussion

The National Stronger Regions Fund (NSRF) is a Federal Government initiative which supports investment in priority economic and infrastructure projects. Funding for eligible projects must be matched on a dollar for dollar basis by the applicant or project consortium.

Three rounds of funding have been awarded since 2014 and examples of the projects in the Adelaide metropolitan that have received funding include the development of the CBD Hub in Gawler and Playford CBD Infrastructure.

During the 2016 Federal Election, the Coalition Government announced that the NSRF would become the Building Better Regions Fund and the application criteria would be amended to only include projects in regional, rural and remote Australia. The rationale for the change is that smaller projects in regional, rural and remote areas would no longer be required to compete against large metropolitan projects.

To date there have been no announcements about an additional program or funding that will be made available to metropolitan councils to access funds for priority economic and infrastructure projects, including sport and recreation facilities.

As this is a matter of interest and concern to metropolitan councils, the LGA has sought advice from ALGA about whether this issue has been raised by other state associations and any action they are taking to secure an additional federal infrastructure program for metropolitan councils.

A verbal update will be provided about any activity that ALGA is progressing at the national level.

If the MLGG would like to take further action, either in collaboration with or independently of ALGA, consideration should be given to seeking support from the LGA Board for the LGA President to write to Federal Ministers Nash and Fletcher advocating for funds to be
reinstated for metropolitan councils, additional to the funds that are available for projects in regional, rural and remote areas

**Financial Implications**

Nil
6.1 MLGG Budget Report November 2016

LGA Business

To: Metropolitan Local Government Group
From: MLGG Executive Committee
(LGA Contact – Lisa Teburea, Executive Director Public Affairs)

Financial Implications: (if no financial implications, write Nil)
Meeting MLGG 9 November 2016
ECM: 844674 Attachment: Nil.

Recommendation

That the Metropolitan Local Government Group notes the report.

Discussion

The following table provides a summary of the MLGG’s finances for the period 1 July to 30 September 2016.

Opening balance: $242,097
Closing balance: $211,029

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Explanation</th>
<th>Expenses</th>
<th>Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meeting &amp; workshop costs</td>
<td>$5,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultants</td>
<td>$9,150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Lighting Project Manager</td>
<td>$15,352</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstreet SA Campaign</td>
<td>$1,727</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>$62</td>
<td>$622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reimbursement by attending councils for cost of Metro CEO Luncheon</td>
<td></td>
<td>$622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$31,690</strong></td>
<td><strong>$622</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following outlines the 2016 projects with an approved budget allocation (refer to revised Annual Priority Action Plans). To date a total of $59,987 has been spent on the MLGG’s 2016 annual priority activities. A further $105,883 has been committed to progressing outstanding activities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Development</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Think Tank Meetings</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$4,200</td>
<td>$5,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstreet Forum</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting New Business Guidelines</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro Tourism Project</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstreet SA Campaign</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$1,727</td>
<td>$273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Efficiency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Services/Business Review</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage and Character</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$3,600</td>
<td>$3,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Planning Workshop</td>
<td>$5,550</td>
<td>$5,550</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cycling</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnside Pilot Project</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling Forum</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Precinct Planning</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,170</td>
<td>$4,560</td>
<td>$610</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment Forum</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Lighting Project Management</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$15,350</td>
<td>$64,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>$165,870</td>
<td>$59,987</td>
<td>$105,883</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Financial Implications**

Nil- All expenditure has previously been approved by the MLGG
7.1 LGA Governance Review Workshop

LGA Business
To: Metropolitan Local Government Group
From: MLGG Executive Committee
(LGA Contact – Kathy Jarrett, Executive Director, Corporate and Member Services)
Financial Implications: Nil
Meeting: MLGG 9 November 2016
ECM: 644776

Recommendation
That the Metropolitan Local Government Group:

1. notes the report; and
2. notes any further feedback provided during to the meeting to be considered as part of the LGA Governance Review.

Background
In January 2016, the Local Government Association (LGA) Board resolved to pursue a number of key initiatives including the conduct of an LGA Board Governance review.

The review encompasses various matters raised by LGA members over the last 12-18 months. In addition to the individual matters raised, the LGA Board took a strategic approach and identified the project scope as being to undertake an analysis and review of the governance framework required to enable the LGA to adequately fulfil its key functions as outlined in the LGA’s Constitution, namely:

1. to provide leadership for local government in SA;
2. to maintain key relations with the State and Commonwealth governments; and
3. to undertake appropriate business to maintain the economic health of local government in South Australia.

During the course of 2016, broad sector engagement was undertaken commencing with a President’s Forum held in April just prior to the LGA’s Ordinary General Meeting. Other workshops were held over the ensuing months with the Board, SAROC, MLGG and Regional LGA Executive Officers. Through these forums, the Sector’s feedback on a series of questions was received:

1. What should be the role, purpose and function of the LGA?
2. Who are the members of the LGA?
3. How does this new LGA engage with and respond to the needs of its diverse membership, and in particular the development of new policy?
Key areas emerging from the initial series of workshops included:

- The LGA is a facilitator of local government working together as one sector by bringing members together to develop clear policy and at the same time, representing and reflecting the different communities of interest is important.
- Strategies and structures for ‘regional’ engagement are critical.
- After engagement comes leadership and the setting of strategic direction with the LGA as facilitator.
- Putting the leadership and strategic direction into action through:
  - **Advocacy** - advocacy and representation with other levels of government, the community and other stakeholders. Strong, quick and clear advocacy, representing the different communities of interest.
  - **Advancing** - provision of specialist services and commercial activities
  - **Assisting** - provision of frontline support and assistance
- Communication is critical - closing the loop – communication back to members. All members need to know about and be able to communicate the achievements of the sector.
- Everyone in local government should “feel” like a member of the LGA.

The early consultation confirmed a consistent view was held across the Sector regarding the LGA’s purpose, that being Advocacy, Advancing and Assisting.

This purpose is already well embedded in the LGA Constitution, as well as in the suite of emerging LGA Strategic Plans.

The LGA is currently reviewing the ‘LGA Policy Manual’. This review is highlighting that in order to provide leadership and advocacy, the LGA membership needs to refresh and adopt high level policy positions that represent sector wide views and a vision for the State – from a local government perspective.

In order to develop and maintain a suite of high level policy positions that informs leadership and advocacy activity, structures that facilitate engagement across the Sector are vital – such as the existing SAROC, regional LGA’s and a much needed and reformed MLGG.

Similarly, structures that facilitate sector advancement through the provision of specialist services, commercial activities and frontline support and assistance to Councils are also vital. These structures may however be different albeit under the one LGA Governance framework.

At the September 2016 MLGG meeting, a workshop was held to discuss in detail the role and function of the MLGG, with the view to providing input to the LGAs Governance Review as to proposed future models of operation. A copy of the workshop notes are attached for information. In summary, it was agreed that the current format of MLGG was no longer adding value and that regional structures would be further explored. This included the development of criteria for the identification of regional boundaries for the metropolitan group.

**Discussion**

With the information outlined above as a backdrop, the LGA’s structure has been the topic of a second series of engagements held during August, September, October and continuing
into November. The LGA’s structure, particularly in the context of ‘Advancing’ the sector through the provision of specialist services and commercial activities was also discussed in detail as part of the LGA Schemes Review.

How do we organise ourselves? What is our structure? Who is participating? Are there different communities of interest which need recognition and separate representation? How do we ensure that the different communities of interest have a VOICE? These are/were the questions posed, and some consistent suggestions are emerging:

- Annual and ordinary general meetings and showcases are key engagement mechanisms, bringing mayors, elected members and professionals together to debate and set high level policy positions that represent regional and sector wide views, with a vision for the State.
- A Representative Council (as distinct from a board) determining/defining policy detail, with LGA Secretariat translating this detail into a Policy Manual, which in turn informs the LGA Annual Business Plan and other organisational planning documents.
- South Australian Regional Organisations of Councils (SAROC) is working well. It provides opportunity for regional councils to support each other, and is a good filter for the Board. It should remain as currently structured albeit with some improvements to how it works.
- Regional LGA’s to continue, but with a review of their current constituencies / boundaries.
- Metropolitan Local Government Group (MLGG) to take a ‘regional’ approach similar to that adopted by SAROC.
- Criteria should be developed to assist members to identify regional boundaries (including within metropolitan Adelaide) based on communities of interest.
- The unique role and function of Adelaide City Council to be recognised/considered in terms of metropolitan regions and Governing Council representation.
- A professional advisory group(s), ensuring the voice of local government’s workforce and other professional advisors have avenues for input.
- An Executive Committee (or Board) appointed by the Representative Council providing oversight of the Secretariat’s operations.
- An LGA Audit Committee in its current form to continue.
- Consideration of a commercial enterprise board (perhaps a public corporation), providing oversight of the provision of specialist services and commercial activities.

**MLGG Workshop**

As mentioned above, engagement on the different structures that may be adopted for the LGA is currently underway. To date, 3 sessions have been held for metropolitan councils with a total of 20 participants. The sessions are structured around feedback received to date, utilising a draft schematic for an LGA structure to prompt discussion.

It is intended that during the MLGG meeting, the schematic will be presented to seek further feedback from metropolitan councils on:

- The overall structure and how and whether it meets the needs of the Sector.
The structure of the MLGG within the overall structure. In this regard, the workshop will explore criteria to assist in defining metropolitan regional boundaries, and then apply that criteria to identify possible metropolitan regions.

Ted Byrt, who has attended all workshops held to date to assist with the review will be in attendance to facilitate the session.

Next Steps
Following this current round of engagement:

- A report outlining options for MLGG purpose, structures and operational and funding arrangements will be presented to the January MLGG meeting for review. This structure may then be trialled for a period of time to ensure it is fit for purpose.

- For the overall Governance Review, a Leadership Group comprising Mayors and CEOs from both regional and metropolitan, large and small councils will review the feedback received in detail, and refine the overall structure further. This will draw on the feedback and approaches discussed by MLGG and SAROC (including Regional LGAs).

- Input will be sought from experts in corporate governance to ensure that the LGAs structure is considered from both representational and contemporary corporate governance aspects.

- A further round of sector wide engagement will take place during February concerning a proposed structure, inclusive of key constitutional provisions that outline respective powers and decision making authority. This engagement will encompass engagement with the Minister for Local Government.

- Finalise draft Constitution based on feedback received. Present revised LGA structure and associated Constitution to April 2017 Ordinary General Meeting for adoption together with recommended transitional arrangements.

- During the period May 2017 – November 2018 progressively implement transitional arrangements as necessary.

- Post November 2018 Local Government General Election, full implementation of new governance arrangements.

Financial and Resource Implications

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